

**LANA'I PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 28, 2014**

APPROVED 09-24-2014

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Lana'i Planning Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chair John Ornellas at approximately 9:00 a.m., Saturday, June 28, 2014, in the Lana'i Community Center (Old Bowling Alley), Lana'i City, Hawaii.

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

Mr. John Ornellas: Meeting come to order for Lana'i Planning Commission, the CPAC Review. I want to make sure everybody has their cell phones turned off or in the whatever mode. Yeah. So we'll -- we'll start with the agenda item for June 28th Lana'i -- the Lana'i Community Center. And we'll start off with Item B, Public Testimony. If anybody wanna come up and testify -- there'll be other -- there'll be other times during the day where you'd be able to testify. So, if you have something to say now, please step forward and grab a mic. There's a mic right there by Mary's desk. Seeing none, let's move on for the approval of minutes of the May 7th, 2014 meeting.

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 Commission. More information on oral and written testimony can be found below.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2014 AND MAY 28, 2014 MEETINGS
(Commissioners, please bring your copy of the draft May 7, 2014 and May 28, 2014 meeting minutes that were distributed in the June 20, 2014 packets.)

Mr. Ornellas: Any changes members? Corrections? I don't know. Mary, on the first page of the minutes of May 7th, just below the second paragraph, below the public testimony, it says Mary Jorgensen -- somebody -- Sally asked about, something about, I guess, putting it on the computer or something. And -- and then you said, "thank you, it would be something that I would have to check with Corp Counsel before the document being in a Word version could be made. I'd have to check and see." Do you have an update for that?

Ms. Mary Jorgensen: Yes. Sally communicated via e-mail and she was able to just -- any pdf you can just convert into Word and she did that for sending her comments in.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay so --

Ms. Jorgensen: So, it doesn't resolve whether we can post one on the web in Word.

Mr. Ornellas: Is that before Corp -- still before Corp Counsel?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes, that's a question that we'd still need to follow up, but -- of whether we would post it in a Word version on the web.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So, Sally was okay with the way -- the way you decided?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, it is possible you take any pdf, there's a function that will just change it into Word.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, and then you'll continue to find out from Corp Counsel? Can we put that as a --

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: -- as an unsolved -- unsolved mystery?

Ms. Jorgensen: I'll -- I'll follow up and see.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Great. Thank you Mary. Anyone else, any questions, corrections, to the May 7th regular minutes? Seeing none, all those in favor of accepting the minutes just raise your hand. No. Do you accept it? Alright. So be it. It's accepted. And so the next item would be the 28th -- May 28th minutes. Any corrections or changes? Seeing none, any objections to -- to accepting the minutes of the 28th? Alright, so be it. We accept the minutes of the 28th. Going to item no. D, Lana'i Planning Commission discussion, recommendations relating to the -- the 2013 -- the December 2013 Draft of the Lana'i -- the Lana'i Community Plan. We'll start off with Chapter 9, Land Use. Go ahead Mary.

After discussion ensued and with no oppositions, the Lana'i Planning Commission approved the May 7, 2014 and the May 28, 2014 meeting minutes as presented.

D. Lana'i PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE DECEMBER 2013 DRAFT Lana'i COMMUNITY PLAN

1. Ch. 9 Land Use
2. Ch. 10 Urban Design
3. Ch. 7 Infrastructure
4. Ch. 11 Housing
5. Ch. 8 Public Facilities & Services

Ms. Jorgensen: Good morning everyone. I'm trying to get uncaught from the wheel here. Yeah, this morning we're going to go over Land Use and as Butch Gima, our CPAC Chair, said last -- at the May 28th meeting -- that was a major focus of the CPAC meetings. We took a lot of time and a thorough review because there was over 3,000 acres of new development proposal, and they worked very hard on -- on reviewing that between June and the end of -- September 25th was our last meeting. And -- and between -- so the CPAC draft came out and there -- it was -- theirs was September dated one. It's on the website. And what the Planning Commission is reviewing right now is the December version which incorporates all of the Planning Department's revisions which you'll see in blue and red, if you look at the files, and also incorporates agency comments. So there's -- they're similar. You can -- but there are some -- some differences between these two drafts.

This December draft will eventually become the Planning Commission's draft with all of your recommendations. And within that, in support of Chapter 9 there's five different maps at the -- at the end of the document that we'll be going over today. And there's also four appendices that are quite important to understanding Chapter 9. And the -- two of the appendices are over there as a handout, and they explain all the land use designations which is the -- the -- when these community plans are for -- they're called on a state level, development plans, and it's the county's responsibility to say what is going to be the designation category for all areas on the island. And then we receive proposals for -- for changes and recommendations that will be ultimately reviewed by the County Council. So there's -- we had in, as Butch referred to, we had a number of discussions because they -- it gets very confusing at times with who has jurisdiction over -- over the land. And there's multiple layers. The State of Hawaii has a land use layer that has four categories. So you can think of these as like almost a, you know, a stacking of rules over the land. And the -- there's the State layer with its four -- four land use designation categories. Then there's County land use designations, and currently we have between 18 categories, two more being proposed by the Lana'i CPAC. And -- and then ultimately the next layer would be that all those designations that come out of the community plan are assigned specific zoning which is numerous types of -- of zoning regulations that could go -- and all of those serve to regulate what's going on the land.

So as we're going through it, we'll try to make it as simple as possible, but it is -- it is a complex process as to what are the specific rules for any particular area. And so with that we can start with Chapter 9. And I just -- I just wanted to call out that appendices. You didn't, Commissioners, receive this in your packet, but we did put it down on your table -- that gives the comparison between State Land Use designations, County and then County zoning.

Mr. Ornellas: Mary, I also want to acknowledge there's two members here from the CPAC -- Debbie dela Cruz and Ron McOmber -- so they'll be probably interjecting on some -- based on what their memory was on the process. Thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: That'll be great. Okay. Okay so we can begin just as we normally do. We can start with page 1 -- I mean, page 9 -- 9-1. And what you'll see up here is the December draft. There's a few things that I made some minor corrections that I would recommend and just very

simple things. The Keamoku, I'm putting it in green as a recommending deletion because of what Stacie had said when we were discussing environment that it be just the east -- eastern coast or -- or leeward coast and not have Keamoku because that was a place so --

Ms. Beverly Zigmond: Mary, excuse me, so you're saying that you've made some changes because I see that is different from what I have in front of me?

Ms. Jorgensen: It is just in terms of changing 2%. I'm just -- I'm just showing that I have -- these are things that come out of --. It is 2%. It's just written out.

Ms. Zigmond: Right, right, right.

Ms. Jorgensen: There's a few -- a few minor changes there. And as we go on, there are some things that I'll recommend for deletions. But it's up to the Commissioners now to discuss first page 9.1 -- 9-1. Recommendations?

Mr. Ornellas: Any recommendations members?

Ms. Shelly Barfield: I agree with Stacie, just remove Keamoku cause it's a district and call it the east -- east side or you know, the other. I think it was referred to east side in the other community plan.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, east side rather than leeward?

Ms. Barfield: I, guess. Yeah cause leeward could be, you know, the lower side, the lower parts of the island. So to be more specific, just leave east side.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Anybody else? Any objections to keeping it -- the way Shelly wants it and Stacie? No objections, go ahead and change it.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Mike, let's wait and see if there are corrections on it. Okay, so 9 -- 9-2? Any -- any changes that you have for recommendations -- you know, recommended changes?

Mr. Ornellas: Commissioners, any changes to 9-2? Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: I would like to suggest that we go into 9.2, that as I was saying during the CPAC we spent a lot of time trying to resolve these -- how the County land use designations, if they were consistent with the State land use designations, and you really can't get complete consistency. We're just working towards that. So this is kind of a remnant discussion from that where we were looking at -- and it's phrased in the future tense that we'll resolve this. And then it compares what the changes are between the different drafts, CPAC drafts, and Planning Department draft, and I don't think we really need this anymore in -- because it's -- we'll be looking at the final change.

Mr. Ornellas: Any comments Commissioners? Hearing none, we'll continue.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, you're fine with that change? Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: So we're on 9-3 now?

Ms. Jorgensen: On line 28 I also, if you scroll down, I would suggest replacing where it says also "space within the existing school campus" -- replace the word "space" with "buildable land" because that's what I heard people calling it. On line 28.

Mr. Ornellas: 9-2.

Ms. Jorgensen: On page 9-2, line 28, the word "space" delete that, and replace it with "buildable land."

Ms. Zigmond: Mary, I'm sorry, I'm on 9-2. I'm looking at line 28, and I don't see what word you're saying.

Mr. Ornellas: Try -- try line 27 or 26. Start there.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Sorry. My numbering's off a little bit. It's line 27.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Is that -- is that it Bev? It's just you couldn't find it? Any changes?

Ms. Zigmond: I just needed to be on the same line. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: It doesn't --. You know what Mary, there is enough space for the school expansion there based on the -- on the expansion of master plan that we have, so there is buildable land down there and I don't know where -- where that came from.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, so then maybe that whole -- the second clause needs to be removed, so you just say there's a shortage of housing within town. Period.

Mr. Ornellas: Within town, yeah.

Ms. Jorgensen: And after the "and" delete the rest.

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Anything on 9-3?

Mr. Ornellas: Anybody else?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: Line 7, see appendix 9.1 in the appendices that, I believe, is labeled as 9.4. There are two 9.4s.

Ms. Jorgensen: Right. Where there's a correction on the appendices it will be the 9 -- the first one is mislabeled 9.4. It should be 9.1.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, you got the change? Okay, anything else Bev? Alright, members, anything -- anything else for page 9.2?

Ms. Jorgensen: 9 -- 9-3?

Mr. Ornellas: Let's go to 9-3.

Ms. Zigmond: I have a comment from Kelli.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Zigmond: So we got a piece of paper saying Land Use Planning Principles that is suppose to be inserted on 9-3, before line 16, so may I speak to that?

Mr. Ornellas: Sure.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay. So her concern was that some of the proposed projects, particularly the third resort, were not in agreement with the Land Use Planning Principles especially one, two and three. And so I just wanted to get that on the record for Kelli cause she couldn't be here.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, you did have in your -- the commissioner's packet, these land use planning principles which are -- there's a section where at the end of the chapter where we said we'd be putting them in there. But we looked at that it be -- suggesting the location prior to the future condition planned growth section. So we'd like to go over these land use planning principles. We received commissioners comments and see if there's other comments on that sheet and -- and what -- whether you're fine with inserting it on page 9-3.

Mr. Ornellas: You wanna go over it members? Let's -- let's do it then. Go ahead Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Mike, do you have that file in there? It should be land use planning principles. That one. Okay. And it's also on the table as a handout if people need it. So any

comments, recommendations for the first principle? One moment.

Mr. David Yamashita: Just so that I think people understand where this is coming from it's --. Okay, this Dave Yamashita from the Planning Department. So I think it's important to understand where these are coming from because this is -- it's a requirement of 2.80B. And it doesn't go into really any detail on what land use planning principles -- I mean, it's, yeah -- there's just no, there's no definition. So I think, as you go through these, you need to think about how you're going to use them. I think one -- one of the things we were -- we tried to do with these is to make them apply to the whole island which is a challenge because you've got both urban areas and rural areas and essentially undeveloped areas. So they need to be general enough -- they need to be general, but then also provide direction, but also allow flexibility so that -- because you don't know exactly what's gonna happen in some of these areas. So I think as we go through these that's an important thing to remember. And it is -- it is difficult, and I think we tried to --. You know these -- these could be revised, I think they could be worked on, but it's something maybe we could even bring back at the next meeting if we have to. But, I just -- because these are -- these are important, but they're also a little vague in the description of 2.80B. I don't know if that helped or hurt or did you --. Well, I mean, I'd like to hear what other people have to say, I mean, from the commissioners and maybe --

Mr. Ornellas: Excuse me, if people are gonna make comments and stuff, come to a mic so we can record it, okay? Please? Thank you. Ron, you wanna come up and say something?

Mr. Ron McOmber: Ron McOmber, CPAC member. You know, two things. First of all, this is a shitty place to hold a meeting. You can't hear anything in this building. You cannot hear this conversations back here. I'm sorry. And people like me that are getting old is really suffering from this. Secondly, I want to give the County a scolding because how come the CPAC didn't address these issues that they're now bringing up? We should have had the right to discuss this. And we rush, rushed it through, rushed it through -- now we're seeing all this and how are we suppose to comment on this? This is not fair to this -- to this CPAC who busted their ass for this, and now we have this. I think it's unfair to the County to do this to us. And if you're going to pitch the community, the planning department, the planning commission and the CPAC against each other, and I don't think that's fair.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, thank you Ron. Members, any comments, questions?

Ms. Jorgensen: We have another -- community member.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. State your name and then --

Mr. Chris Richardson: Chris Richardson. Yeah, it's the first time I've seen it and so I just got a brief look at it, but I don't see anything that I can object to. I really believe that in that principle no. 1. And I think whatever planning for development is gonna happen should really, truly follow each one of those things, especially ecological stand point, because as -- is it Mr. Yamashita mentioned, we don't know what's going to happen and so it is good to have these principles. But Ron is completely right. I mean, the people need a chance to digest this stuff and thank

you.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Yeah, we -- we can review it now and if there's something that you have as comments, we can work them in, even from any community member, CPAC member, and bring it back. It's not a -- it's not a finished product at this time. We realize we're introducing something that was not previously discussed and it's -- and it's rather lengthy, but it is -- reflects what is in a lot of the other sections of the chapter in terms of no. 2, "Identify and protect natural resources and agricultural lands," as it's very much in Chapter 3, protecting the open space. But I think probably the only one that might not specifically been called some place is no. 4, "Identify opportunities for infill and redevelopment to strengthen existing communities." But that may be in the Urban Design chapter. And -- so these are -- these are pretty much in other areas of the document that the CPAC was working with. It was just putting them all together in one place for the planning -- that's directing the planning growth. But you're welcome, you know, to comment on it and, yes, there were -- there were pieces missing from requirements out of 2.80B during the review and I, on behalf of the County, I apologize to CPAC for that because I really do feel that all of it should be completed before a CPAC is convened and, and, and begins their work. You should have all of the materials in front of you.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes?

