

**MAUI REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 27, 2014**

APPROVED 07-25-2014

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Maui Redevelopment Agency (Agency) was called to order by Mr. Bill Mitchell, Chair, at approximately 1:00 p.m. Friday, June 27, 2014, in the Planning Conference Room, First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street, Island of Maui.

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

Mr. Bill Mitchell: Good afternoon everybody. We'll open today's meeting, June 27th, 2014, of the Maui Redevelopment Agency. Here in attendance, members, we have Jonathan Starr, we have Tom Fairbanks, Vice Chair Don Fujimoto, myself Bill Mitchell, and staff today will be Ann Cua. We'll first open the floor to public testimony. If anybody would like to testify on any agenda item you may do so. You have a time limit of three minutes and if you'd like to testify again on a specific item agenda when it comes up you're welcome to do that as well. Is there anybody in the public that would like to testify on any agenda item this afternoon?

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY - At the discretion of the Chair, public testimony may also be taken when each agenda item is discussed, except for contested cases under Chapter 91, HRS. Individuals who cannot be present when the agenda item is discussed may testify at the beginning of the meeting instead and will not be allowed to testify again when the agenda item is discussed unless new or additional information will be offered. Maximum time limits of at least three minutes may be established on individual testimony by the Agency. More information on oral and written testimony can be found below.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 25, 2014 AND MAY 23, 2014 MEETINGS (transmitted to members via e-mail)

Mr. Mitchell: Seeing none, I will close Item B on our -- on our agenda for public testimony and go on to approval of minutes, April minutes -- excuse me -- minutes of April 25th, 2014 and minutes of May 23rd, 2014. Has everybody had a chance to review those and do you have any comments or edits you'd like to make to those? Seeing none, do I have a motion to approve those minutes?

Mr. Don Fujimoto: So move.

Mr. Mitchell: Do I have a second?

Mr. Thomas Fairbanks III: Second.

Mr. Mitchell: All in favor? Aye. So those minutes are approved unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Don Fujimoto, seconded by Mr. Thomas Fairbanks III, then unanimously

VOTED: To approve the April 25, 2014 and May 23, 2014 meeting minutes as presented.
(Assenting: T. Fairbanks, D. Fujimoto, J. Starr
Excused: C. Ball)

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. Les Young of Smartlink, LLC - Representing AT&T requesting an MRA Use Permit to upgrade an existing rooftop wireless antenna facility located at 1885 Main Street, Wailuku, HI 96793, TMK (2) 3-4-011-017 (MRA 2014/0002) *This public hearing was rescheduled from the February 28, 2014 meeting that was canceled.***

Mr. Mitchell: Going on to Item D, we have one public hearing item. This is applicant, Les Young, of Smartlink, LLC, representing AT&T requesting an MRA Use Permit to upgrade an existing roof top wireless antenna facility located at 1885 Main Street, also known as the Maui Realty Building. Is that the correct?

Ms. Ann Cua: Right.

Mr. Mitchell: If anyone in the public has -- would like to testify regarding that item, please step to the podium and state your name. You'll have three minutes to -- to share with us. Seeing no one in -- seeing no one in the audience going to come forth and testify we'll close public testimony and ask staff to describe the project to the MRA and so we can consider the request. Ann Cua, thank you.

Ms. Cua: Good afternoon Chair, members of the redevelopment agency. I'm here today subbing for Erin Wade who's on vacation so I have -- I am familiar somewhat with the project so I'll take you through this application. The application was submitted to the department on January 20th, 2014, and as mentioned by the Chair the project will take place on the roof top of the Maui Realty Suites located at 1886 Main Street. And located in our report are photographs of the building and the location of where the proposed improvements will take place. The agenda notes that this public hearing was originally planned to be heard by your Agency on February 28th. However, due to the unforeseen circumstances which you know what that was, the department's staff -- we had to cancel the meeting and therefore rescheduled it to today's meeting.

The applicant is requesting an MRA Use Permit Approval from the Redevelopment Agency for the upgrade of the existing telecommunications facilities and referenced at the records property. Specifically the project includes six, eight-foot high panel antennas mounted to existing equipment shelter on a roof top exist -- on roof top including existing two to be replaced;

proposed one radio equipment mounted to existing rack inside the equipment shelter; six radio remote units mounted behind the proposed panel antennas; and one surge protector zoned unit mounted near the proposed radio remote unit. And then finally one GPS antenna mounted to the existing equipment shelter. So as you can see from the photographs there are facilities that are existing already. There's improvements both for AT&T and I believe, Sprint, that's already operating on top of the -- on this office building. And so basically AT&T wants to just upgrade their facilities on the island, and this is one of the locations that they want to do that.

The property -- I'm on now page 4 -- the property is in the Urban district. It's in the -- it's designed Business Commercial on the Wailuku-Kahului Community Plan. The MRA Zoning is Commercial Mixed-Use. And it's within the Maui Redevelopment Area. The property is currently developed with a six-story office building, and the property is accessed from Main Street, with a parking structure on the south of the building.

So the reason why we're today is because telecommunications and broadcasting antennas are listed as a permitted use in the Commercial Mixed-Use district as long as an MRA Use Permit is obtained by this body. The, the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code goes on to say that projects of this type shall be assessed for its mauka and makai visual impacts, with special consideration given to the visual impacts towards Iao Valley. And again as you -- as you look at the photograph that are attached to the report, you can see that already the facility is up there, kind of blend. You know, they don't, you know, sorely stick out. Given the height of the Maui Realty Suites Building it's very unlikely that views from any public roadway or park would be impacted by the upgrades, particularly towards Iao Valley.

In terms of the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Design Guidelines, these design guidelines were not written to address equipment facilities such as telecommunications facilities. However, generally in the past, they MRA has requested that the facility be painted a light color so as to blend with the sky, making it less visible. And I think that is evident in what you had recommended previously for this operator as well as other operators. And therefore, I believe the new additions would be painted to match the existing.

As of today, the department has not received any letters concerning the proposed project. We did receive a phone call with concerns about the potential for radiation generated by the facility to affect the residents of the DHHL housing in the immediate vicinity of the project. The applicant has contacted the concerned party and can address this at the meeting as well. At this point in time that concludes my presentation. I can possibly answer any questions, but we also have the applicant here that could answer any questions, and then later we can go on to the recommendation.

Mr. Mitchell: Members, any questions?

Mr. Jonathan Starr: I have a question for the applicant if no one has anything for staff.

Mr. Mitchell: Sure. Les?

Mr. Les Young: Good afternoon.

Mr. Starr: Hi. Good afternoon. I, I don't know your name.

