

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2011**

APPROVED 03-18-2011

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Robert Horcajo, Chair, at 1:00 p.m. Friday, January 21, 2011, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

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

Mr. Robert Horcajo: Good afternoon everybody. Chair would like to call the meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency to order, January 21, 1:00 p.m. Thank you all for coming and Happy New Year! We haven't said that within the past 21 days I guess.

B. INTRODUCTION OF NEW PLANNING DIRECTOR WILLIAM SPENCE AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR MICHELE McLEAN

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, first on our agenda is the introduction of our new Planning Director William Spence and Deputy Director Michele McLean. Sorry, we didn't have any budget money in our budget for leis. But thank you for coming and I think we all appreciate your, I guess, you folks are willing to work for the public again. Do you folks have any comments to make?

Mr. William Spence: If you don't know me, I'm Will Spence. I'm the Planning Director. I'm just looking forward to working with the MRA and all the issues that everybody's dealing with. I just want staff that will help with everything. You know, we've got to run off to another meeting, but, you know, we definitely want to keep all the lines of communications open and work with everybody just as well as we can.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you. Michele?

Ms. Michele McLean: I really don't have anything additional, but, yeah, we're here to support you so please – working with whatever different resources the department has – please reach out and continue with your mission. It's fantastic. We're really supportive of it.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, thank you very much and thank you for coming.

Mr. Spence: Thank you. You don't have a quorum.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we do have a quorum. In fact, I just realized I forgot to say that we have a quorum. We have five members.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Spence: Different from every other board.

Mr. Horcajo: Yes.

Mr. Spence: I'm learning a lot.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, we have five. And for everybody's information, Ray Phillips has resigned. His term was due to expire in March of this year, but for health reasons he decided to resign. So his seat will be replaced hopefully sometime in April. So we have four active board members and we have three to be a quorum. Okay. So for the record, present we have our Vice-Chair Katharine Popenuk, Alexa Basinger, Warren Suzuki and myself the Chair. And we have our staff Erin Wade from Planning, Leilani Ramoran from Planning, and our Corporation Counsel James Giroux.

C. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Mr. Horcajo: So second on, or third on the agenda is public testimony. The Chair will open the floor to public testimony. You have an opportunity to testify on any agenda item at this time or when the agenda item does come up. We also have a sign up sheet probably on that desk there. So if somebody wants to testify at this point in time please step to the podium, identify yourself. If you represent a group, identify the group you represent. Leilani, at two minutes and thirty seconds will tell you it's two minutes and thirty seconds. And at three minutes I'll ask you to conclude your testimony. Alright, first on the public testimony sign up sheet is Yuki Lei Sugimura, representing Malama Wailuku.

Ms. Yuki Lei Sugimura: What a nice surprise to have Will and Michele come and visit. My name is Yuki Lei Sugimura, and I'm here to just kind of talk about an update – because know it's on the agenda – Malama Wailuku project that which, you know, we did the banners in Wailuku town. That was one of the aspects of our project. And the other thing that we did was we did the historic walking tour, the brochure, the actual brochure that we printed 25,000 of them, and we reprinted Barbara Long's brochure. And what we're doing now is the phase II, and I just wanted to bring that up, is we're doing a walking tour online so that people all around the world can pull up the map as you see it on the MRA website. And we'll have it online so that people can actually come to Maui and using GPS be able to walk to the site, click on that, and to get the historic information. So we're trying to figuring out how to do without having to hire people. That is the expense part. So this is something that I'm working on right now. I've talked to Teena Rasmussen, the new Economic Development Coordinator for Mayor Arakawa's administration. So that's one thing, and I'll keep you apprized of that.

The other thing, Wailuku First Friday, I think I'll give you a little bit of where we are for Wailuku First Friday. I don't see Teri here. We are doing an "I Love Wailuku" project for

APPROVED 03-18-2011

February 4th, and having entertainment and all of that. But prior to that we're doing – this is all our goal for that whole project is to keep Wailuku's name out in the universe. So besides marketing Wailuku, I think successfully our event has grown every month, so we're very pleased of where we are. We're going to do an "I Love Wailuku" video contest and have three minute videos produced that go online and post it on You Tube. So hopefully what will happen is we'll get more exposure for Wailuku. And the final product, hopefully, is, it's going to have more than Wailuku First Friday. It has to be about Wailuku. I talked with Maui Visitors Bureau and asked if possibly the finish product could be taken online, I mean, on the road with them when they promote Hawaii and try to bring visitors here. So Terrill was very honest. She said depends on the final product. So it cannot be only about Wailuku First Friday. So I'm trying to make as broad as possible, and the finish product may not even be what they want, but we're trying. That's kind of something exciting that I think falls within what we try to do as an MRA.

And the last thing that I want to bring up in general is a Malama Wailuku booklet that I want to produce. And the booklet then would have information just about things about Wailuku in general, things about what I just talked about in general, but have something so that we can give it out to the merchants or different people who get asked information about Wailuku that may or may not have it at their finger tips. So included in this is I would like to include information about the MRA. I think it's a very valuable tool for people who live in the commercial core of Wailuku, or even for people who want to develop and do things. But very general and we can refer them to your website. But these are projects that – that's a project that I would like to do this year.

Ms. Perreira: Chair, point of clarification. . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Did I hear the two minutes, thirty-second or I missed it? I'm sorry.

Mr. Warren Suzuki: You missed it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, can you conclude your testimony?

Ms. Sugimura: I'm done.

Mr. Horcajo: You're done. Alright. Thank you very much. Any questions for the testifier?

Mr. Suzuki: Yuki, I have a couple of questions. So, Malama Wailuku is the one that puts on the First Friday?

Ms. Sugimura: No.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, who puts on First Friday?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Sugimura: Wailuku Community Association and Tri-Isle RC&D. They're non profit. I'm sorry, I looked around, I said, Teri is not here so I'll give a report.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Suzuki: So, but then at the same time, Malama Wailuku is involved in First Friday?

Ms. Sugimura: Not really. No.

Mr. Suzuki: So when you spoke about trying to make it a bigger event and all that, you're not speaking on behalf of Malama Wailuku.

Ms. Sugimura: That's when I turned around, I said Teri is not here with Wailuku Community Association.

Mr. Horcajo: So Yuki maybe if you can explain to the board here your affiliation with First Friday.

Ms. Sugimura: Okay. So, I'm sorry, I snuck that in, in relationship to I'll tell you about all the different things going on and Teri wasn't here. So Teri is the President of Wailuku Community Association. And Wailuku Community Association along – there's a committee of us, we basically meet every month and we drive the event and we get out, you know, we try to network, so it's a completely separate organization than Malama Wailuku.

Mr. Suzuki: Right. So, as you clarified, Wailuku Community Association together with Tri-Isle RC&D are the two entities that put together First Friday.

Ms. Sugimura: Administratively, yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: The other question is Malama Wailuku gets funding from the County? Where the funding come for Malama Wailuku?

Ms. Sugimura: The Malama Wailuku project receive –. The only time I've received – the project that we did under Malama Wailuku is the banners which you were involved in, and OED was involved in, and Tri-Isle RC&D.

Mr. Suzuki: But it's County of Maui funding?

Ms. Sugimura: It receives some County of Maui funding. Correct.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, thank you.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for Yuki Lei? Thank you very much. Any other public testimony at that point in time? Alright, so the Chair will close this portion, I guess, this agenda item. We have no public hearing so item E is a workshop, and it was suggested at last month's meeting that the parties involved with the parking structure update the members and the public as to the history. So I guess Morgan is going to lead – Morgan and Erin will I guess – then I'm going to have public testimony and then the board, we can ask questions of the presenters. Okay, Morgan you've got the floor. Again, identify yourself.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS (none)

E. WORKSHOP

Presentation by Morgan Gerdel, AIA, Parking Structure Coordinator, on the history and status to present day of the Wailuku Municipal Parking Structure. The Board may provide its comments on the information presented. A discussion on the MRA's role in the process of the development of the parking structure, and other issues related to the design and construction process to follow the presentation.

Mr. J. Morgan Gerdel: Aloha Chair and MRA members. My name is Morgan Gerdel and I'm with Nishikawa Architects, serving as the project coordinator for the Municipal Parking Structure project. And I'm here today to just give an overview of the work done to date just to bring you up to speed of what has been happening.

Can everyone see that okay? Okay. This is a rendering from the 2004 Master Plan for the Parking Structure by Chris Hart & Partners. Just to give you a little bit of an idea of what that looks like. That was looking from Market up to the proposed Pili Street for the option PC-1 design.

So the redevelopment of the Wailuku Municipal Parking Lot, the property was originally acquired by the County as a central parking area in the 1960s. And it's central location is kind of ideal because it's nearly all of the downtown Wailuku is within a quarter mile radius so it's a short walk, maybe a five minute walk. And that slide kind of illustrates that area extends into Happy Valley and close to the County Building, so almost all the commercial areas are within that radius. And the other opportunity is there's a frontage along Vineyard Street which is a place where activity generating use could be developed.

We're looking at developing a public parking supply for the community because the existing lots are substandard and irregularly shaped. It's really hard for people to provide the onsite parking on their developments and there's a high cost associated with doing the onsite

APPROVED 03-18-2011

parking. So that can be a deterrent as people want to redevelop the surrounding area. And we're also looking at doing better management of the existing on and off street parking to free up more spaces which will help both with the perception, the actual, just finding a space in Wailuku. And we're working on the design and the construction of a multi-level parking structure, and it's an opportunity to link to some other modes of transportation, whether it's bicycling, walking, possibly a connection to a close by bus stop. It's an infrastructure investment in Wailuku which can help give developers more confidence in investing in Wailuku. And by promoting parking in a central area, it can promote walking in the downtown. And a lot of studies have shown that walkable neighborhoods are actually increase life expectancy and make everyone healthier so that's a plus.

This is some of the earlier planning that was done for the parking structure. In December 2000, the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan was prepared to update the 1991 Wailuku Redevelopment Plan by the County of Maui, Planning Department. The plan calls for the redevelopment of the Wailuku Municipal Parking lot site to provide additional parking along with other mixed land uses. In 2001, a survey of parking lot users was completed by Qmark Research and Polling, but it does need to be updated to show how the lot is currently used. At that time the County of Maui also contracted with Chris Hart & Partners to develop a master plan for the redevelopment of this site. In 2004, the master plan of the municipal parking lot was completed. And based on community input from a variety of stakeholders, the MRA voted to recommend implementation of the option PC-1 which was a fourth version that came out of the three initial versions that were presented. In January 2004, there was also a parking needs study completed as an update to the 1990 future parking needs projection. This study determined that approximately 270 additional public stalls may be needed to meet future development needs, and the study stated that may require a parking structure of approximately 460 stalls. And then in April of 2008, a group of stakeholders identified the next steps for the parking structure project. The participants included Mayor Tavares, Council member Mike Victorino, MRA representatives, the Wailuku Main Street Association/Tri-Isle Main Street Resource Center representatives, Wailuku Community Association representatives, Chris Hart & Partners, and County Planning and Department representatives. The steps they looked at as far as the next phase would be getting the administration and Council support for the project, adopting a resolution and design criteria for it, hiring a project manager, finalizing the conceptual design and securing the project funding.

So now I'm just going to go over a little of the design details for the option PC-1. It's a four level structure. I have it highlighted in tan on the plan. And it re-establishes Pili Street which is highlighted with the green arrow, and it maintains the existing pedestrian connections as exits for the structure. And this structure provides 363 stalls within the structure itself, and 26 stalls on grade around it along Pili Street and parallel to Market Street.

Mr. Suzuki: Question Morgan.

Mr. Gerdel: Yes?

Mr. Suzuki: Pili Street is – the upper portion of Pili Street – so the mauka portion is the Church Street? It goes up to Church Street and that's it?

Mr. Gerdel: That's correct. Yes. The other consideration of the design was preserving about 20,000 square feet along Vineyard Street, and that could be an opportunity for creating some mixed use development in the future to allow, to generate, more activity in the area and to allow the area to redevelop. This particular scheme it's tucked into the building envelope of the building's to the mauka and makai of the structure. So it maintains the visual corridors looking up Pili Street towards Lao Valley and then also looking down towards the Pacific Ocean. And then January 2004, the MRA voted to approve the scheme. I guess as an update to the scheme some of what I've been working on is getting comments from stakeholders to review this design and contribute additional feedback that can help moving forward with the conceptual design process.

One item that was brought up as a priority was to use energy efficient features such as lighting, and that's going to reduce the operating costs. And also there's a lot of discussion about allowing for daylight, to allow light into the structure to make it feel more open and not require artificial lighting. Renewable energy options were a priority for a lot of the stakeholders. It could be roof top photo voltaic panels. It could also be that ties into electrical vehicle charging stations in the structure. And then sustainable features were another priority. There's discussion on making a LEED certifiable design. It may not become LEED certified but at least the design intent would follow that rating system. And then if there's funding in place available for that, that would be an option for the County. Other sustainable features would be looking at how it connects to the Maui Bus system, whether it's a nearby stop. And then also bicycle storage within, or close to the structure itself that can reduce traffic and the number of cars using the structure. And then there's also some architectural features that were mentioned as important. They wanted us to look at additional level. It could be a four or five level structure. Currently the design is looking at the use of the 20,000 square feet as additional on grade parking, but it doesn't necessarily mean that there could another project, separate from this one, that creates additional use. And then the structure itself has to comply with the MRA guidelines so the architectural treatment would fall within those guidelines.

These are some of the tasks that we have been working on for the current planning of the project. We've updated the design criteria to give to the design consultant. And Nishikawa Architects has met with a lot of stakeholders. We met with the Mayor, County Council members, the Wailuku Main Street Association, the Wailuku Community Association and several interested property owners. The Wailuku, I guess, earlier this year the Wailuku

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Market Base Plan was completed and that identified a number of parking related recommendations. For short term goals, one would be to undertake a parking management plan, also to re-stripe the parking lot to accommodate additional spaces, and initiate paid parking for 12-hour spaces in the central lot. Some mid-term goals they discussed in that plan was to build a parking structure and create a parking district where the funds could be used for other projects. And then long term goals were transportation demand management policies that would reduce the vehicle use which could free up parking spaces. And then looking at additional satellite parking for future needs.

Right now the conceptual design of the parking structure has started. It started at the beginning of this month. The consultant team, Allison & Ide Structural Engineers is the prime. Media Five Ltd is the architect. Wilson Okamoto is doing the traffic engineering. And Chris Hart & Partners is helping with the planning. Also starting this month, I'm going to be working with Andy Miller with Downtown Parking and Planning Associates to do a parking management plan. And then also with this plan, the interim parking required during the construction of the structure will be addressed and incorporated.

These are some of the major components of the parking management plan. We're going to be looking at the parking supply, the existing parking supply, the demand and the utilization of how the parking is used now. And we're going to be doing a user survey and also a mapping of how parking is used now. We're also going to look at the parking management operations regulations ways the parking management can change to better serve Wailuku. Third we'll look at the parking revenue budget and finances, how this could be an opportunity for an organization like the MRA where parking revenue can come back to Wailuku to provide a benefit. And then how that ties in with the parking enforcement program and policies to make Wailuku a welcoming place and people enjoy parking there and it's not a chore.

I was actually hoping these wouldn't come up all at once, but I'll go through it. This is the design and planning time line for the parking structure. I've broken it into different areas of work. The first row has to do with the design of the structure itself. From January to April, they're going to be working on the preliminary plans and studies for the structure, and they're looking at doing an MRA presentation in May 2011. And there may also be a public information meeting, possibly evening, to allow more people to see the design and comment on it. And then right now we're looking at the possibility of getting MRA approval in June 2011. And that would allow for the construction plans to start in July, and those construction plans would run from July 2011 to January 2012. And from there, the permit process could begin. Right now, it's predicted to be about six month permit process for the structure.

In the second row, it's outlining the tasks for the EA submittal. Starting that concurrently with the design of the structure and looking at getting a draft EA to the Department of

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Public Works in June 2011. That would allow publishing the draft EA in July and the final EA could be prepared between August and November 2011. And they're looking at the final EA to be published at the end of 2011.

And the third row is related to the parking management plan which will also run during this time. During January and February we're going to be gathering info as far as the mapping and surveying for the plan. And then in March and April of 2011 we create a presentation to, of the draft parking management plan. And that would allow for the final plan to be published in May 2011. And I guess we'll have to work together with the County but the review and approval of the recommendations in the plan could be from the summer to the fall and possibly the plan can be implemented in 2012. There maybe ordinances that need to be changed or other aspects to that.

This is a just a little bit about the project funding. Right now it's planned for inclusion in the capital improvement plan for fiscal year 2012. Support of the Mayor and Council members will be key as far as getting the funding and making sure it stays within, or it's allocated in the budget. And community base support will help the funding process if we can get everyone in Wailuku behind the project. It will help it a lot.

And this is just the overview of the bidding and the construction time line. They're looking at advertizing for bids in August 2012 to September 2012. And the bidding evaluation would flow through to October where they would, the contract will be processed and approved. And then that would allow the notice to proceed in December 2012. So the eventual construction would be starting in February 2013 and it could be a 12 to 18 month process depending on the design. But the latest, or the projected latest right now would be August 2014 to complete the project.

And this is just a breakdown of how the project is organized. The Department of Planning is managing the Nishikawa Architects contract for the project coordinator, and the parking management consultant is under our contract. And then Department of Public Works is handling the parking structure design consultant, construction manager and the contractor under them.

And this the appendix of some of the sources used for the presentation, but I can open it up for any questions.