Ms. Winifred Basques: Good morning. Winifred Basques, as a community person. No. 2 item, identify and protect natural resources and agricultural lands. Okay, I went to Honolulu the other day, and we're talking about natural resources as well as agriculture and -- the thing is that when you have agriculture -- I know this is a big area -- the pineapple field was 16,000 acres of land on the island of Lana'i. And of course, when you do this kind of a brief summary, you have to get the low down on what it's all about. Are you folks going be planting things in the ground for agriculture or are you folks going be doing other resources like the fish in the aquaponics? Are you folks going be doing that kind of stuff too as well? For agriculture? Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Winnie.

Ms. Jorgensen: This is not -- these principle are not -- are like a broad umbrella. They're not going into specifics in -- in terms of agricultural lands and it's addressed in chapter 3 as a resource, as a natural resource. So we don't talk about the specifics of what's going to be planted in agricultural lands.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, anymore on this item? Any comments? Alright, thank you Mary. So -- so we're gonna continue on or--?

Ms. Jorgensen: If you have -- if the Commissioners had a chance to read it and have something that you'd like me to incorporate and then we can bring it back so that -- and the community has. It's here and we can also post it on the web, this new material.

Mr. Ornellas: We can --. Yes, ma'am. You want to come up and say something? Okay. We

don't have to make a decision now. I mean -- so we have a break and people would be able to read it and draw some conclusions or comments. And if, if -- if they don't now, they can e-mail you the information and that kind of stuff so --. Is that okay with you guys?

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Yeah, that's fine. We can bring -- we can definitely bring it back and -- for the next meeting.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. David?

Mr. Yamashita: I would also encourage based on what Ron was saying that you -- you look at this and offer us comments, and really anybody else who has comments on this so that we can incorporate them and -- and bring them back at the next meeting, but --

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah, it can be done today, or they can e-mail you whenever so -- before our next meeting. Okay. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Julie Ann Cachola: Aloha. My name is Julie Ann Cachola, I'm a planner with Department of Hawaiian Homelands (DHHL). I'm, I'm sorry I didn't -- this is my first meeting, I didn't realize the format was that, you know, you could participate and get clarification. If I could go back to page 9-2 -- I just didn't know that we could raise our hand and participate -- on that line 27 that we're talking about, you know, as the whole paragraph reads right now, Lana'i City is the island's population, the service center, I would suggest, comma, "however, there is a shortage of housing within the town, and also buildable land within the existing school campus," which is a true story, within existing campus. I remember receiving a, you know, the planning presentation for the expansion of the school, and they're saying within the campus, they can't move, so they need to go down. So I think that's a true statement. And then I would say, however in the three large -- I don't want to say large -- three development projects. Or you can even say, government or public sector projects because these are not private projects. And that might be something that you want to distinguish as contributing to, you know, the development here. Three government projects are planned, etcetera, etcetera. That way if you include that thing about the campus, no. 3 would make sense. Because if not, you're only talking about housing. And so when you get to no. 3, Department of Education, it kind of -- it's weird that that comes up. So I'm just suggesting to put some kind of reference back in and maybe a connected sentences so you're making a statement, hey, this is our center, however, we're -- we're -- there's a shortage of lands. You know, on the other hand, you know, the three government projects are being proposed. I know I'm not being specific, but I can suggest specific languages if you're interested, but I just wanted to just kind of address the general problems with this paragraph. And also, taking that "large" out, and either putting in public sector or government or just government projects.

Mr. Ornellas: Members -- members, any questions or comments? Thank you. Robin, you wanted to say something?

Mr. Robin Kaye: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, alright.

Ms. Jorgensen: John, did you --

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Jorgensen: Did you want any action on the --

Mr. Ornellas: You know I'm just -- I'm trying to formulate something for that paragraph, but we'll just continue on and I'll make --.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: When, when I come in my mind which is a little sleepy today, but I'll --.

Ms. Cachola: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, I'll talk to you later about it. So you're -- you're representing the DHHL today at this -- in this? So our discussion about the acreage here right off of Kaunalapau Highway will be coming up and so we will be calling on you later. Thank you. Go ahead Mary, I think what we're on -- back to 9-3? Page 9-3?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, 9-3. So I think we decided to get comments on the Planning Principles and Standards, and so our next section is the one that discussed in -- in the written description of what would occur with the proposed development. And so it's a key section as we go through it. And we also have it on -- on detailed maps that, that shows where the areas are. There were five different areas that were proposed for new development. The Lana'i City area, the Kahalepalaoa area, the Manele mauka area, the airport, and the Kaunalapau area. So -- so each of those areas we'll go over in turn. I might not have put them in the correct order as they are in the chapter, but there's detailed maps for those areas, and at the break, you can look at the maps up there as well. So to begin we'll start with if there's any comments on page 9-3.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, 9-3, page? Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, it's not specific to 9-3, but this whole section that we're talking about which is the future. And, I'm just curious, I -- I have made mentioned of this before and I'm sure that it's not well received, but in the unlikely event that the current landowner was not the landowner in the future, and they didn't want all these projects, it's going to be in our community plan, and what happens then? So we're putting very specific projects in there, and I'm just wondering what happens if that awful thing would happen?

Mr. Ornellas: If -- if I'm correct -- if it's not in the community plan, you'd have to go and get a community plan amendment. A community plan amendment. If it's not in the community plan, you have to get an amendment, and you have to go through the process of --

Ms. Zigmond: But what if it's in there and they don't want it?

Mr. Ornellas: Then it just dies. It's up -- it will be up to -- it was up to the CPAC, it's up to the Lana'i Planning Commission and it's up to the Planning Department, and it's up to the -- the final say is going to be the Maui County Council. If there's something that you don't want or, you know, you can do it here or the -- or you do it at the Maui County Council. You get our Council member to -- to have him remove it so --. But that's -- that's this process that we're in now, so if there's things in there that you don't like, then we can have it removed. That doesn't say that -- that it's dead, they just have to get a community plan amendment. And that's a process that goes through the Planning Department and through the Maui County Council so --. I think there's a committee that also has to hear it first before it does. I think it's Don Couch's committee, public? But anyway, it still -- it's not a process that, that once you say, no, it's dead. No. Okay, so 9-3. Everybody's okay with 9-3? We can continue? Members? Just nod your head. Okay. Page --. Go ahead.

Ms. Jorgensen: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: I don't think your mic is on, I can't hear you.

Ms. Jorgensen: This is Mary Jorgensen. I have a change on -- in the section where -- in your plan it's lines 27 through 34, that paragraph, on page 9-3. And this came where the CPAC had use a County land use designation of conservation, and -- and after that or actually the same as CPAC was going on, the County Planning Department was having a discussion of -- of whether to reduce the number of categories in the community plan designations. There's about 20. And we were asked to reduce them down. And one of the logical ones to reduce down was to take out conservation and use the State conservation because we don't have any jurisdiction over State conservation lands. So, it shows up. It looks -- the CPAC version is in the middle, you know. Or, the State conservation is that top map where you see all the yellow. And the CPAC is the middle version which is consistent with where they wanted conservation where the State conservation land was. So this paragraph reflects the need to change the language where instead of using County conservation, we moved to using State conservation.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, you understand what she just said? That's basically --. Well, no it's more than verbiage. It's, it's, it's -- we're allowing the State to take over any type of conservation and some people like myself are not too happy with what the State has done in the past to this island, so --. Go ahead David.

Mr. Yamashita: Dave Yamashita. Well, the County doesn't have jurisdiction over it any way, so that's the point of just trying to simplify things. So, when people see State conservation, it's still County conservation. I mean it's not -- I shouldn't say anything. Anyway, we just don't have jurisdiction over it, so we're just trying to simplify things.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So, the County does have jurisdiction over open space, right?

Ms. Jorgensen: We do have an open space County community plan land use designation. So

we're saying the land use, wherever you put open space in the County that's how we would look at it. And then we would look at the zoning for open space which there are two categories. But if someone wants to still do something on the land that would -- that would be allowed under the State conservation, they could -- they could go and ask for a community plan amendment and -- and then State layer would be effective. So you could -- we could replace like it was in the 98 plan, you could put open space over all of the conservation lands. And it's not --

Mr. Ornellas: And if I'm mistaken, you know, cause Ron and Kurt were all part of that. We had a long discussion about that -- about that stuff about giving up -- giving up our responsibility for this island and giving it to the State. And that's why a lot of it was changed because we didn't want to give anything up to the State because the State has a -- you know, somebody shows up with a big wad of money, they're willing to change almost anything so --

Ms. Jorgensen: When it is in State conservation land, the County does not have any jurisdiction in that area.

Mr. Ornellas: Understood. But, the County home rule still stands if we change State conservation. No, I take that back. We change County conservation to open space. Since you're getting rid of County conservation. Yeah, it's State, the State is still going to do it. But if you open -- if you change the designation to County open space, then that kuleana still remains with -- with us.

Ms. Barfield: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Why not?

Ms. Jorgensen: If it's State conservation land they have the ultimate say --

Mr. Ornellas: Understood. But there is County conservation now.

Ms. Jorgensen: The County conservation land use category defers and says we will do what the State conservation says. It was a redundant land use designation and that's why we said let's remove it and show where the State conservation land is so we have a clearer idea where there is really -- it is in the State jurisdiction. And in our discussions with Corporation Counsel and the CPAC that we came to that end, and we said, okay, we'll -- we'll do that and we'll show it as County conservation over the State conversation. But it was a redundant layer, so then we said, well, let's -- let's remove the County conservation layer because we're in this other separate process of trying to reduce all these designations and get down to clearer definitions that -- to use in areas. So that's how it came about.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. I also -- also Butch just walked in. He's another CPAC member. He was a Chair for -- just acknowledging him. Thank you for your work. Okay, so if we're not going to make that an issue, so let's move on. So --

Mr. Bradford Oshiro: Wait.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Brad.

Mr. Oshiro: I've got something. On the pamphlet is saying 36, on the screen it's 38 -- "Pulama Lana'i's target for total future population is approximately 6,000 residents." My question is unless we start taking care of that hale up there, I don't think we get enough water to hold 6,000 people. I mean, are we -- I think Pulama at one time said they were working on it. They going take care the land, take care the hale. I was just wondering, are they still planning to do that? Because if they not, you can down grade that number a whole lot.

Ms. Zigmond: Brad, that's, that's -- that's a good question. Could someone speak to that? You are? Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Kurt.

Mr. Kurt Matsumoto: So one of -- one of the things I would suggest is changing that word "target" to something different because I think I've explained before that this process asked for a number, and, you know, because this process requires us to come up with a number, that's the number we came up with. So, it's not our target. I don't have a plan that gets us to 6,000 residents, so please be clear about that. And remember that the prior plan has a resident goal of 12,000. Not a goal, but it says it could accommodate 12,000 people here. So, just two points. Regarding your question about the watershed, yes, we do have plans to improve the conditions of the watershed and improve the rainforest, and try to help the recharge value up there.

Ms. Zigmond: Kurt, could I ask you, is that on the priority list?

Mr. Matsumoto: I'm not quite sure what you mean by priority list, but, yes, it is important to us, and it's something that we already actively engage in today.

Ms. Jorgensen: Would the word "goal" instead of "target" be an acceptable revision?

Mr. Ornellas: How about estimate? Instead of target put estimate. Any objections? Go ahead and change it to estimate.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. So now --

Mr. Ornellas: Let's -- let's -- let's hang on here. Where does Brad's comments fit in page 9-3? Where? 36. He was talking about the housing, I mean, the, the hale -- Lana'ihale. For the watershed, and I don't see --. Okay, he was -- I understand now. Okay, thank you for sitting next to me today. Okay, so we're on our way to 9-4, page 9-4?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Mike, can we see map 9.5, for the Lana'i City area? So this map shows the development that is proposed and we can hear comments from the Commissioners on the text on page 9-4.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, let's -- let's kind of split it up here so we don't get confused with the whole -- because there's different -- there's four different topics. So from line no. 1 to line no. 10, any comments, members? Alright, hearing none, let's go on to 9.5A, Lana'i City Expansion -- Lana'i City Expansion. That's line 12 through 26. Go ahead Debbie, please come forward.

Ms. Debbie dela Cruz: On line 12 where it's talking about this area will be approximately 546 acres. CPAC had 470. It's not indicated as a change from what we looked at. And can I just -- so I don't have to keep popping up -- also on page 9-6, on line 28 --

Mr. Ornellas: Debbie, can we stick to 9-4?

Ms. dela Cruz: Okay, I'll just pop up later, then.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes. I got no problems with you guys popping up.

Ms. dela Cruz: Okay. I just didn't want to be the black mole.

Ms. Barfield: What was the number you said, the -- for CPAC? How many acres was your number?

Ms. dela Cruz: This is Debbie dela Cruz. It's 470.

Ms. Barfield: Could that include a park? Maybe there's a park within that expansion. Because if I'm not mistaken whenever you have development you're suppose to have a park as well. But I don't see the verbiage for park in there Mary. Cause I think from what I understand previously the Lana'i City Expansion, you're suppose to have affordable housing and a community center within that center -- within that expansion as well.

Ms. dela Cruz: I am merely bringing this up as another example where things are being changed without being indicated as changes.

Ms. Barfield: No, I understand. But then Mary, maybe that could be it -- the park and the community center or whatever.

Ms. Jorgensen: The Lana'i City expansion is a mixed use residential area that will have most -- primarily residential, but it will also have nodes of, like, your corner store, parks, whatever. You know, it can be, in this, there was not in that short period of time, and it's not normal to have a very detailed plan of all the things that might go in the area. There was -- so at the end of each section there is language that says, like, in the end of the Lana'i City section, there's language that says that the proposed development area as described above and as shown on the Lana'i City conceptual plan, map 9.5, a determination we made at the time of entitlement as to whether

a project district detailed zoning or other means will achieve the goals stated above. So these are description -- descriptions of the goal similar to what you will see in your 98 plan when they described the Manele and Koele Project Districts. You don't want to get too specific because you will lock yourself into something that there isn't the detailed design that -- behind these descriptions that you're asking for. That will come later and the plans will come through the Planning Commission for review.

Ms. Zigmond: Mary, I see that's a nice little loop hole there at the end, but I'm just a little uncomfortable that Debbie keeps finding things that were changed and things that have some substance.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, I looked through the meeting notes from last August and then the beginning of September for when we discussed the Land Use and the -- the -- there was -- there was a lot of -- there was recording of all the actions that the CPAC asked for and then they were put into the CPAC draft. And if they were changed in, in the December draft, they're shown as strikes -- strike thru or the blue color addition. And right now I'm searching through the CPAC because I'm talking to you for looking for that acreage that Debbie's referring to, the CPAC September draft. The university was 524 acres, Lana'i City 546, in the CPAC draft, the CPAC table of acreage. So, I'm not sure, Debbie, if you're looking at an older draft, the September draft.