Mr. Young: I'm sorry. My name is Les Young. I'm a consultant with AT&T.

Mr. Starr: Okay, thank you Mr. Young. My question is will there be any, any difference in the ERP, or effected radio -- radiated power as perceived from the grade particularly to the south where there's parks and schools from the changing of equipments and antennas that are proposed?

Mr. Young: Whenever we upgrade, especially when we are adding additional antennas, there is a slight increase. However, the EIRP or the radiant power that comes out of the antennas are significantly below that which is the health threshold to be anywhere from several hundreds of thousands of times below what is recommended. So even though there will be an increase, the increase would be fairly minimal in the overall scope of where it ranks within the, the health . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: Can you give us some -- a number?

Mr. Young: The ERP for antenna right now is about 500 watts. The energy from the antenna goes straight out horizontally. And once --

Mr. Starr: Horizontal?

Mr. Young: No, it's straight, horizontal. Once the antenna -- once you get about maybe anywhere from 15 to 30 feet directly in front of the antenna, the energy from antenna significantly decreases. It decreases from, from the front of the antenna up to about 25 to 30 feet, and then after that point, it then decreases very, very significantly. So being about 90, close to 90 feet above ground and then horizontally straight out, there should be no impact to the surrounding areas especially the park that's to the south.

Mr. Starr: Do you have a number for what it would be at, at the nearest point on street level?

Mr. Young: We have not done any studies. Typically when we do studies, the numbers are so negligible that the readings are almost nothing. But I can go back to AT&T and ask if they can have a study prepared. We have done those on occasion. They're preformed by a company out of the east coast. They fly into Honolulu about twice a year, and that's when we grab them and ask them to do a study for us if one is appropriate or asked.

Mr. Starr: I know, I, I don't have, have a problem with the project per se, but I think it is a good practice to have a, a number for what the intended radiation at grade level is, and I think that should become part of the, part of the record for this so that if there is a concern in the future if there's something measurable as a standard. I, I -- you know, I'm not sure I'm around antennas and radio for a lot of my life, but I understand the issue and it's, it's not something

that's hard to calculate. So I'd like to ask that you follow up with a, a study saying what it is.

Mr. Young: Sure.

Mr. Starr: And these applications it should -- it should be part of the package.

Mr. Young: Okay. That, I would -- I would venture to ask or say would be part of the conditions of approval maybe or I'm not sure if that's being looked upon as --. We would definitely put --

Mr. Starr: It could be, as far as I'm concerned, I don't think we even need to go that far if you say you'll do it and follow it up.

Mr. Young: We'll have one done.

Mr. Starr: So you go through the department. That, that would be good, that would be good too.

Mr. Young: Okay. I'll put a request to have a study done and then the results would be routed to Ann or to Erin.

Mr. Mitchell: Don, Tom, anything, questions for Les?

Mr. Thomas Fairbanks: No.

Mr. Young: May I make one, one correction?

Mr. Mitchell: Sure.

Mr. Young: From what Ann had mentioned, and that is I did receive a call from Erin prior to her going on vacation. She did mention to me that there was a lady from the state housing area who had called in with some concerns. However, information for that particular lady was -- I did not get that information so as a result I did not contact her. I did not get that contact information so as a result I was not able to contact her.

Mr. Starr: And I think what I asked for would create a matrix. It would answer that question as well. I, I have one additional question and it is -- it's a little bit remote from, from this question, but I just want to ask if you have any, any particular knowledge that you could share with us about plans for telecommunications -- telecommunications, both cellular and otherwise with the facilities in Wailuku town looking forward.

Mr. Young: I can speak only for AT&T since that's who I represent. Right now AT&T, statewide, not just for Maui or specifically Wailuku, AT&T is going through a fairly extensive modernization program -- all the carriers are -- to upgrade their existing facilities to be able to accommodate for the, basically the customer's request for faster data speeds. The voice is fine, but it's . . . (inaudible) . . . some drop calls have been recently reported by Sprint last night. But voice

seems to be fine, people are wanting to have faster data transmission speeds, so as a result a lot of the current facilities in Hawaii -- nation wide also -- is going through an upgrade.

The upgrade consists primarily of swapping out antennas and adding additional equipment to the bottom of the antennas to increase its performance. That is taking place now, and for AT&T it should be completed probably by the end of this year. I did some work with Sprint. Sprint is also going through their upgrade. Theirs should also be completed. Well, actually for Maui, they should already be done. The entire state should be completed by the end of this year. Verizon is well on its way and may already be finished. T-Mobile, I've done no work with them, so I don't know the status of T-Mobile, nor with Mobi PCS.

Mr. Starr: Does that mean 2Gs is going away and 5G is coming? Is that what this is?

Mr. Young: Well, there's not been any specific discussion about a, quote on quote, 5G type of technology yet. With regards to 2G, that's, that's been gone for a while. 2G was basically just voice with very preliminary data. And over the last four or five years as your phone has been able to do e-mail, texting, basically a mini computer. That has changed from being a 3G to a 4G phone. Hence, the numbers from 3G to 4G basically just signify the so-called generation of technology that allows for increase transmission speeds.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, I think it's a -- the recommendation in the staff report mentioned it's a -- it's beneficial to the county as whole in terms of the ability to communicate wirelessly and certainly just part of the urban infrastructure. It's already -- I don't, I don't perceive it being much of visual impact beyond of what's already there since it's already on an existing structure so I don't see an issue with it. Any other questions or comments? Anybody would like to make a motion? I'm sorry, recommendations.

Ms. Cua: So as I understand it you did -- that was opening and closing the public hearing?

Mr. Mitchell: We did. Yes.

Ms. Cua: At the beginning?

Mr. Mitchell: Correct.

Ms. Cua: Okay. Alright. Just making sure. The proposed project is consistent with the Wailuku-Kahului Community Plan, the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Design Guidelines, the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Plan, and the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning & Development Code, and therefore, the Planning Department is recommending approval of the MRA Use Permit subject to the following conditions. The first condition deals with construction being in accordance, in accordance with plans and representations made to -- and approved -- by the MRA at your meeting today. The applicant shall develop the property in substantial compliance with the representations made to the Maui Redevelopment Agency in obtaining this permit. Failure to do so may result in the revocation of this approval. The second condition is the insurance -- is our standard insurance conditions. And the last condition is a full -- a full

compliance condition.

Ms. Michele McLean: Four conditions.

Ms. Cua: Are there four? Sorry. Fourth condition, that the new equipment be painted in a color consistent with the remainder of the existing facility. Sorry I missed that. And then I think -- okay, I'll leave at that for now and we can talk about Jonathan's comment later.