Mr. Horcajo: The Chair would like to open up the floor to public testimony on your presentation first.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, is there any member of the public who wants to offer testimony on

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Gerdel's presentation at this point in time? And please be reminded that your questions should be directed to us and undoubtedly we take good notes. And when we get to our time to ask questions, we'll ask Morgan and whoever else. Mr. MacPherson go ahead.

Mr. Howard MacPherson: Hi. I'm Howard MacPherson. I just have one question. Morgan mentioned that there's a possible fifth level. Are we still – are you still being constrained by the 45-foot height maximum on the project?

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any questions for the testifier? Any other public testimony at this point in time?

Ms. Sugimura: I'm Yuki Sugimura. So I have a question. For this fiscal year budget which is coming up, how much is in the budget, what is it for and what kind of support can we give to make that happen? It's kind of a critical time.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for the testifier? Any other public testimony?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira. Wailuku Main Street Association. We do have some things that I guess perhaps we'll speak to Mr. Gerdel about because as mentioned before the MRA he cited the Qmark study and the Qmark study was reputed and disputed by the MRA. So we want to make sure that that gets clarified. I do think that you should also have the extensive work that led to the 2000 effort because that's pretty much where we're at with the same thing today pretty much. We are very pleased with the report Morgan, and especially pleased that to see which was kind of our objective in the first place that this would be considered a County infrastructure project and that it's going to be handled under the Department of Public Works because I think that there's going to be very – it's going to be much easier to get the kind of support from the Council and even the Mayor to move this project forward because of that. And I think that all the entities that have stayed together to try to bring this to this point will be the very same entities that will be encouraging, and I believe the funding, in our view point is the funding will be placed in the Public Works. We just don't know how much, and we know Wendy Taomoto probably has that. Because some of that questions, we have some of the same questions. So we stand ready to be supportive on this. Move this forward. It is the completion and the culmination of decades of hard work, and we are glad to see it brought to this point. And I do want to forget people who have worked in partnership, your predecessors and even people in the Planning Department like John Summers and so on and sort forth, and all the other people that have had a large, a large part, assisted to bring it to this point. So thank you very, very much.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you Jocelyn. Any questions for Jocelyn? Okay, any other public testimony? Alright, the Chair will close this portion of the workshop, I guess. Morgan, you

APPROVED 03-18-2011

want to get back up? So members? Alexa?

Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger: Great presentation Morgan, and what we've been waiting for.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay. Good.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Synced. Great. Terrific. Thank you so much. I have no questions.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Katharine Popenuk: Yeah, I was wondering how well the MRA be allowed to contribute ideas, or will we be allowed to contribute ideas to the design development? At what stage can we offer input?

Mr. Gerdel: Okay. I think the first time would be the presentation of the conceptual plans in May. And I think it will be an early enough stage where the comments can still be incorporated. The construction drawings won't be that far along.

Ms. Popenuk: I was also wondering about the PV, the photo voltaic, on the roof. Would that displace potential parking if you had PV on the roof?

Mr. Gerdel: Yeah, I don't think it's been looked at in that in-depth yet. I think it's an option they're considering but there would have to be funding to do the PV system. I know there are some where, I think, cantilevers, so there's a small structure that attaches to it.

Ms. Popenuk: I was just wondering – I would someone to consider that, the trade off of losing parking at, or getting PV at the expense of losing parking. You know, does that make sense or . . . (inaudible) . . .? And also about the LEED certification. Of course we want it to be an environmentally responsible project, would LEED certification open up any other funding sources?

Mr. Gerdel: I'd have to do research on that, but sure.

Ms. Popenuk: Because it actually costs a lot –

Mr. Gerdel: Right. It does.

Ms. Popenuk: – to become LEED certified, as well as expenses involved in there. And I noticed on the parking structure design, option PC-1, I noticed that there's an access lane that's not on Market Street, but to the Lao Valley side of Market Street. Is that private property or has that been acquired or what's the status on that?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Gerdel: I think right now the access to Main Street is on private property so they may not have that access in the design, depending on –. I don't think the designers were looking at the access currently.

Ms. Popenuk: So that hasn't been acquired or anything?

Mr. Gerdel: No. That has not been acquired.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Gerdel: I'm sorry, which?

Ms. Popenuk: That one right there.

Mr. Joseph Alueta: She's talking of Main Street.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, off of Main Street. I guess that's by the Joslin –

Mr. Horcajo: It's between the Promenade and that building.

Mr. Gerdel: Yeah, that has not been acquired.

Ms. Popenuk: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Warren? I'm sorry.

Ms. Popenuk: And then I guess the last thing I'd like to put my two cents in for like mixed use even within the parking structure on the ground level of the perimeter or something possibly. I actually participated in the charrettes years ago and I remembered there was one concept that thought to use that alley way. If you do gain that access through Joslin, the Promenade or whatever that building is called, sorry, and that alley is created, there was discussion about having life on both sides of that alley way instead of just the noses of cars in the backs of buildings. So something to enliven that area as well, even if it was pedestrian only.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay.

Ms. Popenuk: So that's it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, Warren before you ask your questions, I wanted to have Erin respond to Katharine's first question about the participation by the MRA. I noticed you had a slide up there, Erin, maybe you want to spend some time talking about?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Erin Wade: One of the things that was put on your agenda today was to talk exactly about the MRA's role would be given a projected fiscal year '12 presentation, or fiscal year '12 budget proposal. So essentially there's three components of the project that would get MRA review. The first is the design of the parking structure. The second is the parking management plan. And the third is the environmental assessment. I just did really basic slides quickly so you folks could get an understanding because the way it is mapped out now is the critical path to achieving a fiscal year '12 CIP allocation. If any of these components change, it likely changes the year that it gets allocated for CIP. So at this point what would be expected is that you folks would get a 60% conceptual design in May, and that's generally what we see anyway at MRA. We will never see a 100% construction drawings. We see the conceptual. And that on May 19th, the Thursday – right now it's right before furlough Friday. I don't know if that will be in future but on May 19th of that evening there would be a community meeting that would be hosted by the MRA and the public would be invited to comment. If need be, the consultant team has offered to have a follow up meeting on Friday to further discuss the components of the design. And then in June 2011, they have offered an opportunity to have an additional meeting at the beginning of June. However, to meet the fiscal year '12 CIP budget, they would need a decision of approval in June on the design of the parking structure. Now this is important to understand because you do have a lot of elements. These are the elements that we review in the MRA design review for interior and exterior of structure. And I'll give you folks a copy of this.

And then the second component is the parking management plan which Morgan had said would probably get to see it in the Spring. We should have a really good idea of what that's include by June in the parking management plan. Public Works Department is the accepting authority of all of these elements.

But the third is the EA. And the reason that I wanted to bring this to your attention is basically because of the way the Kahawai Housing approval went where you folks reserved – you approved the variances but you reserved the design approval until after the EA is complete. Well that would be the same process that this would be following where we would be looking for, or the consultant team and the Public Works Department would be seeking design approval from you prior to the finalization of the EA. Because as they've said the EA will not be finalized until the winter of 2011. So just for your awareness then because an EA is required, the MRA will be a commenting agency because it's an affected agency and that will held at a public meeting. You will get public input. We'll give our comments back to the consultant team and Public Works Department. They will do their 30-day requirements. And then Public Works is the accepting authority. But it does, as you most of you folks know, it does have to follow a certain time procedure of the EA. So I wanted to put this together so you basically understood the ramifications of the critical path and what your role is in it and the expectation of a sign off in June to move forward for fiscal year '12.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: You folks have any questions for Erin at this point in time?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I do. So Erin just to clarify on our meeting of June 17th, that is the day that they're looking for our final approval?

Ms. Wade: Yes. Let me confirm. We've got multiple members of the team here. Joe Alueta is the project manager. We have Wendy Taomoto, the CIP coordinator, and Mike Summers from the design team. Okay, and he left. What I'm sharing is accurate as far as you understand? Yeah. In order to meet the fiscal year '12 deadline. So that is what we wanted to know is if you are uncomfortable with the schedule, we do need to adjust then and plan for fiscal year '13 instead.

Ms. Wendy Taomoto: If you need me to – I'm Wendy Taomoto, CIP County Coordinator. If you need me to explain what the, you know, in general what the fiscal year '13 capital budget appropriation would mean to this project, I can do that. But the earliest opportunity for this project to be accepted by the Mayor and the Council is the fiscal year '12 budget. It's not – we're not in an ideal point in the project to present this to the Mayor or the Council, but it will be presented for Mayor's consideration to be included in his proposed budget. And also Council, of course, knows about this project so they could also discuss it during the budget deliberations if he does not include it. But I can do it either now or when we do our presentation in May.

I just wanted to clarify one thing that Erin said that may not be 100% of what I think you may expect on the 60% conceptual design which is what you guys may be calling the plan that you have been reviewing. Our structural engineer's definition of the 60% is a different level. It's more nuts and bolts. So what you will be getting – if Erin goes back to the slide that she didn't go over but she said handed out – what you will be getting is a conceptual design that has enough information to make these decisions. It's the structural engineer. So his definition of 60% is just the re-bar size and this and that to build the structure. So you don't need to or I don't have any approval over that. But we will present to you in what you guys are defining as 60% conceptual enough information. And I will go over as we build the presentation, we will make sure we're in contact with Erin so we meet your expectations in the May meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: So Members, do we want Wendy to talk more about the budget potentials now? And then if not, I'm going to probably open up to public testimony as we've had some presentation information by Erin and by Wendy. So do we want to ask Wendy to talk about budget potentials?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I would like her to be available if we have questions. Would you mind Wendy? Thanks.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: So Morgan, if you don't mind, I guess I'll open it again for public testimony based on comments from Erin and Wendy. So anybody please step forward and identify yourself.

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street. I'm trying to get this clear and straight and it's not. So I can see the MRA responsibility and so on and so forth, the conceptual design and when you folks have to give the agency's approval. But, I think for anybody reading this or trying to understand it, the Council can make changes on the design as well. That's what I don't see in part of the presentation is like, you know, even though this gets approved and supported like the MRA did with the PC-1 which happened before, it's still subject to Council being able to make changes. And the reason why I'm asking that is because last time that's how the PC-1 got held up was the misunderstanding, I guess, between the Council and, you know, yeah, the MRA staff and what not. And was like this is what you need to pass, and it was like, I know one Council member in particular, I mean, he almost 86 the thing. So we want to make real clear when we're stating MRA is going to do this on a particular time and what not, MRA is not the final word. The final word is the County Council. And I think people feel more comfortable if they know that, that they still have an option. If there's something that the MRA decided that they wanted to go with and there's something in particular that they may have a problem with, they still can appeal to the County Council because I am assuming with some degree of experience that it's the Council that is going to approve the very final product – no.

Mr. Joseph Alueta: The funding.

Ms. Perreira: Who is going to do the final product?

Mr. Alueta: The Council has the final word in the sense of the funding.

Ms. Perreira: Right.

Mr. Alueta: But as far as the unique particular design, hopefully, between myself and Morgan and the rest of the staff, we have brought on most of the Council members. And we'll go back through our dog and pony show with the Council members to bring them up to speed. So hopefully we will not have that, the same type of fly by or mis-communication we happened the first time. Primarily, and I don't want dig up too much old history, but the main reason it got a lot mis-communication the last time was they mis-took providing office space for County workers and providing parking for redevelopment of Wailuku. And I think that for the most part, they now know those are two separate functions. Civic improvements – the civic and service center here around the County building and the State building, as well as the parking for revitalization of our commercial core. And I think they got that as far as least when we went through and talked about it.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

And, you know, when the MRA initially – remember the MRA reviewed a variety of designs going over this, and it was all over the board. I mean, Mike Summers is not here, but he was there and Jocelyn was there, and it really came down to compromise and a lot of tug of war with the final design being approved by this board as being PC-1. And the tweaking, the final tweaking has more to do with how many stories are really going to go? How much PV are we going to have? We are going to have electrical vehicle charging stations. That is, I believe that is a requirement by the State law to provide a certain level of that. But it's more, you know, how much. There is going to be some design tweaking, but for the most part, PC-1 is what's being followed. That's what went out on the contract. But as far as arguing with Council members, hopefully, we will not have that ugly scene on the floor. We'll have that behind the scene, and they understand where that is coming from. It does make a difference. Again, we did have two different, like I say, back in the day, we had opposition should this be a County building, should this be mixed use building. And the resolution, I mean, for Vice-Chair Popenuk is that we didn't put mixed uses in the structure itself. We reserved the 10,000 square foot lot not to have it in the structure. And so to go back now and try to stick a mixed use in the structure now is going to kill it. I mean, honestly, that will. That's a significant change to a project and the Department would not be supportive of that. We will try to convince you otherwise. But I think we're on the right, but we're as close as we have come in a long time because we actually had money to get where we're at.

Ms. Perreira: But the problem is and I want to stress again and the reason why the confusion happened was that the consultant presented two projects at the same time, and the Council got confused between a municipal employee project and this municipal parking project. But please remember we have three new Council members. They're green and they're going to have questions. And one of the things that held it up too the last time was because people who are concerned about heights or whatever, yeah, on this, we had a Council member that asked about how this fits in with the community plan versus whatever the MRA – which may not necessarily be exactly in sync. So that kind of brought about some concerns. So I would just caution that we need to cross the t's, dot all of the i's and one of that would be to check how that is in sync with that.

And finally, it seems to me there was testimony from the general public that – and there's always somebody coming out in the ninth hour that didn't do anything, that doesn't understand what's going on and they shoot from hip. But expect that because that's a part of the reality. And so be prepared for the fact that there is going to be some public testimony and the public should be reassured that if there is some change or some revision that has to be made, the Council can in fact institute a revision that may be coming for somebody in case something we don't anticipate, and I don't will happen, but could slip through the cracks. And it's just we reassure everybody on that because then they feel comfortable that it's done by elected officials and not appointees. So I just wanted to make very clear. And just got to give a lot of time and attention to trying to check what not to do

that happened the last time.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, Jocelyn can you conclude your testimony?

Ms. Perreira: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Are you all done?

Ms. Perreira: Yeah, that's it.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you very much. Any questions for Jocelyn. My hearing must be bad on my right side. Excuse me. Any other public testimony on recent information from Erin or from Wendy? Okay, members, again. Warren, you have any questions for either one of them?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. Well, I think just a comment. I'm glad that Erin provided clarification as to what stage of the conceptual plans will the drawings be brought before the MRA. Because my concern was that the if conceptual plans were close to 100% when it came to us, and we wanted to tweak it. You know that could potentially cause some delays because then you're going to have to step back quite a bit. At the 60% completion, you know, I think, it gives an opportunity for the MRA to provide comments, maybe suggest some minor tweaks, and yet not impact the schedule. And because, you know, based upon the comments that I made previously, I'm always very conscious of the schedule and any sort of delays in the schedule. Now having said that Morgan, you know, right now you're projecting an August 2014 completion. I don't have the original schedule that you gave us back when, but what was the original completion date that was on that schedule?

Mr. Gerdel: I'd have to look it up. I don't have it right in front of me. I think I have it in this binder. I could look it up.

Mr. Suzuki: I want to know because I want to know the difference between what you're saying now and what you said when you first presented this to us.

Ms. Taomoto: Well, I just want to clarify that it isn't Morgan's schedule that is being presented. It is the architect's schedule. He's just providing -. I provided him this information and he's just passing it on to you. So he cannot drive the schedule. The architect was given some criteria to follow and based on all the different sub-consultants, the EA, Chris Hart and the structural architect, this is the schedule to accommodate the fiscal year '12 funding request. So, you know, Morgan didn't have anything to do with the dates on this particular schedule that we're presenting today, other than just providing to you through his presentation. So I just want to make sure that, you know -

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: That's fine. I think Warren's kind of looking it from abroad because we had a schedule.

Ms. Taomoto: I'm confident in the schedule only because the architect had to put his reputation on this schedule assuming we would receive the funding in fiscal year '12.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay, I can comment that at the next meeting I can update my schedule with the schedule.

Mr. Suzuki: So what do you have originally though?

Ms. Betts Basinger: '13.

Mr. Gerdel: Was it 2013?

Mr. Suzuki: January 2013?

Ms. Betts Basinger: 5, 23, 2013, as the original end date.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, so you're about a year behind. About a year behind schedule.

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: And I realize what you just said Wendy, but that's one of the things that I've stated from the very beginning, from the very first meeting that we had, the first time we had this schedule. You know, I was very conscious about okay this is the schedule that we have, we need to make sure that we track it and we need to know early on in terms of what sort of impact any sort of activity is going to have on the completion date because almost inherently with every project that you do you're going to run into delay. But a lot of times delays can be prevented if you know what needs to be done, and what needs to be accelerated to resolve the issue so you can move forward and hope to try to catch up as much as you can. So right now we're already looking at, let's say, 15-months behind what was originally presented to the MRA. So I'm obviously very concerned about.

I think what I'd like to request as far as future meetings to the MRA as far as this project is concerned, I talked about this before, you know what sort of activities are current at the moment you come before the MRA? What sort of concerns that you might have as far as activities that should be on-going and how is it progressing according to what the original schedule was? Basically at each MRA meeting, I'd like to request that we be given a detail update as far as activities, the progress, and any concerns that you might have in terms of ability to keep up with the schedule. Because if we are going to see slippage, you know, we need to know at that point in time, and not four or five months down the road.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: And again, I'm just reiterating what I said time and time again, at every single meeting. The other point I had is for the project funding, Wendy. I'm a little bit confused because if you're saying that the MRA has to approve the plans by June of 2011, to be included in the 2012 budget.

Ms. Taomoto: To meet the deadline.

Mr. Suzuki: That's too late because the budget already approved in May.