Ms. dela Cruz: It's in the September draft but we did not discuss it.

Ms. Jorgensen: I don't know where, then, the acreage came from if we didn't --. I mean, the area, we had in the discussion, for CPAC, we had this, this table, so it was, it was there at CPAC meetings, and as the acreage that was involved for each of these expansion areas. We, unfortunately, don't have detailed minutes of the CPAC. We just have actions that we are suppose to make changes here and there. We have lists of actions to change. We have approval by page at the September 25th meeting. So maybe this table wasn't there at the earlier meeting that you were in. And when we got -- filled this table in from the acreage, it could be from using the map and getting, from that polygon, having that acreage. But I think it was on the earlier maps so I'll check -- I'll check the draft maps through the summer. They did have acreage on them.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, any -- any comments, questions? You know, in 9.5A, 12 through -- lines 12 through 26, can you put in there, make sure that the word "parks" in there, some place? Just kind of incorporate it that, make sure we have a park? I mean, it's, it's not stated, but on --

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: On the next page, it is kind of stated because they say a gateway park, but as -- but I don't know where that gateway park is at. So whatever development that they're going to do -- planned out there, they should have the word parks.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. We'll add parks in there.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: And some of the confusion may be that the Lana'i City Expansion area includes some of those park acreage as someone was bringing up that the -- on the map this says 457, but all these other areas that are part of it -- the tennis academy, those other areas -- are all part of the Lana'i City Expansion.

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah. Alright. That's --

Ms. Jorgensen: That would be the difference that you're --

Mr. Ornellas: Obviously that's a park that -- a tennis academy is not gonna be for --

Ms. Jorgensen: So the, the total acreage is of the Lana'i City -- the brown areas that you're seeing there. It's salmon on the maps. A salmon color. And -- so, you know, 9.5A, 9.5B, 9.5C are added together as Lana'i City Expansion, and then the university is a separate -- well, maybe -- no, that doesn't make sense. Excuse me.

Mr. Ornellas: And, you know, when we start talking about parks, the County -- when a development goes in, there's suppose to parks as part of the plan, if I'm not mistaken. Okay, but, I wanna make sure that the park in there because in the past the County has given developers money, or the developers has given the County money and they've -- they just don't do the park. So that -- I mean, our parks are very dear to this community so we have to have a park, not just a bag of money exchanging hands. So I do want to have parks in there some place, on that chapter, 9.5A.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, and we can add -- we can add parks in there.

Mr. Ornellas: And then isn't there different types of parks? A passive park is just grass. Is that --? I mean, we have one of those County parks at the end of Fraser Avenue. It's just grass. Kids play there, but it's not a playground type park where the families could go there and enjoy the place. So, I guess, there's gotta be a definition of what kind of parks that we're gonna be having in these different locations.

Ms. Jorgensen: You can, in the policy section, make sure that you have that in there that will address the types and the diversity of parks. And it's also in the Urban Design section in Lana'i City that will influence how that extension area is designed so that it's reflective of the existing Lana'i City. And so we can add -- yeah, we'll, we'll add something in the description here and then think about it again when we get to the policy section. And on these numbers I'm going to double check them and I appreciate Debbie -- she was wonderful during the CPAC in finding errors and so it could be the table's wrong and we're just looking at -- there's an inconsistency between the table and the map. So thank you Debbie.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. So, 9.5A, anymore, anymore questions, comments, members? We're gonna move on? Alright. Hearing none, let's go to 9.5B, Tennis Academy Park. Any? Hearing none, any questions, comments? Hearing none, let's just take that. Then we go to 9.5C, Gateway Park.

Ms. Zigmond: I have a question on that.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: So, that's on the side where Central is right now, right? And then on the opposite side is the DHHL parcel is that correct?

Mr. Ornellas: That is my -- that was -- that's what I've read. County, can you show that on the -- is that on the map where you can see the difference where the Gateway Park is suppose to go versus the DHHL 10 acres?

Ms. Zigmond: I think that's where Murdock always wanted the flowers and stuff on that side. Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: So for the record, we do not have that parcel identified. These maps are showing the CPAC proposal.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: And yeah, so there's not --

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. You can hand the mic over to DHHL and let them -- this is where -- this is where we talk about this.

Ms. Cachola: And actually I apologize in trying to get all of this paper work together, but I have suggestions on the section right before this, with the residential, to include our residential acres and units as part of the expansion area. And also our parks that we plan in the expansion area, and I can give you language on that. For this area, we're on the makai -- I don't what you call it -- right side of that intersection -- that's the 10 acres, and that's going to establish our metes and bounds. So I have the map I can convey to the GIS person there, so that, that can be depicted in there.

Mr. Ornellas: We know where it's at. We know -- we know what land you're talking about. That's 10 acres there, right?

Ms. Cachola: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: But it's zoned -- you guys have it planned zoned commercial.

Ms. Cachola: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. And then the Gateway Park is basically on the other -- the north side of Kaunalapau Highway? County, is that correct?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: On map 9.5, it shows 9.5C at the corner of Kaunalapau and Manele Road. Isn't that where the DHHL property is designated? And that's designated as 9.5C Gateway Park, according to the map.

Ms. Jorgensen: That's correct.

Ms. Aoki: So they're going to be in the same location or next to each other?

Ms. Jorgensen: At the time these maps were produced we knew nothing about the DHHL property. They testified at February 26th meeting and we're trying to understand, you know, how that all works as to whether it be located here or some other location. It seems -- and so, Jen, do you know?

Ms. Jennifer Maydan: Jen Maydan, Long Range Planning. Through this process, the -- your commission can decide whether you want to put something on that intersection with DHHL's recommendations. If you choose not to, then you don't. I believe Director Spence kind of alluded to that at the last meeting that it is your choice what goes on the, the designation maps for the proposed community plan designations.

Ms. Aoki: Joelle Aoki. So as I understand it the land has been formally transferred over to the State of Hawaii, Department of Hawaiian Homelands. How would that affects the deed if its already been deeded as a parcel? Just curious. How does that affect the deed? Can we make a change considering that they have a deeded property transferred over to them already? Because then that -- it's a moot point that we really can't make a decision if it's been deeded.

Mr. Yamashita: Okay, David Yamashita, and I just trying to read Lynn's lips, and I think she said that it hasn't been deeded. I mean, that was our understanding, and I think she just confirmed that.

Ms. Zigmond: But it hasn't been deeded, but it is in the process of being deeded, so why would we even consider doing designated something on land that is DHHL's?

Mr. Yamashita: It's really -- this is the community -- it's a community plan. I mean, you're the ones who ultimately, for this process anyway, make that determination. I, I should say also that there are lands, and I think Julie Ann can confirm this, that there are lands -- other lands, at least on Maui, that I'm aware of where there is no community plan designation. There's a conflict between the community plan designation and DHHL's plans. So that -- that's already there. And I think that's why --

Ms. Aoki: I'm sorry, could you repeat that again?

Mr. Yamashita: There are pieces of lands, parcels on Maui where the County designation is inconsistent or conflicts with what --

Ms. Cachola: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Yamashita: Right. Right. Wait, wait -- you should use the microphone. Okay, yeah, so there are -- there are places where there is a conflict. But what Director Spence is telling you as a Commission is to think of what's -- what should be in the community plan for the community.

Mr. Ornellas: What's best -- what's best for this island, for the residents of this island.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. I just wanted clarification so we know how to move forward because it seems a bit confusing when you have land that's deeded and you're asking us to make a change. How does that affect the deed and what -- what has occurred in Maui in situations like this?

Ms. Cachola: Can I just say we're -- we're generally consistent with the County because we're there, we designated our lands, and they kind of -- we corresponded with them during this process and so the Planning Department basically put our stuff in. Where there was an inconsistency was in this area, Pulehunui, Puunene area where it was -- we were taken out of the urban growth boundary. That's the only thing. And now, that makes us in conflict with the project district because everything has been consistent actually. But, beyond the consistency, there is an additional concern here because this a -- this a condition of the State Land Use Commission. Earlier on, it was in '94 coming -- many of you folks know about this, of course, as a condition for golf course in the State Land Use Commission. So this is specifically designated as commercial, via that process, via -- a lot of the work as far as I understand from the record, people in this room that had actually fought for that designation in these areas. So we're just like -- we're right at the tail end of this, being the receiver as a settlement in our Act 14 which is long -- other kind of change -- process we've been going through. So, you know, and so we're accepting it as the . . . (inaudible) . . . as designated by the conditions of the State Land Use Commission.

Mr. Ornellas: Is that it? I'm not going to say anything. Ron, you wanna come up? Please?

Mr. McOmber: This is amazing. How soon we forget. With the Land Use Commission decision with LSG on -- on developing things within their community. We were given 10 acres. We originally wanted where Hale Kupuna is right now. Castle & Cooke decided to put Hale Kupuna there and negated that 10 acres. We tried to get 10 acres throughout the town. Couldn't get it. We finally come up with a deal with Land Use Commission on the corner of Kaumalapau and Manele Road for 10 acres for industrial which would have been the expansion of the city which we really didn't like, but it was better than nothing. Now it's going to be a park. But remember, that originally is a Land Use Commission condition put on this property. And also if I remember

correctly we asked for -- been asking for a by pass road to get around the city for years, and we've been promised. And the only reason that we didn't get it is because Manele -- I mean, Koele housing project didn't fill in. If they had sold all the homes at -- at Koele, right above Bob Hera's house, then they would go ahead and do the by pass road. But don't forget, the Land Use Commission gave that to this community as part of the agreement with Castle & Cooke. So you better find out what is before you start dealing it away to somebody, and the community needs -- have something given in return. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Members, any -- anything else? I do want to -- 9.5C, the Gateway Park, and this is what it reads, "This 16 acre site will expand the existing underdeveloped -- undeveloped park at the junction of Manele Road and Kaunalapau Highway. The park will provide an attractive gateway entrance to Lana'i City." Okay, so people were thinking back then as far as how -- when you enter Lana'i City -- Lana'i City from that part what it looks like so -- and I've been hearing that people don't particularly want to see a strip mall or a commercial district there where right now it's just open space. And I remember the fight back in the -- in the 90s over this. Steve Snow didn't want -- didn't want nothing built there because that was going to be his agriculture place. That's where he's gonna grow his old hay or whatever, which never came about. So to put -- to put a -- a commercial property right there at the corner, I, just, to me, doesn't seem right. Go ahead.

Ms. Cachola: I hear what you're saying, and I -- and we're sensitive to that. And I think the key attribute of this parcel is that it is a gateway, and that we would design it appropriately. And I would suggest that this time because, you know, we sitting down, looking and there's a lot of people in the room that have that vision as to what that gateway would look like. You know, to kind of specify, hey, this is the -- this is how we see the entrance of our city. And I think that would go a long way to help us when we go ahead and look at, now, what are we gonna do with this, this 10 acres and, and specify. You know, Lana'i would like to see the gateway looking like this and that, and feel like this, and give us -- give guidance with that, you know. It's our interest not to put a strip mall. It's our interest to be able to service this community and be in consistent -- be consistent with it. Where we're not consistent with is, I guess, the proposed plans by the landowner which had -- now identified as this gateway park. So, you know, a lot of things can be taken cared in the design and the development process, and we have a detailed consultation policy for any of our land uses. We do consultant with our beneficiaries, and in this case, you know, I think, you know, we should be talking with the community too about -- because it is a special park, so, and it is a significant, you know, parcel in the land use kind of design.

Ms. Barfield: Hey Mary, before we even, you know, designate or whatever, maybe we should research what Ron had recommended. That way we can have the whole story. We can understand what our options are, or what we can do. I mean, we gotta understand it. If we're the final authority, then we need to review it. So, if we can get the facts before us, we can make that decision.

Ms. Jorgensen: So there's prior agreements between the State Land Use board and the community that occurred during Castle & Cooke's time that you would like to see, and that was what was sent out and the -- that's in the handout. And -- and -- so we can -- you can definitely

wait on making that recommendation and review that. I think what -- what Will Spence was saying and, and David Yamashita reiterated is that when you're looking at that -- and, and even as Bev said tonight -- what happens over time when it changes. And really you're to look at what you want to see there as a community. And because parcels, what's underneath can have different land owners. This land -- the title hasn't changed from this particular parcel as yet, but there's the legal issues there. So it's like, you're looking at the entrance to your community and what you want to see.

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle?

Ms. Aoki: So, the reason I brought up the map is just that it was brought up at -- in the May meeting which is two meetings back for the LPC. And was it part of --? No, yes, it was part of CPAC. And I believe Shelly provided a copy of the State Land Use map. That did have the designation of those -- of the land converted over to DHHL on it. It was a certified map. Is that correct, Shelly? You provided a copy or you showed Director Spence a copy of the State Land Use map that did show the designation at that meeting.

Ms. Barfield: Yes.

Ms. Aoki: And so I'm just curious at -- as to will we have any resolution to that question back in May because we're still looking at this map. It was brought up back in May that we do have a State Land Use map that's certified, that shows the acreage that has been converted over to DHHL on it. And I understand what you're saying -- thank you Mary -- as far as expressing what our wishes are for the plan. But, I -- I just want to know, like, you know, we -- we not only would have to make decisions in my view as far as what our gateway entrance would look like, number one, but also have it -- have the information needed to make the decisions about where we would recommend for DHHL to relocate to in a nutshell. Because I just find it, like, crazy making, making a decision on something knowing what's already deeded on a map, on a State Land Use map. And it's a certified State Land Use map back in 1999. So that map was shown to Director Spence in May. So that's the reason -- I just wanted it to be reflected in the notes, in the -- on the record that we're looking at the same map again, and the issues coming up once again when we've already presented the evidence that we know for a fact the State Land Use has, has it on the certified maps. So I don't know how that affects us -- just, you know, wanting to get more information. Thank you.

Ms. Cachola: Department would not be interested in moving. You know what I mean? So it's not like, oh, we're gonna have a park here, and -- so you can't do your commercial here so you gotta go here. I mean, I shouldn't say -- I can't make any comments for this department, but , internally that's what our discussion is to be frank with you, you know. So --

Mr. Ornellas: Butch -- Butch --. Go ahead Joelle as Butch is coming up.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. I appreciate that, and I just want to make that on the record because I think this is the forum to have that dialogue. I mean, if we're gonna be saying this is how our gateway wants to look, let's just -- let's just all kill two birds with one story. Knock it all down

now and figure out, okay, what can we do to move forward with DHHL because there will come a day and a time where they may say they're going to move forward with this commercial area, and we want to be proactive, not reactive, right? So I understand also what, you know, you're saying as far as expressing our wishes which I think is a good thing. But, I think, I would -- I personally would like to know legally what -- how will this affect DHHL. My family are -- are native Hawaiians so I would like to know that answer.