Mr. Mitchell: You want to make it a recommendation that they submit the ERP study? Is that correct?

Mr. Starr: I mean, the cleanest way to do it would be to make it as a condition. I mean, it sounds like they're going to do that now, and I don't have a problem with it. But I would hope that this makes it into standard condition for these types of projects, both for this body and other, other bodies in the future. Because it is a concern and that creates a record that will eliminate any, any possibility of probability for this body or the department in the future.

Ms. Cua: So we can, we can do it one of two ways. Obviously if the commission wants to make -- the Board, the Agency -- wants to make this a condition we would add it as condition no. 5. If you want, we could also as part of the approval letter, if you're not making it a condition say that -- because it does say condition no. 1 as represented by the, by the applicant so we could, you know, put a statement in the letter that says, you know, the Board -- you advise that as represented that you will be preparing this electro magnetic study. So it's either -- whatever the Board decides.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, sir.

Mr. Starr: Could I ask the applicant whether they have a problem with it being a condition?

Mr. Mitchell: Sure.

Mr. Young: The only concern that I would have would be if the fulfilling of that condition would be required prior to us obtaining our building permit, or applying for a building permit. We don't have any issue with going ahead and preparing the report. As I mentioned earlier it can take up sometimes up to six months or more before the company that we contract to do the report is in town, so I would not want -- I would prefer to have not be a, a delay in us being able to get our permits.

Mr. Starr: Could you craft, craft it so that, in this case, after the fact is accept, is acceptable but it does kind of create a precedence that these become part of such a package?

Ms. Cua: Well, the, the condition doesn't have to be prepared so that it affects other project in the future. The department would know that. But are you saying that you would like the

condition crafted so that they still would be able to get their, their building permit and –

Mr. Mitchell: Correct.

Ms. Cua: So I guess we're looking at what is a reasonable time. Is it within a year or two years or --? Within a year? Okay. So within a year of the -- should I say within the year of the issuance of the building permit?

Mr. Starr: Yeah. Okay.

Ms. Cua: Yeah? That would give them a little bit -- because we don't know how long it will take them. Okay, so within a year. And it will be something to this effect that an electro magnetic study be prepared for the project within a year of issuance of the building permit. Something like that.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. And, and just to state my concern is that if 10 years from now it turns out that this, you know, facility is roasting chickens down on the sidewalk, then –

Ms. Cua: We'll have a problem.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, there's something -- there's something measurable.

Mr. Mitchell: So it will be an after-the-fact compliance thing essentially. It won't be a condition of the building permit, correct? It will be -- there's no -- there won't be any condition on the building permit. They'll just have to submit it within a year of their issuing.

Ms. Cua: Yeah, we, we -- yeah, we can't make a condition on the building permit.

Mr. Mitchell: Correct.

Ms. Cua: It could be a condition of your permit that it would be effective one year. They would have to submit it within one year after they obtain a building permit.

Mr. Mitchell: They don't need to come back to us. They'll submit it to staff.

Ms. Cua: No. No. That's correct.

Mr. Starr: So I'm going to need to make a motion.

Mr. Mitchell: Please.

Mr. Starr: I move that we approve the submittal as recommended by the department with an additional condition regarding an after -- the submittal within a year of a radiation -- a grade level radiation study or -- radiation -- grade level radiation study. And this wording is to be fine tuned by the department's staff.

Ms. Cua: I have a question?

Mr. Mitchell: I have a motion. Any discussion? Yes, please.

Mr. Fairbanks: So is this going to hang up the building permit? It will be hang up?

Mr. Michael Hopper: The condition is to do it within one year of getting the building permit, then, no. That means they can get the permit and then do the report afterwards.

Mr. Mitchell: Any other questions or discussions?

Ms. Cua: I have a question. I just want to make sure I get the right terminology so –

Mr. Mitchell: Sure.

Ms. Cua: Is it -- should I be saying an electro magnetic study or a grade level radiation study? What is the appropriate language?

Mr. Starr: What is the -- what is the applicant say?

Mr. Young: Electro magnetic radiation study.

Ms. Cua: Okay. That's all I need. Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell: Questions? Any other questions or discussions? We have a motion on the floor.

Mr. Don Fujimoto: Second.

Ms. McLean: You need a second.

Mr. Mitchell: We got a second? Yes. We have a second, so all, all in favor? So, unanimously approved.

It was moved by Mr. Jonathan Starr, seconded by Mr. Don Fujimoto, then unanimously

**VOTED: To approve the department's report and recommendations
with the additional condition as discussed.**

(Assenting: T. Fairbanks III, D. Fujimoto, J. Starr

Excused: C. Ball)

Ms. Cua: Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you very much.

E. OLD BUSINESS

1. Review and approval of amendments to the Wailuku Redevelopment Area Zoning and Development Code Chapter 30.13 Off-Street Parking Loading.

Mr. Mitchell: Alright. Rolling down the agenda here, Old Business, and this is old ongoing business. Did anybody have the opportunity to look through what were recommendations to the off street parking and loading ordinance? I think we did this, Michele, I think it was what? About a year ago? Do you remember?

Ms. McLean: Ann and I are at a bit of a loss with this one. We had thought that Public Works was going to be coming today to go through this as neither Ann or I were prepared to discuss it, so I apologize for that.

Mr. Mitchell: That's okay.

Ms. McLean: So I'm --

Mr. Mitchell: I'm prepared to discuss it with the, the Board.

Ms. McLean: Sure, absolutely.

Mr. Mitchell: Because this was, this was going to be sort informational and to bring it back to everybody's -- everybody's input with the expectation that once we got the Board's input we could then take this to a public hearing and have it adopted, and have the off street parking loading ordinance for the redevelopment agency changed. I think it was last -- I know it was last year, but I want to say it was almost a year ago what prompted this -- look at the ordinance and revisions to it was two fold and it is described in this language Erin put in the preface to the ordinance right there behind 30-13 were two things. One was the 2010 Wailuku Based Market Study, and the second was the 2011 Parking Management Plan and Analysis that we had done. And the purpose of it was to try to both encourage businesses and also make it easier for businesses to redevelop in the, in the MRA and lighten some of the, the burden of the parking requirements. So that was the -- that was the basic reason for doing it. And there aren't a whole lot of changes, and if, if you don't mind I'd, I'd just walk through the changes. I won't go through the whole ordinance and, and get everybody's input. Yes sir?

Mr. Starr: I'm really glad to see, to see this moving forward, you know, and I, I thank the chair and staff for doing that. Could you just give me a little bit of history of what, what process and, you know, where the suggestions came from? Because they, they look great. I, I just want a little history.

