

**MAUI GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING OF JULY 26, 2007**

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Maui General Plan Advisory Committee (Committee or GPAC) was called to order by Chair Tom Cannon, at 5:10pm, Thursday, July 26, 2007, in the Kaunoa Senior Citizens Center, 401 Alakapa Place, Spreckelsville, Paia, Hawaii 96779.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Chair Tom Cannon opens the floor to public testimony. Upon not seeing any testifiers, he moved to the next agenda item.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 16, MAY 19, MAY 30 and JUNE 2, 2007 MEETING

Chair Tom Cannon noted that there are 850 pages of minutes and that the prints of these minutes are small.

Mr. Stan Franco moved to approve the May 16, 2007 meeting minutes as they are and Mr. Carl Lindquist seconds the motion. The members of the GPAC all agree to accept the May 16th meeting minutes, as they are, and the motion was carried.

Mr. Dick Mayer moved to approve the May 19, 2007 meeting minutes as they are and Mr. Stan Franco seconds the motion. The members of the GPAC all agree to accept the May 19th meeting minutes, as they are, and the motion was carried.

Ms. Lesley Bruce indicates there is an error in the May 30, 2007 meeting minutes. She notes that on page 9, sheet 3, Mr. Hutsie's name is John and on page 78, line 14, her name is misspelled. It should be "Lesley". Mr. Warren Shibuya moves to approve the May 30th meeting minutes with their corrections and Mr. Carl Lindquist seconds the motion. The members of the GPAC all agree to accept the May 30th meeting minutes with their corrections and the motion was carried.

Ms. Lesley Bruce indicates there is an error in the June 2, 2007 meeting minutes. She notes that on page 4, the word "kapu" is supposed to be "kahu" and on page 5 line 25, sheet 2, "kako" is spelled without a "u". Mr. Stan Franco moves to approve the June 2nd meeting minutes with their corrections and Mr. Carl Lindquist seconds the motion. The members of the GPAC all agree to accept the June 2nd meeting minutes with their corrections and the motion was carried.

Chair Tom Cannon calls for Public Testimony.

Mr. Tom Blackburn-Rodrigues expresses his aloha and mahalo to the GPAC for their dedication to the betterment of Maui. He also talks briefly about the new Olowalu project and proceeds to hand out a copy of information regarding his project to all in attendance.

Mr. Rory Frampton also expresses his mahalo to the GPAC for their dedication to Maui, to the upcoming schedule, and to the future. He also makes comments on the Policy Document. He says it's "too spread out", "watered down", "too much information", need more "planning related strategies", "the vision isn't clear", "not to core planning standards", "pair down to be more focused", "follow Focus Maui Nui writing style", "keep the plan focused to the land use and ordinance", the "plan is too complicated", and then noted that "it's easier said than done." However he thanks the GPAC for being dedicated to this "incredible workload" and that it's "amazing" what they need to do to get it done in time.

Mr. Stan Franco has a question for Mr. Rory Frampton. "When you looked at the workload schedule, did you have any suggestions?"

Mr. Rory Frampton says to "use more land use/ growth strategies, to focus them down to be more specific, more information on the front end of the plan, when going to the different districts/communities to do it later in the process – after the plan is written, keep it focused and simple, and the GPAC sets the vision but you are not the planners."

Ms. Jeanne Skog asks Mr. Rory Frampton, "are you saying that the clarity on each of the sections should be written as a narrative?"

Mr. Rory Frampton says "Exactly. Use the Focus Maui Nui as an example. Keep it a small light package."

Ms. Jocelyn Perreira had similar things to say, but stressed that she did not want the GPAC to shorten the plan to the point where you can't understand what has transpired. She's concerned that information will be lost in a brief writing style. She has created her own matrix and will present it to the GPAC. She stressed the public would like to read about the process. She thanks the group for their hard work and want the people of Maui to understand all that this Committee has done.

D. WORKSHOP – The Maui GPAC will assess and evaluate past meeting operations, ground rules, and attendance.

Chair Tom Cannon read his "Report to the Committee" just before starting the Workshop.

Report to the Committee – July 26, 2007

As Chair of this Committee, I rely on the laws that formed us and our rules for guidance. It is clear in Bill 84 (that created this Committee), and in Bill 53, which amended the ordinance created by Bill 84, that this committee and the Planning Director have two distinctly different jobs. Bill 53 says that the (quote) “Director shall prepare and recommend proposed revisions to the general plan”. The Committee’s job is (quote) “to comment, advise, and provide recommendations to the Director regarding” the director’s proposed General Plan revisions. Bill 53 says that (quote) “The Planning Director shall be responsible for providing staff to support the work of the General Plan Advisory Committees”, and that the Committee shall elect a chair and vice chair, and adopt rules” related to our meetings.

It is also clear that the enabling ordinance and Bill 53 envisioned an independent General Plan Advisory Committee (or GPAC) that would accurately reflect the wishes, desires and concerns of Maui County’s residents, through a GPAC all-inclusive transparent public process. This Committee has a good cross section of residents, and I am honored to have been unanimously elected as your chair.

At our 1st meeting of the Committee under its own direction, we edited and approved our required rules. In keeping with the intent of Bill’s 84 and 53 to provide for an independent GPAC, the Committee adopted a rule saying (quote) “The Maui GPAC shall file an agenda with the County Clerk at least six...days before (a) meeting” and that “(t)he final decision as to the setting of the Maui GPAC agenda shall rest with the Committee”. Without that rule, the Committee would not be independent, just as before we elected our own chair, we were not independent. Without that rule, the Director could say put an item such as “GPAC Leadership” on the agenda at any time to suggest a new election and thereby persuade an existing chair to support department objections, instead of the community’s, ...not that the Director would do this, but it would be possible.

Director Hunt understands that we have different roles in this process. We agree that (obviously) the Committee cannot hire or fire him, and that he answers only to the mayor. The Committee, on the other hand, is here to represent the community as a whole. Some of us are appointed by the Mayor, some buy the Council. We do not set the Director’s agenda. He does not set ours. We are independent, as we should be, accountable to the people, using every avenue to hear their collective voices. The policy plan we came up with is significantly different to the Department’s version. In Bill’s

84 and 53, the Council intended to have these two viewpoints, along with that of the Planning Commission, to consider. This is what we should give them. I'm sure we can work with the Planning Department to come up with a reasonably good way to ensure that the Committee controls its own agenda, as set out in our Rules. Some last minute items might have to wait a week or so, but that shouldn't happen often. We need to be independent and set our own agenda to truly represent the entire community's interests.