Ms. Jorgensen: Thank you. Butch?

Mr. Reynold "Butch" Gima: Good morning. Butch Gima. From a decision making point of view, your responsibility is to look at what the CPAC put together. So one of the options is you don't have to do anything and you can just go with what the CPAC provided. If you do that, it's not a done deal for DHHL. As John mentioned earlier, if they don't like what you guys and the County Council eventually come up with, they can come back with a community plan amendment to change it to fit their needs. Now early on in the CPAC process, we didn't want projects to dictate what the plan was going to be. You know, we wanted the plan to be developed and hopefully whatever entities had specific projects would come in and would fit the plan. So basically you don't want -- what's a term -- the tail to wag the dog. Right? So keep that in mind as you make that decision.

Now personally I'm -- I'm a bit frustrated that DHHL came after the fact. I wasn't here at the other meeting so I don't know what their representations were in terms of why they did not come before the CPAC. The other thing about DHHL and -- correct me if I'm wrong -- they are exempted, I believe, from some County permitting rules. And we ran into that when we were planning the master plan for the school, and they were putting in Hawaiian Homelands. So that's a consideration that, I think, will enter into your decision making process. So that, if they're saying they're going to put this project in that projected area, they don't -- they don't have to comply with all permitting regulations, and that includes stuff like drainage. So please -- please keep that -- please keep that in mind. So I would -- I would strongly suggest go with what the CPAC recommended, and if DHHL does not agree with it, then can come back. They have a recourse. They can come back and submit a community plan amendment and go through that process to change it. Thank you.

Ms. Zigmond: Butch, just a question. I'm a little confused. So, how is, is DHHL's plans for that parcel wagging the tail or the dog wagging -- or whatever you said -- any different from what the company. They're putting forth projects in certain areas, so how is that different?

Mr. Gima: It is -- it is not different, and that's -- that's the challenge that the CPAC had early on. That there were some on the CPAC who wanted the company to put forth projects so that can help us develop the community plan. There were a number of us who preferred that the CPAC develop the plan and hopefully that the company's project would fit into what the CPAC came up with. What you have before you obviously is a compromise between those points of views in terms of planning.

Ms. Aoki: I mean, I agree with you. I also feel that that should be a park, not a commercial area.

However, I'd like to have all the accurate information in front of me when I'm making a decision, so I'd like to please request for more information on the maps so we know what's, you know, what's happening on the State Land Use maps. That would prevent us from having other things come up, specifically the question that Uncle Ron brought up and having that addressed as well. I just want to have more information because I think if we are prepared and we look at all the avenues and information that can be provided, it will help me and maybe others on the -- on the commission make better sound recommendations for our community plan.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Brad, do you have something?

Mr. Oshiro: Yeah, the only thing I got to say is you gotta get with the land owner because the land owner is the one that's gonna give the -- if they not putting the Hawaiian Homes in that area, the land owner's the one going put them wherever they want or wherever the property they going give. So if it's light industrial, can you stick underneath that light industrial where the Maui -- Maui County's land yard is and go down that way or can't be done or --? I mean, we gotta talk with -- you guys gotta talk with the landowners because if Hawaiian Homes got that, they're entitled to some kind of property on the island so you gotta --. I mean, we wasting our time. It's between the land owner, where they want to put Hawaiian Homes. If they want Hawaiian Homes over there, and they start building light industrial, kind of ruins our gateway to Lana'i City, yeah?

Ms. Cachola: Clarify the question about our -- our zoning powers or exemptions. It's not that we're exempted from zoning. We have exclusive land use authority over our lands. Exclusive land use authority -- because we existed before the County, before even the State. We're established in 1920 by Act of Congress. So it's, in going forward, we -- the Commission, the Hawaiian Homes Commission appointed by the Governor has -- is our policy making board and they have exclusive jurisdiction over the land uses. But, that being said, and through different court procedures is it -- because we're State lands, because we are considered State lands, we are subject to Chapter 343 which is, you know, Environmental Impacts Statements and Environmental Assessments. So we go through that Chapter 343 process. A lot of times with our housing, we go through a subdivision process. That's by our choice so then we would go to the County and say, hey, we are coming to you for the subdivision process. So it kind of depends. But, this would be definitely be going through the Chapter 343, Environmental Assessment process.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Members, any more questions? Yeah, we can -- we can just -- just we'll take Joelle's recommendation and then get more information, and then, you know, we can just leave it as is, as the way it's posted, and let DHHL fight with whoever they need to fight with over the change. So --

Ms. Barfield: I would go with what Butch had recommended, just go with what the CPAC had recommended, and leave it as park. It is a gateway, and like John said, just let the land owner and DHHL, hash it out.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. You know what, it's 10:30. Let's take a 10 minute break. We'll be back

20 till? Right? Thank you.

(The Lana'i Planning Commission recessed at 10:30 a.m. and reconvened at 10:43 a.m.)

Mr. Ornellas: Let's reconvene. So presently we are -- we are, C -- 9.5C, Gateway Park. We kind of made a -- I guess we're okay with leaving it, waiting for more information, and leaving it as park at this time -- based on any further information that we may get. Alright. So then let's go on to 9.5D, University of Lana'i. What is it? Wayne's University. Any -- any questions or comments about 9.5D, the university? Okay. And then also, members, if you can look at page 9. -- 9.5, there's kind of like a break down of where their acreage is going to be going to, and how much it's going to be. You know, I was looking at the parks, there's a -- there's acreage already issued for parks. I just don't know where they're at. And then also down at the last one I was hoping that the Kaunalapau -- it says there's also residential. It says 50, so I was hoping maybe there would be a park. Mary, could we enter the word "park" and then just let Pulama decide how to plug the puka with how many acres? You know 500 acres, 600 acres for a park.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, down at that one for -- for this chart there's a couple -- you know, for -- there was Lana'i City expansion and then there's residential for the Manele mauka and the Kaunalapau residential. But, we, as I was saying, we changed our land use categories and -- and we could make both or those columns into mixed use residential, dash, whatever the common name -- Lana'i City expansion. So it would be mixed use residential, Manele mauka, mixed use residential, Kaunalapau. Because the mixed use residential will have the definition, that it will have primarily residential, small commercial business nodes, like your corner store or whatever, and parks. So --

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, but it doesn't give -- it doesn't give you a --. I mean, they can choose everything but park. I mean, I have an idea what a park looks like, but it may not have a store sitting on it. If you're gonna -- the word "park," people on this commission would, would probably get the idea that there is play ground equipment and that kind of stuff. And mixed residential use, that doesn't sound like a park. The word park is important.

Ms. Jorgensen: Mixed -- mixed use residential is the broad county land use -- you're talking a specific and what you want in a site design and whether you want, like, in the park column where it is a large -- you want to see the park acreage within that.

Mr. Ornellas: You don't even have a designation like the rest of them for Kaunalapau. You have -- you have resources, industrial, residential. You have nothing there as a park. But the other categories all have a park listed. So, all I want is a park listed. That way eventually Pulama then can plug in the number for a park. They would understand that a park is needed down there. Period.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Okay, but it's a different designation than -- like if you're looking at this appendix 9.2 where I sent a handout -- I mean, there's a handout on the table and it's -- it's changing the county -- county's community plan designation to mixed use residential. And

there, it doesn't even have parks mentioned because parks are, when you get in the specific design within the residential area, it is required to have parks for so many housing units that go in. That's a different type of park than the park land use designation that has a separate category. So what you're -- what you're saying is that at this time within, say, the 50 acres that are down by the harbor, you'd like to know the exact location of a park and see that park on the map. Because it's a different designation. It's a park -- county park designation on appendix, page A-25.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, I don't want to belabor this anymore. It's just --

Ms. Jorgensen: So -- so you could put it in the description that you would like to have different types of parks within the -- the -- when you get to page 9-9, the Harbor Residential, 99.9B, you can add parks to that. But I'm just trying to say that there's different designation categories. There's these mixed use residential has -- that have housing parks. You can have a community hall, you can have a little business nodes in them, and they get designed with a -- with a parks proportional to the number of houses that you have, under the zoning code. Then you have a park designation which is on the map is a -- as an area where you are saying a particular park is going to occur there.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Let's just go on and then we'll talk about it more than at nine because --.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: I know what you're saying, you know what you're saying, but when it gets up to the County Council and that place, it's money that gets exchanged and our parks goes out -- goes out the window. The monies been exchanged, the land is no longer needed, or the land is there, but yet they're not going to put any money towards it. It doesn't make -- it doesn't do any body any good, alright? So, let's continue. Let's go to page -- I guess we're still on -- we're pau with the university so let's go to page 9-6, Paliamano Gulch Park. It's a linear park drainage along Paliamano Gulch. Where is that area?

Ms. Jorgensen: That's that one.

Mr. Ornellas: That's lwiolo.

Ms. Jorgensen: Different name?

Mr. Ornellas: No I give that the -- that is -- okay, that's -- that's lwiolo. They call that lwiolo ditch, so -- because it runs between the city and lwiolo.

Ms. Jorgensen: Would -- would you like to change the name on that or something?

Mr. Ornellas: No. No.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: No. Anybody got any questions about this? Go ahead Brad. You want to say something? Go ahead.

Mr. Oshiro: Yeah. One question. Right now what I noticed because I go -- lot of fishing down on that end, the gulches or the run offs from the city is making the gulches down towards the ocean really deep. And the roads on that side of the -- I know it's the State's side, they gotta take care of the roads, but, because the runoff of the water, the rain water running off, those gulches -- those gulches or ditches, whatever you want to call them, is making the gulches on the bottom end really, really deep. If there's a way -- well, this is not the place to put it but is there some way they can do something because — when they had the pineapple fields pretty much on the west side of the island, they never had brown water. But now, because there's no pineapple field, the water go straight to the ocean, and it's kind of polluting the west side of the island.

Mr. Ornellas: Is there a --? I think there's a chapter coming up where it discuss erosion control and that kind of stuff. Is it Urban Review?

Ms. Jorgensen: Urban Design --

Mr. Ornellas: Urban Design is --

Ms. Jorgensen: -- is chapter 10. . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Chapter 10. Okay. And we can discuss that, basically, with run off and drainage?

Ms. Jorgensen: Surface water run off and drainage was covered in the infrastructure chapter as well. I'm not sure if it's in Chapter 10. It was in Chapter 7.

Mr. Ornellas: Chapter 7.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's on the agenda, so we can discuss it.

Mr. Ornellas: Brad? Brad, hello? Can you write that down because it's in Chapter 7. Write that down and review Chapter 7 and see where we can put that -- that information. Okay? Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: So just for clarification, parks can be construed as landscape, erosion control with, with foliage? And the reason why --. Well, please, if you could answer that question.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, if there was an area that you thought that needed -- that would be a good passive park site, I'd say an unfinished, unpaved trail, and it also had some drainage or, you know, issues, you could designate -- you could use the park category -- you know, that designation to, to show where you'd like to have that.

Ms. Aoki: Just a note, that drainage ditch that comes down along Iwiolo comes all the down on

the side of Kanepuu. It flows down past Department of Hawaiian Homelands, and that large culvert that they have that is unmaintained by DHHL leads to Paliamano Gulch. So all of that is connected and our family's managed that land for over a decade. And so I just want to bring it to the -- everyone's attention that if, you know, it is technically a drainage area that would be very nicely -- could be very nicely landscaped, but to allow public access, we could be -- it could be a safety hazard because we've had children fall into drainage ditches, and community members had to literally dive into the culvert, underneath the road, to pull kids out. And this would be one of those areas of concern. So, I think it would be a nicely landscaped area, but to allow public access in that area once this happens. So I don't know the designation is correct or -- I'm not sure. And, yes, I agree with your recommendation, Mr. Chair, to look at that in Chapter 7. But just food for thought, it's not necessarily a good area to have as a park with public access, but, it could be very nicely landscaped and cared for.

Mr. Ornellas: So, Joelle, you would want to put down on 9.5E that a linear park -- a landscaped linear park and drainage along the gulch is required. Is that -- is that what you want to say?

Ms. Aoki: I think that would be beneficial.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Aoki: The only reason why I'm saying that is I've literally seen one of our vehicles parked in that gulch or in that path of the gulch, and when heavy rains came, I went back, and it moved the vehicle. So we know that lots of water travels. That's a heavy, heavy, heavy drainage way.

Mr. Ornellas: Right. Okay, so is that what you want it to say -- landscaped drainage, the linear park?

Ms. Aoki: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So can you add that where it says 275 acres of a -- of landscaped linear park and drainage along the gulch?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes. I have that. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. I'm sorry. Any objections, members, to putting that down? Okay. Yes, sir, Ron. Oh, and by the way, the County, Riki Hokama is going to buy us, for the island, wireless mics. So, hopefully they'll be showing up soon. So Ron will have his own mic.

Mr. McOmber: The extra -- the addition to that -- the landscaping and the upper reaches of that is fine, but the rest of the Paliamono ditch serves a purpose, and it's off limits for hunting, as DNLR -- it's an off limit hunting area. It's so close to the city. But the lower reaches, I don't know how the hell you're going to ever get in there and manage to do that. It would be the part where it's DHHL responsibility for the upper reaches. But the lower reaches, leave it alone in its natural state.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: We could add the word “natural” -- natural landscape. So that’s whatever is in there, I think, what, what Ron was referring to is you can’t put in plants that area going to take high maintenance in -- in that ditch.

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah. Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: You just need to -- basically building green infrastructure like we discussed for Chapter 7.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. That’s fine. Any objections, members? Okay. Alright, so let’s move onto 9.5F, Rural Residential. Any comments or we’re just gonna let it -- let -- go with the CPAC recommendation? Yes sir Robin. I know you can talk loud, but Leilani won’t remember what you said.

Mr. Robin Kaye: Robin Kaye, just a question. I’m not familiar. I know the area you’re talking about, but where is Kopolihua Road? Are you talking about the road to the old Hawaiian cemetery, is that where we’re talking about?