Mr. Mitchell: The majority of it came through the parking management plan that Andy Miller did. This one. So I would say most of the recommendations that I recall came from Andy's analysis, either directly or inferred by your -- you're making things too difficult for the types of businesses

that you want to come into Wailuku town, so look at your parking ordinance and adjust that as necessary. The one good overall component to the MRA is anyone can come in and ask for a variance to parking. So regardless of the use -- and Michele or Ann please correct me if I'm wrong -- anybody can come in and ask for a variance with the given condition or a hardship even with whatever we look at or modify in the ordinance. But our thought was to make it cleaner and a little easier so if somebody wanted to come in and say specifically a restaurant or an entertainment establishment, they could see that -- and these are the first three recommendations on the, under this section 13-20 -- that there -- we've actually eliminated the need for parking with the thought that there's plenty of on-street parking after hours which most of these establishments would use. And so we're, in fact, incentivizing those type of businesses by eliminating the need for any parking. And as you can see it was pretty onerous. Everything from eating establishments to food and beverage, it was either one per 500, or one per 100 in dining and serving areas. It makes it almost impossible for any new eatery to come online within Wailuku Town. So those, and the adult establishment were the first three that we eliminated as needing parking. And I, and I believe that's something that Andy recommended in his, his report as well. Does that sort of answer the question, Jon?

Mr. Starr: Uh-huh.

Mr. Mitchell: Don?

Mr. Fujimoto: I have a question -- couple of questions. The first is so how do we have the existing restaurant places? I mean, are we able to say they don't need any parking because you give it away to someone else?

Mr. Mitchell: I don't think that's what we're saying. I think we're, we're saying if this were adopted from the date that this were adopted -- in other words, you're not -- you can't -- they can't retroactively come in and say, well, I don't need parking now or I've got extra parking so I'm gonna, I'm gonna sell it or joint use it or something, do something different.

Mr. Fujimoto: I guess the next one is what if we have a restaurant that changes use in the future. That future change . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: Presumably with the change in use, there would be a change in building permits, which would trigger a zoning compliance and a look at the parking requirements. So if something changed, they would either have to come back to us or comply with the ordinance. Is that a correct description? Good question, though, because, yeah, that's very possible to happen.

The other major change is to the ordinance that we proposed was under the section entitled joint use shared parking and that's 30-13-40. And we eliminated the language in item 5 for somewhat going back to what your question was, Tom -- excuse me, Don -- and that was, it said in item 5, it said, proposed use which is served by off street parking shall occur within an existing building. And a joint use parking shall not be an optional method of providing required off site parking stalls for structures constructed or expanded after the effective of the rule.

Essentially limiting this to existing structures and not new structures, and we thought that kind of didn't make sense because we want, if possible, somebody to build new structures as well, or tear down existing one and build a new one. So as I recall that was why we eliminated -- that's why you see that crossed off and it's on page 41, item 5. We took, we took that out. There's similar language to that in section, about existing use parking -- where was it? -- yeah, the other side on off street parking in section 50 of page 42. Again, identical language where we struck that because it limited it to existing structures and not new structures. We want to be able to accommodate both. The other language that was changed back on page 46 and we put in some, some text about temporary parking facilities and this was partially came about as a function of then -- a one time proposed municipal parking structure and what we would do for temporary parking. And so we put this language in related to what would be required for temporary parking and what the design conditions would be. Or, in the event that somebody wanted to do temporary parking. And, and basically says you've got to meet county codes and requirements. You can do it, but you have to meet county requirements. And that the director shall have the authority to approve plans and at the discretion propose additional conditions upon the project's health, safety and welfare.

So those were the major changes. Not huge, but some, some adjustments there, and we're certainly open to anybody's suggestions or thoughts. The idea of making it easier and less onerous. But if you're not aware of it, and you probably are, within the MRA there is also 30% parking reduction. So, so there are a number of ways that if somebody were to construct a new building they can get reduced parking requirements. It's in the MRA guidelines versus just the County. The rest of the information, on pages 43, 44 and 45, are generally -- well 44 -- design related, specific design related requirements for parking stalls. And then it does give a breakdown for required on-street parking by square footage for typical uses.

But we have in the past given variances to businesses or redevelopment area -- for people who have come in for redevelopment based on either hardship. The lot was too small, they couldn't provide the parking, there was enough joint use parking or next to the municipal parking lot. Whatever the case may be. So there's, there's a lot of flexibility already in the guidelines, but we wanted to try to make them as user friendly as possible. Yes, sir?

Mr. Starr: Well, I think it's great. I think that this is -- unlocks the -- you know, provide the key to unlock the problem we have with dining and entertainment usage where we really do want to get some body heat out on the street after hours, and so I think it's, I think it's wonderful. I haven't, you know, really spent much time, much time with it, but I appreciate it. What does it do with -- with, say, apartments?

Mr. Mitchell: Well, you know, the residential side, we didn't spend much time on it because Andy didn't talk -- as I recall -- didn't speak to it much in his report. It was more -- his report was more geared toward the business design. But we could certainly consider that. I mean, you can see the -- those to apartment use or to residential use, there's a slide, there's a scale -- scale on page 44 -- excuse me. Well, multiple family is 45. It speaks to multi-family buildings. But I think the code under, I think, one per two -- for multi-family dwelling spaces. So multi-family, two spaces for unit or detached single family dwellings and duplexes. Multi-family, kind of --

doesn't read very clearly to me what that means, but essentially it looks like two spaces per unit.

Mr. Starr: So that kind of remains to the County.

Mr. Mitchell: That remits to the County -- off street parking and loading, I think, is that right, Ann, the same? The same?

Mr. Starr: I think that's an area that I -- perhaps we should, we should examine because, you know, that's one of the things . . . (inaudible) . . . the possibility of building a compact real work force housing having to have --

Mr. Mitchell: Absolutely.

Mr. Starr: -- two spaces. Unlike with for the cost, you know, in an urban area, you just can't -- either use that much and or for that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: Enough, enough parking. And similar, similar to the hotel requirement, one space for two lodging units, plus parking for eating establishment. I mean, I think that's the other one that would warrant.

Mr. Starr: I think that's pretty good. That's a lot better than what it would be. What does the county, county wide on, on that for hotel?

Ms. Cua: I believe it's similar. I think for, for apartments it's two spaces -- for apartments or complexes are two spaces for one, and hotel is one for two.

Mr. Starr: Okay.

Ms. Cua: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: And that would be for attached to the . . . (inaudible) . . . is that correct? Am I just not reading?