Regarding meeting operations, I have heard through the rumor mill that certain unnamed individuals have expressed concern that I have "advocated" from the position of Chair. I believe the record shows that if I have been an advocate, it has been to advocate for the stated goals of the County, to preserve special Hawaiian places, to correct existing hazardous conditions and protect vital infrastructure, and to perpetuate Maui's unique natural assets and the traditional character of our small towns. Yes, I have advocated for these, briefly, and I have given ample time to each of you to advocate for similar community benefits. Thanks to Melissa Prince, we have only to look at our meetings shown on AKAKU television to confirm that.

Some of you Committee members have commented on possible ways to improve meeting operations. Thank you for your comments. When we were running out of time at the end of the Policy Plan sessions, several of you individually mentioned that we really needed that last Saturday to finish up, even if staff was not available. Several Committee members suggested that this Committee has the competence to take our own minutes, etc. When I brought that out-of-the-box suggestions up at our last meeting, it was quickly put back-in-the-box by the Department, who felt this was unworkable. I understand this position, but we ran out of time in large part due to only having enough staff to meet every two weeks. We still have not ~~seen, nor~~ approved our final Policy Plan, (yet) and I ask that every member receive a copy of the final document ~~to review~~ so that we can approve it.

My objective as chair is to fully and efficiently represent the desires of Maui's residents and develop the best possible community-based plan, the people's plan, to steer the Island and County for the next 23 years. I appreciate all your helpful suggestions and your positive feedback.

(A copy of Tom's report will be included in the meeting minutes.)

Ms. Erin Wade of the Planning Department starts off the workshop by referring to Planning Director Jeff Hunt's letter dated June 26, 2007 to the GPAC. She emphasizes the GPAC come to the table with efficiency, expectations, and courtesy to each other. She goes

through a list on the 2nd page of the letter that contains the expectations. “How group members and staff treat each other has improved as times went by”, she says. She indicated that we have good measuring points, improvement and ground rules.

Chair Tom Cannon asks the LRD staff, “How can we improve our meetings, logistics, absentees, and what group members bring to the table?”

- E. WORKSHOP** – The Maui GPAC will discuss future meeting operations, ground rules and attendance and may recommend procedures and ground rules to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of future meetings.

Chair Tom Cannon asks for any public testimony. Seeing that there is none, he moves to the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Stan Franco shares his notes on our system regarding how and what we are doing. He comments that he appreciates the Chair and the Vice Chair and how they preside over the meetings and keep order. He suggests that the Vice Chair be the parliamentarian, to help the group stay on track since the group often goes off track. He suggests that the Chair turn the meeting over to the Vice Chair so that he can facilitate the meeting when the Chair wants to state his views. Lastly, Mr. Franco suggests that all business should be done in a motion. Alternating speakers should be allowed to speak. Then a second turn can talk. He says, “2 chances in favor, then 2 chances not in favor and then pau.”

Ms. Lucienne deNaie shares Mr. Franco’s views that the Chair should temporarily turn over the meeting to the Vice Chair when he wants to state his views or bring up other business. She feels their comments would move more in an orderly process and is very supportive of this idea. It would improve the process. She suggests a time limit on participation because there are a lot of decisions to make and the amount of time needed to hash things out make some nights too long. She encourages people representing a specific area to have a 60% attendance at the meetings so that their geographical area would be fairly represented.

Ms. Kehau Filimoeatu asks if there is a process for being un-appointed.

Corporation Council Attorney Mr. James Giroux was asked to look into this issue and stated it was more focused on the attendance. Within the HRS there is a section 92-15.5 where non-attendance of board members are given 3 consecutive meetings as excusable. After the 3rd unexcused absence action would be taken. Section B and Section C of 92-2, State law addresses this issue. This County does not address this issue so we go to the Charter. Impeachment is the only way unless you are appointed. Within your rules it does say each Maui GPAC member serves until the Maui General and Island Plan are done. So the life of the member is same as the life of the Committee. After some discussion with Mr. Dick

Mayer concerning Roberts Rules of Order, Mr. Giroux says that the Mayor or Council will need to make this decision. Planning Director Mr. Hunt suggests a softer approach that would involve talking to them and explaining that they are needed, or send a letter or memo to the council or ask for a resignation. But a parliamentary approach would be a better way to go.

Mr. Hans Michel asks about why the meetings have changed from Wednesday to Thursday nights. He explains that his business is dependant on the coffee season and they harvest on Thursday's so his presence will not be good during coffee season.

Planning Director Mr. Jeff Hunt expressed that attendance is the subject at hand and his concern about meeting dates will be addressed at a later time.

Mr. Joe Bertram III expresses his opinion of having an independent parliamentary person to keep discussions on track and to keep the group focused.

Ms. Kehau Filimoeatu suggests we go moot on the subject since there is no issue.

Ms. Susan Moikeha agrees that there is a need to find a more efficient way to get through the agenda. She wonders why the process has to be done twice before it is final. She asks Mr. John Summers of the Planning Department about how the Island Plan will be structured. He replies by saying he will comment of this later.

Ms. Walette Pelegrino suggests bringing back Lynn Nakamura-Tengan, the GPAC's original facilitator. She feels that the need to have someone handle the meetings should be someone who understands the process and knows how to make judgments whether a discussion should be stopped or allowed to continue. She also notes that the cross reference is confusing and she likes the common courtesy part. She's not sure the public understands the Sunshine Law. She needs more clarification on all the items, not regulations. She would like the GPAC to operate efficiently and to separate the items. She suggests that the Staff, Chair, and Vice Chair look over the items.

Ms. Kehau Filimoeatu expresses frustration that the GPAC just "deals" with things. She says we need to attack, stop deferring items and to forget the "hana hou" method. Deal with things now, make a decision now, and move on.

Mr. Joe Bertram moves to get a facilitator to regulate discussions, help the group stay on track, and run the meeting. He stressed "we need something like that".

Ms. Kehau Filimoeatu seconds the motion with a suggestion that the facilitator comes from the staff.

Planning Director Jeff Hunt supports the idea however will need to consult with staff regarding Ms. Filimoeatu's suggestion and the budget for Mr. Bertram's suggestion.

Mr. Bertram suggests Ms. Wade as an option.

Ms. Filimoeatu asks the staff "who controls the budget?"

Planning Director Jeff Hunt says the Planning Department would be funding this endeavor.

Ms. Jeanne Skog says "wasn't there a facilitator in the first phase? Where are those funds?"