Ms. Taomoto: I guess it's not clear. The schedule assumes for the sake of the schedule, not to make an assumption on Council or the Mayor, that the funding will be approved by both fiscal year '12. So if all the stars line up and Council and Mayor supports this project and it gets into the fiscal year '12 budget, this is the schedule, the best schedule, that the team came up with to meet the '12 funding request. In other words, when we go in front of the Mayor, which is in the next two or three weeks, and we present this project for consideration from the Department of Public Works, we wanted to make sure our team was confident we can deliver a project that can be encumbered within the fiscal year '12, and this is that schedule. This is assuming –. This is like you're getting a preview – the Mayor hasn't even seen it – of what we will be telling the Mayor to sell this project that we have every confidence if you give us the money in fiscal year '12, we will deliver a project in fiscal year '12. That's why it's a risky schedule because if you look at the advertisement for construction bids for fiscal year '12 project that is the absolute drop deadline to bid a project out. So we are at the end of the fiscal year '12 cycle. Optimally, management has, you know, advised against pushing projects to the very last month of advertisement, and we prefer to be on the first quarter of the fiscal year, so this really, based on this schedule, this is the budgeting part that's a little bit confusing because it's an 18-month capital project time frame. This really, if we keep on this tight schedule, this August '12 to September '12 bidding period and then the contract processing October to November really can be done under two fiscal years. Either the '12 at it's very end, or the '13 at it's very beginning.

Mr. Suzuki: So you're saying when the NTP has to be issued December 2012?

Ms. Taomoto: Not the NTP. The contract has to be encumbered by the Finance Director, and the funds certified under fiscal year '12, by December 31st. Under fiscal year '13, based on this schedule, we are at the beginning of the fiscal year '13 because that commences July 1, 2012. And so that would give a little breathing room for mix up. And some of the things that Erin didn't elaborate on that I maybe I should point out so we don't have a misunderstanding when we come in front of you in May is that the design is contract. As Joe stated, it is based on option PC-1. Any major modification of that type of design – getting bigger, taking out this, putting in this connection or whatever nuts – is

APPROVED 03-18-2011

going to cause a contract amendment which we don't have funding for. And that will stop the project until we can get to Council for a budget amendment. So I, with all that meeting and all that effort that was put in to come up and have an agreed upon option PC-1, we took it as an assurance we would be safe in entering to a contract to deliver the design documents, the knots and bolts, to build option PC-1. And basically when I met with the consultant earlier this week, the footprint is almost exactly where you see option PC-1 on the –. I mean, the footprint of the structure we're probably bring to you is almost on the exact footprint as option PC-1. I've notified them, you know, we had talked about making some slight modifications to come into compliance with some fire requirements for access around the structure and things like that. That's design tweaking just to come into compliance with requirements. But basically you're looking at that footprint, that remnant parcel there, Pili Street, formerly known as Pili Street, because you have to remember, it's not Pili Street now, it's a two driveway entrances for the municipal parking lot. We are not re-establish Pili Street, after a long discussion, as Pili Street a public right a way. Rather we are going to maintain the two driveways on Church and Market, and we are going to create, you know, maintain two driveway access points for this parking lot structure on Church and Market. And we're not going to really re-establish a right of way that, you know, technically serve as a right a way. No. But that's why the emphasis is on the MRA to – I'm going to make sure that what we bring to you in May is enough information to come to evaluate all of your design requirements. But just to warn you if you have any ideas that is way outside of option PC-1, we don't have the design contract to handle that currently. So that would be, stop the work, we got to go back to Council to get budget amendment, and basically re-design. Because the design is option PC-1.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Taomoto: And we are presenting two options for you. The 45-foot maximum height, and then one deck lower as an option on the renderings just so you can see what it would look at maximum height at 45-feet to meet the variance – I mean, height ordinance – and then we'll take it down one level just for your consideration, just to make it easier for you to visual it.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: I have a bunch of more questions. So, Morgan, if you can complete a revised schedule based upon when you said the schedule is given it to you by consultants. And for me, I would be looking at that as the base.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: Because, I guess, it's been made clear to me that what you came up before really is a more relevance to us, and then more so let's move towards what they have. But

APPROVED 03-18-2011

the other thing is that you don't need MRA approval for the Council to approve the budget funding, correct? Okay, because in looking at the note, I thought you needed MRA approval, but you don't need MRA approval.

Ms. Taomoto: No, MRA approval is not required for Council to provide you the funding. Once Council provides the funding appropriation, likely bonds, we will seek MRA approval because Council will be budget session between March. Final approval, they'll pass out the budget May 25th or 29th or something, so that's right before.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Ms. Taomoto: So, you know, you'll know in March/April based on deliberations whether you have a project to talk about in June or not. Even if they don't approve funding, I'm telling the team that we're going to proceed on this schedule because we still have another opportunity come February 2012 to re-approach the administration for construction funding. And we would be in the best position to receive that funding if the design is completed and MRA and the EA's are completed. It is – the project being presented to the, like I said the administration and the Council, in this condition it's in, is not the best thing for project presentation. We are asking for a lot basically. So this schedule I would maintain this schedule even though we don't get the fiscal year '12 funding.

Mr. Suzuki: So Morgan, help me here. You know one of the tasks that you folks have as the project manager is to look at other funding sources. Based upon what you've presented to us today, are we saying now that the only funding will be from the County?

Mr. Gerdel: I did some initial research on the funding, but our contract was amended to do the parking management plan in place of that. So right now our contract doesn't have any further work doing funding studies.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay. I'm looking at the project organization chart, Morgan, and I'm a little bit confused in terms of how you fit in with the work that Wendy is doing because you're a project coordinator for the Department of Planning, and it seems like all the responsibility for the parking structure comes under DPW. So I'm confused.

Mr. Gerdel: Yeah, I guess my contract is with the Department of Planning, but I can still assist other County departments.

Mr. Suzuki: So the contract is to do what now?

Mr. Gerdel: The contract is to coordinate the project with the stakeholders throughout the process of the design and construction.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Suzuki: So it's not to coordinate the design, but to coordinate with the stakeholders.

Mr. Gerdel: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: The stakeholders being?

Mr. Gerdel: Stakeholders being the MRA, the County Council, the Mayor, Wailuku Main Street Association, Wailuku Community Association and property owners in Wailuku.

Mr. Suzuki: And that's how it's spelled out in the scope of the contract right now?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Just to help clarify for me as well, it was my understanding Erin that the contract was an MRA contract with Nishikawa, and monies came out of our budget to pay for the project coordinator.

Mr. Horcajo: No.

Ms. Wade: Contract with the Planning Department?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Wade: And only a partial payment came out of some the MRA funds. The other was matched by the Planning Department, so, yeah, it was jointly funded, you know Planning and MRA, but MRA's budget is under Planning also.

Mr. Suzuki: So, I'm one who always very conscious about the finances. So if the scope has been revised, is there a need to revise the amount of the contract if the scope of work has been reduced?

Ms. Wade: My understanding is that's already occurred so where portions of the coordination, you know, Morgan went out and found a parking management plan expert. So that portion that had been in his contract is now going to that expert who's going to be coming in this coming month. So monies have been reallocated out of the contract to other sub-consultants essentially.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And we have been apprized of all that as it's happening, this body.

Mr. Suzuki: We have? The monies have been reallocated?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: Regarding the parking management plan, four or five months ago or

something.

Mr. Suzuki: You mean out of his contract?

Mr. Gerdel: I think I discussed that our scope, which was originally doing funding studies got changed to do the parking management plan. It's funded from the same contract amount.

Ms. Taomoto: The reason for that, Warren, to just clarify because I know it's confusing, is that meeting with Finance Director and the Budget Director of the past administration, they were really with the state of the nation, it wasn't going to be likely we were going to get any grants and loans. And we've met with USDA. We've met with other grant potentials, the Finance and Budget Directors did, and we were advised that we will be realistic and we would be wise to rely on the bonds because that likely grant funding or loan funding wouldn't happen in the time frame you want it to happen. We can wait until it comes, but that means it might not get built.

The other thing is when we discussed the appropriateness of modifying Morgan's contract to include the parking management plan, it seemed that that financial element, that parking management ordinance to take in the revenue to maintain the structure to assist with the revitalization, you know, of this parking project was missing from any of the contract. All the contracts that already existed was missing this financial element, the revenue element, the revenue generating element. And so to take care of that, we decided to take out the funding from Morgan's contract to look for specific construction funding and put in funding revenue generating financial advice via parking management plan into his contract. So it kind of fell within the same financial element that's needed to make this project successful or sell as a whole. I mean we can open the structure without collecting revenue, but somebody's got to pay for this maintenance.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, I mean, that's not the issue. I guess for me I'm a little bit confused and I still continue to be a little bit confused because when this things first started I looked to Morgan to be the one that will be the face, the overall coordinator, for this particular project to take care of all aspects, the design coordination and whatever else. And now I'm looking to Wendy, it seems like, you know, she's the one that's doing the overall coordination as far as with the consultants and all of that. And now we have two, paying one, paying one more, so what's going on?

Ms. Taomoto: What I'm going to be doing because we had an urgency to move this project, and we had to change the administration of the contract from Planning to Public Works. And it's not that you just tell somebody and it just get changed. And it took a lot of coordination to move the project from Planning to Public Works in the time frame it needed to be moved to meet this schedule. So Mayor's Office assigned me to coordinate between

APPROVED 03-18-2011

the two departments because he doesn't have oversight over either and Mayor's Office does. So I was assigned to make sure that coordination goes smoothly and we meet some schedule that we set to accommodate. But as this project moves and as the teams have been notified, Morgan will become here, be able to, I'm confident that our design team and our parking management team would be reporting to everyone simultaneously with their reports of what the status is in terms of the design, the EA, the soil survey, topographic survey. We'll all get the report at the same time. So he'll get when I get it, when Wendy gets it, when Joe gets it, and he'll be coming down and letting us know if you folks have an issue with our schedule. But for now, we just got started on January 3rd. I'm still like kind of making sure I'm pushing them. Like we just got this schedule yesterday so I needed to push them because he doesn't have the ability to push our consultants as hard as I can. So I'm pushing them. We got this schedule. We all signed this schedule, and we're all committed to this schedule, and so now I can kind of back out. I don't really want to.

Mr. Suzuki: But he still can't –

Ms. Taomoto: He's going to be here.

Mr. Suzuki: But he still can't push the consultants because they're not under contract with him.

Ms. Taomoto: If he has to call about our consultants then they will – they know they don't want to hear from me, okay.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Taomoto: So he will be on top of it because when they get the call from me, it's like they're in trouble already. I mean, we shouldn't have to go there with these consultants. They're committed. I mean, we have to give them a chance to perform. The first performance they're going to do is in May. If they slip that and miss it by a month, that's major for me. I mean, it's major.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, can we move on?

Mr. Suzuki: No.

Ms. Taomoto: You know what I'm saying Warren?

Mr. Suzuki: No, I understand.

Ms. Taomoto: Give them a chance.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Suzuki: No, no. I understand exactly what you're saying Wendy, you know, from the standpoint of the consultants and all that. I'm still confused about the project management, project coordination aspect, nothing as far as what's happening below. And again, as I've said, when we first started this thing, he was going to be face, he's the one that's going to be us all the information. You stepping in, I'm glad you have, because I've worked with you many, many years before, so I know the type of person you are. I know you get the job done. But I'm confused now in terms of, you know, who's going to be one that's going to be reporting to us. I don't want to be in a situation where we ask the question of Morgan, and he says well, I don't know, I got to find out from you what's going on. I mean, for MRA, and we had the same problem as far as with when the Market Street improvements is going on. You know, we would ask a person of what's going on. Response is well I don't know, I got to find out from this person. You know, when we have a meeting, when a question is asked, you know, from the MRA perspective, it's important for us to be able to be provided with the answers right then and there and not be told I got to follow up with this, I'll have to get back to you because then it results in the discussion being delayed one more month. So, I'll move on. I'll move on, but I just want to make clear my concern that, you know, we need to know who's going to be coming before us. We need to know that the person that comes before us would be able to respond, you know, all aspects of the project, be able to respond to us in terms of, you know, what the situation may be, you know, who needs to do what and not respond, well I got to follow up with this person and get back because then it's another month into it. I don't want that. Again, I've said time and time again, I'm going to follow this schedule every month that we meet to make sure that we don't run into unnecessary delays.

Ms. Taomoto: Well, from the coordination standpoint of the entire because it's like Planning, Public Works, Morgan, MRA, he's being copied when, you know, other than the processing of the contract which was painful, he's going to be in all of our meetings. And like I said when we get a status update, he and everybody gets the update. There shouldn't be a communication problem moving forward. They only got the contract January 3rd. So moving forward, there shouldn't be a problem. The only discussions he's not going to be included in is nuts and bolts discussions with Public Works on drainage and, you know, that kind water system, they met with Water and this and that, and all that little stuff. But the way the team is going to be reporting, the sub-consultant, engineers and various consultants are reporting to the prime consultant, Allison & Ide with detailed what they did and what they're going to be doing, I think, it's every month. What they did over the past month, what they're going to be doing looking forward. And this is going to come in from every one of the consultants until they complete their tasks.

Mr. Suzuki: One last comment, and then end of discussion. So, again, Wendy, you know, I don't want to –. I don't think it will be in the best interest of this project from a scheduling standpoint, you know, to run into those kind of delays. Like in today's meeting, we asked the question to Morgan, but then he's looking to you for the answers. You know, when we

APPROVED 03-18-2011

ask the question of Morgan, in the future, I expect him to be the one to give us the answers, and that's all I'm saying.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Alexa, any questions?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, thank you Chair.

Mr. Horcajo: This is an important topic.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, it's a very important topic, and following on that, first of all, I really like the collaboration I'm seeing, Morgan, and you've stepped up to the plate here and I think we're going to start seeing going forward what we were hoping to see for you and Wendy. I have two requests, Morgan, in your monthly report to the MRA, I would like you to include the on-going elements of the design status, whatever they might be, whether they've been approved by the team or not, just so that we know what elements of the design are being discussed so that we have an opportunity to make comments at our monthly meetings that we'll get back to them. Secondly, because not everyone on this body remembers everything that went into PC-1 being approved, and this body approved it. So really we're just here now to look at the on-going tweaking and hopefully approve the final and they're ready to build it. So I would like everyone to have a copy of PC-1 as it was approved by this body originally. I don't know that you've ever seen that have you?

Ms. Popenuk: Probably ages ago.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, but recently.

Ms. Popenuk: That would be great to have one.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay, we can provide that.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then anything else that allows us to be able to be review comment and approve on the date that we need to even if – I would like to feel prepared before that drop dead date of June 17th. So Chair, if it's permissible for Morgan to perhaps even email to each of us on-going updates, and James maybe you can chime in on that, so that at our meetings we're a little bit more prepared.

Mr. Horcajo: Wendy, did you want to make any comments?

Ms. Taomoto: Yeah, I think you're going to be disappointed if you say that and we don't deliver it because it's likely we're not going to be able to deliver you anything before May. The consultants are working on waiting for the soil survey to be done, the topographic survey, traffic studies. And even directly overseeing consultants in the past, we don't

APPROVED 03-18-2011

normally see the intermediate work product before they have internally reviewed it. And like I said, you want that, then we're pushing out the schedule three months because that work product is going to take a tremendous effort for them to even be comfortable. I mean, they're really stepping outside of their box of comfort to present something in May. So to ask them for something like February, March, April, there's nothing that you're going to get because they're waiting for this, waiting for that, and all the different pieces and trying to build this structure. What my understanding is is the structure will look very similar to what PC-1 had that look, but it's better, they said. You know, the color renderings is a better choice. It's going to be very, very similar. What they're working on is a lot of technical studies and –

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I know Wendy.

Ms. Taomoto: You know what I mean?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I wasn't speaking to that level of detail. I know that we had a comment by one of our members that clearly comes from comments by some of the public that we are now in a review and reinvent and redesign phase.

Ms. Taomoto: No.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I just simply want to make it really clear to everyone that PC-1 is it. In addition to some of the things that we already saw on this great presentation, the addition of environmental friendly lighting, LEED possibilities. I don't think this body should be expecting to have input on major changes, like this issue of a fifth floor.

Ms. Popenuk: No, no. I get that now. Thank you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. That was the main thing. So that when we are talking to the public, we can be really clear about that. Sorry you don't have a chance to come and change it. It was approved years ago.

Ms. Taomoto: Well, the options, like you said, is minimal. The energy efficient lights is a no brainer. It's going to be in there no matter what you say. It's all energy efficient now, right, Morgan? We don't even put inefficient energy lighting. And then the electric plug in, like Joe said, we're going to put the minimum required by, you know, at least one. Handicap accessible parking locations is going to be put in as required by DCAB. The only things I think you might – the only things I'm thinking is going to be of discussion is maybe the PV and the affect it's going to have on the surrounding buildings, having to look at the PV. How much PV we're going to put in? How much of the load we want to take of. The County's Corporation Counsel's Office – not him – but the other Corporation Counsel also. We're going to have to outright as is now today we are in no position to enter into a power

APPROVED 03-18-2011

purchase agreement for a third party to come in with our construction project. So we're assuming we're going to either out right purchase PV, very expensive, long pay back, or we're not going to put it in, and we're just going to build the structure's electrical system to accommodate our future PPA agreement. And whether you want to outright purchase PV or not is not really your choice. I'm going to put it in as a design alternative because when come time to open bids, and we're over budget by that \$100,000, it's coming out.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I love you. You're so detailed oriented, and I trust that what we get.

Ms. Taomoto: You know what I'm saying? Because we have structure everything –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes, I know what you're saying. I don't think we even what to impose any kind of things like that.