Ms. Cua: I'm sorry. Where are, are you at hotel or --

Mr. Mitchell: On page 38 on regular dwellings, it says two spaces per unit for detached single-family dwelling and duplexes. What about attached? Or multi-family? It says multi-family, but then it just says studios, studio one space.

Ms. Cua: I don't -- I don't think the -- are you asking the comparison of this with the Maui County Code, Chapter 19.36?

Mr. Mitchell: I'm just asking -- this seems like it's incomplete because it doesn't specify for multi-family, unless that's that's back on the table.

Ms. McLean: Yeah, I think the way that table is intended to read is that for multi-family, if you have a studio, you have one parking space. If you have one bedroom, you have one parking space. If you have two or more bedrooms, you have two parking spaces.

Mr. Mitchell: Got it.

Ms. Cua: Because it goes on to the next page.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. I see. One, one. Two, two. Got it.

Ms. Cua: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: Next page. Got it. Yeah, one for one, and two or more for two.

Ms. Cua: And I don't think the County -- I don't think 19.36 -- or maybe it got changed. I know before it wouldn't allow -- it wouldn't differentiate between a studio and, you know, a larger unit. I don't know if it does that now. It may. I can't recall. But, it never used to.

Mr. Mitchell: Anybody have any thoughts on that? I mean, we're trying to, again, encourage, encourage redevelopment, acknowledging that people are going to own cars, but somebody with two bedroom units, if I only owned a single car, need a single car, it's a hard metric in my estimation to set a specific standard code without seeing it developed.

Mr. Starr: I know, I, I've been seeing a little bit about what, what's happening in other, other urban areas. And there tends to be a lot more nuance or flexible approach. You know, a lot of, a lot of urban walkable or transit oriented type developments are being built with a lot, a lot less parking with the option to rent or buy, buy in to this, buy stalls if you want. And a lot of the providers are using things like zip car as an amenity which reduces the need. I, I do feel maybe this is an area where we could get a little more, you know, a little more nuance -- and approve it. But, you know, it's definitely come a long, come a long way. What's the process that this will, that this will go through? Do we accept it and then it moves to Council? Or is it something we approve, or, or what?

Mr. Mitchell: It's essentially at our discretion. We just have to have one public meeting to adopt it. Is that correct?

Ms. Cua: I'm sure you'll have to have a public hearing. I'm not sure if it stops here. I'm not sure of the process for this if it does have to go to Council or it's just with this Agency.

Mr. Mitchell: My understanding was just with this Agency.

Ms. Cua: Okay. That's great.

Mr. Mitchell: That was the -- that's why we started this last year, knowing essentially we can do it because it rests, it rests totally within our development code. Unless there's something I'm

not -- not aware of which is highly possible, but –

Mr. Starr: How does -- how does it handle, you know, small inns that are kind of, I guess, more than bed and breakfast, but they're not really hotels. I want to be sure that they're included in this type of thinking with, with, you know, with reduced requirements.

Mr. Mitchell: Well I guess there is a bed and breakfast and there's a hotel. So somewhere they'd have to fall into one of those uses right now.

Mr. Starr: Maybe Tom has something. Because I, I, I think that, you know, as the town becomes more walkable more people will be coming without, without cars. And there should be the option to, to go for that.

Mr. Fairbanks: . . . (inaudible) . . . not in the district not having to comply with it. I'm not a very good person to ask.

Mr. Mitchell: What do you -- what would you see the actual use, I mean, right now?

Mr. Fairbanks: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: Do you need one parking space per bedroom?

Mr. Fairbanks: . . . (Inaudible) . . . Two of them I'm using. My experience is that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: Right. You rent a car or have a car, right?

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: So one space per bedroom is not an unreasonable requirement.

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah.

Ms. McLean: And chair for the -- for your information bed and breakfast is defined in the redevelopment code as having up to six bedrooms. So if you go beyond six then you're no longer a bed and breakfast with that one, one parking space per room requirement.

Mr. Mitchell: You're a hotel?

Ms. McLean: That's probably how we would -- would look at it, yeah.

Ms. Cua: I have a question? Is hotel defined in there? Because I know in the Maui County Code, hotel is defined as, I think, more than 20 rooms. So is there a gap that we –

Mr. Fairbanks: Well, I know, when we did ours, we have 10. . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. McLean: Hotel is defined as a facility containing lodging units or dwellings in which 50% or more of the units are lodging units, and whether there's a lobby, clerks desk, or a counter with 24-hour clerk service of facilities for registration and keeping records.

Ms. Cua: Okay, so that's perfect, then. We're either up to the six rooms, or you would be that.

Mr. Mitchell: What if you were a condo, though?

Ms. McLean: You would probably fit under the definition of hotel if more than 50% of the rooms were lodging.

Mr. Starr: I know I'd like to see this moved along, but I think I'd like to have one more chance to study it and maybe gain some, gain some input.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, I don't see any, any -- we want to do it. There's no rush, nobody's has come to us with a project so, I think, I think that certainly makes sense.

Ms. Cua: So we could place this on the next agenda.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, place on the next agenda please, and then Carol will be back too. I'm sure she'll have some input. And if anybody can find any standards, and we can ask Erin because she may have other small towns that have similar codes or requirements. We can see what everybody else is doing.

Ms. McLean: Chair, if I could ask for a couple of questions that we can get direction. You have met -- in the discussion earlier you talked about existing uses, and how they would be affected by this, like, if you have an existing restaurant that provides the required number of stalls --

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. McLean: -- and then this passes, and restaurants no longer have to provide parking, what does that mean for that establishment? Are they allowed to benefit from the new law and maybe that parking can be shared use or something like? It just needs to be clarified one way or the other because if the thinking is that existing people that are compliance have to abide by today, they wouldn't be able to benefit from that change in the future. We'd want to check that out with Corp Counsel. And if, if that's doable, then we'd want to put some sort of language in to make that clear. To me, if you're letting the new guys do it, you should let the old guys do it too. But you just made -- there was a discussion earlier, it wasn't clear to me what your intent was in that regard.

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah, I'm, I'm certainly open to discussion. I don't know if there's a precedent in terms of any code, when a code changes then can you retroactively do something because the code changes. If you've already got a permit under the existing ordinance. I don't know, I don't know what the standard for that is. That's a good question. If there's a standard for that. Like a building permit, you can no longer -- you couldn't do a four feet eave, and then all of sudden

you can do a four foot eave, does that mean the guy who wants it, he has to come back and reapply.