Planning Director Jeff Hunt says it's a great idea but he's not certain of the details. He can not commit to a decision right now. The staff needs time to think this through.

Mr. Bertram changes his motion to, "I move that the Staff explore getting a facilitator whether it's an outside consultant or if it comes from the Staff."

Ms. Filimoeatu seconds the motion.

Mr. Stan Franco notes that 12-901-15 where it lists officer and their duties of the Chair and Vice Chair in item #2 maintains order. We cannot use an outside facilitator. My suggestion is the Vice Chair be this. We are responsible. We cannot lend the responsibility to someone else. Is this legal or not?

Mr. Hans Michel says to "let Tom carry the ball".

Mr. John Blumer-Buell doesn't want a facilitator. The Chair needs to tighten up with cutting people off when they take too long. A Parliamentarian is a conflict with the Chair and Vice Chair. Everyone speaks once. But with the discussion of the Policies and Objectives, people rambled and I learned a lot. A facilitator will not know what to do when that happens. The Vice Chair can handle things when the Chair has too much.

Mr. Joel Bertram suggests a need to find a way for the staff to work with the Chair and Vice Chair to make meetings more efficient.

Chair Tom Cannon says item 3, ground rules, makes great headway when time limits are set. Timing and scheduling is important. He suggests we need a more structures and discipline so that the finish line is in view.

Vice Chair Dick Mayer suggest when we have a motion on the floor to speak only to the motion and that the facilitator be used at times but not all the time.

Chair Tom Cannon asks for “kokua” (help) from the Vice Chair to get back on track.

Mr. Joe Betram amends his 2nd motion and says “Staff with the Chair and Vice Chair to run the meetings more efficiently whether it is with a facilitator or not”.

Ms. Kehau Filimoeatu calls for the question.

All in favor = GPAC members say aye with none opposing. This motion was passed.

Chair Cannon calls for a 5 minute break. Time is 6:20pm

Chair Cannon calls for the meeting to resume. Time is 6:28pm.

Chair Cannon thanks Mr. Tom Cook for the pizza dinner. He states that he will be a stricter Chair and quickly goes to cover the “Ground Rules”. Some discussion happens as to which “Ground Rules” to look at and finally it is decided that they will work off the Ground Rules from the letter from the Director.

Mr. Warren Shibuya makes a motion that no more than 15 minutes will be spent on making and adopting the rules.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Lucienne deNaie. All agreed, no one opposed and the motion was carried.

Chair Cannon starts with the first Expectation:

1. Cell phones off or on vibrate during meetings.

All members agreed to keep this Expectation as is, therefore no changes were made.

2. Emails among GPAC members regarding topics related to the general plan are discouraged based on the spirit of the “Sunshine law rules”.

Ms. Lisa Hamilton expresses concern about this expectation. She doesn’t think its fair for the group to be discouraged to talk about the plan and its process. She expressed she likes to talk about the plan and have no problems talking about the plan. Chair Cannon agrees that if you are in a one on one conversation it is okay. Ms. Hamilton asks Corporation Council attorney James Giroux for further clarification.

Mr. Giroux stresses the importance of the Sunshine Law and its self policing policy. He specifies that if emails are sent to a GPAC member and that member forwards the email to

someone not on the GPAC that it is illegal. This will expose you to a lawsuit. Anybody can challenge an action of a Commission within 90 days of the action and if the action is found to be in willful violation of the Sunshine Law the action would be voidable. The body has 180 days to do the Island plan, so be careful. Email is a technological tool that adds another level to be a possible lawsuit if not monitored.

Chair Cannon asks if emails between the GPAC and the Department are public record and Mr. Giroux responds that they are. Anything that is brought to the GPAC as a communication item is public record he adds. Chair Cannon asks if all emails that are sent to the Department are disseminated to the GPAC. Planning Director Hunt states that only if there are substance issues discussed in the email it will be sent out as a correspondence.

Chair Cannon asks the group if everyone is okay with Expectations 1 & 2. All agreed and discussion to Expectation 3 began.

3. GPAC members may not discuss the general plan or related issues among themselves, based on “Sunshine law rules”.

Planning Director Hunt asks Mr. Giroux to define “among”. Mr. Giroux responds by saying, “2 people without one more person can talk to each other. You cannot try to solicit someone to take a vote on something that’s pertinent to the body. What you can do is call up Joe and ask him if he’s going to the meeting. What you can not do is call Joe and say I’ve got this thing and I believe in this and are you on? You can not do this.” Ms. Lisa Hamilton says that the board is an “advisory” board and our votes don’t really mean anything. She expresses that she really doesn’t understand why she can’t talk to people about this. Chair Cannon asks Mr. Giroux to provide a distinction between an “Advisory Board.” Mr. Giroux says to stick to what you can do and can not do. Mr. Hans Michel says the Sunshine Law is complicated and not everyone knows about it. He expresses that he’d like things to be simpler. Chair Cannon informs the group that the simplest way to understand this is to not to talk amongst yourselves unless it’s in a meeting. Ms. Lucienne deNaie asks if there is any difference between her calling Joe and telling him that she loves his idea of getting more efficient, what do you think about x, y, or z? Is that a direct violation of the Sunshine Law? Mr. Giroux says there are a few exceptions when electing leadership. That’s one of the few exceptions. Ms. deNaie says what the Council does, like a back room kind of a deal. But Mr. Giroux says again that it’s not absolutely condoned. Ms. deNaie says that just discussing our general process here is violating the Sunshine Law if we discuss it with another person. Mr. Giroux says that if you involve another person that’s fine. But if you involve another person on top of that, that would be a violation.

Mr. Kaipo Kekona makes a motion to adopt #3. Ms. Moikeha seconds the motion. There is some discussion on whether it can be adopted or where there changes to it. Vice Chair asks Mr. Kekona if there were any changes he’s making. Mr. Kekona said

no, he was wanting to make a motion to accept #3 as it is and move on. The motion was seconded by Ms. Moikeha.

Mr. Stan Franco makes a motion for #4, #5, and #6 to be approved as written. Mr. Carl Lindquist seconds the motion.

4. C members can continue to represent their personal interest on community boards or community meetings; as long as they say they are speaking as an individual, not as a GPAC member.
5. GPAC member handouts to be distributed to **all** GPAC members. Options: 1) GPAC member can provide to the Planning Department – Long Range Development (PD-LRD) 2-3 days prior to a meeting, for duplication and dissemination, 2) bring 30 copies to the meeting, or 3) email to PD-LRD to be emailed or sent via USPS.
6. There will be time for public to input following GPAC meetings.