Ms. Taomoto: Yeah, I mean, there's very little design elements that we have, so it's just a structure with lights, one or two electric handicap parking, and the PV.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. Exactly.

Ms. Taomoto: Two elevators. You will be given a choice whether you want one or two elevators. That is an option.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine, do you have any questions? I'm going to ask some technical questions mainly because it's been commented on by a public member, and maybe either whoever can clarify. Mr. MacPherson had mentioned if there was any limitation of the 45-foot height maximum. Undoubtedly, it's been mentioned, I think he's heard that we're focusing on the PC-1 plan and decided, of course, not to go beyond that height. So am I correct in saying that? I think Wendy had said that. That decision was not to go beyond the 45 maximum height limitations way back when.

Ms. Taomoto: Well, Morgan didn't speak to the architect. I actually spoke to them last time, and the designs, the two options that you'll be presented is the 40-foot height. Option one will be 40-foot height max, five-foot above that to 50 for the PV. Okay, we're allowed five-foot for the PV. The second option you'll be presented is just dropping it one deck below 45, whatever that is. So we're going to max it out at 45 with an additional five to 50 for the PV, and then drop it, take out one deck. So we are not proposing to come in with a height variance above the 45.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, I just want to be sure that we talk about that.

Ms. Taomoto: And if you do want to go that way, again, that's a design amendment that we need additional funds for.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, I understand. The second, more construction side, I don't know if you can answer this question but it's been asked a few times before the type of construction to lessen the time by which we'll be out of parking. There was discussion on tilt up type of construction. Has there been any discussion about that?

Ms. Taomoto: No. I mean, the consultant, during our negotiations of the contract, we discussed the constructability and the construction efficiency to minimize the impact to everybody, just traffic and the surrounding areas. And they're going to evaluate different construction methods as well as talk to some of the major suppliers that's going to provide the concrete, and the ability of the contractors who would bid on this project. And they're going to give us the best, economical, intrusive, you know, construction intrusive project. They will likely present us a number, a couple of options, on construction, but that's going to be a Public Works call, which one is the better option. If it's not cost, and it's just a matter of this one is going to take two more weeks than this one, but you're going to get this instead of that, I mean, it's going to be a Public Work's call. But they are hired, and we paid extra to have them look at minimizing the impact to look at different types of construction methods. We did pay extra to do that.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. Any other questions? Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I do have a question. Do we have a ball park budget amount? 2012 CIP budget amount?

Mr. Gerdel: Possibly \$10 to \$12 million.

Ms. Taomoto: The only reason it's kind of slipping my mind is cause I've kind of accepted the fact that when we have – in the next three weeks, the consultant is also first item is to work on a revised budget for the Mayor to consider. That's more representative now that we have, they've kind of figured out what they want to build now. They have the contract. They put more effort and they've figured out they're going to have to give me their best shot for the February Mayor's meeting as to what we're going to ask him for. And at the most, I would think we would ask for \$12 million. You know, some where between \$10 to \$12.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So right now it's \$10 to \$12 million, ball park.

Ms. Taomoto: By the time Morgan meets with you in February, I think we're going to have a number.

Mr. Gerdel: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Last question.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Suzuki: So based on potential '12, what does it equate as far as cost per stall? \$20,000 to \$25,000?

Ms. Taomoto: Warren, let me talk about the stall thing. The stall count in option PC-1 is only a guideline.

Mr. Suzuki: No, I realize that.

Ms. Taomoto: But because of the structure, we're proposing, we're looking at more. If you go with the 45 maximum on the structure with the five-foot for the PV, we're talking about 400-something stalls above and beyond what option PC-1 counts.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, I understand.

Ms. Taomoto: So, you know, right now the design consultant without his final layout is saying that because of the property grade and we had to do this and that, we're actually going to get more stalls than anticipated by option PC-1 with the same footprint.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, so I guess my question was –

Mr. Horcajo: \$31,000 plus.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, based upon the 470?

Mr. Horcajo: 384 stalls is what I used, at \$12 million.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, but it may be less.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, thank you Morgan, Erin, Wendy and Joe, who is already gone. You know what, we have, if you don't mind, I want to continue at least through one more agenda item. We have somebody here from Maui Nui Botanical Gardens, so I want her to be able to make a presentation, if you don't mind. Okay? Tamara, please. This is agenda item F1. You know, I'm going to have Erin, I guess, say a few words first.

F. MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BUSINESS

- 1. Discussion on a collaborative endeavor with Maui Nui Botanical Gardens to install native plants in the Market Street planters. (Tamara Sherrill, Interim Executive Director.)**

Ms. Wade: Great. Thank you. As many of you know, we have new planters on Market

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Street. This is a really fun agenda item. And we have been debating what do we do with these planters? How do we maintain it? What should we come up with? Bob and I had been talking back and forth about a couple of ideas, and then it sort of just came to us, what about Maui Nui Botanical. We thought we'll just give them a call, and see if they're interested. Well, I called and asked Tamara, and she said, yes, we are interested in collaborating on the planters, so we're really excited. And she's a really good sport to sit through the whole conversation about the parking structure.

Ms. Tamara Sherrill: Government in action.

Mr. Suzuki: Entertaining.

Ms. Sherrill: I'm excited to witness it.

Ms. Wade: I didn't prep her for how long that discussion might be, so thank you very much for staying. But she did go back and take a look at their nursery and some opportunities, so she's here today to present what they might be able to offer to the MRA in terms of planting in the planters.

Ms. Sherrill: Thank you. Aloha. So I met Erin and Robert.

Mr. Horcajo: Tamara, if you can please identify yourself and who you represent.

Ms. Sherrill: Sorry. My name is Tamara Sherrill, and I'm the inter Executive Director for Maui Nui Botanical Gardens. I met Erin and Robert and Wendy about a month ago, and we had a discussion that she just told you about. In case you don't know about Maui Nui Botanical Gardens, that's why I'm here. We think that the planters would be a great way to let people know that we're right down the street. We're a non-profit that's managing a portion of Keopuolani Park, and the land we manage is on County land, and it's the old zoo location. So our mission is to foster appreciation and understanding of Maui Nui's, meaning Maui County's, native plants and their role in Hawaiian cultural expression by providing a gathering place for discovery and conservation education. And we're open to the public, Monday through Saturday, and we're free admission. We do free tours three days a week. We have semi-annual plant sales, Arbor Day and Native Tree give away. I'm sure you've heard about that. And we just started this year doing free cultural Saturday's where there's traditional Hawaiian arts that are demonstrated by practitioners.

So I just put together really quickly. We had discussed three different species that we have immediately available in the nursery and that would look good together. They're part of these eight species that I'm going pass out to you so you can see what aesthetically we're talking about. And we had discussed just replacing the periwinkle that's in the smaller planters – I think there's 21 along Market Street – with native plants that could really

APPROVED 03-18-2011

withstand drought and handle the fact that I think that there's not a water meter installed yet. Is that correct, Erin?

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Sherrill: So the three that we have that we were talking about putting into the smaller planters are on that sheet that you have. The first one is Ihi. The second one that we were proposing was the *achyranthes splendens*. It doesn't have a Hawaiian name. And the third one is on the back page, the very last page, is *carex wahuensis*. So basically it's a succulent, a really silvery shrub that would probably grow in those tiny planters. It's only a couple of feet high and a sedge that gets quite exuberant and also really drought tolerant. But there are other plants in our nursery right now that we could easily substitute out if they don't work out. We have plants that I've also shown you there that might work in the larger planters. You know, there's an Ohia Lehua that does really well in Kahului that we've just found. We've been, you know, planting native plants in Kahului for more than 10-years now. So we've done a lot of experimenting, and we just think it would be a great opportunity for the garden, especially if we could combine it with some signage or a story board on Market Street about the fact that there's this park, you know, the only public botanical garden on Maui, and it's right down the street. And we're all about native plants and Polynesian introduced plants.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. You know what, I need to open it up for public testimony first, so if you don't mind. Then the board can ask you questions.

Ms. Sherrill: Sure.

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association/Tri-Isle Main Street Resource Center. Thank you Tamara. This is really excellent, but I do have a recommendation. Having done, worked with this native plants by the Wailuku bridge when we did the river rock and trying to do native Hawaiian, and we worked with a real specialist who is no longer here, Renee Silva. But, we also have worked in other areas with Mr. Ernest Rezens from the Maui Arborist Committee. And the reason why I'm going to recommend that you seek his advice is because he knows the areas and certain plants are indicative of the area, even historically, connected to the area. So I would recommend, and Main Street would like to see it connected to the area. Because when we did our schematic planting for the kukui trees and all the different pohinas and all that Hawaiian plants that we did down there, it has to be connected – that's my grandson – it has to be connected to the area. But thank you. That's our recommendations.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any questions for Jocelyn? Anybody? Any other public testimony please?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Sugimura: I'm Yuki Lei Sugimura. I'd like to, since we're talking about planters, I'd like to again recommend that we get rid of the old ones. It's still there. And I'll tell you, seeing Wailuku First Friday and all the people there, it is not easy to get past those planters on the sidewalk for a handicap person. I'm concerned about it. And it's come up many, many meetings, so some decision should be made.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any questions of Yuki Lei?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thanks.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other public testimony? Howard please.

Mr. MacPherson: Howard MacPherson. I have quick question about PC-1. I'm curious as to –

Mr. Horcajo: Howard, I think you need to speak to this agenda item.

Mr. MacPherson: I'm sorry, I thought you were closing off. I'm sorry.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, thank you very much. Tamara please? And I guess maybe Erin, what are we – are we making a decision? What's the proposal first, then we can ask our questions.

Ms. Wade: Well, in the conversation I had with Tamara and Bob and Wendy Kobashigawa was the other person who we talked with is basically wanted to bring this to you today to determine whether or not you were interested in the collaborative. You know, as a staff person, and Wendy and I felt that it would be a positive, as another staff person. But I needed to bring it to my board, Tamara brought it to here board, and we need your okay to basically work on a program, to work out the details in terms of planting, when it happens, maintenance and what our contribution would be. The thing that we had talked about is perhaps having plaques on the planters that describe whatever plant material is placed within the pot, and that, you know, referencing the Maui Nui Botanical Gardens. And then to also to do a story board somewhere on Market Street that the MRA would sponsor. And we would work with the Botanical Gardens to determine what that would entail exactly, but it would be something about the Botanical Gardens, and either working with Iao Theater or somewhere to have that showcased for the duration of the project.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, so it sounds like we just want to probably get some consensus and then they'll come back to us with a proposal so that we can –

Ms. Betts Basinger: I had a couple of comments and maybe more like requests. I think when this was presented to us before everyone agreed that this is just a fantastic project.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

And our concern at that time was, of course, budgetary requirements, you know, what is the maintenance is going to be. I would like to ask that when you guys move on to meet and come back with some final plan, I do like the suggestion that came from Jocelyn that we look for plants amongst all the plants that you have that have a location specific significance. I think that's important. And there are other people that are experts on what grows in shade and all that kind of stuff, but I like the idea of them being specific to Wailuku and the history of Wailuku.

Also, if there's a possibility that you guys can discuss on either incorporating, moving, reusing the existing planters, get them off the street and out of the way, but not just throw them away. If they could be somehow incorporated into the beautification plan by moving, I don't know. This has been an on-going, troubling on-going, thing for this agency, and I would like to see them either used or gotten out of the way. And I would prefer used.

And so yeah, so I'm in favor of having you move forward with the groups. Oh, and that maybe it could become a part of the tour that Malama Wailuku has, you know, to point out the significance and where these plants are and which ones they are. So if Malama Wailuku might want to be invited to that meeting. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine, any questions?

Mr. Suzuki: So Erin, being that, you know, my understanding is that because the meters have not been installed, there's still some contractor responsibility, obligation on part of their contract. So if we were to take initiative and work with, you know, Maui Nui Botanical Gardens, and put the plants in, how does that compromise our position as far as with contractor being that it's their responsibility?

Ms. Wade: At this time, you know, the contractor is responsible to follow through and get the meters installed, and to keep the plants alive. So when we made the phone call, new plants showed up in all the planters, and the meter is still not installed. So what we would do then is basically release them from that responsibility of maintaining the plants and push them to get the meter installed. And that would be the only reason that they might not, this first round, be able to do the significant to Wailuku plant materials because of the lack of the water meter at this time. So we had talked maybe there would be a rotation at some point or something, but these are all the plants that have been proposed at this time, are succulence because they will need to survive with minimal water, at least for the initial portion. Unless we delay it until we know that the water meter is installed.

Mr. Suzuki: How much longer is it going to take before the meters get installed?

Ms. Wade: We asked Wendy that same question and she wasn't able to give us a definitive date. So I got the sense it would be in a few months.

Mr. Suzuki: The last question.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: So as far as the old planters –

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, let's finish our discussion with her because I think we can discuss the old planters ourselves since we've had the discussion. So you've got any questions for Tamara?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I do have one additional thought based on the current expectations of the current contractor. And I think that we should hold the current contractor to the contract, to get the water meter in and to maintain the plants until that contract is completed. And then that gives us more planning time too I think to move forward. That's just my suggestion.

Mr. Suzuki: But, you know, Chair, because Alexa talked about the possibility of using the old planters and having that incorporated as part of the overall plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: If can.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, let me tell you why. Excuse me. Yeah, we've had the discussion months ago, and really the decision, the consensus that we all have had for a long time is to move the planters.

Mr. Suzuki: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: Main Street offered some suggestions. Board members did. I think what I hear from the community is that we don't need the old planters. We already have new plants and new planters, so I'm saying we've already made that. We've had a lot of discussion. I think we just, as a body, need – Well, really, we've also discussed it's a Public Works decision also. They own the planters. If they want to take just them off, they could do it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, that's why I think it should be included in your meetings with and your collaborations because if they can be used in Happy Valley for example that got no plant beautification, that's a solution. So I don't want to just get rid of them. That hasn't happened. But since this group is going to work on it, maybe they can come up with some really good ideas that we couldn't pick up.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Fine. Yeah, and I think last month if you remember Yuki Lei brought up the reason there's no planters or plants in the second phase because of the width of the

APPROVED 03-18-2011

sidewalks and the impacts that would have on ADA.

Mr. Suzuki: It would make it worse. That would make it worse.

Mr. Horcajo: What's that? Exactly. Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It might.

Mr. Horcajo: So my point being, whatever, that was discussed, let's further the discussion so we can make a decision.

Ms. Sherrill: Question.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Sherrill: So you're discussing the larger planters that currently are in other areas?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, the pebble larger planters.

Ms. Sherrill: Okay. Those are the ones you're talking about possibly moving. The smaller planter are the new ones that will stay.

Mr. Horcajo: The little reddish ones, right.

Ms. Sherrill: That helps. Thanks.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Wade: I just also wanted to mention that we did talk to Tamara about the entry way to Market Street. If you remember we had a conversation a while back when we thought we had some extra budgetary funds to do a landscape design for that area. I'd like to continue that discussion with them, to identify some alternatives. She actually herself mentioned Ernie Rezens when we were there to say –

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Sure. To say it would be good to talk the members of the Arborist Committee as well about the appropriate materials for there, so she's totally on top of it. And if we can just continue to have a conversation I can come back to you with a budget proposal essentially.

Mr. Suzuki: That's fine.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Wade: That will be great.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Wonderful.

Mr. Horcajo: Thank you very much.

Ms. Sherrill: And I just want to say to Jocelyn that Renee Silva started the garden, so we're just trying to carry on his work.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. Thank you very much. You know what members if you don't mind, one more agenda item so that Yuki can leave.

Mr. Suzuki: I want to talk about the planters.

Mr. Horcajo: The planters. Okay go ahead. We'll talk about the planters. Sorry, we're still here. Go ahead.

Mr. Suzuki: So as far as the planters, I mean, is it going to be moved? Is it going to sit there? I mean, what is the status?

Ms. Wade: So Public Works said they don't have any problem with the planters the way they are. Yes they own them. And they will sit there until someone chooses to pay for their relocation. So if the MRA would like to take responsibility for the relocation, we can do that. At this time, there has been no formal complaint filed regarding ADA and therefore, they will sit where they sit until someone takes responsibility.

Mr. Suzuki: Is it possible to get some kind of quote to have the planters relocated?

Ms. Wade: Yeah. You bet. Sure.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, and we've had discussion with him about moving it down to the base yard temporarily until an appropriate location is created.

Mr. Suzuki: Next to the lao Theater.

Ms. Wade: And that, I did ask.

Mr. Horcajo: The fear with that they could be lost and damaged.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, they rejected the responsibility of having them any where but on Market Street at this time. So we can locate them to else where along Market Street.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Popenuk: So they don't want to move it to a different street? I thought I remembered High Street was being considered or something, in front of the –

Mr. Horcajo: We talked about in front of the Lao Theater illegal parking lot. We talked about Betsill Property. I think that came up two months ago. But, yeah, so I guess you've asked the question. Let's –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I'm hoping this team of folks can really come up with some good ideas.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. Again, one more agenda item before we take a break so if Yuki doesn't want to hang around for our discussion on the RFP's. So Yuki Lei you're up Market Street Improvement Project Phase II update.

2. Market Street Improvement Project, Phase II through Happy Valley Update on project progress, public relations and schedule. (Yuki Lei Sugimura, Public Relations)

Ms. Sugimura: Hi. I'm Yuki Lei Sugimura. On Market Street, the good news is that the streets are lined. It was, we thought, it may not be completely done because of the weather, but I drove past it today, I talked to SSFM, the Project Engineer, he was Project Manager then, and it's done. So, that is the good news. It looks really nice. I hope you like it. I've already gotten good comments back, you know, from some of the people who are using it. Now that they can see how it looks like, you know, versus going through all the agony of construction. So, we're not – we're still working on it, of course. As you know how construction is but the big, visual, last impact is done.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Thank you. Any public testimony on this agenda item? Yuki please. Board members?