Mr. Ornellas: It’s the road past -- it goes past the stables and then makes the turn down at the bottom. At least that’s my -- my knowledge. When it rains that’s usually where the cars sink to their axils right there at that corner. Okay, so hearing no changes or -- let’s move on to the next, 9.5G Paramount Pictures West, Film Studios. It’s 22 acres of light industrial land will be used for film studio facilities. Let’s see, it’s on the map. Keep going south. There it is. There it is right there at the bottom. Yes, and it’s just as you -- it’s just as you leave past the dog -- the old dog pound. As you start to go down, that’s where it’s off into the hole. I guess that one time the company was gonna put the stables there, in that general area. Yeah, just as you -- just as you get out of the city, and then you start to just go down, off to the left you have that big --. Yeah, that’s basically -- that’s basically the same area. And that’s -- we’re talking the 22 -- 22 acres. Community Plan, the CPAC, made some changes, but for the most part it stays the same. So, you wanna go along with the -- with the CPAC? Any objections? Okay, so let’s move on. Kahalepalaoa Area, that’s a -- people -- most people know it as Club Lana’i area.

Mr. Oshiro: John?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead.

Mr. Oshiro: 9.6 -- 9.6A, B, C and the buffers on D, I don’t think the project should go at all.

Mr. Matsumoto: Sorry Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Ornellas: Yes?

Mr. Matsumoto: Before you leave that, the urban section, the city.

Mr. Ornellas: The film studios?

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, can you go back to the -- the town?

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, alright. This -- 9.5A, Lana'i Expansion?

Mr. Matsumoto: So on the -- there's, there's an issue in the BCT that I just wanted to bring to everybody's attention. So, you know the three homes on Lana'i Avenue, when they get renovated, we're going to ask for a variance so that they can be residential instead of BCT. And one of the considerations you would have is you can leave it BCT then the residences are always going to be non-conforming, or change that block to residential. So, just for your consideration. Not the entire block, of course, because the theater's at the end.

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah, the theater's the only thing that wouldn't be considered residential. But there's -- there's -- those three houses plus Kelly's house. Yeah, that's . . . (inaudible) . . . So, does anybody -- want to make that change? It's already zoned. I mean, it's already commercial. I mean, residential, so we just want to change it to commercial? Residential? Sorry. We can do it. We can put it in there now.

Mr. Oshiro: Yeah, that one gotta come through the Land Commission on the other side of -- not the plan -- not the planning side, but the planning commission.

Mr. Ornellas: This will be in the changing.

Mr. Oshiro: No, but, they would have to come back again, in front of us to get it zoned back to residential. Yeah.

Ms. Zigmond: To get a variance it's gonna have to come back.

Mr. Oshiro: Whether we -- whether we put it in the plan or not, they still gotta come back in front of us.

Mr. Ornellas: I'm not -- I'm not disagreeing with that. I'm just saying that -- Kurt asked if we would change it to --

Ms. Zigmond: No, he said, he brought it to our attention to consider that it will be coming to us.

Mr. Ornellas: So I take nobody wants to do anything about it? Alright.

Mr. Matsumoto: No, so --. Okay, to be more clear, I'm -- I'm suggesting that you take a look at it. You have two ways you can deal with it. I'm just saying that it would be a good opportunity to have it all in alignment now with the map, the CPAC map would be in alignment. Then we come to you for the change, then everything would be in alignment.

Ms. Barfield: So what Kurt is saying is when it comes before us it's already designated

residential in our community plan, so that way it's already there, like, how when we did the variance for the police station, we want it to be consistent with the community plan.

Mr. Ornellas: Well put. You want to make that change? Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: I'm okay with the change, but, you know, we here -- we sit here on behalf of the community and there is one privately owned home in that section. Will that affect that home or just the --

Ms. Barfield: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Aoki: It's already residential. Okay.

Ms. Lynn McCrory: Hi. Lynn McCrory, Pulama Lana'i. No, actually, that fourth home that's there is -- is also in BCT, so we want to take the three houses and that fourth home, so that fourth home can stay residential should they take that down at any point in time.

Ms. Aoki: I'm okay with going residential, but I think we should give that homeowner the opportunity because that home was acquired in the last decade with the -- from my understanding -- because it was on BCT. So -- I mean, I'm just saying, I'm okay with it, but just so you folks are aware that individual which you all know is Kelly, he bought the land with the assumption that it was commercial so --

Ms. McCrory: Then just do the three homes, and then we don't have an issue.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So, somebody want to make a motion and make those three homes residential? No?

Mr. Stuart Marlowe: So move.

Mr. Ornellas: Second? Who's going to second it?

Ms. Aoki: I second it.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Joelle made the second, so all those in favor of changing those three homes to residential versus Country Town Business raise your hand. Joelle, you voting for the residential? So that's three. I'm four. Is that enough for --? No, I need five. Alright, so it doesn't pass.

It was moved by Commissioner Stuart Marlowe, seconded by Commissioner Joelle Aoki, then

VOTED: To change the zoning of the three homes on Lana'i Avenue from BCT to Residential -- MOTION FAILED.

Assenting: J. Aoki, S. Barfield, S. Marlowe, J. Ornellas

Dissenting: B. Oshiro, B. Zigmond
Excused: K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, so let's -- but thank you for the information Kurt. Where are we at? So let's go to -- let's go back to 9.6 and Brad you said that you wanted to --

Mr. Oshiro: 9.6 A, B, C, and D.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. You want to go ahead and elaborate, please?

Mr. Oshiro: Okay, the last time we had a Saturday meeting, they brought somebody from the University of Hawaii, and she said in 30 years the water is gonna raise 18 inches. And if you guys ever went down there, you know, on high tide, the water already reaching the road, okay. 18 inches going put that water at the base of the mountain where it starts sloping up. So most of the kiawe trees down there going be covered with water, or when high tide come the water's going be up to that point. I feel that if it's gonna be covered in 15 -- in, in 15 years that area is going to be pretty much -- the road on the bottom -- the bottom side of that -- on that east side is going be covered, most of it. So, how are you suppose to get down there? Now, the way I looked at, Pulama plans to put in a by pass off Awehi Trail, and Awehi Trail comes down and before they hit the bottom, they going cut off through the gulches, and then connect with the -- this, the village -- the road -- village over there, and I guess that's how they going get to their property. But then pretty much the landing area is going be covered with water so are they going to have huts in the water, underwater, or what? I don't understand. My feeling is if it going be covered in -- in 15 years or 30 years, let the residences of Lana'i enjoy what's left before that whole side of that island becomes covered with water.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Members, any more comments? Yes sir Ron. Debbie?

Ms. dela Cruz: I just wanted to express that quite a few of the CPAC members did not want the development and they were out voted, so we were not in, you know --

Mr. Ornellas: Can you -- can you repeat what you just said? I can't --

Ms. dela Cruz: There were quite a few CPAC members that did not want the development, and -- but they got out voted, so it was not a very unanimous kind of thing. I just wanted to point out that because of that we wanted to make sure that the development was enveloped by this conservation area and would not be allowed to expand. And my personal concern was that the residents be able to have access to that area -- there's a lot of fishing and diving that goes off -- gets done over there. And my preference would have been that we allow not just physical, you know, be able to walk down there, but that people be able to drive their vehicles because you don't want to lug your coolers around. Specifically and some specific points, line 28 where it deleted "an open space coastal preserve." I'm not sure why they deleted that. Lines 35 and 36, those came out of nowhere. They were not even in the September plan and they're not designed -- marked as being new materials. We had, we had previously brought up about line 43, about the rural residential lots -- will be approximately five acres or larger. I think in our

previous version it just says five acre lots. Anyways, I just wanted to point that out and ask you to keep in mind about not allowing that area, developments to get any larger and that the community access be preserved. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Ron. Thank you Debbie.

Mr. McOmber: Debbie's right. We had quite a debate on this. I'm one that voted against it. I cannot see how it can work. But we'll let Pulama discover that as they move along. This is not a wonderful area. Sharks have babies out there that fronting that ocean in front that, it's the dirtiest in the whole island. But we let Pulama come up with their buffer zones and whatever. The only people that really supported this was the union, and it wasn't the local boys in the union. It was the Maui union bosses that were prompting their people to vote for affordable housing down there which we still haven't figured out that yet. But I'll tell you on the record, I was not for this. I don't think it's going to fly. I think eventually Pulama will discover that.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Ron. Yes, sir, Butch?

Ms. Zigmond: I have a question for Ron.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead. Ron, hang on.

Ms. Zigmond: Sorry. Did I hear the words "affordable housing" down there? Who are we speaking affordable for?

Mr. McOmber: Well, what the union was saying if they're going to have help down there, you need housing for the help. Because you're going to have to have somebody take care of those luxury homes that are down there. So basically what they were striving for was affordable housing for their workers that are going to work down there.

Ms. Zigmond: So I don't see that indicated in here.

Mr. McOmber: No, you won't see it because we didn't -- we really didn't push on it. We just let it go. I mean, it's just, to us, it's one of those things that I don't think it's going to fly. And, you know, and Pulama does a lot of stuff, and they spend their money fine, but I don't think they're going to waste their money on this.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Ron. Go ahead Butch.

Mr. Gima: Butch Gima. Over a course of about three or four board meetings in 2013, Lana'ians for Sensible Growth talked about a lot of the issues coming before the CPAC. The one that garnered the most attention was this proposed project. And at our November 24, 2013 meeting Lana'ians for Sensible Growth took a specific position opposing the project for the following reasons. Some felt that this side of the island sacred. Some felt that it would be opening up pandora's box. There would be so many unknowns and we'd -- they wanted to prevent the windward side of the island turning into another Kaanapali type of development. They wanted

to -- the board wanted to leave the windward side open for hunting, diving, fishing, camping, et cetera. They were concerned that it would end the current use of that side of the island by locals since they're using that side of the island more than Hulopoe now. They felt hunting would be affected. They felt the development on the windward side would ruin the beauty on that side of the island. Some were concerned that this issue would be a divisive issue like the windmill issues, issue where it lasts so many years. We didn't have any empirical evidence, but some on the board felt that there were potential archaeological impacts. And like -- like Ron mentioned, we questioned the feasibility of a project on that side given the weather issues, sharks being in the water especially when the water's murky, and what impact eventual sea rise would have on that development, and how of a financial risk that would be. Someone on the board said, well, as an alternative, maybe they can open up the Federation Camp area, but that wasn't a unanimous decision for the board. Now we -- it was real clear that we opposed that project but that we would -- the board was willing to support should Pulama pursue making the windward side of the island a conservation land trust, and that was something LSG would be strongly in favor of. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you Butch. Yes, sir?

Mr. Christopher Richardson: My name is Chris Richardson. Back in 2005, I had a company that cleaned up the Halepalaoa area, the 13 acres that was originally known as Club Lana'i. It had been purchased and not maintained for many years. The 180 coconut trees hadn't been cleaned for many years. There were dumped cars, refrigerators, all kinds of broken glass, whatever, refuse. Anyway, 20 or so 30-foot roll off containers of rubbish was removed from that site. That was only a side project to the company. The company's goal was to reforest this whole side of the island. Because our land use principal, no. 1, in talking about ecological standpoint, we tend to focus on the hale as the main water recharge area, which is correct. We forget that this entire coast line, the aquifer runs to this coastline. So you can dig, say 10 feet, into to the sand, and you're going to hit brackish water. If you look at a satellite imagine of this area, you will see all the way from Polehua, down past Naha to Kopoho is mainly encrusted with this Prosopis palette of kiawe plant. This desert plant have very unusual rooting properties and it is rooted into all of that available fresh water, and has been for about 100 years or more, or maybe since 1880. Well, actually since the sugar cane stopped around 1903, it was allowed to just -- just run loose so more than 100 years. So if development's going to occur here, using the principals of sustainability. If we're going to put an input, a major input of a development here, we need to understand what the potential outputs are. The potential outputs are that this area is already environmentally damaged due to all the ranching and previous activities. It needs to be addressed that this area is repaired paramount first as part of our water recharge system, then we can consider development options afterwards. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Members, do we have any -- any more comments? Go ahead Brad.

Mr. Oshiro: Okay, the other thing is if you build a road, a paved road, and you go down Awehi Trail and you put a paved road, water takes the least resistance. So it's gonna come down that road. I don't know how you going prevent run off into the ocean because right now if you go

on Awehi Trail it's almost impassible. It took me an hour and half to get from top to bottom, just two, three weeks ago. So, you know, the road's gone, almost gone. So, you know, what I'm saying, the erosion off of that road, no matter if -- even if they put one going across from Awehi across to Puunene flat, going across that way. If even if they put that road there, the water that going be collected and run off is going affect all that area over there. The mud, the filth or whatever you want to call it. Unless they going really do one project where they go in there and every year clean out whatever they put --. You know, if they put a damn or whatever, mud catchment, or whatever, they gotta clean it out every -- come -- come April, they gotta go down there and clean it out. Because . . . (inaudible) . . . if they leave it, you know, flood and it really affected the area and ruined the grounds down there.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So, what would you like us to do? I mean, do you want -- do you want map --

Ms. Jorgensen: Recheck the mic. I don't think yours is on.

Mr. Ornellas: You talking -- you're talking about me or you're talking about --? It's on. It's on now. Okay. We'll test it. We'll test it. When is -- when is the lunch suppose to show up? I'm hungry. I do have my priorities. So 11:30? So, we're about five minutes away. Okay. So Brad would you -- are you just saying that map 9.6, 9.6A, 9.6B, 9.6C, and 9.6D be removed from the -- the community plan?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmond: Kelli Gima had -- I know she's not here, and she can't vote, but that was her -- her expression also.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Brad, why don't you make that -- make that motion then.

Mr. Oshiro: I'd like to see 9.6 A, B, C, and D stricken from this community plan.

Mr. Ornellas: Any second?

Ms. Zigmond: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Wait a minute. We have motion, so Bev second it. Okay, so let's open the floor up for discussion. Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: I'd like to hear from Pulama Lana'i.

Mr. Ornellas: It's going to be my next step after you're done.

Ms. Aoki: I'm done.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Pulama, you want to contribute?