Ms. Moikeha wants to add to #4, for people who are presenting material, DVD's, pamphlets, that there is a process for receiving that. Chair Cannon asks her if she wants to make a rule. And she says that if the Chair wants that separate then she is willing to wait till the end.

Mr. Franco says that he wanted to move the process along, but admits that #6 is confusing. He asks for clarification. **Vice Chair Mayer wants to modify #6 to, Public input will be accepted at GPAC meetings based on the schedule of the agenda. Seconded by Mr. Lindquist.**

Ms. Filimoeatu asks that this is just expectation right? Meaning that this is for particular meetings. She's confused as to why they are talking about "expectations" instead of "ground rules". Chair Cannon asks someone to give a 10 second explanation of the difference between expectations and ground rules. Planning Director Hunt says they are very similar and if both are discussed that's okay. She's very confused between the 2 different pages and which one are we working on. Ms. Wade explains that some are duplicates and consolidated into the single sheet because it was easier. However, Ms. Filimoeatu asks that staff to not pass out duplicates because it's confusing. Chair Cannon says that we are going over our 15 minutes and asks to extend. **Ms. Filimoeatu makes a motion to extend 10 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Franco.**

Ms. deNaie expresses she still needs more clarity on #6. What is its purpose for being here? Mr. Summers expresses that he's uncomfortable with the way #6 was written and feels more comfortable with the way it has been proposed to be revised. Mr. Giroux explains that as he remembers this rule came up because the GPAC was criticized for only having public testimony in the beginning of the meeting. Then the GPAC agreed to have

public testimony at the end of the meeting too. But this also didn't sit well. So it was again amended to have public testimony before and after an agenda item or before an action. Vice Chair Mayer sums everything up by suggesting 2 steps. First step is to have public input before discussion on something, and the second step is to have meetings dedicated in getting community input. He also suggests that they have these meetings at different locations and for several hours so that the public can air their concerns on that particular region. Mr. Kaipō Kekona urges the group to accept #4 & #5 as they are and change #6 to accept time for public input during and following public GPAC meetings. Chair Cannon states that Vice Chair Mayer's suggestion is what is being discussed and calls for Mr. Mayer to re-state his suggestion. Ms. Julia Staley, Planning Staff, reads: "**Public input will be accepted at GPAC meetings based on the schedule of the agenda.**" Chair Cannon asks for further discussion on #6. Everyone agrees in the affirmative for the change with none opposing. Therefore the motion has passed to accept Vice Chair Mayer's change for #6.

Chair Cannon moves on to Ground Rules. He asks if Ground Rule #1, one person speak at a time, if there is any dissent. Having seen none from the group, he moves on to #2. But Ms. Moikeha reminds Chair Cannon that she and Ms. Skog had wanted to add to the Expectation list. She suggests **Expectation #7 to be, establish a procedure for the GPAC members to receive materials (any format i.e.; DVD, CD, printed materials).** Mr. Cannon asks for her to repeat her suggestion. She says; **establish a procedure for GPAC members to distribute materials to the GPAC in any format (CD, DVD, printed materials).** Ms. deNaie wants to second the motion but wants clarity from Ms. Moikeha if she's also meaning handouts to be distributed to all GPAC members from the Department or from the GPAC members. Ms. Moikeha says from anyone who's presenting material to the GPAC members should be giving in all kinds of format such as DVD, CD, etc. Vice Chair Mayer suggests instead of saying handouts, to substitute it with the word materials that would cover it all. She then realizes that the statement really is intended for the public to distribute to the GPAC members. She restates her intentions that all she wants to do is establish a procedure that if a member feels strongly about something on a personal level, or if they represent those in their district, personal interests put on a DVD, that we have some kind of procedure to handle how it's given to the GPAC members. It must be fair to everyone that a procedure is in place so that we know who it's coming from, where it's coming from, so that we are all prepared. Chair Cannon suggests this: The GPAC members come up with a policy that shall allow...Ms. Moikeha says, **establish a procedure for GPAC members to distribute materials to the GPAC in any format. Chair Cannon calls for a second; it's seconded by Mr. Bertram. Mr. Mayer suggests changing Expectation #5 to: GPAC member materials to be distributed to all GPAC members. Thus changing the word handouts to materials. Chair Cannon asks Ms. Moikeha if this was ok with her, and she indicated: "let's just move on."**

Chair Cannon proceeds to the next Ground Rules (#2) but Ms. Skog brings us back to the "back side of the single sheet" where it says "General consensus is desirable. If there is no

general consensus on an issue/topic....” **Ms. Skog suggests changing this wording to: General consensus is desirable. If there is no general consensus on an issue/topic, the decision of the majority will be recorded with a description of the opposing views. This was seconded by Ms. deNaie. Chair calls for discussion. Vice Chair Mayer asks what is Ms. Skog’s suggestion of what to do with the 4 points? She suggests deleting the other options as we are an advisory committee and we convey our outcomes along with other views. Vice Chair asks how we should write this up. Ms. Skog suggests there be a combination on minutes and staff notes to help finesse it.** Ms. Filimoeatu asks if a minority report be given now that we have to include everyone’s views. Mr. Summers says that it would be very hard and time consuming to put together a minority report because of the amount of people we have on the GPAC who have different views. Since the meeting is done in verbatim minutes, it will give everyone an idea of who’s views were stated and why. This is satisfactory to Kehau and Chair Cannon reminds the group that they are way off their allotted time. Ms. deNaie asks if the meeting minutes are available to the public and Chair Cannon said yes. **Chair Cannon asks if everyone is in favor of the motion, all said “aye” with none opposing and the motion was carried.**

Ms. Moikeha makes a motion to accept Ground Rules 1 – 6 and is seconded by Mr. Bertram. Chair Cannon asks if all is in favor, all say “aye” with none opposing and the motion was passed.