Mr. Suzuki: I just had a question Yuki and I noticed this once when I was driving on Market Street, and I mentioned it to you about if there's a larger than normal truck parked, let's say, in front of Valley Hardware, kind of diagonal, then the cars coming in the direction towards Waihee are not able to stay within their travel way, and get past that truck. There was a letter sent to the editor that basically said the same thing and they're concerned about, you know, cars being backed up. And I noticed that just recently when I went to Happy Valley, and my concern is that there may be some exposure as far as liability because you know as well as I do the type of vehicles that park on Market Street between Main and Vineyard are different from the type of vehicles that park on Market Street in Happy Valley, you know, at Takamiya and also Valley Hardware. You might get your larger type of construction, you know, flat beds and all that. And I'm just saying for the record, I see a

APPROVED 03-18-2011

potential liability issue that you might have some accidents because of the fact that there's not enough travel width clearance for the vehicles to be able to go against traffic flow.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: You've got a comment? Excuse me.

Ms. Sugimura: Yeah. Just so –. What have happened, even before I'm hearing you say this today, is that we've seen the letters to the editor. The project has seen the letters to the editor. Concerns have come through from various offices expressing the same concern. And Teddy from Public Works who's in charge of this project and the project engineers have actually gone out there and measured and whatever, and they have determined that it is according – it's build according to specs and it's built according to what has been determined as safe, you know, the way that it has to be. But I understand what you're saying because if you see a large truck, construction truck, parking at an angle – we've even looked at what if we move the angle a little bit sharper – they said that the difference would be very slight, but we are in compliance. So that is the answer that I got from Public Works.

Mr. Horcajo: Alexa?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah Yuki, thank you. What is left to be done before you can actually have a final date and dedication?

Ms. Sugimura: We are – there's some signage that has to be, you know, tweaked and things like that. So it's really small kind in terms of what needs to be done in the total project. And I'll let you know when that final determination is done.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So it's essentially completed.

Ms. Sugimura: Pretty much. Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. And I just do want to comment Chair that I drive that a lot and I agree, I mean, I have to stop sometimes if I'm either coming into town or going home because the trucks are longer than the stall is. And, you know, is it that truck owner's liability because he's going to get whacked. So, I think it's – I would like to know what the answer is to that, and maybe Corporation Counsel can –

Mr. Horcajo: Well, Erin wants to make a comment, and then I also have a question.

Ms. Wade: I just wanted to make the comment that this was identified as part of the market base plan as well, and their recommendation was to acquire an off-site parking lot. That

APPROVED 03-18-2011

there would be a satellite municipal lot in Happy Valley area near Takamiya Market because the right-of-way just isn't sufficient for that type of a truck and you know, it's not designed for our standard parking stall regardless. You know, it really is the owner's responsibility if they're parking a larger vehicle in a regular sized parking stall. So when we had talked to Public Works in the past, they said you folks need a parking lot that is designed to handle larger vehicles off public streets.

Ms. Sugimura: You know speaking of parking lots – excuse me – if you drive pass the TK Supermarket, former TK Supermarket, all of the abandoned vehicles there have been removed. I mean, Giovanni has been diligently working on that, so that helped. And there's one car left there, but I think it's just another new one. But all the old ones, the one caught on fire, and those little things help.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's a great clean up.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine? Go ahead Alexa.

Ms. Betts Basinger: A secondary option might be to have it be restricted parking. You know how sometimes you see compact only. You know, if whoever is the department that does that, just put signage up restricting so we don't get those potential accidents.

Mr. Horcajo: Katharine?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Is that our jurisdiction Erin?

Ms. Wade: We can certainly make a written recommendation of Public Works Department.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay. I would like us to do that because I do see it as a safety hazard.

Ms. Popenuk: Is there a loading zone any where?

Ms. Sugimura: There is not a loading any where. You mean, like, to just stop and go now?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think that would meet with opposition because it would take away parking stalls. There have been requests for loading zones in the other end of Market Street that have just met with –

Ms. Sugimura: Right in front of Iao Theater.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Popenuk: But if it's a hazard.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. I have a couple questions, I guess, and one has to do with this big trucks in little stalls. Undoubtably that issue has been up in Makawao forever, but I noticed, of course the last time they relined the stalls, they also put an actual back line. And I don't know whether that's a legal thing where basically if you park in –

Ms. Sugimura: Where now?

Mr. Horcajo: If you go to Makawao town, kind of like to old Royo Store, on that side, is that aside from having the parallel stall line, they have a line that's on the actual driving side. I'm assuming it means you cannot extend your vehicle to be behind that. Now whether that's legally within our code or not, I'm not sure. But my suggestion is whether it's you or Erin, I guess, we should ask whether that is how we can help solve that issue now.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, we're going to put that in, in our letter. I think that's a great idea.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, Makawao town, that's basically what they have. And then my second question is there's an issue brought up before about responses to letters to the editor and who's responsibility is that. Have you folks, have you had any discussion with –?

Ms. Sugimura: Yeah. So, we as a construction team did talk about that. You know, I brought the letters to the construction meeting, and basically if you look at the role of the construction team is to build the project. And so we've passed it on to the County, passed it back to Public Works saying, okay, what do you want to do? And they basically said that it's not for this team to answer that question.

Mr. Horcajo: Right. So it's up to Public Works to answer the question.

Ms. Sugimura: That was the answer. Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Fine. Okay, any other questions for Yuki on this issue? Thank you very much.

Ms. Sugimura: Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, back at three o'clock members? Is that okay, eight minutes?

(The Maui Redevelopment Agency recessed at approximately 2:53 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 3:01 p.m.)

3. Discussion on the process to update the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan update.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, we are on agenda item F3, discussion on the process to update the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan update. I'm going to let Erin lead and obviously you guys got some input, some RFPs, and based on our discussions the past couple months, suggestions by board members. So Erin.

Ms. Wade: Okay, last month the discussion, I brought to you folks a really comprehensive RFP that included the redevelopment plan, the TIF and the Zoning and Development Code. The conversation was there was too much to bite off at once and there was component of that we could do in house so why don't we save some funds and try to do that. So what I brought you was basically this is HRS Chapter 53-6 which defines – it has the highlights – defines the process, so where the highlights are. Actually it says the agency shall submit the plans to the Planning Commission. Following their approval, the Planning Commission that the MRA will submit it to Council. And on the back, it says, if at any time after the initial adoption of the redevelopment plan, the agency determines that a change in the plan is in the public interest and in furtherance of the purpose of the redevelopment. The Plan or any part thereof may be amended by following the same procedure as set forth in the adoption of the original plan. It doesn't give us any leeway unfortunately.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. Which is what we thought.

Ms. Wade: Not even an inch of leeway. The good news is, you know, a lot of the conversation or discussion in HRS 53-6 is about acquisition of property and the importance of going out to the public, informing them if you're going to displace people, you know, and you're going to acquire property and then how you're going to mitigate those circumstances. It's not likely, based on the things that we have discussed there will be any, you know, there will be little if any of that. So that seems to be what could potentially clog up a process like this. But ours is a relatively clean project, project that we've discussed.

So, that being said, we had, the conversation was to have the redevelopment plan itself updated in house and my proposal then would be to update about a section at a time of the redevelopment plan. So each month we would have a new section to review and then we could just move forward section by section, just sort of plotting through the update if that works for you folks. In the mean time, to send out an RFP for the tax increment financing component to actually have those numbers worked out. I did look into this in quite a bit of detail, and I also talked to Brad Segal about this. We could do our projections in house. Both the real property tax division and Brad recommended that we actually hire someone to take a look at the two components. One, to give different growth rates by geographic area because the anticipation would be that the growth rates – the increase in valuation would be higher surrounding the parking structure and elsewhere in the district. And then also the increase in valuation by use would be different. So those that have a residential component might grow more slowly than something with a commercial component. So those are difficult and you really want do want some of those expertise to be taking a look

APPROVED 03-18-2011

at that. So, for your information, I have an RFP for the tax increment financing plan, and one for the Zoning and Development Code as well to support what we will be doing in house, the update of the redevelopment plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I should probably open it to public testimony first. So, is there any public testimony on what Erin had just presented to us?

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira, Wailuku Main Street Association. So, this process to update the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan, I'm sure there's sections that don't need any updating whatsoever. So couldn't it be more expedient to, instead of taking it one section at a time and having it re-worked after gone through such an arduous process in the first place, that we look at areas that do need to get updates and then present that forward for consideration to be updated. I think that is far better use of time is to look at the areas that are in need of updating, instead of looking at taking the whole document one step at a time. Because otherwise you're going to leave out people who were involved in the initial process, so on and so forth, to know what's being changed and not knowing the how, when, why, and so forth. So I think that would be the best situation. That's our recommendation.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any questions for Jocelyn?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I do Jocelyn. Are you referring specifically to the table of tasks?

Ms. Perreira: No, I wasn't thinking of that specifically but table of tasks, I think you got to look at, and there maybe something that you have to add or something you're going to delete. But, I was looking at each section, you know, the text even because I mean why re-invent the wheel. You're going to be reduced to word smithing in some instances. I mean, you know, there were very, very, competent people that looked at it and we're not trying to throw out the baby with the bath water just to repackage. What we're trying to do is just update where it's absolutely necessary.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Sugimura: Yuki Lei Sugimura. I have just a general thought on in that whole process to get us to December 2000 where we adopted the Redevelopment Area Plan. I was part of that process when I was working for Mayor Apana in the Office of Economic

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Development with John Summers. And I would just like to say that I understand what Jocelyn is saying what she just said because yeah there's probably areas that we all know we need to change. But, for public process, knowing what we went through just to get it to where we ended up with that document, we probably need to say, in the public process, that we are going to be addressing this chapter, or however you want to say, so that anybody who has a vested interest in that will show up at that time, and not be arbitrarily has to come to all the meetings because you don't know what we're going to take up. You know what I mean? So it's more planned, I think, because otherwise, everything will fall under the Maui Redevelopment Area Plan document. So anything could come up at any time. So just so it's more, I think, what Erin is saying makes more sense for a community process.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any questions for Yuki Lei?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I do. Do you mean Erin's plan to take it chapter by chapter?

Ms. Sugimura: Chapter by chapter or whatever her system.

Ms. Ferreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Please. She can ask questions.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Or am I hearing that we want to be very specific about the areas that we're looking at to change? And remember it's not an update. What Erin is proposing here is changing the document, not just updating it.

Ms. Sugimura: So more so. I think the clearer we are the better. I mean, whatever process.

Ms. Betts Basinger: To be specific.

Ms. Sugimura: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other questions for Yuki Lei?

Ms. Ferreira: . . . (inaudible) . . . This particular document was prepared before the Apana administration. The section that they worked on was the inclusion of the marketing section of this particular plan. I do think that it is very important like she's saying that instead of just saying, you know, and I feel we shouldn't be like taking it from ground zero because it's not necessary. But the parts that you are intent on looking at and changing, definitely post that on the agenda. If we're looking at the marketing section, then people know and can expect what they need to come to discuss. Because I agree with her, I would hate to miss a

APPROVED 03-18-2011

meeting that something got taken up. But by the same token, you don't have feel apprehensive that you're going to redo a whole document that people have spent vastly more years involved in getting the document to where it was when it got passed. Thank you.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions? Okay. Questions for Erin please? Katharine? I do want to make a comment. I think we all were here last month. I'm not sure about Warren, but you folks still have the RFP that had both the WRP update and the WRZAD update?

Ms. Betts Basinger: From the last meeting?

Mr. Horcajo: From the last meeting. Just so we're all clear about the process because that –. Yeah, Erin had listed the three, I guess, four things. I guess three major things that was in that RFP. One had to do with the market base plan, and we're going to do that in house. Second was update the narratives in the charts. And we did, when Alexa was Chair, we did a strategic plan process to update that last year. So that's what we're doing. The TIF we talked about, which we'll talk about next, is something that the consultants, the Planning Department, the Planning Department feels we're going to go outside. So that is what was discussed the past couple of months, so I hope it's clear that's kind of where we're headed now. So when we talk about the TIF that's, again, outside but we're definitely doing at least these two other discussions to update the WRP.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair? In our previous discussion, a lot of my discomfort, I think, was that I've never been able to really understand why we are changing this document and going through this elaborate amendment process which was just as hard as the first time. And it seemed to me that simply updating certain demographics or statistics would not require a change based on the law. If it is things like adding to, and many of you will remember the work that we did updating the task list. You know, this is one, we completed it so let's take it out. We're just updating. But if we are adding a task that substantially changes the public interest and furtherance of the purpose of redevelopment, then we need to go through this elaborate system. But it seems to me that a TIF already falls within –. I mean, the plan already allows us the ability to raise revenues in a variety of ways. And the good thing about the plan is that it didn't itemize it. It left it open to any kind of funding source that we can come up with to fund this agency to do more and more of it's own work, was good. So I'm not understanding a justification that by adding a TIF we need to change the plan. So I'm still at that point where I'm not understanding why we have to go through all this work and then convincing Council and la-di-da-di-da. And I know at one point the conversation was that it has to be updated every 10-years in order to get CDBG funding. Well, then maybe we just don't want to go after CDBG funding. So I don't think this body, at least me, understands yet why we're going down this road.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, let me make a comment, I guess, first. Let's just start the process. I

APPROVED 03-18-2011

mean, this body can decide, for example, when we – well, we decided last month and it's been on our goals for a while, is to really talk about what came out of the market base plan. Okay, so we're going to be bedding what came out of the plan. Part of the whole stakeholder group was to get consensus or approval from MRA, from Main Street, and we haven't done our part of that yet. So let's go through that. And if we decide as a body that some of those, all, or none or some – if some of those recommendations that came out of the PUMA plan is something we want to put on the WRP, then I would imagine at that point in time we're going to have to change the plans and go through this process. But also, I think it was brought up last meeting, we also in our strategic plan took a vote and we dropped the Holowai Road improvements from the plan. For me, that's substantial. That is a change that probably in my opinion has to go through this public process because that's – whatever words you want to use – we made that decision.

I mean, I realize your concern, but for me, at some point in time, we're going to have to go through this public process, Planning Commission, County Council because we are going to be making some changes. And I realize some of the changes will be minor, updating demographics, all kinds of stuff. But I think Corporation Counsel has already said more than once that we probably have to go through this process.

Ms. Betts Basinger: If we're making a – as the law says – if we're making a major change to the plan. For the things that are on our task list – and remember we haven't even updated it yet – we spent many, many months updating it, all of us, task by task. But we haven't done that officially. So anything that we did can be undone, and I'm trying to remind myself of the Holowai project that you're talking about. We didn't take it out. Or if we did, we can keep it in if that's a concern. It doesn't require this huge change. You know, I'm really against things that put this agency's work backwards and stops us from going forward, and that kind of administrative change. Recommendations that came from the study, I think we should spend some time seeing where they would fit. This recommendation that we agreed to that came out of the market base study, where does it fit in our plan? Where do they align? It doesn't require a change. It just requires, you know, inserting it into the task list under that area that allows it. So I'm still, I'm still wondering why we're changing the whole plan that had so much effort put in from the community, and has already been approved by the Council.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead, and maybe Counsel can respond again.

Ms. Wade: Essentially, you know, the Council gave you folks permission to do exactly what's in this plan when you adopted this plan. And if you are just fine with the scope of work as it's outlined in this plan, then there's no need to do an update. If there are any of these things – and we did like you said, we identified the things from the market base plan that might be put into the redevelopment plan and how they might fit under the existing headings or elements as they're called in here, so this was our first cut at that. And then

APPROVED 03-18-2011

this is sort of the next progression of that conversation, do we want these things to actually be part of this plan?

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I think that's the stage we need to have a meeting about. Those things that were highlighted by staff that need to be added to the plan, that's what we should talk about. Do we want to put this in, understanding now what that change would cause or cost versus is there a way to incorporate it or is there a way we can do that outside of the existing plan? You know, we do lots of things. We enter into collaborations to do things that are broader than our specific scope. So I like that idea, Erin, that we go back to that with everyone available and say is this something we want to change the plan for? Is this in the best interest of the public that we serve?

Ms. Popenuk: I wanted to ask you what does it cost or cause?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm going to defer to folks that were around when this plan was being developed and they can tell you how long it took and all the exhaustive studies and research that was done, taking it before Council, et cetera, et cetera, which is the compromise of the community. It's already been done, and it's in this plan that was passed by Council in 2000. To change it, and I'm glad that Erin brought this, if at any time after the initial adoption of the plan, this agency determines that a change in the plan is in the public interest and furtherance of the purpose of redevelopment, the plan or any part of it may be amended following the same procedure as set forth above for adoption of the original plan. And then they highlight all the laws and codes that you can refer to in that. So it would be repeating to answer Katharine's question. It would be repeating this long and arduous process that this community already went through, and that this agency, since 2000, has been trying to implement. So, I still don't get why we're getting back, you know?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, let's just start the process. And that's why I brought up what we handed out last month. Incorporate or whatever – just review the findings and recommendations of the Wailuku market base plan. So we're going to do that next. We're going to do that, the MRA. We can decide whether we want to incorporate it or not. And as Erin says, if we don't want to, then that's fine. That's the choice of this body to include what we discussed in the strategic plan last year. Okay. Fine. And then as we go through the process, Corporation Counsel or anybody else can weight in whether in fact, you know, even changing demographic information, census, is a change that requires the process. So let's belabor this point, let's move on. Go ahead.