Mr. Matsumoto: Kurt Matsumoto from Pulama Lana'i. That proposal that we have up there, we discussed with the CPAC quite extensively, and the same kinds of concerns were brought up. What I had mentioned at the time was this is something that we want to explore. We wouldn't do something that would harm that area. There was a lot of concern about engineering of a road which we haven't even gone into the research about how to do that yet. Over time the idea about how to use that area, how to access that area would probably crystalize more in and address all the concerns that you guys are bringing up. So, not disputing anything that you guys have mentioned here today. We still think that there's potential to do some type of -- not, not -- I wouldn't characterize it as a resort, but we still think there's a potential to add to the type of visitor experience on Lana'i down there, but not in the way that you see at Manele or Koele. They would be more like a tent structure like what was tried out on Molokai. So it would be more of a rustic kind of a retreat experience, and they have examples of this in a lot of different locations right now, and they actually are build as eco-tourism experiences. So this isn't some place where you would go, lounge around at a pool, play golf. This is some place where they would go, they would experience that rugged environment and they would be learning about the environment and the challenges out there, so it wouldn't be about creating this really plush type of environment. So, it would be not at all like anything that you see at Manele or Koele. So we're hoping that you would keep that in mind when you consider to attempt to take this out of the plan. It's also something that we felt was important from the economic standpoint for the island. As I mentioned when we started the process, the two hotels historically have not been entirely successful so we're doing a lot of things to try to reposition both. But it's also about repositioning the island and being able to attract people to the island as a destination. So we're competing. Lana'i competes with Maui, not just Manele competing with the Four Seasons at Wailea. So these are all the different things that we have thought into this and we don't have an active plan to try to do something there in the next five years. So this is not something that we're going to do, like, next year or start the project right away. But as you know this plan process is suppose to last us at least 10 years. This one took 15 years to come around again, so that's the reason why it's on the map.

Ms. Zigmond: Kurt, could you please tell us where the water's going to come from?

Mr. Matsumoto: If we were to develop something down there, we would -- we would create a desalination plant down there. That would be our proposal. We would make that area self contained. So we wouldn't try to bring utility lines down from this -- from MECo. We would try to make that area self contained so that would have a small footprint, not a big impact on the island's infrastructure.

Ms. Zigmond: That's something that -- that's the first I've heard of that, and to me, that's pretty major stuff.

Mr. Matsumoto: I did bring it up during the CPAC process that that's what we would try to do, and -- and yeah, it's a big undertaking, but we're talking about on the scale of a Manele Bay Hotel. We're talking about something that will be even a smaller footprint than the Lodge at

Koele.

Ms. Zigmond: But then you have the 50 -- I keep hearing it referred to as gentlemen estates, and, you know, it just seems like we're becoming very gentify.

Mr. Matsumoto: So in, in that proposal that we have up there, the most important thing to us the ability to do that -- that alternative visitor experience. That's the most important thing to us.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Thank you Kurt. Go ahead Robin. I just remind everybody, we still have a motion on the floor, so --

Mr. Kaye: Sorry, it was just a question too. So you're saying that the 55 acre lots is no longer part of your vision for that?

Mr. Matsumoto: No, that's actually not what I said. I said that the most important thing to us is the -- is the visitor area. So we're not -- we're not asking you to change anything that's on that map today.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Alright, we have a motion on the floor, it's been seconded. No more discussion members? Okay, so we'll call for -- go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: Just out of curiosity, is it only mentioned on the maps?

Mr. Ornellas: . . . (Inaudible) . . . What are you talking about?

Ms. Aoki: Is this area development only mentioned on the maps? Is it any where else that any one has seen or knows of?

Mr. Ornellas: It's in our community plan, on page 9-6, 9-7.

Ms. Aoki: So is the motion to remove it from the maps or -- and/or are you going to --

Mr. Ornellas: It's everything. Yeah, the maps and -- the map -- the map is 9.6 and then 9.6A, 9.6B, 9.6C, and 9.6D.

Ms. Aoki: So again the question is, is it only mentioned in the maps? Is it in any other section in the plan?

Mr. Ornellas: It would be removed if we -- if it got voted in because basically the -- that development, in our eyes, at this time, would be, would be gone. I mean -- I mean, again, once it goes pass -- it gets done with us, it goes to the Maui County Council, and they could put it back if they choose, choose to, so --. And then that's not to say if, if they do put it back on, that doesn't say we're not going to see it again because it falls within the SMA and so it would come back here. So --. Hello? Alright, so any more questions? Did I answer your question okay Joelle?

Ms. Aoki: Yeah you did. I was just wondering if outside of section 9, if it's mentioned in any where else.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's also in on page 9-5 in the table.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so if -- if this motion carries, then anything that's pertaining to this development would be removed.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: No matter what page it's on.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay?

Ms. Aoki: Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Any more questions, comments, members? Alright, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of removing map 9.6, and then also the verbiage on 9.6A, 9.6B, 9.6C, 9.6D. All those in favor, raise your hand. It fails. So it stays on. Okay, so let's -- let's continue. We'll go through each one of those. Let's start with 9.6A. Is there any changes? Wait, wait, wait. Are you guys ready? Are we --? Can we --? We're ready? Okay. We will take a break for a lunch here and we'll meet, what, 45 minutes is good enough, at 12:45? I'm sorry, 12:15? Is that okay members? 12:15? Alright. Thank you. Adjourned. I mean, recessed.

It was moved by Commissioner Bradford Oshiro, seconded by Commissioner Beverly Zigmond, then

VOTED: To remove map 9.6 and verbiage on 9.6A, 9.6B, 9.6C, and 9.6D. -- MOTION FAILED.

Assenting: B. Oshiro, B. Zigmond

Dissenting: J. Aoki, S. Barfield, S. Marlowe

Excused: K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar

(The Lana'i Planning Commission recessed at 11:35 p.m. and reconvened at 12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Ornellas: Back to our work. Alright so we are --. We were going to -- we were gonna check -- we're going to work on each paragraph on 9.6A, 9.6B, C, D and then --. So let's just start with the first -- the first one, 9.6A. Any changes, any discussion? From that -- just that paragraph from, from 33 through 39. Hearing none, then let's move on to B. That is item -- that's 41 through 44. Go ahead.

Mr. Oshiro: If this village --. Hello? If this village is built I would like to see access to the beach

because what it is is in 30 years the water going be up to the slope, so they going have the only property down there pretty much. I'd like to see some kind of access to -- through the property, beach access and it's part of the State law, yeah?

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. So -- is that -- where do you see that? Which one? The 6C, okay. Yeah, B. It could -- any objections of adding -- providing beach access? I know -- I know it's state law that you have to provide that so --

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, it is -- it is in 9.6C and we discussed it quite a bit. It -- and that's why we put it per Maui County Code because it's approximately every 1,500 feet.

Mr. Oshiro: No, I'm talking about when I'm dying -- when I'm dead 30 years from now, the water's going be up to the slope. And the only access they going have is through those 50 acres.

Ms. Jorgensen: Through --

Mr. Oshiro: Through the 50 acres. To the gentleman ranch. The five acre gentleman ranch. That's the only way they going get down to the beach.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Another -- another way.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. How can -- how can we --. How can -- Planning, how can we -- I see where he's coming from about future. How can we add that verbiage to -- to that, to reflect that? Because -- you know, in fact, how many -- how many feet between -- you know, every so often you have to have a beach access right? What is the distance?

Ms. Jorgensen: It's about 1,500 feet so it would be perpendicular to your Keamoku Beach Road. They would put a line that would go down to the shorelines, so you'd -- every -- about, approximately 1,500 feet.

Mr. Ornellas: You would have an opening to the ocean.

Ms. Jorgensen: You'd have an opening to the ocean. And here, Kurt has a comment.

Mr. Matsumoto: I think what that is talking about is the shoreline would -- you're imaging the shoreline is going to creep up hill right, and you're concerned about the access because that -- so the property lines actually would continue to move up. So the shoreline buffer that that would continue to creep as the water level would rise. So there's a concept in real estate where you -- your property can shrink if the body of water that you're next to changes. And so whoever purchases there or so -- in our case right now, let's say we don't sell any land. As the water level rises, our property line changes because the shoreline changes.

Mr. Ornellas: But the requirement for beach access still remains.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes. So no matter where the shoreline is, there would be every 1,500 feet a trail going from your road, down to the shore. And the area from high tide, there's always a public access along the shoreline, by State law, so it -- so it would remain. And the property owner's line moves inland.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr. Oshiro: I know, I know what the -- right now the law states, but, like in 15 years the water going rise nine inches. It's going to be on top of the property that they want to put the -- the shacks on. It's going to be on there. In 30 years, it's going to be up to the base of the hill, going up. All the kiawe trees going to be under water. So, the only people that going have access to that area are going to be that 50 acres, five acre gentleman ranch.

Mr. Ornellas: But they -- but they still have to provide beach access.

Mr. Oshiro: Through somebody's property?

Mr. Ornellas: They would -- yeah, they would have to. I mean, I think --

Ms. Jorgensen: If the beach moved up to here, there still would be public access to the beach. The same as if your -- your high tide line is up here as it is now down here. And you're -- and the lines that are perpendicular to the road that cuts across to that access would remain. And then if they move the development up hill, and you need to access to your hunting, there's also access that goes to the mountains as well as the sea, perpendicular from the road. In the subdivision code.

Mr. Ornellas: Mary, when -- during the SMA process, do we, do we have the ability to keep, based on what Brad said, when they do -- when we schedule -- when we push the 50 acres for these -- say five acres lots for 50 acres, we keep an open between lot sizes, where we can use that as future beach access? So in other words, you have one piece of property ends, and then the new one takes -- can you leave a gap between the two?

Ms. Jorgensen: That would be your shoreline access trail. It would be designated land for shoreline access. So, the layout of whatever housing they're going to put in here, would have to have that corridor going from the road down to the beach. And then you couldn't build or -- on top of it. It has -- so that's part of the subdivision design process is they will be looking for those corridors. It would be from, from the road down to the shorelines.

Mr. Oshiro: I understand that, but -- so it works makai and mauka.

Ms. Jorgensen: That's my understanding, but I'm not a permitting person. You know -- I just -- that's, I believe, is in the -- in the law for it be accessed both -- yeah, makai and mauka.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright.

Ms. Jorgensen: That's only mauka if there's a subdivision there. This is -- this is different. It's open space. So if they were building a subdivision, say, you know, between a public road and where people went up, they would have to have access through, as part of a subdivision code.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Anything else for 9.6B?

Ms. Jorgensen: John, can I speak to that last one?

Mr. Ornellas: Which one? C?

Ms. Jorgensen: 9.6B to address what Debbie's concern was. Somehow where the word larger got in there, I believe, because it's in black type it was from the CPAC, but I'll look some more and see. But the idea with the CPAC and you can look at this language to make sure we have it is that there would be a maximum of 50 houses, and a maximum of 250 acres, and that's why the conservation buffer is there. So, I think it was in of those last discussions that we had on land -- on this land use chapter that the -- where larger came to say well someone might want a house on 10 acres under rural residential. And then you would have 49 houses if you have one 10 acre lot. And if you had five 10-acre lots, you'd have 45 houses instead of 50 houses. So that's what our intent was. You know, that's what was discussed was to limit so there was no more than 50 houses on the total of 250 acres. But I -- you know, I don't know if there's an issue still that you're concerned about it of it being larger lots for these houses.

Mr. Oshiro: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Ms. Jorgensen: The . . . (inaudible) . . . rule goes up to a maximum of 20 acres, so --. So you could have some 20 acres, some 10, some 5. But no smaller than 5 was one of the reasons why they chose five. So at least you'll probably put a minimum of five acres with a maximum of 50 total residents.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, any comments on that change? Everybody's okay with that change? Yeah, we're adding a minimum. Okay, go ahead and make the change. No comments from us.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. And one more on line -- I think it's on line 24, there's, again, where it says eastern Keamoku coast, I'd like to delete the Keamoku so that it's consistent all the way through the document. We're just calling it eastern coast. The east side.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Okay, so we're done with 9.6. Everybody okay with that? So let's move on to 9. -- 9-7 and that's 9.6C, Kikoa Point and Kahalepalaoa Landing Beach Parks. Do we have this map for this old government road?

Ms. Jorgensen: We have the map that Stan referred to down there on the far end that showed the roads, that he brought to us -- last November, December. And I think Mike's got to draw that up -- I mean, pull that up on the computer as well.

Mr. Ornellas: Any comments on 9.6C? Alright, everybody's okay with that? Fine, let's move on. 9.6D, Buffer -- Conservation Buffer. Yes, sir, Butch?

Mr. Gima: Butch Gima. I just wanted to make a clarification. The buffer in here, and the wording associated with that is different from my earlier testimony where LSG opposed this project, but would be in favor a conservation land trust. The conservation land trust we're looking at the whole windward side of the island, the Ahupuaa concept. This one is just a minimum 1,000 foot buffer around the project and the reason why that was recommended was if in fact this project materialized that it would not be expanded. There are those that's on the CPAC that felt that if this was approved that eventually this would be like a stepping stone to larger development. So the thought was putting that buffer around this proposed project to either limit or prevent further expansion should this project be approved.

Mr. Ornellas: So -- so members -- you okay with the way it's written? You guys okay the way it's written? Joelle? Beverly?

Ms. Aoki: Just some clarification. Butch, that last part of your sentence was that if this should be approved, LSG was requesting that this buffer zone be expanded? I'm sorry.

Mr. Gima: No, the discussion in the CPAC was to put the buffer around it, not LSG. CPAC put in the wording that you have the buffer around that to prevent further expansion. That was some what -- somewhat of a compromise that, okay, you know, we're not going to object to that, but we're concerned about further expansion so that's why we have the buffer. Okay, so that's CPAC. I wanted to make that distinction between that discussion and my earlier testimony about the conservation land trust which basically encompasses the whole windward side of the island.

Ms. Aoki: Thank you. I couldn't hear very clearly from here.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Any more discussion, thoughts, members? So we are -- we are okay with the way it is and move forward? Alright, so be it, we're moving forward. Alright, so we're still on page 9-7 and this is Airport Expansion. There's a map on 9.7, and then there's 7A, 7B, 7C. Kurt, you want to come up and tell us the news?

Mr. Matsumoto: The planners have a new map to present to all of you, Commissioners. We are proposing a change be implemented in the community plan. So instead of having the two runway proposal we have decided to drop the second runway idea, and we want to recommend some other changes to the existing runway be made. One would be to lengthen it an additional 500 feet, and then address with the DOT about adding a taxiway.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so they're handing this out.

Mr. Oshiro: Kurt, which way we going on this runway? Mauka or makai?

Mr. Matsumoto: You'll see that the proposal to add the 500 feet is on the mauka side. But you'll

notice on the detail of the map, which may not be that obvious to you, but if that proposal goes through and -- and you have to keep in mind that this is very preliminary. So it's not like a thorough engineering study has been done. But if we were to lengthen the runway 500 feet mauka, we probably would have to realign Miki Road a little bit.