Chair Cannon asks Ms. Wade if she has anything more in the workshop to present. Ms. Wade says she’s done, and opens it up to the GPAC if they have any information or suggestions to the staff. Vice Chair Mayer wants to see more awareness to the public. He expresses that he doesn’t see any advertisements of the GPAC meetings in the newspaper unlike how the Planning Commissions do theirs. He also urges the next agenda to be set as early as possible so that legal opinion can be obtained. Ms. Filimoeatu also suggests that the GPAC members get documentation earlier. She also expresses her desire to not do things that are redundant. She wants to have things numbered or lettered to help organize everything. She wants to separate things that we need to do and things that will involve some discussion. She again expresses the need to get the materials earlier than they are currently receiving them. Mr. Michel expresses people do not know what the GPAC is or it’s function. He suggests that it be explained in the newspaper. Planning Director Hunt says that dissemination of info to the public whether it’s interviews with the media, or ads in the paper, etc. the Planning Department is on board but would need to make sure they have the budget to do so. Ms. Skog suggests viral marketing: like using companies with large email distributions. She gives examples like Chamber, MEO, MCC, and Maui Tomorrow. However Director Hunt says that there might be some logistical infraction such as people changing things and we wouldn’t be able to control it. But he expresses that he’s on board with the intent. Vice Chair Mayer says there are no changes made to the draft document and the title isn’t what it should be. It should read Maui Island

GPAC's Recommendations. He feels that it should say recommendations instead of amendments. He would like to see what's actually going to the Planning Commission. Mr. Shibuya suggests that we utilize the website as a direction point for people. It can also be a place to obtain information and used as an advertisement. Planning Director expresses that he is unable to commit to an answer at this time. He says there are a lot of things to consider and will not be tied down to a decision tonight. He reassures the GPAC that we will do our best to get information to the public. Mr. Michel asks if the newspaper ads cost the Department. Director Hunt says yes, legal ads don't cost anything but there are a number of tools that we will want to get information on and will step up the public notification.

Vice Chair Mayer would like to make a motion to not send this (the amendments) to the Planning Commission until this body has looked at it and commented on it at the next meeting, and approved it. This motion was seconded by Ms. Hamilton. Mr. Summers explains they do have an item under the Director's Report (5) Schedule of Maui Planning Commission on the "Countywide Policy Plan", and he questions Mr. Giroux if this type of motion and vote is appropriate in the context of this workshop. Since this workshop is about ground rules and attendance, etc. Mr. Giroux says that if the Chair wants to talk about it under F instead of E, then it's just a matter of order. Chair Cannon asks for any further discussion. Mr. Bertram wants to call for the question and says that this may have gotten out there because it was asked to the GPAC members if they had any input or suggestions. **Chair Cannon takes the vote. All are in favor with none opposing. The motion is passed.** Chair Cannon asks the group if there any other comments to the Staff for them to do things better. Mr. Bertram would like to suggest that if there are any suggestions that they be submitted to them in writing or email. Ms. deNaie would like to know what kind of resource people will be invited to talk to the GPAC? Chair Cannon responds saying that he believes Staff will respond to that under F, #2.

F. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Maui Island Plan Schedule

Ms. Moikeha asks before we start if the Department can give the GPAC a concept what will be the structure of this next document. Mr. Summers asks the GPAC members to get their 5-page matrix, titled GPAC Meetings, as well as the gant chart. He starts off with the Ordinance requires that the Island Plan have a vision statement, a near shore coastal water element, an element that addresses the environmental issues, an economic development element, a housing element, a land use element, and a transportation element, a capital improvement element, as well as a financial planning and implementation schedule. So the document will include all these requirements set forth in the Ordinance. There's also a requirement that we have milestones or benchmarks that we can follow to mark our

progress. There will be an introductory chapter that will lay out the process we used to create the product. Ms. Moikeha wants to know if there is more text that goes with these maps. Mr. Summers explains that the text and maps of before were ideally for the County of Maui and that what we are going to now work on will be more specifically for the Island of Maui. There will be text that will be specifically for Maui. Ms. Moikeha asks if the maps are going to be in separate sections. Mr. Summers says maps with growth boundaries will be included in the land use element. There will be maps included in different elements. The maps will include both urban and rural elements under the land use section. Mr. Franco indicates that Mr. Summers left out the water element. He would like to know what the islands carrying capacity is. With all these developments, will there be enough water? We are in a drought! We need this information before the developers decided what happens on our island. Mr. Summers explains that the Department has been meeting with the various infrastructure agencies over the last 18 months. Their discussions has been specific and focused to identify capacity constraints. Social carrying capacity, which is a little harder to measure than infrastructure capacity, information has also been collected thru the various communities. They also have a lot of environmental and historic resources and potential threats. We have a reasonable amount of information and technical studies to help us make some really good educated decisions. Ms. deNaie asks if someone from “Waste Water” will come and talk to us and answer our questions. Mr. Summers says that will not only provide you with answers to your questions we will also schedule people from the different departments to come and speak with you. Mr. Michel asks about regional transit and when is it coming? Mr. Summers says the land use and transportation element is fairly early in the process. So both roadway and public transit will be discussed. Ms. Filimoeatu asks if the group will the Maui Island Plan that will include the historical pages from the previous plan. Mr. Summers assures the members that everyone will receive a complete Maui Island Plan and then will have 120 days to review the plan. It will have a historical piece included that will be very land use focused. Mr. Shibuya is very concerned about how the County will pay for all these obligations. He requests a full accounting on everything including bonds.

Mr. Summers would like to walk everyone through the 4 phases that are on the Maui Island Plan handout. For meetings 1- 8, government agencies will come before the GPAC with tech studies and will follow a question and answer time.

The second phase would be regional meetings where the GPAC will go out into the different communities to gather information.

The third phase is meetings 9 – 14 where the GPAC will review the document. Then the last phase, meetings 26 – 27, will be the final approval of the document.

Vice Chair Mayer would like to break down the four phases so that the members can understand. He starts with; the first 2 meetings are orientation meetings. Followed by

meetings 3 – 6 where government agencies will come and talk to us. Then Meetings 7 – 8 which is on Sept 13th and 15th will be a planning exercise so that the GPAC members can give the Planning Department ideas because they would like to get ideas from the group instead of handing everyone a draft plan. Then there is a 7 week break for them to prepare the plan. Then at the 9th meeting, November 8th, the GPAC members get the plan. This will be followed by 6 meetings, where the meetings will be held in the different regions so that the Planning Department and the GPAC can get diversified view. Then from meetings 15 – 25, which is spread over 2 ½ months, this is where the GPAC would put together their recommendations. Then a 5 week break will follow, which is when the Department will review our recommendations. Then they will give it to us on the 26th and 27th meeting which would bring us to Mid April. Our 6 month deadline based on the time we got the document, which is November 8th, would be May 8th.