Mr. Suzuki: See that was my question. I mean, James can already give us some guidance as to based upon on what's here. You know, what is a definition of a change?

Mr. James Giroux: I think that, you know, listening to your discussion that it's very important for you to understand that if you read that section where it says that the amendment of the

APPROVED 03-18-2011

plan or any part thereof may be amended. You're looking at it very narrowly, from the attorney's point of view, because you're saying well, or any part thereof. If any part of the document gets change, that triggers the process. So, you know, to slow down and look at the big picture and say, is it worth going through the process for minor changes or should the process encumber more time and energy and effort to look at possible major revisions in order to justify the use of time, energy and resources. So, I don't think it's a part of the attorney saying well, that's just a minor change, we're not going to go to Council. That's not going to happen. It says any, any, any, any, you know, and that's where the attorney is coming from. But it's for the agency to use it's discretion to look at it and say well if there's any change we want to do, then let's look at what are we going to do as far as our time, energy and resource.

Mr. Suzuki: So basically what you're saying James is that based upon the language that is here, the way you read, the way you interpret it, any change will require us going back before the Planning Commission and the Council?

Mr. Giroux: Yeah, I would have a hard time justifying a revision of that document without going through this process.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any other questions or discussions about this agenda item? If not, we can move on to the TIF.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair, I do want to thank James for that because he brought up something that I'm glad he did and that was that it's this agency's responsibility to measure the value of that change against the work and resources it's going to take to accomplish it. So, you know, our resources that we have available to us are slim to none. And I'm still not sure what the huge value. What it is that we want to change that is so, that rises to that level of importance. And that's the question I've been asking at every meeting, why? I mean, what change is it that we want to make?

Mr. Horcajo: We're not there yet, but we're going to start.

Mr. Suzuki: So we are going to change.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, we have to change something, well, if we want to update the plan. Just changing the census numbers if we want to update the plan. And I think Erin or maybe Alexa had mentioned one good reason to change the plan is that if this body wants to get CDBG grants, block grants, any federal grants, you cannot be longer than 10-years old. And for us to not have that opportunity, for me, I feel we're short changing this body and the public in general by not having that source of potential funds. And we can't do that until we update the plan.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, so based upon what James said, and based upon what you said we're going to go through the process. We are going to go through the process.

Ms. Wade: That's what I'm waiting to hear because I've heard two suggestions. One we go chapter by chapter, or two, we jump straight to this and figure out how much of this gets incorporated, if any, and if any, then we go chapter by chapter. Do you want to do the interim stuff where we determine is it worthwhile to update or do you want to go straight to the chapter by chapter update?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, because based upon what James said, based upon what Bob said, we are going to go through the process.

Mr. Horcajo: And for me, it's two steps. This is one because we had a plan, and the second part is chapter by chapter. For me, it's kind of two separate things because the chapter by chapter, you know, we're going to update the time lines that are now old or the projects are gone, the actual task – Iao Theater, Police resource – you know, so that's a separate process in looking at the plan. And then the second is we have to go through the process of making our recommendations or comments on the market base plan. So the second part of that process is whether we want to incorporate any of those recommendations into the Wailuku plan.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay, so what sequence are we going to be doing the review?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, what's your recommendations? For me, we go chapter by chapter first I guess. Yeah, chapter by chapter. But, I mean, there's going to be some chapters we're not going to have any discussion.

Ms. Wade: Or little.

Mr. Horcajo: Or little. Right? But there's going to be some chapters we may have longer discussion. But for me, the charts, the action charts, we went through that, whatever, last year. So I would imagine that would be fairly quickly because we're changing time lines. We're updating that, and we're going to eliminate the tasks that have already been completed.

Mr. Suzuki: So, and going back and trying give Erin . . . (inaudible) . . we're going to do the chapter by chapter review.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Suzuki: Then what's after that?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Wade: That's it. I mean, it's chapter by chapter, and concurrently we hire a consultant to do a TIF plan. We package those and then we send them through the process. That would be the way. If you're saying today, yes, we are interested in updating the redevelopment plan –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Please say change, not update. Because then update is different than a change.

Mr. Suzuki: We're going to update –. We've got to update to be able to get funding.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That's not –. I mean, that's a conjecture that's been put forth so we haven't seen anything like this that says we cannot get Federal funding.

Ms. Wade: Well, I did send you the quote from the CDBG book from Carol Gentz that said –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, but that's one source. And it's a difficult source. I mean, I know a little bit about grants and CDBG, and I do know that source is – it's unlikely that this agency would get funding from that source because our mission does not align with that funder's goal for that money. And, I mean, I'm saying that as conjecture but it's based on my own applications to that agency for projects in the past for non-profits.

Mr. Suzuki: I mean, I've been confused for awhile, and I'm getting more confused now.

Ms. Wade: Good. Let's sort it out. I mean, what's the confusion? I do know, having worked for a redevelopment agency in past, we received CDBG funding with the updated plan. So it is an opportunity. I mean, it's not impossible, but for – you do have some tasks left in this plan. I mean, if you just want to get through the end of these tasks, to not update the plan, keep it as it is, that's an opportunity. I mean, you can do that. Or, if you wanted to look at this, we've got to go through the process.

Ms. Popenuk: So you're saying without an updated plan, all Federal grants?

Ms. Wade: That's what Carol has told me.

Ms. Popenuk: Would be off limits to us. And another question is –

Ms. Wade: Wait, let me clarify, as it relates to slum and blight. Okay, so as it relates to slum and blight conditions which is where you folks get your authority now. But if, for example, we were able to determine we want this park, it has nothing to do with slum and blight, you could apply for another pot of money from the Federal government that isn't related to slum and blight, and qualify without a plan that explains how you get yourself out

of slum and blight.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Thank you.

Ms. Popenuk: But you're saying MRA is slum and blight.

Ms. Wade: I mean, that's your mission is to, you know, remove or to eradicate slum and blight conditions from the Wailuku Redevelopment Area. But it doesn't mean that you can't get money from elsewhere or from other pots.

Ms. Popenuk: And then my other question is regarding the TIF, instigating the TIF. Would that require a change in our plan? Does that automatically mean that we're going to be changing the plan if we decide to go that route?

Ms. Wade: The TIF can go up with a plan that is separate from this plan. But then whatever is in that TIF plan is all you can spend your money on. So if you said we're going to ask because the TIF ordinance is going to do a couple of things. It's going to give the Council the authority to use tax increment financing. It's going to create a fund that it goes into. And it's going to say the redevelopment agency is going to be utilizing this money for these things. And those things that are listed, and whatever plan goes up with it, you know, the use of funds, is what you're required, you're limited to. Which is why I was saying it just kind of makes sense to send – and this is how most redevelopment agencies do it – they do their redevelopment plan and then they do their TIF and they go together because you don't want two separate actions out there generally. You want all your TIF money to be able to cover any activity that you're identifying in the plan as much as possible.

Ms. Popenuk: So this is much humbug proceeding with the TIF, the idea of instigating the TIF as the community plan?

Ms. Wade: Well, my opinion is it's simpler –

Ms. Betts Basinger: No, no. Because if the TIF would give us revenue to do –

Mr. Horcajo: Let her answer the question first.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm sorry.

Mr. Horcajo: Go ahead.

Ms. Wade: My opinion is if you put the plan and the TIF together it's simpler because there's only one plan out there for the public to understand. There's only one package of financing and they're married, so you only go through one process overall. If you do it

APPROVED 03-18-2011

separately where if we left this redevelopment plan as is, and then we created a new plan that was just going to with the tax incrementing financing, you create a whole lot of confusion and you likely are going to trigger the need to update this, the full redevelopment plan later. So you've sent this other package plan, up with a TIF, and then you still got to go through the process again in updating the redeveloping plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'd like to add to that. What she says is correct, but we don't have to marry a TIF ordinance to a new plan.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We marry it to the existing plan.

Ms. Wade: Then that's what I'm saying.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And so the TIF ordinance is a way for this body to have steady revenue so that we can fulfill the tasks that are already in here and undone. There's a lot in here that we haven't done and we haven't been able to do it because of lack of funding. So, I hate to see everything stop. And someone in the audience reminded me that a former Planning Director who was Planning Director during the time this was done, we may not understand the cost that goes into redoing this entire document in excess of half a million dollars. Do we have that? We're talking about hiring a consultant to do a TIF ordinance. We can afford that. And the TIF ordinance will support the tasks that we already have, that this community has already said, this is what we want you to do. The only thing that I'm asking of staff and Chair to help me is what tasks do we want to add here that is of such high value that we have to start from scratch?

Mr. Suzuki: That's not what they're saying though. That's not what they're saying.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I just want that answer.

Mr. Horcajo: The answer will come in the process of us redoing the plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But the process takes all our time away from everything else we could be doing. So I just really want someone to say, well, you know, if we want to complete the parking structure, we have to do this. Or if we want to purchase property at the corner of Church and Vineyard for redevelopment, we have to change this. Now both of those projects I just said, we don't have to change this to do either of those. It's already our task

APPROVED 03-18-2011

to – we can right now purchase – and there's some Betsill property for sale in Wailuku now – we can purchase property and prepare it for redevelopment. We can't own it. We can't build a building on it. But we can turn it over to a developer with good infrastructure and other things that make it enticing for that developer to come in. That's what our agency is all about – enticing development and redevelopment. Not doing it, but being that vehicle. So, I really and again, maybe I'm just really stupid, but I'm here every month asking the same question. What is the –. What is so important that we have to change the whole plan? I just want to know.

Ms. Popenuk: I have another question. So I'm thinking about like how much time this would take. If we have the TIF ordinance and alterations/changes to our plan, and they move together, how long will that take? And if we just had the TIF ordinance and the plans for spending that money, how long would that take?

Ms. Wade: I would expect that it will be about six months in house here with updating and changing the redevelopment plan. And then we would be able to go through the process. There does look like there's a noticing process that's required as part of this so I'd have to look at the timing. Council has to host or hold a public hearing as well. But either way that's got to occur with the tax increment financing plan. So it will take maybe three months for the tax increment financing plan development, six months for the redevelopment plan development – those three can be concurrent – so an additional three months to update the redevelopment plan as opposed to just doing the tax increment financing plan.

Ms. Betts Basinger: So are you saying that the Planning Commission needs to review the TIF?

Mr. Suzuki: Yup.

Ms. Wade: I don't know about the TIF. I'll have to look up the TIF.

Ms. Betts Basinger: TIF ordinance? Why would Planning Commission have to?

Ms. Wade: They do not have to hold a public hearing in either situation. But I can't imagine they would have to do the TIF.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Mr. Suzuki: But the Council has to.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But this plan, if it were changed, has to go before the Planning Commission too.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And then before Council.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Ms. Betts Basinger: But the TIF doesn't have that – doesn't have to –. But the TIF were going to support the existing plan, it would not go to Planning Commission.

Mr. Suzuki: But it has to go to Council.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It would go to Council. The TIF will. But the TIF, to write the TIF ordinance, once we hire a consultant, they'll do that very quickly. I mean, that process can start right away.

Mr. Suzuki: But can it go on parallel tracks?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Ms. Betts Basinger: James?

Mr. Giroux: I think the only reason the TIF would possibly, as far as I know, would go to the Commission would be if it would be considered an ordinance that's a land use ordinance.

Ms. Wade: Right. Well, if it's tied to the plan it would go.

Mr. Suzuki: What do you mean?

Mr. Giroux: I mean, we would have, Corporation Counsel would have to look into that if that –. We would probably have to be asked formally if there's no other statutory reason for it to go to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Popenuk: What do you mean by tied to the plan?

Ms. Wade: I mean if you make the tax increment financing program part of the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan they would have to go to Planning Commission. But if you do like a separate plan like I was saying, you know, we're going to do these things with this money, it would probably go directly to Council. I mean, we're going to have to wait for James. That would be my read of it.

Ms. Betts Basinger: If we were going to do these things, it would go directly to Council. Is that what you're saying?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: So maybe what I might suggest is this. I was trying to finish this agenda item by asking whether we want to update the WRP in house as was projected in last month's thing. Maybe for our purpose today let's just not even discuss that. We're going to handle the actual TIF next, RFP for the TIF. But next month on the agenda, it's going to be reviewing the market base plan recommendations. Let's just deal with that as a separate item and then we'll all have more time to think about reasons or no reasons to update the plan between this month and next month's meeting. Let's just focus on something we should have done already anyway is review the market base plan and do that separately. Now at that meeting we may decide we don't want to put anything of those recommendations into this plan. And if we do, then we're going to have to change plan. But let's not confuse the issue with the market base plan recommendations and at least let's focus on the TIF because we discussed last month that's our biggest priority.

Mr. Suzuki: I think we're discussing even a higher level and separate from the market base plan recommendation. I mean the market base recommendation is one aspect that could potentially affect the redevelopment plan. But we're talking about a higher level in terms of, you know, if we do what sort of process we go through. Another question came up in my mind is that when we come up with the assessment ordinance for the parking structure, I mean, what process does that have to go through?

Ms. Wade: 14 doesn't go to Planning Commission I don't think. 14 goes straight to Council.

Mr. Suzuki: But how does that relate to the redevelopment plan?

Ms. Betts Basinger: The parking structure is in our current plan, so it doesn't require anything of us to change. We don't need to change our plan for the parking structure.

Ms. Wade: You're talking about the parking assessment?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: I think that just goes straight to Council. We do the needs assessment study, it goes straight to Council.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I like that recommendation, Chair, that we have a thorough discussion at the next meeting about recommendations from the market base plan and to see if any of them rise to the level. You know, I would still like to hear from every member at that meeting too, what is inadequate about this plan. I mean, what's wrong with it that we need to change it?

Mr. Horcajo: You've asked four times, so let's move on with that one.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: So if everyone can be prepared to maybe go through it and say here this doesn't serve the community moving into the future. Because I ask at every meeting, but no one ever tells me.

Ms. Wade: Well, I did give you a write up of all the things that I felt needed to be updated.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes you did.

Ms. Wade: So let me ask the question, is this the product you folks want to discuss then at the next meeting? This was the one that I did that added in all of the strategic planning and PUMA.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yes.

Ms. Wade: So this would be the discussion topic at that meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: That's the base. Is that okay?

Mr. Suzuki: That's the market base study?

Mr. Horcajo: Well incorporated into the elements of the Wailuku plan. There were five elements, land use infrastructure. So Erin took those recommendations out of the plan that would fit into the five elements.

Mr. Suzuki: The market base study.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Wade: And the strategic planning from before, we created a new category.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: So is that okay then?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. I think that's perfect.

Mr. Horcajo: So we'll move on from this agenda item. And as Alexa said and I said earlier let's take a real good hard look at this back page, this one sentence here or whatever, one or two, as you're reviewing.

Mr. Suzuki: Well, it's clear to us what the implications are.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Well –

Mr. Suzuki: I mean, James already made it real clear what the implications are.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So can we move on to the TIF RFP, I guess? That's the next agenda item. Erin you are in charge.

4. Request for proposals to develop a Tax Increment Financing Plan, program and accompanying legislation.

Ms. Wade: You have two RFP's. The one that does not say draft is the TIF and unfortunately the heading is incorrect. But it does say in the introduction, consultants to develop the tax increment financing plan. The only thing that's new about this –

Mr. Horcajo: It was e-mailed to you.

Ms. Wade: It was e-mailed to everybody.

Mr. Suzuki: I didn't make a hard copy of that.

Ms. Wade: So the part that got – basically this got pulled out of the really comprehensive RFP that was published last, well, distributed for your review last month. Now the scope of work has been adjusted and the things that are broken out further is the introduction and number three. Number three is a result of me talking with Brad and Scott Teruya. It further describes the preparation of the capture projections and what our expectations is. It's more descriptive than what Brad had sent us as a sample. He just average the tax rates for all the different uses which I think it's too generic for this district. We want something more specific. And then the rest of the language from schedule on down is the same with the exception of where it had said, County staff being a decision maker and also selection committee.

Mr. Horcajo: So I'm going to have –

Ms. Betts Basinger: To where, Erin? So everything remains the same expect what?

Ms. Wade: Where it said County staff provide this to County staff. County staff will get their discretion, make the review. Now it says selection committee.

Mr. Horcajo: You had a comment Alexa about who is on that committee.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah because I felt that the MRA was not part of the deciding who the

APPROVED 03-18-2011

consultant would be and it's our money.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So the Chair is going to open this up for public testimony first please

Ms. Perreira: Thank you. Jocelyn Perreira. I've seen part of this, but the only thing that we haven't seen and I reserve the right to comment is the scope of work, that number three, that you said you adjusted. I really want to run this by our bankers and other people knowledgeable in that area to see what they think. You know, they're the nuts and bolts of understanding this. They live with this day in and day out. So, if I do have something I can forward it to you for the next meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any question for the testifier? Alright members, questions for Erin. If you want to make any suggestions starting with the title. Erin, maybe what's your suggestion for the title change?

Ms. Wade: Just to develop a tax increment financing program for the Maui Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Suzuki: Do we want to delete any kind of reference to update?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: That's what she's suggesting – just talk about it separately.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Say that again, what you just read.

Ms. Wade: To development a tax increment financing program for the Maui Redevelopment Agency.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Could we include the writing of an appropriate ordinance?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, let's add that to scope of work because I had that on my list too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. Good.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, we're just talking title right now. Okay, I think we all probably saw a few typos so we don't have to talk about that. No comment on introduction. Any comment on background besides the typos?

Mr. Suzuki: The second paragraph, third sentence.