Mr. Ornellas Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: So I have a question. If we're -- if the projected taxi zone is coming mauka 500 feet, how will that affect the light and heavy industrial area within the FAA zoning with hazardous explosive materials that could be stored in the area, as well as the powerhouse? Does that affect the taxi area?

Mr. Matsumoto: I'm sure that we wouldn't be allowed to do anything that would endanger. So, in getting that type of zoning, even if you had the light industrial zoning, when you apply for the use, you wouldn't be allowed to do something that would interfere with the runway. So if you look right now, it's, it's -- you can't see it on that map -- but the ones that you have, you'll notice that in the dark purple area there's kind of an odd shaped line, black line, so that's the -- it's marked as existing heavy industrial two acres, that's MECo. Sorry, 27 acres.

Mr. Ornellas: So which way did you say that the -- the extension would be?

Mr. Matsumoto: Towards the hale.

Mr. Ornellas: Towards the hale?

Mr. Matsumoto: So currently, you know, when you -- when you get to the end of the runway, there's like that narrow strip of the original runway that's still there, and it's like considered like the safety zone. So it would go over that in that direction, 500 feet.

Mr. Ornellas: 500 feet.

Mr. Matsumoto: Right. So that little drawing at the end of the runway there, there's a block. That's the 500 feet. That represents 500 feet.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Matsumoto: It's marked as proposed runway extension.

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Joelle.

Ms. Aoki: So Kurt, does that mean that the existing power lines would have to be moved from -- if you're going to restructure Miki Road, and then also the so-called radar that we have on the runway that's not working at that end of the runway be reinstalled and then possibly operating?

Mr. Matsumoto: Yes. A lot of the details like that would have to be worked out, but essentially,

you know, the FAA would make sure that if -- if a runway extension was requested and approved that all these things would be taken into consideration for the safety of the aircraft and the passengers. So, yes. Whatever would be required would have to be adjusted. So maybe we have to bury the lines. But, like I said, this is just preliminary. We wanted you to have the benefit of looking at this and taking off the second runway from the map. It doesn't mean that, you know, all the details are exactly understood.

Ms. Zigmond: Kurt, why the change of plans?

Mr. Matsumoto: Simple. We learned a lot in the last 18 months. We don't believe that in -- in this iteration of the community plan that there would be enough of demand to drive building a second runway.

Mr. Ornellas: With 500 feet added to -- to the hale, to the Lana'i City side, what kind of planes did you foresee land with that extra 500 feet?

Mr. Matsumoto: We believe the 500 feet just adds a safety measure to the existing runway for the type of aircraft that lands currently.

Mr. Ornellas: So you're not looking for 757s or bigger?

Mr. Matsumoto: No.

Mr. Ornellas: Everything smaller.

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, so it would be whatever the existing aircraft they fly, private jets, Island Air, Ohana.

Mr. Ornellas: Because you were part of the discussion -- the reason why our present runway extension is headed towards the ocean, not towards the city right?

Mr. Matsumoto: Right. But that also was a much longer runway. This is only adding 500 feet.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Alright. Ron, you had your hand up? Do you want to come up and say something? Ron?

Mr. McOmber: Well, one thing it proves -- Ron McOmber -- one thing it proves is that the company looks -- watching what's going on, and that's good. They aren't going ahead with their heads square up their you know what. One thing of caution here and Kurt knows this because he sat on the last community plan, there is no extension of that runway towards the city. Even the 500 feet is going to be a questionable thing. We talked about this for years. Do not extend that runway towards the city because if Hawaiian or somebody decides to bring their jets back, their take off, they break right over the top of the city. They may never do that, but I'm skeptical about the 500 feet towards the city, and that would be my only concern. I like the -- I like the idea of the taxiway. I worked there for six and a half years. They need a taxiway there

desperately. But I am not in favor, and I wasn't in 94, and I'm not in favor of it now, of having a 500 foot or any kind of an extension towards the city on that runway.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Thank you. So which one of these two maps should we consider putting into the community plan? I mean, I'm confused. They look the same except --

Mr. Matsumoto: The one with the cross hatched on it is for your benefit so you see what was proposed prior. And then the other map is what you would call like -- so it's considered a red -- the cross hatched is like a redline property, and the other one is a clean copy.

Mr. Ornellas: So -- so basically you would be removing 9.7A or changing it to read --

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, the language would have to be re-written in terms of the acreage. We no longer are asking for a 7,000 to 8,000 foot runway. But --

Mr. Ornellas: So, after -- what would be the -- what would be the final total if you added, if you added the 500 would be 5,500 feet?

Mr. Matsumoto: No, I think he's asking about the length of the runway.

Mr. Ornellas: What is that? 5,500. Okay. Okay, so, airport expansion will add approximately 680 acres or we can just say add another 500 feet to the -- take out the acreage and put in -- put in 500 foot extension.

Mr. Matsumoto: The acreage is going to be --

Mr. Ornellas: You can leave the acreage the way it is. I've got no problems with that. But you don't -- we're also going to have to change the -- the length of the new proposed runway which would 5,500 feet.

Mr. Matsumoto: You would -- you would change the language so the airport -- instead of airport expansion, it would be just simply a runway expansion adding 500 feet for additional safety measures and a taxiway. You know, as a suggestion if you left it, . . . (inaudible) . . . in terms of the direction, then the FAA can determine the safest course, whether it's mauka or makai. So the -- the FAA consultants that we talked to say that this is possible, but, you know, when the time comes and this comes in front of this body, the FAA would actually weigh in.

Mr. Ornellas: I understand what you're saying, but I do want to give them some guidelines, and it should be coming from the island, not from some federally --. Hangar area? Is that still on the table or you're taking that out?

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, we still want the hangar area. We want the ability to refuel. The taxiway is something that I remember was being requested when we were on the last committee, but maybe the DOT -- I mean, FAA -- has different ideas now. You know, for example, the technologies are changing so much. So like the aircraft that we're getting, the new aircraft that

we're getting, can fly as fast as a jet, so that negates the need to bring over a 717. And -- and they operate much more efficiently so, you know, airlines are going to be looking for the lowest cost way of moving people.

Mr. Ornellas: Debbie, you kind of had your hand up.

Ms. dela Cruz: This is Debbie dela Cruz. I was told this by a resident who lives on that side of the island, and I'm not sure if it's actually -- so, but I was told that you cannot plant certain kind of plants within so many feet of an, an airport because it attracts birds which then endangers the planes. So if it's gonna -- if you're going to extend the runway this way it may impact people in the city further.

Mr. Ornellas: Good point.

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Yes.

Ms. Zigmond: Kurt, I have two questions. One, is there any safeguards where the -- that the planes will not be flying over the city, and, and no. 2, could you state how you think that 9.7A should read because I'm confused what's going to remain in there and what's not going to remain in there. Thank you.

Mr. Matsumoto: So I can't comment about the -- the routing of the flight patterns. I don't know the answer to that. I know that all of us remember when jets were taking off, and they were taking off towards the city. The planes currently take off towards the city, and I would imagine that route will continue as long as the runway is oriented in that fashion, but I'm not an expert. I don't know.

As far as the language, what we would want to state is you take out the additional 680 acres because we're no longer asking for that. So instead of 9.7A talking about an airport expansion, I think you would talk about airport enhancements and to include a runway enhancement of 500 feet. And you continue to have language in there, promoting a hangar area. I would recommend adding some fueling station, and advice -- or looking for advice from FAA or DOT about a taxiway or a turning area to assist the aircraft operations.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you. So is a fueling station part of the support facilities? I guess I'm stuck on that.

Mr. Matsumoto: Yes, it would be.

Mr. Ornellas: Bev, your question about flying over the city -- back then Hawaiian was flying DC9s and they couldn't fill up and they couldn't fill both fuel, luggage and people. Now they're flying 717s which is the same configuration. They can fly out of Lana'i in the present, the present length of the runway, fully loaded -- people, baggage, fuel. So the airplanes have

gotten better over the period of time. So that they don't require -- in fact, they're building -- the whole thought of they building airports and airplanes, now the thought is let's build airplanes to fit airports. Not the other way around. It just costs too much money so --. So, do we want --? Mary, did you get that -- that kind of change that the -- that Kurt mentioned? Can you repeat it to us please?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes. So it would -- I believe I can get it. It was 9.7A, with the airport enhancement. The airport enhancement will add 500 feet to the existing runway, include a fueling station, and a -- I'm not sure if it's a new or just re-routed taxiway to assist airplane traffic operation. So is it a new taxiway or --? A new taxiway.

Mr. Ornellas: It keeps -- it keeps airplanes taxiing off the main runway so that the two don't get confused. We can get collisions that way. So, so it says -- and to increase the lift capacity of Lana'i Airport to a new 5,500 foot runway. No. An expanded -- expanded runway. Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah.

Mr. Ornellas: And then, in addition, supporting facilities, a taxiway, hangar area including fueling station will support the anticipated increase in air transportation. I think it's important that we do put fuel. We mentioned fueling station only because it's important. Because when we have something happen on this island where it requires helicopters to come, they got to fly fuel in in 55 gallon drums at the same time. So having a fueling station at our airport would eliminate that crap so --

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes, sir, Ron? Yes, sir, Ron? No, I'm not going to make you get up. Then we'll just move on.

Mr. McOmber: Ron McOmber. I worked that airport for six and half years. We do not need fuel at that airport. If they're going to bring in helicopters let them bring in some special stuff for just that. But we do not need fuel at that airport. This causes all kinds of problems for the airport. It's just -- you can't have it there constantly. If you do that, then you're going to increase the people coming in and fueling up their planes here. We don't need it. Just like at the harbor at Manele. We don't need fuel down there because we don't need boats coming in and fueling up. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Go ahead Kurt.

Mr. Matsumoto: So, you know, Ron's worked for the state. I haven't, but we do get requests from Fire Department, from DNLR asking us to have fuel facility there. Currently, there is -- Castle & Cooke Aviation currently does have the ability to put in fuel and a hangar at the airport.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Thank you. Mary, can repeat the 9.7A, and we're going to make a decision on that one now?

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. 9.7A, Airport Enhancement. The airport enhancement will increase lift capacity to Lana'i airport with a additional 500 feet of runway. In addition, supporting facilities -- a taxiway, and hangar area, including fueling station will support an anticipated increase in air transportation.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Also include some where in there that the runway length at the end of this enhancement is 5,500 feet.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, for a total of 5,500 feet.

Mr. Ornellas: 5,500 feet.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. The one question I have is on the map. The new map that Kurt brought today. There -- there are a couple areas where you are expanding the airport by 17 acres in that little corner. And then beyond it the end of the airport down there -- I don't know how many acres that is, but that was not part of the original airport where you see the tip of it down here? And then just a little sliver along Miki Road that it looks like some sort of mapping error, correction that's in there. So we could -- we figure out what those, those areas are and add that in. And, yeah, it's minor, but there is -- there is an extension of it.

Mr. Matsumoto: So if you look at that map there, you see that dotted line. That dotted line is the same dotted line as what's shown on the map that I'm pointing to you. So the southern dotted line at the south end of the runway. So put the hand more to the left. What Mary was talking about is this area right here. Okay. So that area is represented on your maps here. So that dotted line is, as Ron's saying, the 1388 road, it's still on this map, and that same gray area is represented here, so that's not in addition. There is this 17 acres. It's on the old map, and it continues to be on this map. So this was part of the 680.

Ms. Jorgensen: Which old map are referring to? The CPAC draft? Okay. But I'm -- the CPAC draft, it was a change from whatever the airport land use designation was in the 98 plan which is this boundary here. So this is existing from 98 plan. This area here is new designation. This is new designation and little tiny sliver up at the top. So -- but they are on -- they're in the CPAC plan. It's just with -- but you didn't take off -- you took this out and that piece up there which were -- and this huge piece here. So, you know, it's just an adjustment of that 600 acres. It's probably down to like 30, or, you know, this is 17 -- so maybe 45 acres.

Mr. Ornellas: So, the statement is -- is -- doesn't -- doesn't require us to do whatever acreage. We took the acreage out and replaced it with feet -- runway feet. So I mean, we can't decide that today as far as how many acreage we're talking about.

Ms. Maydan: Jen Maydan. We do need to identify the acreage because it is a change from the 98 plan to today. The CPAC map is a change of 680 acres. Pulama Lana'i's new revision is a change of -- we don't know how many acres. They're going to have to total that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Then you guys will total that.

Ms. Maydan: Yes, we'll total that.

Mr. Ornellas: Because anything that we're concerned about now is the 500 foot extension. We don't -- we don't -- we don't have the information to provide you with acreage, so let's just stick with the 500 feet extension, and then you guys come up with the -- with the acreage.

Ms. Maydan: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: That requires to support basically what Pulama wants.

Ms. Maydan: Exactly.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Cachola: I'd like to -- that 17 acre box, that's the industrial lands, right, that we're talking about, I think, right? As far as -- my map's a different calibration and I'm trying to figure it out. But it looks like that's the box that's been designated for the 15 -- well, we rounded to 15 acres industrial, so maybe I would recommend putting in 9.7, I don't know, B or X, you know, to denote maybe that being our industrial area.

Mr. Matsumoto: No, sorry, you're mistaken. Your industrial area is actually located somewhere where that hand is right now.

Ms. Cachola: I would like to include that 15 acres where it's suppose to be as been corrected, and I'll give the actual maps to you folks in that area where the hand is.

Mr. Ornellas: You mean, your Department of Hawaiian Homelands is giving us land?

Ms. Cachola: No. I'm suggesting including a new 9.7B -- I believe, B, that would be DHHL industrial development. I mean, industrial development, I guess because you guys are identifying projects. And, and to include it also in the map as 9.7B, in the appropriate area.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. These are County land use designations. They're not ownership. We aren't putting description here Pulama Lana'i's light industrial lands or -- yeah, this is the layer that goes over ownership. It's a county designation of industrial lands or airport lands. Yeah, it's not parcel boundaries. It's not airport extension. It's airport land use designations. So that's why we wanted to get the acres. Okay? For you guys, you want to understand why you're going to have that extension or why you're going to have a change, that's understandable. But in the end, we're looking at where is the layer of land that is a county designation of land.

Mr. Ornellas: And you said you were going -- County will provide us with the acres. Right now we're just gonna. We're gonna look at 500 feet.