Ms. McLean: If it -- if the code change takes away something, it takes a right or a use, and you had established that lawfully, that's considering grand-fathering. You're allowed to continue.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. McLean: But in this case, it's, it's becoming less restrictive. And I don't know if we keep it restrictive.

Ms. Cua: Yeah. I don't know. I was going to say, it's usually the other way. We, you know, legislation will usually say that from the time this legislation is past and moving forward, you're subject to it.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Ms. Cua: Yeah. So if you, if you've, if you have your business, you're not subject to it. But I've -- in my 31 years, I've never dealt with it going the other way. I guess, less restrictive. I've never had a situation where someone has come and asked. But I think this scenario that you talked -- somebody talked about -- you, I think you were asking. So if somebody now -- if there's going to be a change in use, I think that may be an opportunity where we have to look at it again. Usually we looked at it based on the law that's in effect at that time. So maybe that would be the opportunity. But I don't know the other way where someone would just randomly come in and say, okay, can I now not pay for this off-site parking that I've been paying for?

Mr. Mitchell: Right. It would no longer require it. I guess you'd have to --

Ms. Cua: Because that could be exempted.

Mr. Mitchell: You have to come in and ask the question and maybe that would be . . . (inaudible)
. . .

Mr. Starr: I, I -- I know that -- I mean, a lot of this goes to what we want, what we want to encourage in the town, and, you know, I look at the, the restaurants on Market Street for example which --

Mr. Mitchell: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: Yeah, which -- I believe its had a lot of its struggles because of this, the limitation and issues regarding parking. And, I, I think most people in the community would like to see it vibrant and thriving. And to say that, well, that couldn't, but the next person who wants to create a facility could. You know, that, that, seems a little, a little bit troublesome and may -- so maybe that's something that we should, we should examine.

Ms. Cua: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. I mean I guess I can see the scenario where somebody that had say five -- a restaurant who had five parking stalls required said -- would come back in and say, well, I no longer by code need those five parking stalls, so I'm going to leave those two such and such for office.

Ms. McLean: Right.

Mr. Mitchell: And then we'd say, well, yeah, you're not required those and you are required those for office, okay. I mean, I can see that happening.

Mr. Starr: I guess so. There is a value to have a certain, to have a certain minimum number of stalls as a, as a business owner because it, it's, you know, it's difficult not to, kind of not to have it, not to have any or not to be able to provide.

Mr. Fujimoto: What if you just increase the reduction from 30 to like 50% for restaurants?

Mr. Mitchell: That would be another way to -- another way to do it. Let me see what it is for --

Mr. Fujimoto: And if, and if you're open for dinner, then 100%.

Mr. Starr: I think though that with a history of -- but this body has just been to, to exempt them, exempted them all but it's being done on a, kind of on a piece meal basis.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Fujimoto: But that still doesn't answer the question about the existing restaurant owners.

Mr. Starr: No.

Ms. Cua: But isn't it saying that food and beverage retail would be none?

Mr. Mitchell: Correct. That's what it's saying. Food and beverage, retail, eating establishments, and adult establishments are all none, right? Proposed.

Mr. Starr: I think that's great. We've had some -- have places to go for lunch this afternoon.

Mr. Fujimoto: Just have to address the 15 restaurant owners when they come to the public hearing?

Ms. Cua: So I think that's a comment the department is hearing today, that, you know, if the law is going to change to require less parking, how can existing businesses take advantage of that?

Mr. Mitchell: Right. Right.

Mr. Starr: But if, you know, if that makes a space that, that in the town, and the town is pretty tight available from the uses, then that, that will have a positive effect also.

Ms. McLean: The danger is that if -- I don't know if there are any such parcels like this, but if you have a restaurant on a parcel and half the parcel is occupied by the building, and the other half is occupied by parking, then they could expand it and take over all of the parking with restaurants.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Mr. Starr: But is that bad?

Ms. McLean: No. It eliminates -- it reduces the number of stalls in the district. We're assuming that a restaurant will turn its parking over to an office or some other business that needs parking but they could turn it into more restaurant use, which I, I'm just suggesting that's a possible scenario. It's, it's your call as to whether that's -- that's a beneficial outcome.

Mr. Mitchell: Right. And, and likewise, if it doesn't work, they're not going to be in business. So if they say -- I'm a new restaurant guy, I come in and look, I'm going to put a little restaurant in one of these existing buildings. I know I don't have any parking, but then patrons can't find parking. So, it's kind of -- it's a bit of -- the restaurant goes at risk --

Ms. Cua: Without.

Mr. Mitchell: Without the parking because (a) you're get, you get it on the street, or you get it from the county lot, or you're -- you'll maybe get something from your neighbor on a side deal. But essentially buyer beware.

Mr. Fujimoto: Unless they're only open for dinner.

Mr. Mitchell: Unless you're only open for dinner, then you get all the parking you want.

Mr. Starr: I think that if, you know, in a vacuum the way the lot is issued. But my feeling is that we are and should be looking at a very major paradigm shift as far as parking in the town goes where, right now, parking has -- it's either non existent or it has no value. It's free. And, you know, the 12-hour free parking means that, you know, as a, as a property and business owner, you know, the parking that I have to, I have to create and maintain, it doesn't really have value because it's competing with free government subsidized parking. Whereas when the inventory of government parking goes on-street and off-street becomes time limited and eventually has a value to it, then it's a, then it's a market condition. And it becomes valuable, and I would assume it would eventually equalize in value to that parking which the, the business community is, is providing. Which is more of the case in, say Lahaina, and other urban areas, where, you know, parking costs whatever, you know, a dollar an hour or a quarter an hour, you know. And then that just becomes part of cost, the cost of a meal. And if a restaurant wants to provide it to make it more convenient --

Mr. Mitchell: . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: Yeah then it -- you know, people realize it has a value. It's not just something that is, is provided free.

Mr. Mitchell: Good point.

Ms. McLean: Chair, I just have a couple of other comments. You had cited one of these areas. There's also another section where eating establishments are referenced. Under hotel, there's a parking requirement of one space per two lodging units, plus parking for eating establishments. So if you're going to eliminate the parking requirement for eating establishments, that should probably just be crossed out. And then also on page 44 where it's talking about loading spaces, there's also a requirement for loading spaces for eating establishments. So you might want to talk about whether to keep that requirement for a loading space, or if you choose to eliminate it.

And then my last comment is, is on the last section about temporary parking facilities. It would be helpful for the Planning Department to know whether there is any landscaping requirements for these. I'm guessing probably not. That's probably the approach that you'd be taking to this, but it would be good to indicate that one way or the other, or else the Planning Department might be inclined to require parking if it's silent.