Mr. Horcajo: Remove that right? Where it says the Wailuku Redevelopment Plan will be

APPROVED 03-18-2011

updated in house.

Mr. Suzuki: The first is the update. No, the sentence before.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: We're in background paragraph. Well, background section, second paragraph, in reference to updating the WRP, it's being suggested to be removed from this RFP. So that's really the second and third and fourth sentences I guess, and even part of the fourth. Any way, Erin can redo it. But the gist is any reference to updating the plan. So can we jump to scope of work? And they mentioned two things were changed from the last RFP and that's one and three. Is that correct?

Ms. Wade: Uh-huh.

Ms. Popenuk: So this is – it's State Legislation is our only concern?

Ms. Wade: Yes. It has to comply with HRS 53, and section 101 which is the tax increment financing plan.

Ms. Popenuk: So County –

Ms. Wade: Well, that's whole other ball . . . (inaudible). . . basically because our initial conversations had all been with Kalbert about this. He was totally onboard and ready to move forward, and we haven't had a conversation yet with the new Finance Director. But I continue to be in touch with Scott Teruya from Real Property who this really affects, you know, intimately. In all honestly he has expressed a little bit of reservation now that California is repealing all of their tax increment financing. So we have to make a good case for him, and we will continue to have to make a good case for the Council as well for tax increment financing. But their reasons are totally different than our situation. Just for the record, California really abused the tax increment financing laws, where any small town essentially, anything with a traditional business district, not just the downtown, but even like a Makawao/Paia in post tax increment financing, they created districts for all of those communities. And as you know any increase in valuation gets relocated from the general fund to these just tax increment districts. Well, it turned out to be almost 10% of the budget of those communities. I'm sorry, 12%, so it was way above and beyond what we would be even be approximating. Where the Wailuku town is less than 1% of, you know, the valuation of the County. And it doesn't have any implications whatsoever for the other small towns. This is the only district that would be authorized to use that.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, I have a question on number three, on the second sentence down. Projected increase in valuation by use type or.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm wondering if that should be and. I mean, does it make sense to break it down based on districts, residential, commercial on one end, and then geographically, I guess, by street kind of?

Ms. Wade: Maybe we could do and/or. I would kind of like to leave it up to the expert to make that call.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, so and/or.

Ms. Popenuk: Sorry, getting back to one again. So presenting it to the County or selling this idea to the County, should that be part of this person's scope of work?

Mr. Horcajo: Well, that's further down.

Ms. Popenuk: Sorry.

Mr. Horcajo: So any questions? So far we're one, two, three, four I guess. Can you explain four, establish from the project fund?

Ms. Wade: Yeah, basically what that does is it establishes what portion of the budget that the fund is going to be created in and then where that money will be directed. So it says it in the plan, and then it gets also transferred later into the budget document.

Ms. Betts Basinger: On that number four, and I don't know if it's relevant. Under four if it needs a section of it's own. Would we want this consultant, in addition to doing this research, creating the plan, writing the ordinance, would we want them to advise us on options for this agency's receipt of these monies? I mean, how are we actually going to receive these monies. One of the problems we've had for many years is that there's no vehicle right now for us to write checks or to receive payments. I think that's worthy of having them suggest options since you're talking to them.

Ms. Wade: Yes. We were talking to Kalbert. He said we would need our own bank account.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Exactly. Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, I was wondering whether that would be in the legislation that's prepared as well I guess, but I'm not sure.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, if they could find out all those questions for us and give us some

APPROVED 03-18-2011

options on how we can manage our own funds.

Mr. Horcajo: So that makes sense. That's in four, I guess.

Ms. Betts Basinger: On schedule, do we want to –

Mr. Horcajo: You know what, let's finish up five, six and seven, and any additional thing I guess if you wanted to scope. Any comments on five, six and seven?

Mr. Suzuki: It doesn't include a . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: I think you're right. Yeah. So what we should maybe do is say, A, develop the program and it includes all these things. And then, B, work with County staff and the MRA to take it through the approval process.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Could you repeat that again Erin?

Ms. Wade: Still under scope of work, just to add a B.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Scope of work to say to make this all, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, under A, item A, which should be development of a tax increment program. And then create an item B, which would say take it through the approval process basically.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Page one. Front, right between the line that says scope of work and number one, we would insert item A.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Suzuki: No, above number one.

Ms. Wade: Above number one.

Ms. Betts Basinger: After roman numeral three.

Ms. Wade: I'm sorry.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you. . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: 3A, develop tax increment financing program.

Mr. Horcajo: So I had a comment on item six, I guess, under the scope. Does the word potential use of money, or adding the word potential to use. Should or could or not important?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, I think based on our earlier conversation about the plan. I mean, this is what we can use money for, anything in this plan. I don't know if we need to be specific, any more specific than use of money as based on the Wailuku Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, it was more giving us an idea of the potential usages. For example, you know, one of our task is to look at designing sidewalks on Vineyard Street. So can that money be used for design? Can that money be used for infrastructure? Just basically informing us of the potential uses for the TIF funding. Or are we saying it doesn't matter, and it's whatever we want to do. Buy a lot? Use it to buy a lot? That's the potential uses.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think it should be open to everything that we could possibly do.

Ms. Wade: Except marketing.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, except marketing.

Ms. Popenuk: Isn't there a requirement for TIF that you show like a need. You know, you can't like set up a TIF unless you demonstrate that there's like a bunch of broken sidewalks or something?

Mr. Horcajo: This is our need right here.

Ms. Wade: Well, and essentially you have to demonstrate that you would not get reinvestment but for the improvements that you're going to make as a result of having the TIF funded. So, you know, we have to document. Like the parking structure is a perfect example. Nobody can meet our parking requirements right now, you know. So no one can build, or redevelop, or intensify in any way without having some resource for additional parking within the district. So that totally meets the criteria for Saeng. But for this TIF money, we wouldn't get any reinvestment. You know, so things like that. And that's an

APPROVED 03-18-2011

extremely clear cut example. You can do like a Vineyard Street sidewalk is a really good one. And any component of that you could fund with tax increment. But when it gets into marketing and advertising that's not –

Ms. Betts Basinger: – So you're saying that the consultant we hire will identify the use from our plan of these monies, or the exclusion of marketing?

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah, potentially. Right, that's what I'm suggesting.

Ms. Wade: I got pull in one small caveat though is I wouldn't put potential use of monies because if you don't use it, they can take it. So you want to say we will be using it for these things.

Mr. Horcajo: Alright. I'll make another note I guess. Alexa and I both kind of thought about who's going to create the ordinance. Is that part of the scope A or scope B? To me take through the approval process, I don't know if that specifically says to draft the ordinance.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, let's say it, the ordinance.

Mr. Horcajo: And that's under 3A? It's under 3B.

Ms. Wade: No. That's B. Let's put it under B.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah because that goes along with taking it through the process.

Mr. Horcajo: And so under that it's going to be public hearing. That's part of that 3B?

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, the process that Warren wants us, that they take it through the whole process.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Popenuk: Is this person an on-going person or is this like a one shot thing? Because I'm looking at seven annual reports with County Council.

Ms. Wade: That's a requirement of that section of the document where you have to describe in your tax increment enabling plan that says we will report annually to the Council and it will include this information basically which illustrates how close you are to your projected income, you know, that kind of thing.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: So they will be advising us on what we have to report annually?

Ms. Wade: Exactly.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any other additional scope potential? You guys can think about that. Okay, so any other suggested or comments or suggested changes? Erin mentioned earlier the changes made through selection criteria based on discussions last month.

Ms. Wade: Sorry, I did start doing that, Ramseyer, and then when I pulled apart all three different parts, it just got really confusing, so I ended up just giving you a clean document.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, and just one last thing I remembered from last meeting. I don't I voted incorrectly, but on number eight, minimum bid. Somebody or maybe Alexa brought up, said, maybe that should be minimum RFP a requirement.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: That's right.

Mr. Horcajo: And I had one more thing, sorry, my notes. The last RFP you had a post contact award meeting that wasn't on this RFP. What's your reason for that?

Ms. Wade: Well mostly because the other two components would have taken a much bigger public input process and we would have wanted to meet and talk about the schedule and the stakeholder meeting. This is pretty technical.

Mr. Horcajo: That's why. Okay. Alright.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I'm quickly trying to go through roman number eight, minimum bid requirements, through all the letters. Is there one that – do we ask them to give us the names of clients where they've done some of their work?

Ms. Wade: Qualifications and resources.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I thought you might know off the top off your head.

Ms. Wade: Qualification and resource, but we can ask for specific projects.

Mr. Horcajo: It says here descriptions of three projects similar to that described in this RFP if undertaken by the prospective contractor must be –

Ms. Betts Basinger: Which one is that Bob?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: That's under E, about third sentence maybe. Third or fourth. Must include project name and description, clients name, reference and phone number.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. Okay. It is in there. Great.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Cause would we expect that this might be a CPA, a tax firm or public?

Ms. Wade: Often an attorney.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. A tax attorney.

Mr. Suzuki: Probably a combination.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: So members what do you want to do? Do we feel comfortable enough to take a vote based on suggested changes we've made or have Erin redo it and come back? And then whatever input we get, put in writing please. Okay, so we're fine with this agenda item for now?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I think this is great.

Ms. Wade: Okay, and what should I anticipate for sending this up to go out for bid?

Ms. Betts Basinger: I think based on the work we've done here today, we're going to be ready to approve it at the next meeting unless there are comments from the public or others.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So I'll try to have a list of potential bidders for next time too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Great.

5. Request for proposals to update and propose amendments to the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code (2002).

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, thank you folks. Next item is the RFP on the WRZDC, the zoning and development code, which Erin has provided us via email as well. Did you guys find copies of that too?

Ms. Wade: I gave you a new copy today with this draft copy on it because – yeah it's right

APPROVED 03-18-2011

up there – mostly because I noticed after I read through it that we had talked about sort of changing the things under item B in the update to be not expecting them to follow up on the things that we had suggested, but just to say these are items of concern, please evaluate and make your recommendations not do this.

Mr. Horcajo: Be more neutral.

Ms. Wade: Yeah, be more neutral. Thank you. But other than that, and the change of the County staff thing too, selection committee.

Mr. Suzuki: Just change all group to RFP.

Ms. Wade: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So one minor change in the title I guess. We'll just eliminate the –

Ms. Wade: – the plan.

Mr. Horcajo: The plan, right. So maybe folks –. I'm sorry, can I open this public testimony at this point in time? Does anybody have any? No? Okay thank you. Alright members, so –.

Ms. Perreira: Jocelyn Perreira. Wailuku Main Street Association. I just want to remind everybody on this and maybe you have it, when the zoning and development code was done, okay, got transmitted to the MRA for approval and we wanted to really run with it, and there was a section regarding road standards and frankly that's what halted it several years ago was because there's a section that was suppose to address road standards, roadway standards. And I think at that time Public Works had said wait a minute they wanted the MRA to pull that out and let them provide the section on roadway standards. I hasten to add that part of the problems in Wailuku as you no doubt have experienced already is relating to roadway standards, and to have this done without the section of roadway standards included. So I would recommend two things. One, get on the horn to Public Works and see if they have that long awaited, over five years we've waited, for the roadway standards. So it would be interesting to see why they didn't do it because they did have a frame work to work off of. And then please, if it's not included in here, it needs to be a part of this. Thank you very much.

Mr. Horcajo: Any questions for Jocelyn? Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Yes.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: Just one comment, I think probably more for Warren who I think missed some of the discussions on this meeting. This is another RFP that's based on findings from the Wailuku market base plan. And I guess the comment I have under scope of work, and it's just a comment for discussion. I don't have an opinion about it. Item no. B3, to evaluate and make recommendations for the development of a dining and entertainment district or overlay which might include et cetera, et cetera. I know that this was one of the findings of the market base program. I don't know that this body has enjoined that to be a part of our responsibility in our tasks. So I'm just throwing that out for discussion. I think this body would encourage restaurants and all kinds of development and business in Wailuku, but I would just like to talk about that.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. You know what, my notes on that particular item was to just, actually, I mean, keep it there, but just keep it broad. Evaluate and make recommendations to market base plan, whatever, to just kind of keep it broad and not be specific, of course, dining and entertainment, good neighbor policy. But I still feel it should be in there. And for me, the potential update of the zoning and redevelopment code is not totally been driven by the market base plan. We've sat in this, you know, we've given variance waivers for people who are told to put parapets on an old plantation house, to move a sign because whatever 10 feet. We've had one of the local planners many times question the authority of DSA to require certain things because there's a question of, you know, being forced to basically make improvements under title 19, whatever, 16 is building stuff, I'm not sure. So for me those are big basic questions we've got to answer. Now, we did get an opinion from our past Director?

Ms. Wade: No the author of the –. We got the letter of intent from the author for the redevelopment ordinance.

Mr. Horcajo: And so for me it's just – and plus a person who has, for example, I just applied for a tent permit. Pretty interesting process for a temporary tent permit.

Ms. Betts Basinger: On your own property?

Mr. Horcajo: For Lao Theater fundraiser next weekend for the movie on our property. I wanted to go through all that process. And, you know, it amazes me what it takes to get a temporary tent permit. So for me, there's a lot of other things other than the market base plan that we should look at because we hear it from the general public. It is part of the market base plan, and of course, it's part of our bible to lessen the regulatory barriers or those two words to get investment in Wailuku town. So for me, it's a critical part of what is going to bring people in, or people willing to bring money in.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I agree with your comment to maybe keep this a little broader, item no.3, because you're exactly right. I think we undertook this request for proposals because

APPROVED 03-18-2011

we wanted to finally clarify who is responsible, who oversees these particular zoning codes, and what authority does the MRA have in weighing those or in –. You know, we don't want to get into a fight with some other coding people. So this whole thing, if I understand it was to clarify what we can do to live up to our design guidelines in our bible.

Mr. Horcajo: So we've got consensus on my suggestion to change three to be more general, but referencing the market base plan?

Ms. Popenuk: I have a question, then, potentially. So let's say that, well, with the new Planning Director, are there any possibilities for any changes in how Wailuku town passing, you know, meeting code requirements in Wailuku town is going to change? And let's say hypothetically that things got more liberal. I'm just thinking like is there a redundancy here? How is our hired person find out what changes that might be happening already with the County? And how do they dovetail their efforts so that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: No, I think what I get from you is that it's a policy interpretation by administration change.

Ms. Popenuk: Yeah, exactly.

Mr. Horcajo: DSA says the tent can be up from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. without a permit. Anything after 6 p.m. you need a permit. Are they going to change their interpretation of that you were saying or it might be better for us to amend that so that it's not that restricted to six to six for a temporary tent?

Ms. Popenuk: Well not so much specifically talking about your tents, but that's an example.

Mr. Horcajo: That's an example. There's a lot of examples I can give you.

Ms. Wade: Well, I would say the change of administration is very pro-stream lining, and pro- not having role making. So basically they're extremely supportive of an updated redevelopment plan because there's a lot of redevelopment code. There's a lot of things that we've had to interpret because there haven't been clear direction in the redevelopment code. So we've had to make a whole lot of assumptions in the past that they're concerned about. So they're very supportive of updating the code, and they're encouraging.

Ms. Popenuk: So maybe this person that should be part of assignment is to make sure they inter face and find out what those changes are so they're not like duplicating. Maybe something, maybe the 10th code got thrown out or something so we don't need to address that.

Ms. Wade: Well, I think it was always the intent of the redevelopment code to stand on it's

APPROVED 03-18-2011

own, you know, to be independent, and it's not functioning that way. So that's the – I think that's everybody's real crux of why they want to bring this into, the vision, for this has always been. And that's what Will has said as well.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And I think you're talking about keeping the integrity of what the area zoning should be, and that person will be working. Whoever the consultant is will be working very closely with Erin.

Ms. Wade: And probably John Summers. I mean, John went through this. And he's more than happy he said to help in any – providing history – you know why things succeeded in and why things that failed. There was a lot that failed with DSA. Just like you're saying, both DSA and Public Works that was attempted in the original draft of this. It just never made it to the final version so we'll have some passionate thoughts.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And perhaps we'll be a model that others can look at, look to.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Sorry. In the last RFP we separated kind of the scope from the process. Do we want to do the same? Like on number – unless you changed the notice. No, you've got it here. Or C.

Ms. Wade: Oh yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: I'm sorry. I got the old one that was e-mailed to me. I guess she has it under C here – provided a draft – facilitate a meeting – but it does not talk about –. That's right, that ordinance. Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And one question. On both of these RFP, under schedule – I meant to bring that up earlier – we're simply saying to complete as quickly as possible. I would feel more comfortable even if they have to request an extension, I would feel more comfortable tying it our budget here, for budgeting purposes if everyone agrees because –

Ms. Wade: For commencement purposes you mean, so that they have to commence before like March 2012.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I just don't like leaving it open ended like that, that they can complete it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, I thought –

Mr. Suzuki: I thought it was by schedule.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: What's that?

Mr. Suzuki: I thought they had to provide a schedule.

Mr. Horcajo: Well, that's what I was going to say. I thought last time we decided the selection committee is going to base their decision based on a lot of factors to include when they're going to get started, when they're going to get it done, aside from the . . .(inaudible) . . . So after that discussion last month, I wasn't – because I brought the same thing up –

Ms. Betts Basinger: – you mean we're setting this up as a potential criteria of who we pick.

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. Exactly.

Ms. Suzuki: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: That's what I thought.

Mr. Suzuki: That was my impression too.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I don't know why we're just not up front about it.

Mr. Suzuki: Time schedule provided. It's here. Under response to the RFP will be scored on the consultant's ability to produce the product in a timely manner.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: So they've got to provide a schedule and that will be part of what you look at when you evaluate them.