Ms. Moikeha asks if the Maui Island Plan is done. Mr. Summers says that it is not finished. She asks what component is missing and why it isn't done. Mr. Summers says that we are still working on some agency input on some infrastructure strategies. Ms. Moikeha expresses that she would like to eliminate meetings 7 & 8 since they have no plan to review. She would like to get the plan on the 6th meeting (September 6th) so that a review process can take place. She also asks if her assumption that the structure will be more specific and depending on the different communities. Mr. Summers says that's correct. Ms. Moikeha stresses that if we are discussing Hana, we should be in Hana. We need to talk to those people that have a better cultural respect that we could. Mr. Summers thanks Ms. Moikeha for the comment. He continues to say that the Department feels that meetings 7 and 8 are very important and that it allows us an opportunity to see some "pukas" that may be missed. He expresses that they have relied heavily on the WalkStory and PlanStory workshops. Regional meetings are great and weekly meetings will be necessary to get through the document. Ms. Moikeha still says that these meetings aren't critical, having the Plan is more critical. She says that since the GPAC has been together for over a year and a half, the Department should know we want. Mr. Summers thanks Ms. Moikeha for her comments and opens the floor to others to express themselves. Mr. Bertram likes the idea of going out to the different communities and talk with the landowners and agencies in that area. He sees the value of meetings 7 & 8. WalkStory was a great idea but it wasn't done by the GPAC. He expresses there are no awareness of principles and how to apply them. He feels this is necessary and also the need to educate ourselves. Mr. Bertram also states that he would like to see meetings 3, 4, 5, & 6 be moved into community meetings. Having the landowners in a separate meeting isn't a good thing. He'd like to incorporate the different agencies to speak when the landowners of that region are there. He'd like to see the principles and the smart growth ideas presented at that time. So in closing he would like to see meetings 3 – 6 and 10 – 13 brought out into the different communities. Mr. Summers says that in concept that's an excellent point. The one issue that bothers us is that the 6 month window is very aggressive. The idea was to have these meetings up front so that when the document is distributed the members would

have the whole 6 months to review. We can look at this new suggestion but we are concerned about the schedule and the review time. Regarding a comment that was made by Mr. Frampton regarding the time after the document is distributed. There's not a lot of time for the community to absorb what the document says before the GPAC goes out into the communities. So what I understood was we would have a couple of meetings here first, let the community have some time to absorb and respond to the document before we go out. It wouldn't affect our time schedule in terms of the length of the schedule but it may affect the earlier meetings. Ms. Lucienne thanks John for the explanation. She feels the same as Joe that the meetings are in the various communities and asks if it's possible to give this group some time to offer suggestions on which agency we'd like to see. Mr. Mayer likes Mr. Bertram's idea but we would take up a lot of time if we had to do a water presentation in Hana, Kula, up to 6 times. It would be better for the communities to give us input. Input from not only communities but from big groups. He expresses his concern on the 7 week delay. Mr. Franco agrees with Ms. Moikeha: the GPAC is only to comment and advise the Planning Department and not be part of the process of developing the plan. He doesn't know why we need to go through these exercises. We are not experts in any of these things. He would like a plan from the Department where the GPAC can ask questions and make changes because that is the GPAC's function. He also adds that he is also perplexed, like Mr. Mayer, with the 7 week delay. He expresses that his life has been on hold for the past year and a half, and that a 7 week delay isn't favorable. He wants to work without any delays. Mr. Michel asks Mr. Summers how he is going to get all the different agencies to come to the meetings. He explains that there was a transportation meeting in Lahaina last week. The only person representing the government was Joanne Johnson. Mr. Summers explained that the different agencies are very willing to come and execute their mission to the GPAC. Paring down the list is what's difficult at this time. Mr. Blumer-Buell expresses his concern about meetings 26 & 27. He doesn't feel that those 2 meetings are enough time for a final review. He agrees with Susan and Joe and shares Hana's frustration on unmet infrastructure and community desires from 1994. He feels instead of sharing the plan with Hana that the GPAC focuses on heritage resources and protective areas in Hana and use meetings 7 & 8 to move forward.

Mr. Shibuya expresses that he endorses Susan's suggestion. He also feels that the financial implantation should be put up front. He would also like to see the CIP Simple Growth Management. He expresses that if we don't know how much we are going to gain in income we don't know how we can help contributions to ensure improvements. No funding, no improvements.

2. Format for Landowner / Developer, Governmental, Community Association, and Non-governmental Agency Meetings and Presentations

Mr. Cook would like an outline of what kind of information, a format, and how long the governmental agencies will have for the GPAC.

Mr. Summers says the governmental agencies that have a direct impact on regional growth such as the Water Department. We would like them to come in and address specific questions about water capacity for certain points in the island, what their highest CIP priorities are, and major threats that they are expecting and planning for. The Finance Department is a very important and will be included. Cost does depend on Land Use Plan.

Mr. Mayer wants a State and County financial review. He needs to know what order things should be in so that it's clear. Finance should be done in the beginning and again at the end.

Chair Cannon would like to know what the GPAC elections are about. He states that holding another election would be like opening "Pandora's Box" when you already have an elected Chair and Vice Chair. He would like to have this item removed because it doesn't make sense. Mr. Summers explains that he put this item in order to look to the GPAC for guidance. Chair Cannon expressed that it would be his guidance that they take it off. Ms. Moikeha asks Chair Cannon if he was representing his personal interest or the group's interest. Chair Cannon said that it's his personal view. Chair Cannon asks Ms. Moikeha if she has another opinion. Ms. Moikeha says that if it's on there it should be discussed. Mr. Cannon asks for a show of hands on this item, GPAC elections. Chair Cannon counts 8 hands. Ms. Moikeha asks if the Chair is proposing a motion and Chair Cannon says no he's just taking note. **Ms. Filimoeatu moves to delete this item, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Lindquist. Chair asks if all those in favor of deleting this item and 14 hands were raised. So the item was deleted.**