Mr. Mitchell: And -- that's a good point -- and I didn't see in here the County Code on temporary parking, only allows it for six months. I didn't see that language in this one.

Ms. McLean: This had -- I thought it said two-years.

Mr. Mitchell: Okay, two years. Yeah, it says two years.

Ms. McLean: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: So we should have a number in there that says the landscape requirement is not -- it's not required for temporary parking.

Ms. McLean: Right.

Mr. Mitchell: I agree. Anybody have any comments on that?

Mr. Fujimoto: I agree.

Mr. Mitchell: Loading? We talked about loading. Weren't not going to require parking. And are we going exempt them from loading, that's the question.

Ms. McLean: Yeah.

Mr. Fujimoto: Or restrict loading to just certain hours, yeah?

Mr. Mitchell: We could do that.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I would like -- I would like to see that. That's more -- that's more an urban or especially an European kind of standard. The trucks come at a specific.

Mr. Fujimoto: And they can park any where, right?

Ms. McLean: So that might be that you end up deleting eating establishments from the table, but then adding language that -- because the loading space isn't required for eating establishments, loading shall --

Mr. Fujimoto: Shall be restricted to these times.

Ms. McLean: Shall be -- yeah, exactly.

Mr. Starr: I have a question about entertainment and then adult establishments. And it's not really a practical -- you know, it's certainly parking related -- but having all entertainment be considered an adult establishment, I kind of have a problem with that. Is that consistent to all County -- County documentation?

Ms. McLean: I don't know if there's an adult establishment definition in Title 19. I don't know if Mike has Title 19 at his fingertips there whether there's a definition.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, what is an adult establishment?

Ms. McLean: Well, it's defined, it's defined in the development code.

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, it's defined in the MRA Code.

Ms. McLean: As businesses or commercial activities primarily restricted to adult customers including bars, night clubs, and taverns, and other establishments that dispense alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Starr: I don't know, I always thought adult establishments was like some kind of, you know, x-rated thing.

Mr. Fairbanks: Korean bars.

Ms. Cua: That's a Korean bar, I would think.

Ms. McLean: Yeah.

Ms. Cua: That's what I'm thinking.

Mr. Fairbanks: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: I mean, I would prefer to see a different -- you know, whether it's --

Ms. McLean: Like a bar that's not a restaurant.

Mr. Fairbanks: Yeah, . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Fujimoto: I guess just that it restricts minors from entering it. That's why it's classified as adult.

Mr. Starr: Yeah. But how can an entertainment establishment that's, you know, some kind of entertainment, but not serving?

Mr. Mitchell: There is, there is a separate entertainment definition.

Mr. Starr: So perhaps the same wording under entertainment establishments should be as -- as under what I'm hoping will re-title but it's now adult entertain -- adult establishment.

Mr. Mitchell: I don't see under entertainment, they don't, they don't specify dispense of alcoholic beverages, right? Is that, would that be the difference between entertainment and adult establishment?

Mr. Fujimoto: I think so. One allows minors and one doesn't.

Mr. Mitchell: For purposes of parking, does it make any difference?

Mr. Starr: I don't know -- I don't it -- for purposes for parking, it should. I'd just --

Mr. Fujimoto: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: I, I agree with you. I'm -- it would be nice to read at some other . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Starr: Ann, you know any other wording for a place that sells alcohol?

Ms. Cua: Besides the bar.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I mean, can we just use, I don't know --

Ms. McLean: Well, the code also has a definition for eating and drinking establishments. A business engaged in the preparation and serving of food to customers on premises. This includes restaurants that also dispense alcoholic beverages if dining is a principle activity. But not including fast food establishments.

Ms. Cua: I know that some places -- just because I have children and I've experienced this is -- like, let's say we wanted to go -- because we're music lovers so we'll go some place just to go watch whoever is playing music. But at a certain time, you know, my son, because he's of age could stay, but my daughter wouldn't be able to stay. And I think, I don't know it has to do with the liquor license or --. So that may be another thing that's going on. And it's just a restaurant. It's a, it's -- you know, it is a restaurant that happens to serve alcohol, but then when they have entertainment that starts and it's just a band playing music.

Mr. Starr: I know I, I have a real problem with that and I've also, you know, testified a number of times before the . . . (inaudible) . . . over dancing. And, I know that our definition of dancing is tied in with some kind of sexual activity, you know, or whatever, stripping or something. It just seems really kind of convoluted and not related to what people do in, you know, in a music club. And you know I don't know if that's a battle to try and even face here for that. I really don't like having kind of an adult -- you know, kind of a sexual connotation to, to a place where people would go and have a drink and, and play music.

Mr. Fairbanks: And the liquor laws, I'm a little bit familiar with it -- the children aren't allowed once the food service stops.

Ms. Cua: I think that's what it is.

Mr. Fairbanks: And there may be some verbiage as to the dancing for children and minors in the area. I don't think it's -- I think it's mostly because the food services stop and now it becomes a lounge. As far as the dancing, I think, it's just because they have to define it. Otherwise, people will push their limits of the envelope. Since I've never run that type of establishment as far as, besides a bar with an eating lounge, I don't know, I think that's the reason why.

Mr. Mitchell: Well, let's, let's put that out for suggestion from staff if there's another definition that we can consider for that use. Because they're to parking where we're exempting all those uses from parking. I think they all kind of fall under the same -- same requirement. A good discussion. So the items that I had to -- or to reconsider are parking for dwellings and for hotel, we're going to exempt eating establishments from the hotel requirement, because we're exempting eating establishments in general. Parking and loading with a qualifier for restricted times, and maybe we can clean up the number of loading spaces. This has never made a lot of sense to me, and I've been through plenty of commercial projects. In the MRA, if you're doing a warehouse, in Maui Lani it does, but not necessarily in the MRA. So maybe we can just have a requirement that -- because there's already loading spaces provided on Market Street. And then the third item was the addition of language related to temporary parking that we would exempt the landscape requirement because temporary parking only allowed for two years. Was there anything else? Any thing else Michele you had in there?

Mr. Fujimoto: What about . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Mitchell: Yeah. Some sort of language that would address the retroactive use of stalls that

would be allowed as a reduction came in place. Does that--? In my estimation, that a business owner, if they wanted that, they would have to come back to us with an application and say I'm no longer required to have these x-number of stalls, I would like to then use them, or joint share them with whoever. But, I'll leave that up to staff to make some recommendations, legally, what the ramifications are. I don't know if there's other things that might happen as a result of that. It is a good question. Don, you suggested it and I, I like it, maybe increasing the percentage reduction in the entire?