Ms. Wade: I do appreciate your concern about starting though. We definitely want to get them beginning prior to the end of this fiscal year.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Exactly.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: So, are we going to do the same with this RFP, that Erin is going to make the suggested changes and with the(inaudible) . . .

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, this we'll approve it at the next meeting.

Ms. Wade: And a list of potential bidders.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah. We would make this minor change, minimum RFP, whatever.

Ms. Wade: I've got that.

Mr. Suzuki: Because RFP we select who send the RFP's to, right? It's a public ad?

Ms. Wade: It's a public ad, be we can have a specific list that we send to as well.

Ms. Betts Basinger: We haven't talked about the dollar value of the RFP's and that would, depending on what the dollar value is dictates.

Mr. Suzuki: We don't know what . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, we do know what our budget is though.

Mr. Suzuki: But we don't know what RFP is going to come in as.

Ms. Wade: Right. I mean, we could say, we could commit to \$50,000 this year, and \$50,000 next year, and you know, that's our fund for the completion of this. But, I don't know. For me it's difficult because you're going to be comparing some national teams against some local teams. Their budgets might be very different, but the service or expertise that they provide might also be worth it or not worth it.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah, I wouldn't worry about –

Ms. Wade: You might want to leave it open ended.

Mr. Suzuki: I would.

Ms. Wade: So that you get the opportunity to select based on who you think is going to do the best job.

Mr. Suzuki: I would. I would.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I don't know.

Mr. Suzuki: I wouldn't put a dollar amount in there.

Ms. Betts Basinger: No a dollar amount, but I think we as a body should kind of know what we can afford to pay.

Mr. Suzuki: But even if –

Ms. Betts Basinger: So that we can maybe, if we have like a great candidate, but they're way above our budget even over a two-year cycle, we can maybe line item some items out. So if they present their bid in such a way that there's a cost to each element that might help us.

Ms. Wade: Well, you know you only have about \$50,000 from this year.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Wade: And then you're going to have to take out the tax increment proposal from whatever.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right.

Ms. Wade: And then, I think, the Deputy is proposing a flat budget, or the Mayor, so you've got \$80,000 there. So that's kind of your budget. And we got creative last time with the market base plan though so if you want to say, you know, the Planning Department doesn't like this, they have professional service dollars, let's see if they're willing to chip in. We might be able to any of those things. So I would say let's get it right this time, hence have them tell us what it's going cost.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Who else would benefit in the County from this kind of –?

Ms. Wade: DSA. Fire.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And they may want to pitch in some money.

Ms. Wade: Yeah. The Mayor's Office with the complaints.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Well, I like it and I think we'd be ready –

6. Request for proposals for clerical assistance to the Maui Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Horcajo: – alright, so can we move on you guys? I guess item six, I think I saw something that it's deferred, right?

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah. We've got to wait.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

G. PLANNING DEPARTMENT UPDATE

1. Wailuku Redevelopment Area permit and enforcement activity

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, Erin, you're on for Planning Department update.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So you've got the list of projects. Well, this doesn't show enforcement. We don't make enforcement public right now, but I will, for the record, state that there have been a number of sign complaints coming in all of sudden which is kind of interesting. Because there was a proliferation during the end of Tavares' administration, then it sort of stopped, and now they're all coming back again. So that might be something we want to put on the website, just how do I apply for a sign kind of thing, you know, like a merchant's corner because it's definitely there. It's an explosion of signs happening.

Rick McGovern, I'm still waiting for his withdraw letter. I don't know if he's going to withdraw that or not. Main Street Bistro is waiting to determine how they're going to provide their parking. The Noble Boutique Hotel is getting routed for agency review. I'm sorry, the Maui Bake Shop is the one that has to do the parking positions.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

Ms. Wade: And then the 346 Market Street is the on-going one that we have in Happy Valley. Remember it came in for design review and then they we denied on the door, and they need to provide a compliant design. So I haven't closed it because I hate to make them pay a second fee if they can bring something new in that complies, but, I'm still waiting.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. Any public testimony for this particular agenda item? Alright.

Ms. Perreira: Erin, we're waiting for the boutique hotel, to look at -. Did you just send it?

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Ms. Perreira: We didn't receive it yet. It's on it's way.

Ms. Wade: What's that?

Ms. Perreira: We didn't receive it yet.

Ms. Wade: Well, I know I sent it out on Tuesday so it should be in route. If it's not at your office, then let me know.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Perreira: Then I can just let you – okay, okay. So, I guess this Maui Bake Shop thing, I guess part of the problem is that they are really gun shy to come through a process. And, is there any way to provide relief? I mean, they had a lot thrown at them including a letter requesting a fine of \$200 something thousand that they had after –. I don't know exactly precisely but there's conflicting opinions whether or not that was waived or not, if you talk to the property owner. But it does seem like they feel like they went through the ringer sort of speak. So is there a way to – and I know part of it is they have to provide parking. But this property, this is quite an important business in the spirit of trying to create and retain small businesses in the area. And this business is close to the municipal parking lot. It's very close to the municipal parking lot. So if they only use the existing space that they have on their roof that they had prior to them adding additional . . . (inaudible). . . couldn't there be a mechanism to give them some consideration until such time as the whole area is upgraded? I'm just thinking –. I know, but there were vastly many people who were up here, for a vastly a lot more, you never once said that.

Mr. Horcajo: Jocelyn, you're not talking to Leilani, you're talking to us. Okay, go ahead and finish.

Ms. Perreira: I think I almost lost my thought because I was generally trying to appeal for this poor business owners that are having a heck of time. They are so terrified of any kind of a process, any additional process they have to go through. I don't know what the answer is. I know that he needs to come with his application. But in order to proceed with his application he has to provide off-site additional parking so on and so forth. Okay. But I remember when we were dealing with the Serreno project and there was a need to remove parking, so on and so forth. I mean, that all takes away from parking for the area. You know what I mean? And then, I'll tell you what seems very, very unfortunate. If you stand there. If you go there on Saturdays when they have this feed my sheep thing going on and you see all the cars that come and park all along, okay, and take up all the street parking for something that is not a business that is paying, you know, trying to pay taxes, trying to participate as a legitimate business, there just must be some way that we can assist this business. And that's all I want to express. I don't have all the answers, but I am concerned and I want to express that.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, can conclude your testimony and then I'll make comments? I'm sure other people will too.

Ms. Perreira: Thank you for allowing me the time necessary to appeal for them.

Mr. Horcajo: No problem. Any question for the testifier? I guess my comment is this. You know, we have a process and as much as they may be wary of the process, that is the process. Serreno went through the process, and they have to go through the same process. It's not something we can vote on now because it's not before us going through

APPROVED 03-18-2011

the process. And part of the hope for owners like him, or like myself, is to look at this zoning code, and look at the potential WRP and see how we can make changes so that it is less, to reduce the bureaucracy and barriers. They're going through the barriers. That's what we're talking about. That's the next phase. The plan starts first. Now we're trying to fine tune it, so that is the hope. But we have to go through the process.

Ms. Perreira: . . .(inaudible) . . .

Mr. Suzuki: No discussion.

Mr. Horcajo: No discussion.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I do have –

Mr. Horcajo: He knows the rules.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I have a question for Erin. What triggers this having being on our list? How did this project come to be on your open list?

Ms. Wade: They applied for an after-the-fact permit for the expansion of their dining area, and are proposing to do an outdoor seating area. Anytime you expand dining or seating area, it triggers additional parking.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Right. So they have initiated an application.

Ms. Wade: Correct.

Ms. Betts Basinger: And they have received the things that they need to get to move on to the next steps.

Ms. Wade: Yes.

Mr. Horcajo: So let me make one quick comment. One of the recommendations of the market base plan is for restaurants smaller than 2,500 square feet do not need to meet parking requirements.

Ms. Wade: Right.

Mr. Horcajo: I mean, that's a potential.

Ms. Betts Basinger: That would be great for the zoning.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Exactly. So there's –. We've got to just go through the process.

Mr. Suzuki: Chair?

Mr. Horcajo: Questions on this issue for Erin or whatever?

Mr. Suzuki: They could apply for a variance, couldn't they?

Ms. Wade: Certainly. They can apply for a variance. They can apply for off-site. They can demonstrate parking within a whole number of areas. And I've explained that and in fact you folks got that, a copy of that letter, two months ago, when I gave them 30-days to send me what they wanted to do with the parking. But they're still discussing.

Mr. Suzuki: Have you sat down personally spoken to them?

Ms. Wade: I've spoken – yes – I've spoken with both the owner and with their applicant, Frank. Yeah. They're very aware of their options. It's just trying to make a call.

Mr. Suzuki: Okay.

Mr. Horcajo: Any other comments or questions for Erin on that agenda item? Okay, item two, website update.

2. Website Update

Ms. Wade: The flood hazard information got transferred to the resource documents, and we're going to be updating about the new public meetings that are going to be coming up on flood hazards, so that will be a resource. And then I'm hoping to get the news letter –. Well, what I wanted to get from you folks is how thoroughly do you want to review a newsletter? Do you want to –? It's just information about tax increment financing, the parking structure status, the MRA priorities, Maui Nui Botanical collaboration, and then a couple of blurbs about other different on-goings in Wailuku. So if that's okay, we can probably get this up before the next meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: Any comments?

Ms. Popenuk: I trust you.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah, I think we should do it the way we did with the first one.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

Mr. Suzuki: Go for it.

Ms. Wade: Publish.

Mr. Horcajo: Any public testimony on this agenda item, website update? Okay, newsletter update.

3. Newsletter Update

Ms. Wade: That was kind of my newsletter update.

Ms. Ferreira: . . .(inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: Good idea.

Mr. Horcajo: Which reminds me, you know, it's not done.

Ms. Wade: Yeah.

Ms. Betts Basinger: It isn't.

Ms. Wade: What? According to Milton it's done.

Mr. Horcajo: It's not done. I've seen it. You go look. I'll show you.

Ms. Wade: Are you certain?

Mr. Horcajo: I guarantee it's not done.

Mr. Suzuki: We were told at the last meeting it was done.

Mr. Horcajo: I know it was, but I saw it.

Ms. Wade: I was told by Public Works it's done.

Mr. Horcajo: Just a few sections they didn't – a few lines.

Ms. Wade: Okay. So the majority is done, and then?

Mr. Horcajo: The majority is done, but not all the striping is done.

Ms. Wade: Okay.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: We'll do that for the next month.

Mr. Horcajo: Shall I take a picture?

Ms. Wade: Actually, yes, let me know where it is so I can –

Mr. Horcajo: I'll tell you after the meeting. Okay.

4. Contracts for services with the MRA update.

Ms. Wade: And then the contracts for services, Teens On Call did pull all the weeds out, and that other contractor planted flowers even though we didn't want any.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Good what a phone call does yeah.

Ms. Wade: It looked really good for the last first Friday so that was good. And for the rest of the year, hopefully. That's it for contracts.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, any public testimony on the contracts for services? Okay, item H, budget.

H. BUDGET

1. Expenditures Update

Mr. Horcajo: Erin did provide a current budget up to –. And I know next month we're going to – next couple of months hopefully, we're going to finalize –

Ms. Wade: You're going to spend all your money in the next couple of months.

Mr. Horcajo: And we should have an opinion on the clerical issue from Planning by next month so we can also have a discussion on that issue next month also as well.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I have a question Chair.

Mr. Horcajo: Yes?

Ms. Betts Basinger: The three line items for the parking lot coordinator contract. What do those amounts indicate? I don't understand. Amendment one, amendment two.

Ms. Wade: Is this new or was this on last month?

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: No.

Mr. Horcajo: No, I don't it was. I don't know what that is.

Ms. Betts Basinger: I like it.

Ms. Wade: I will have to get back to you on that. I will send you an e-mail in the beginning of the week.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Okay thanks.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah if I could too because, you know, again, based upon the discussion that we had earlier, I'm –

Ms. Wade: –Curious.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay. So can we move on to approval of minutes? Do we want to do both together or individually?

I. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 19, 2010 AND DECEMBER 17, 2010 MEETING MINUTES (via e-mail)

Mr. Suzuki: Together. Move to accept.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Second.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, moved by Warren, seconded by Alexa. Any discussion? No discussion. All in favor say aye.

Agency Members: "Aye."

Mr. Horcajo: None oppose. Unanimous.

It was moved by Mr. Warren Suzuki, seconded by Ms. Alexa Betts Basinger, then unanimously,

VOTED: to approve the November 19, 2010 and December 17, 2010

APPROVED 03-18-2011

**Maui Redevelopment Agency Meeting Minutes as
presented.**

J. NEXT MEETING DATE: February 18, 2011 (Friday)

Mr. Horcajo: Alright, our next meeting date is February 18th, on a Friday. Okay, Chair will adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Popenuk: Agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Horcajo: Agenda. Let's go through from the top then. Call to order stays. Public testimony stays. Public hearing, we may or may not have.

Ms. Wade: No, but we will likely have a design review from Maui Medical for a project that has to get fast track.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Wade: I know. We don't even have it in yet. I just met with him this week.

Ms. Perreira: The only reason I'm telling you is he's worked . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: That's fine. MRA business, the Maui Nui thing may be back on the agenda, I guess, depending on the water meter situation.

Ms. Wade: Maui Nui will be back.

Ms. Betts Basinger: At least an update on it on how the collaborations.

Ms. Wade: I think they're ready to go.

Ms. Betts Basinger: Yeah.

Mr. Horcajo: Market Street improvements that will continue. Discussion of process of WRP that's going to disappear, but we are going to be discussing whatever the wording is about the market base plan, right?

Ms. Wade: How about the action charts.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Mr. Horcajo: Yeah.

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah.

Ms. Wade: Action charts.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, and we're going to have the RFP for the TIF, the RFP for the WRZDC. And I guess we'll leave the clerical on depending and we'll just see what happens next month.

Ms. Wade: The other thing that you asked of me, I believe, is to bring back the budget proposal for Maui Nui, you know, whatever that's going to cost. Get a quote to move the planters. You asked me to make a written recommendation to Public Works to identify the parking stalls with compact standards, and then to rear bumper line. And to identify to Public Works that the parking lot is done being striped. So I'll have updates on that.

Mr. Suzuki: Erin, based upon the discussion we had on the parking structure, you can kind of give the heads up and to make sure he does what is being requested of him.

Mr. Horcajo: Okay.

Ms. Popenuk: I have comment. I was just wondering about the flood zone and the mapping, whether MRA was going to –. I see that as being like a really big problem for a lot of people, and I was wondering if we would envision that we would have any role to help out somehow, like information or –

Mr. Horcajo: Sure. Well, I guess we did discuss a couple months, meetings ago, I guess, or maybe the meeting with Francis who was here last month was whether we were willing to – I don't know how much we discussed it – was to send notices to who we thought would be affected, property owners, down there in Happy Valley. And I don't think we made a decision. So, for me, that's what we could do.

Ms. Popenuk: I was also wondering, I don't know anything about this, but I was wondering this is going to be a huge hardship for some people.

Mr. Suzuki: Especially the business owners along Market Street.

Ms. Popenuk: Is there any kind of – I don't know – emergency rolling fund for people or something like that, that, you know, we can find out about and help people?

Ms. Betts Basinger: There are three meetings. You know, Francis talked to us about their public outreach to the community, and it's starting in February. And there are three

APPROVED 03-18-2011

community meetings scheduled. It was in the Maui News. The one that would focus in the Wailuku area is at Vilma McWayne Santos Center, I believe, the evening of February 25th. So we are putting that on our website to let people know, and we are putting it in the newsletter to let people know. And I'm planning on being there just as a concerned citizen, but we'll be able to bring back news about what happened.

You know, my sense of what I've been reading, and I also did read the public notice that was in the Maui News as well, you know, the little fine print, little public notices. This is just going to happen. So who deals with the consequences as they relate to our citizenry. I don't know if that's in our MRA scope, but we can at least get the word out to people to go to these public meetings because they're not going to have any more. It's February. And this is suppose to go into effect in August, I believe. Planning Department is working with FEMA on these outreach.

Ms. Popenuk: Are they providing any assistance for people who might not be able to?

Ms. Betts Basinger: No.

Ms. Wade: The best advice Francis was giving people was to get signed up for flood insurance before you're identified as being in the flood area. I think that's the best we've got at this point.

Mr. Horcajo: Write a letter a letter to the editor as a private citizen expressing whatever concerns you want. It's amazing how many people read that. So, you know, that's something that anybody can do. Whether it be about that, phase two improvement issues or something.

Mr. Suzuki: Can the MRA submit a letter to the editor?

Ms. Wade: You could submit a view point absolutely.

Ms. Perreira: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Horcajo: Do you want to suggest that Erin draft something for us?

Ms. Popenuk: That would be excellent.

Mr. Horcajo: Look at?

Mr. Suzuki: Yeah. Specific to FEMA, that's it.

Mr. Horcajo: Right.

APPROVED 03-18-2011

Ms. Betts Basinger: Informational.

Mr. Horcajo: Information. Exactly.

Ms. Popenuk: You know, in real plain language so people understand what's happening.

K. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Horcajo: Okay, meeting adjourned. Thank you very much all.

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Robert Horcajo, Chair
Katharine Popenuk, Vice-Chair
Alexa Betts Basinger
Warren Suzuki

Others:

Erin Wade, Small Town Planner
William Spence, Planning Director
Michele McLean, Deputy Planning Director
Joseph Alueta, Administrative Planning Officer
James Giroux, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Wendy Taomoto, CIP Coordinator, Department of Management

Morgan Gerdel, Parking Structure Coordinator
Yuki Lei Sugimura, Public Relations