Vice Chair would like to make a motion to put meetings 7 and 8 on the agenda to vote on at the next meeting. The vote would be to get the plan or do and exercise on meetings 7 and 8. Ms. deNaie seconds the motion and the Chair asks for further discussion. Mr. Summers suggests 2 alternatives. One is to have the meeting and the other is to do without it. Also explore moving the regional meetings back a couple of weeks so that the community has more time to absorb the documents. Chair asks Vice Chair if this will satisfy you. After some discussion with Chair Mayer and Mr. Summers, the motion still remained on the floor – "to delete 7 and 8 and going directly to the plan or having 7 and 8 and have the seven week and beginning on November 8th beginning the plan. He would like to vote on that at the next week." Chair asks if there is any further discussion. Ms. Moikeha expresses concern over meetings 3 – 6. She would like to combine have 2 meetings. She asks if we really need 4 meetings. Mr. Summers says we absolutely need 4 meetings to do this. Invitations will be sent out very soon and to help accommodate all that would like to present to the GPAC, 4 meetings will be necessary. Chair Cannon reminds Ms. Moikeha that there is a motion on the floor and would like to hear discussions regarding that. Mr. Bertram expresses that he will vote against this because he feels that it is very important to discuss this with everyone and not

to come back at the next meeting to vote. Mr. Franco also expresses that he is against the motion because it is not useful for 7 and 8 but he would prefer the Planning Department just give us the plan so that we can give our recommendations. Mr. Blumer-Buell is wondering if this motion is to just consider voting on this at the next meeting or something else. Vice Chair Mayer says that his motion is that “we consider deleting meetings 7 and 8 and the 7 week delay that follows it and that we get the plan soon after our 9/6/07 meeting and begin work on the plan in mid-September.” Or to follow the proposed schedule as it is. Ms. deNaie asks if we can vote on this now or to add this to our next agenda. Ms. Moikeha asks why we can’t vote on this now. Vice Chair Mayer says that we can vote on this now, but was giving the Department some time to revise or come up with an alternate solution. Planning Director Hunt would like to clarify that the Staff needs clear direction from the body and that’s why it’s helpful to take a vote. But the way the schedule works, Staff needs to go back take your information and your direction and see if what you want works. So even if you make a motion, it doesn’t dictate the schedule. It lets the Staff know what you want and to see if it can work. Ms. Moikeha asks if item 7 and 8 would involve resources. Mr. Summers says yes it would and that we would like to present 2 options at the next meeting. We want to conduct meetings 2 – 6 as set forth in the schedule and meetings 7 and 8 is optional, but we would like the committee to have a good set of information on them before they make a decision. Ms. Moikeha asks if meetings 7 and 8 are deleted will you be able to give us a plan on 9/13. Mr. Summers says that’s the type of research we need to do to give you an informed schedule and at this particular point we can not do that. Ms. Skog wants to know more about meetings 3 -6 so that we can evaluate the schedule. Because if they knew who was speaking maybe meetings 7 and 8 can or can not be canceled.

Chair Cannon calls for a 5 minute break. Time is 8:10pm

Chair Cannon calls for the meeting to resume. Time is 8:20pm.

Ms. Skog awaits the Department’s response. Ms. Skog asks who we have coming because it’s hard to make decisions not knowing who we have. Ms. Wade says in general we have Water, WasteWater, Fire, and Transportation. We also have non-governmental organizations like schools, hospitals, parks, and well as DLNR, Housing and Civil Defense, Police and Fire. These are the specialty areas and will be given less time than the core services. This is what we are anticipating for our 4 hours. For those land owners that have sent in their letter of interest including numbers and locations, etc. we have separated them by land region. So they will be presenting their requests by region. Mr. Kekona asks Ms. Wade what is the definition of “land owner”? He wants to know if it’s just large land owners or small land owners, or just land owners. Ms. Wade says she’ll get back to him regarding the specific criteria of the original letter that was sent out.

Chair Cannon reminds the group that there is a motion on the floor. **Ms. Moikeha would like to change the motion to eliminating 7 & 8 tonight and receive the plan on September 13th. Mr. Franco has seconded the motion. Chair Cannon confers with Vice Chair Mayer who made the motion and to Ms. deNaie, who seconded the first motion, if they are okay with the change. Both agree. But Ms. deNaie expresses that she feels uncomfortable with the decision if Staff doesn't have a say. Ms. Moikeha says that the decision will be made if we wait longer. She doesn't know why Staff can't get it to the GPAC. She expresses that they don't need to confer with anyone and if we wait to make a decision the GPAC members will be left to accept the schedule the Staff has made and not a schedule that works for us. Ms. deNaie expresses that situation may be true. But what I've heard them say is that they will take our suggestions into consideration, go back and discuss, and they will present 2 options for us to choose from at the next meeting. She believes one of the options will probably be eliminating the meetings, but we are not closing any doors by not voting tonight. She states that she has sympathy for the staff because they work really hard. Ms. Moikeha says that she just suggested this because of the 7 week delay. Chair Cannon explains that Ms. Moikeha is over ruled because the secondary isn't supported. But the first motion, to delete meetings 7 & 8, will be put on the agenda for the next meeting.**

Mr. Bertram strongly expresses that he still feels that the meetings are needed because we all need a common idea of what smart growth is. **Chair Cannon asks who's in favor of putting the motion on to the agenda for the next meeting, 14 committee members raise their hands, and the motion is passed.**

Mr. Michel would like to know when the meeting starts on August 16th. The Department will address that under G in the agenda. Ms. Skog would like to have a list of who will be making a presentation, even though it's a pending list. Director Hunt will try to get the list and Mr. Summers says it would be distributed via USPS mail and email. Mr. Mayer would like a 2-3 page summary of what they want in actual expenditures and policies in the plan. Mr. Bertram would also like a 1-2 page synopsis on the Smart Growth workshop so that the members may understand what's going on.

Ms. Thorlason asks there be "old business" added to the agenda and to keep in mind that people schedule family vacations in December so to please keep that in mind. Mr. Blumer-Buell would like to know if they can make suggestions on who should be invited. Mr. Summers says that they can email either him or Joy for this request. Vice Chair Mayer asks to be CC'd on this email along with the Chair. Planning Director Hunt asks Mr. Giroux if this is possible. Mr. Giroux responds that the Department will have to set some kind of precedence over this situation. He explains that he just gave everybody a 20 minute talk about the Sunshine Law. Director Hunt says that it would be cleaner to just email the Department and when the Department meets with the Chair and Vice Chair they will relay

the email contents then. Mr. Kekona asks why there is a 7 week break. Mr. Summers would like to hear feedback on this matter. But he also explains that this a review time for the Staff to compile information and to go back to agencies if need be. Chair suggests that there be no meeting on 12/20 because there wouldn't be any quorum. A show of hands of would come to the 12/20 meeting and there was 14 hands raised. Ms. Skog asked if meetings can be lengthened or another Saturday added. Planning Director Hunt says that the Staff will take that into consideration and something can be arranged. Vice Chair Mayer suggests either 12/30/07 or 1/3/08. However that suggestion was met with a resounding "no" from all the GPAC members.