Mr. Fujimoto: In lieu of.

Mr. Mitchell: In lieu of?

Mr. Fujimoto: The reduction.

Mr. Mitchell: So commercial non profit, public quasi public uses on land zoned for such uses within the Maui Redevelopment Area Zoning District shall receive a 30% reduction in the required number of parking stalls.

Mr. Fujimoto: Can we also maybe get an update from Public Works on the parking improvements?

Mr. Mitchell: To the municipal lot?

Mr. Fujimoto: Yeah.

Mr. Mitchell: Yes. I think last time we asked for that, and they were going to come today, I think. Were they going to come today?

Ms. McLean: No. We were waiting until the FY 15 budget passed.

Mr. Mitchell: That's what it was. Thank you.

Ms. McLean: And then to give them a little bit of time to start queuing up their projects. And when they were ready, when they had information to give us, when they had an idea of when things might start happening, then they would come before you and talk about it.

Mr. Fujimoto: So their, their project or task is just the physical reconstruction or rehab of the existing lot, right? Their stuff don't take into effect, like, free or paid parking?

Ms. McLean: That's correct. They're just resurfacing the municipal lot.

Mr. Fujimoto: Re-stripping too?

Ms. McLean: The striping layout will be roughly the same as it is today. It won't be significantly altered.

Mr. Fujimoto: Okay.

Mr. Starr: Do we have a status on the, the parking management plan? Is that something that's imminent for us to look at?

Mr. Mitchell: As I recall we were going to get and extend -- Erin was going to solicit proposal from Andy -- I don't know if we got that or not to -- I guess, study parking management related to fee parking. I believe we got one proposal and she was going to have that -- correct me -- redefine, re-scope it. It was -- it's kind of general. It's going to be re-scope so maybe if we could put that on the next, the next agenda to revisit the completion of the parking management plan for fee parking.

Mr. Starr: I believe that there's a possibility that we might have Harrison Rue coming to our -- stopping by at our next meeting. He's coming -- he's on his way through to vacation or something, and might come and help us out.

Mr. Mitchell: Do we need to agendize that if we want to have him? So just put him on as an agenda item?

Ms. Cua: Well, what, maybe what you can do is as it gets closer to the next agenda -- Erin will be back --

Mr. Starr: Yeah, she's working, she's working on it.

Ms. Cua: Yeah, that let -- you know, if we know that's he's going to be here, then definitely let's agendize that.

Mr. Starr: I don't know how, how much time that would take, but we might get some his opinions on the parking, on the parking issues. Does everyone know -- know who that is? Ann?

Ms. Cua: I've heard of him.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, he's -- he's a -- really a world famous and very respected urban and -- urban, urban planner whose worked in lots and lots of cities and towns. And right now he's working for City and County of Honolulu on their transit oriented development and also in Kakaako. He's kind of the inspiration and brains behind the -- their community development. And he's . . . (inaudible) . . . consultant here on Maui, but, I mean, he's -- he's illuminary and practical and funny.

Mr. Mitchell: Okay. So we're gonna --. Any further discussion on the parking? So I'll close up that old business.

Mr. Starr: Yeah, I have one comment.

Mr. Mitchell: Go ahead. Sure.

Mr. Starr: I'm really glad that this is happening, and thank you for getting it going.

Mr. Mitchell: We'll get it done, one day or another.

F. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Open Application Report

Mr. Mitchell: Item F, Director's Report, I don't -- I've got -- we've got the outstanding projects and Erin will have to bring us up to speed on those when she gets back. We did the AT&T today. Toma & Drayson, I don't think there's something. We've looked at that, but there's not anything we can do on it. I believe McDonald's was redesigning and gonna resubmit their application. Green Lotus, I'm not sure; and Sprint, I'm not sure what the status of those projects are, but Erin can bring those back to us when they're, they're ready to go.

G. NEXT MEETING DATE: July 25, 2014

Mr. Mitchell: Let's see here, next, next meeting is July 25th. Everybody is going to be here for that? You'll be here Jon?

Mr. Starr: I wouldn't miss it for the world.

Mr. Mitchell: Alright. Don?

Mr. Fujimoto: So far.

Mr. Mitchell: So far, everybody's here. I, I don't know about Carol, but we'll least have enough for quorum. Okay, Don, you've gotta be out of here in a few minutes. Did we do okay?

Mr. Fujimoto: Great.

Mr. Mitchell: Alright. Any other discussions or items to put on next meeting's agenda? If you do, you can of course e-mail Erin or myself and we can get those put on. Thank you everybody today. Thank you Michele and Ann.

Can you put on the next -- while I'm thinking about -- the, the launch of -- the website is suppose to be ready to launch and I believe Saedene was going to come back in and give us an update on that, but her assistant was gone, or she was gone.

Ms. Cua: And which website is this?

Mr. Mitchell: That's for --

Ms. McLean: WCA.

Mr. Mitchell: -- WCA website. Because I recall it was gonna launch in July.

Ms. Cua: So want an update from Saedene?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, please.

Ms. Cua: Okay.

Mr. Mitchell: They may have already launched. I don't know, but we didn't get an update.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Starr: Can I, can I mention something?

Mr. Mitchell: Sure.

Mr. Starr: It's that I've heard that we have quite a bit of support for implementing the clean and safe program as, as it's been discussed that, both from Council's side and Administration's side and friends and community because it's getting dangerous out there. There was a mugging this week. There's -- there's a lot of -- there's a lot of people wandering around the street, yelling and screaming obscenities and threatening people, so we we'll need to do something. So, I believe that we have a good shot of getting help with funding and when that happens, you know, we'll all do what we've got to do to gain support and to get our friends to . . . (inaudible) . . . So I think we can make that happen.

Mr. Mitchell: Alright. Yes, thank you, and that was, part of, I think, our last meeting's discussions specifically giving merchants more information on procedures to deal with people issues. And I don't know that that happened, so maybe -- I'll send, I'll send Erin an e-mail. We can talk to her this --. When, when does Erin get back, Ann?

Ms. Cua: I think on the 8th.

Mr. Mitchell: Wonderful. If there's nothing else, I'll close today's meeting at 2:16, approximately. Thanks all very much, and we'll see you on the 25th.

There being no further business brought forward to the Agency, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Members Present:

Thomas Fairbanks III
Don Fujimoto, Vice-Chair
William Mitchell, Chair
Jonathan Starr

Members Excused:

Carol Ball

Others:

Ann Cua, Staff Planner, Current Planning Division
Michele McLean, Deputy Planning Director
Michael Hopper, Deputy Corporation Counsel