3. Setting of Future Meeting Agendas

Mr. Franco asks where we are in the agenda. Chair Cannon acknowledges that they are on letter F number 3. Director Hunt expresses that the setting of future meetings is difficult. He reminds the group that the 3 Planning Commissions have to review the plan and so when setting the agenda there really is no flexibility. He reminds all to keep in mind last minute additions/reviews, legal reviews, and rearrangement of things all happens when setting the agenda. So the Staff is asking for flexibility on setting the agenda. The GPAC cannot dictate who, what and where people or things need to go. Consideration to the Staff needs to be considered.

Mr. Blumer-Buell suggests Hana meetings on Saturdays. Director Hunt acknowledges his suggestion and will take it into consideration when looking at the schedule.

Ms. deNaie would like clarification on the Heritage and Resource general discussion. She would like to know if it's a general discussion or if it's specific to the Upcountry area. Mr. Summers says the idea with this meeting is to go through the resources in the region and point people in the area in topics. So for example, Hana will not only be discussed in Hana. The Community will have access to the entire document and will have a chance to discuss via public testimony at the meetings. So following the Public Testimony the GPAC will work to rework that section if need be.

4. General Plan 2030 Progress Report

Mr. Summers reports that Staff is refining the land use maps, working on getting agencies for the workshops and processing of the CountyWide Policy Plan in front of the 3 Planning Commissions.

5. Schedule of Maui Planning Commission on the "Countywide Policy Plan"

Ms. Wade reports that they have completed their orientation workshops with the Planning Commissions. A Public Hearing is scheduled for Molokai on 8/22, Maui on 8/28 and Lana`i

on 9/5. Ms. Wade encourages all to attend the Maui Public Hearing. She explains that they will distribute all 3 voting records, matrixes, director's report, recommendation, summary and process to the Planning Commissions prior to the Public Hearing. Chair Cannon asks if Vice Chair Mayer's suggestion on changing the verbiage in the matrix will be done and Ms. Wade says that the Public Hearings are set and will give the GPAC the exact packet that will be distributed. But because Public Hearings are published in the newspaper a month in advance we are unable to change anything.

Vice Chair Mayer asks if the GPAC can get a copy of their recommendations prior to sending them out to the Planning Commissions so that they may be able to make comments or corrections. Ms. Wade says that the goal is to send it out the week with your agenda. However it is also at that time when the Planning Commissions will be receiving their packets. So if any comments or suggestions were to be made it would be independently of the packet that was sent out. Vice Chair Mayer continues to insist that the GPAC get the packet before the Planning Commissions so that they may review and make any corrections if need be. Planning Director Hunt asks what are the implications on this if there are things that you don't like, are we going to review this again? The Policy was adopted by this body on June 19th or 18th, whatever that day was, so the idea to review it again 1. Isn't a good idea and 2. Don't think it's even possible. Chair Cannon explains that he thinks what Mr. Mayer is asking is to just review the document so that it is as what the GPAC has said. He further explains that it's just like the minutes, where we are allowed to make comments or revisions to what was said. Director Hunt says that the Staff will take all this into consideration and discuss on a way to accommodate Mr. Mayer's request.

Ms. Filimoeatu has a question on the 100% completion tasks on the Progress Report. Such as base maps, build out analysis, existing land use data base. Mr. Summers explains that #13 and #14 is very procedural at this point; all the Planning Commissions are in its very early stages of the review. Points 1-12 is directly related to the island plan. Ms. Filimoeatu asks if they have all this information. Mr. Summers says that the GPAC has all this information. Ms. Filimoeatu asks if there will be any new data concerning Maui Island. Mr. Summers says that the Committee has all this information and strongly encourages all to review their packets.

Mr. Franco would like to know where the location for the Public Hearing on 8/28 and wondered when is the discussion of water will be. Taking a look at the different elements that will be discussed, Mr. Franco expresses that he doesn't see anything on water use. Mr. Franco is looking at the Maui GPAC meeting topics and sites #10 - #19 concerning different elements but there isn't anything on water. Mr. Summers acknowledges that is a very important topic and will take a closer look at the schedule.

Mr. Cook would like to know the water resource availability. Mr. Summers says there will be a significant amount of information in the document and a tech study is almost complete.

The tech study was done by Wilson Okamoto & Associates and the Department has worked with the Water Department in getting that report to 2030.

Ms. deNaie suggests that we include Mr. Carl Berger involved in our water presentation. She also asks if his work will be incorporated into the Water Department presentation. Mr. Summers says that he's not sure if the Water Department uses his work.

Ms deNaie asks the Staff about the first 50 pages of the document. Will there be an effort to clean it up or do something with? Director Hunt says that the Plan is up for review with the Planning Commission and that the GPAC had its 120 days with an extension. We will take into consideration Vice Chair Mayer's comments about returning the Plan to the GPAC. Ms. deNaie explains that this isn't the Plan that she is referring to. It's the 50 pages of historical background at the beginning of the Plan. Mr. Summers explains that they are preparing a staff report on this and the Planning Commission will be receiving this through the Planning Director's report. So they will be making comments on this. Ms. Filimoeatu asks if the Planning Commission can morph this and change it. Mr. Summers says yes they can, but these comments/suggestions will then be transmitted along with the Plan to the Council for their review.

Chair Cannon notes that Regional Transportation is scheduled on our 16th meeting and wants to know if they can put it on the agenda to discuss a possible way to discuss it earlier and to form an investigative committee to handle this. Mr. Michel says that transportation is very important!

6. Maui GPAC communications

G. ANOUNCEMENTS and SUGGESTIONS FOR THE AUGUST 16, 2007 MEETING AGENDA

Director Hunt lists that there is an issue on transportation on our sub-corridor Sub Committee, GPAC declined to hold elections, Maui Island content requirement, Technical studies, Vice Chair Mayer's request to get the Policy Plan to the GPAC, list of agencies and synopsis to Smart Growth exercise. As small discussion of when the next meeting will start occurs. Meeting set at 5pm.

Ms. deNaie asks if they should set their calendars by the schedule that the Staff has provided with the exception of meetings 7 & 8. Director Hunt expresses that we are trying to set a set schedule and will bring back 2 schedules at the next meeting.

Mr. Shibuya likes regional area meetings to move to Saturdays when the majority of the population is available.

Mr. Franco asks when the Planning Commission is meeting. Ms. Wade answers that the meeting begins at 9am and will be in the Kalana Pukui Building planning conference room. Director Hunt also adds that the review will be in the afternoon, so that you all can plan accordingly. Ms. deNaie asks if this is the only Public Hearing that will be held. Director Hunt said that it is the only Public Hearing but public testimony will be taken anytime the Plan is on the agenda.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cook moves to adjourn the meeting. The motion is seconded by Mr. Franco and all are in favor.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05pm.