Ms. Jorgensen: We've got it.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Cachola: I was looking at the red. I got confused. The red says light industrial, heavy industrial and it has acres, so maybe you don't have to put it down with any 9.7. But if you could include a red in this area that would be my recommendation for the -- for the commission to consider in reflecting 15 acres. And, you know, maybe I need to explain that, you know, we need to come into this process kind of bullying our way in. The reason why we're here, the reason why the department pays to send somebody here to sit all day in Lana'i to go over this with you folks is because we believe in planning. We believe in good planning, and we believe in coordinated land uses. We believe that in a small island environment you must do good planning. We believe infrastructure coordination so that it's efficient and so that it's cheap. Right? And the way that that's going happen is for you to know, eyes open, going forward, what is -- what is happening around you. We are committed to this point so we -- we do this ourselves. In June 2010, we did a regional plan for this area. We have 21 regional plans across the state that does exactly the same thing which is get out of our hole and look around and say what is everybody else doing? Maybe we should pay attention, maybe we can coordinate, maybe we can partner, so that we reduce the cost. And we're doing all these joint development because we cannot do it ourselves. We don't have that kind of money so we -- we work with DLNR, we work with other private partners to develop infrastructure, you know, to develop -- to look at how do we develop a region in a coordinated fashion. So when we looked at Lana'i we thought, you know, this is a prime example because when we did our regional plan -- and by the way it's on -- on our website -- DHHL Hawaii dot gov, under planning office, under regional plans, Lana'i plans -- and it identifies all the infrastructure capacities, existing plans, what's being proposed to water, what's being proposed for road, what's being proposed -- you know, what else is happening. What we found is right where we are in our 50 acres, there is the Maui County housing project and the DOE housing project -- I mean, DOE project. We said great, we're adjacent. We're in close proximity. We're all gonna need, what, roads. We're all gonna need waste water. We're all gonna need water. The infrastructure to move forward. So we sat down and met several times to discuss to kind of plan this in a coordinated fashion and in our regional plan we actually have the diagrams, and I would recommend that you folks put that in, but I know we're not in that section. But 9.5, we need some additional narrative descriptions and map designations so that you can see that all of things are happening here. This would be an example of eyes open, walking forward in terms of, you know, airport expansion so that you know, hey, there's another 15 acres, red spot there -- I'm not sure in . . . (inaudible) . . . places that you folks using the labeling -- but to put it there so that we can plan appropriately. That's, you know, really the intention of us in participating in this process so I needed to --

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Alright, so, Department of Hawaiian Homelands, how many -- how many --. What acres are you --? I mean, the information that you're providing us you have nothing to do with, right, DHHL?

Ms. Cachola: This is our -- I remember in this -- the Land Use Commission decision, there were

10 acres of commercial lands, and 15 acres of industrial lands. This is where the 15 acres of industrial lands is located.

Mr. Ornellas: I thought the -- I thought the 15 acres was more towards Miki not by the --. Pulama, am I correct or --

Mr. Matsumoto: I think the reason there's confusion is DHHL doesn't have any of their land on any of these maps so this is the same issue as what existed when you had the discussion about their commercial land. So the 10 acres commercial, 15 acres light industrial, that was given to the State is now with DHHL. So the 15 acres is not anything to do with the acreage that we're proposing. Their land is located on the makai side of the airport, towards the -- closer to the cat sanctuary. So -- so you -- because you don't have it on the maps she's asking to insert it on the map.

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle go ahead.

Ms. Aoki: Mr. Chair, I think if you -- if I could please request that we move forward with the request from Pulama Lana'i in reference to the map and then address that afterwards. But it does touch upon what I was saying earlier about having a clearer picture of everything going on so we don't keep running into this wall again.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: So should we locate that 15 acre parcel near the cat sanctuary and put it on this map, and would you want to recommend it be -- have a county designation of light industrial on it?

Mr. Ornellas: Let's get -- let's go -- let's -- we'll come to that in just a second. Let's finish what we're working on as far as 9.7A. So -- I mean, we've made changes. We're going to take the acreage from this statement and then added it later on when they do define what the acreage is. But we're adding 500 feet to make the total of the runway length would be 5,500 feet. There will be supporting facilities including fueling, taxiway, hangar area to -- to anticipate increase of air transportation, basically. Alright? Can I get a motion to accept?

Mr. Marlowe: So move.

Mr. Ornellas: Second?

Ms. Aoki: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Joelle. Any more discussion? No? Hearing none. So, all in favor of the motion?

Ms. Aoki: In reference to Uncle Ron's request, is it important to have the fueling in there, or can we just say supporting facilities? Because it would come before the Planning Commission and the FAA again at that time -- and is it important to have that in there? Yes? Okay, thank you

for answering.

Mr. Ornellas: I think so. So -- so the motion is on the table. All in favor of supporting the motion raise your hand. Unanimous. All -- everybody voted yes, so -- so we're okay with that. Got that Mary? We're okay? Alright. Okay, let's go to the other thing with the DHHL. Yes, I think it would important to maybe find out where this land is located on a map instead of us just guessing. Any disagreement? I mean, we can put it on and then our next meeting we can see it, right? And so we really don't have to make a decision on it today, and we'll see how it pertains to that map. Yes, sir?

It was moved by Commissioner Stuart Marlowe, seconded by Commissioner Joelle Aoki, then unanimously

VOTED: To amend 9.7A Airport Expansion to the language as discussed.

Assenting: J. Aoki, S. Barfield, S. Marlowe, B. Oshiro, B. Zigmund

Excused: K. Gima, S. Koanui Nefalar

Mr. Mike Napier: Mike Napier, Long Range Planning. If we can get the digital files from Hawaiian Homelands that would be preferable and not maps because it creates an extra amount of work to digitize these maps. And if we could get the actual GIS files that would be excellent. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: So we'll be able --? Go ahead. You'll be able to provide that? Thank you. Pulama, you will assist? Thank you. Okay, so next item is 9.7B, and that goes from page 9-7, line 43 to page 9-8, to one through three, and that is the "Expanded industrial area approximately 200 acres, divided approximately 100 acres each light and heavy industrial. Light industrial from within Lana'i City will also be moved and consolidated to this area. And it will also be the staging area for shipments." Any -- any comments or decisions -- comments or questions? Thank you. Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmund: Mr. Chair? I was just wondering about the Miki Basin area. Is it still where people can go and purchase a spot or a land or whatever? I remember when that application was before the Planning Commission a few years ago, that was how it was going -- if I wanted to do car repairs or something like that I could go and lease a space, or buy a space or whatever, and it was going to be given to Lana'i residents first choice. Can somebody speak to that where that is right now, please?

Mr. Matsumoto: So, yes, the -- the land that you're talking about is actually wrapped up inside that map. It's -- it's 20 acres, and I believe it went through the subdivision already? Not yet?

Ms. McCrory: . . .(Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Matsumoto: So, as soon as it get through the subdivision process then we will be able to list it. The condominium first. Okay, then we'd be able to list it. So then -- then it would be

available to Lana'i residents and I believe it was a period of time. What was the period of time that was --

Ms. McCrory: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Matsumoto: Residents living on Lana'i. But it's actually satisfying something that was set aside 20 years ago. So, it's only happening now.

Mr. Ornellas: So Bev you got that -- that was the answer. You okay with the answer? Okay. So anybody have a problem with the 9.7B? Can we move on? Okay, let's move on to 9.7C Energy Park -- "Approximately 35 acres of light industrial land will be adjacent to the industrial area and airport for energy generation. Example for the uses may be solar energy, algae farms for biofuels."

Ms. Jorgensen: John, I'd recommend that 9.6C be deleted because the -- the light industrial that sticks out there on the right side is 35 acres. It's -- it's this and in one of the original maps it had an energy farm on it. But the energy farm can go on to agricultural lands, and so it didn't need to be specified to be right there. So it gives a little bit more flexibility. It was 100 acres in -- of light industrial. Okay, the Miki Basin Industrial is 200 acres -- 100 light and 100 heavy industrial. So if you look on the map where we're trying to figure out exactly where to put that because it was just a big, put it in this area. We put the 35 out on that -- that point, and then another 65 up at the top for light industrial, working with Pulama Lana'i on where that might be. And it doesn't necessarily have to be an energy park on that 35. Is that what we came to in the end, Lynn?

Mr. Ornellas: Any comments, questions, members? I -- what? I mean, will the world come to an end as we know it if that stays in there?

Ms. Jorgensen: We would have to find another 35 acres of light industrial land to put on the map somewhere.

Ms. Zigmund: I see what Mary's saying that if we don't specify energy park there, although it could be there, it could also be other places so it's not like we're going to lose if we do need to an energy park some place. So this is restricting it there.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, so you want it removed? You okay with removing it? Members? Other members? Looks like they're all in agreement, so go ahead and strike it, Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Then we'll continue on with Manele Mauka area. That's map 9.8.

Ms. Zigmund: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question please?

Mr. Ornellas: What was that?

Ms. Zigmond: Can I ask a question please?

Mr. Ornellas: Sure.

Ms. Zigmond: On 9.8A, could someone illuminate me on the senior housing there please? What are the plans for the senior housing? If I'm a senior, which I'm about to be, can I go and live there if it was built? Can someone from the company speak to that please?

Mr. Ornellas: That is on line -- it's on page 9.8, that is line --

Ms. Zigmond: 19 and 20.

Mr. Ornellas: 19 and 20. Yes.

Mr. Matsumoto: I'm sorry. I wasn't listening. What was your question?

Ms. Zigmond: If someone could elaborate on senior housing, lines 19 and 20, at Manele Mauka.

Mr. Matsumoto: As far as whether there would be senior housing or not, you mean?

Ms. Zigmond: No, I mean, what is -- what does senior housing look like there? Is it another Hale Kupuna? Is it open to anybody?

Mr. Matsumoto: We have not made that determination, so this is just a broad. We approach this process as not getting down to that nitty gritty. So we said, you know, there would be these kinds of things available, but exactly what at this point, I'm not sure.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes? Yes, Debbie.

Ms. dela Cruz: You're taking out that thing about the energy park. Are you going to put something in there in the plan to say that you are in support of the concept? I mean, you don't have to say where it's going, but --

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: We can find a location for that in terms that energy parks and make a statement there that energy parks can be located either on light industrial lands or agricultural lands. And now that there -- some of the airport has -- some of that airport acreage is gone, if you want to have the energy -- that 35 acres that's stuck out there on the side for the energy park and you want to add some more light industrial lands, the 35 acres, that's fine. What ever you want.

Mr. Ornellas: Under -- under Pulama's -- under Pulama's energy guy or that the -- he said that there will be more, not centrally located energy places, it's going to be spread out so -- so I think they -- instead of identifying industrial areas, I think, you guys are going to ask Pulama to do more.

Mr. Matsumoto: So you're right. You're correct. As we're doing the research and as we're learning it's not the most efficient way to set up some of the renewable energy just in all one place. So you're right, it could end up being that the best site is actually closer to Kaunapali Harbor for solar and so, you know, instead of just designating in one area, just allowing us to position it in, in ag use areas would, would -- may give us the flexibility so when we actually have all this work completed, you have the flexibility to more instead of having to come back and go through all this plan amendments.

Mr. Ornellas: So there's -- so there's really no need to identify an area. So -- so there's no reason to replace it, that statement on energy park person.

Ms. Jorgensen: No. There doesn't have to be a specific geographic area, but we can leave a general statement that energy parks can be located either in industrial areas or on agricultural lands. Or do you just want it out? Not necessarily.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, what do you guys think? You want to put in a statement in that -- basically what Mary said or we're just -- we're okay. We already know that energy is the designation for agriculture and we've got plenty of that. So -- just leave it? Okay. We'll just leave it the way it is now. Basically no statement.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Just leave it.

Mr. Ornellas: That we don't need to put in a statement saying that --. Because we all know that agriculture is a designation for -- where you can put energy projects. Okay, so what was the --? Manele Mauka, 9.8A. That's right, Bev asked about housing for seniors. Right.

Ms. Jorgensen: I'd like to make it a comment on this. This is an area, along with the area that's -- that's called residential down by the harbor and the Lana'i City extension that we're saying for a County land use designation to call them mixed use residential which allows primarily residential, some business commercial spots. In this case, it was two acres, park planned, and any kind of public, like, community center area as well. And why we're saying that is it gets away from where in the community plan, where you have those little specific, the two acres at --. Mike, are you on the Manele one? That would be great. Go back to the -- no, the map. Yeah, right here. When you have -- when specify that's going to be two acres commercial, and that's where the park is going to go, and that's where all the housing is going to go. And then get around to doing their site design, and they realized now it's commercially better right there, that junction of the two roads. Or they want to have a little corner store up there, and another one over some place else within the residential. Two little -- two little half acre. Maybe there's a little restaurant coffee shop and a little grocery store. This way they'd have to go in for a community plan amendment when you -- when you make into these three ways of doing it -- park, commercial, and residential. When it's mixed use development -- I mean, mixed use

residential, it says all those are going to occur. And then when you review the site plan, you can see that they are occurring by the text that's in the community plan that says you're going to have approximately two acres, and approximately 20 acre park and this many houses -- you know, this many acres for housing. So, it's what we're trying to move to. So, my -- my recommendation as it's called, mixed use residential Manele Mauka, and then look at the text for, for the -- what will be there.

Ms. Barfield: Any questions commissioners? No, he had to step away, and he instructed me. John, hurry up.

Ms. Jorgensen: So in the appendix 9.3, you can see the definition for that -- in that handout it says mixed use residential, CPAC propose new designation that would include a mixed of single and multi-family residential, business commercial, public quasi-public, and park uses. So that -- that's the designation for the overall category. And then specifically what you want to see at the mixed use residential, Manele Mauka would be your text on -- within the chapter on page 9.8. So basically, you know, you take 9.8A, 9.8B, 9.8C and combine them as 9.8A Mixed Use Residential Manele Mauka. But all the text would stay. Just the title of 9.8B Commercial would go away, 9.8C Park would go away, and 9.8A, the Manele Mauka. So you'd make that one group.

Ms. Zigmond: And then -- what is currently 9.8D the Rural is a different animal.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's different.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's down lower on the map. Yeah.

Ms. Cachola: . . .(Inaudible) . . . brought attention to appendix 9.2, and the Mixed Use, 9.3, and then I noticed that Lana'i City Expansion was crossed out so I was just asking whether that amendment was crossed -- you know, changed on the map to mixed use residential.

Ms. Jorgensen: The county land use designation which is regardless of what island, or where you are, any where within Maui County, has the more generic name of mixed use residential, and a generic -- I mean, an a definition of what that is. Within this plan for Lana'i, it has a mixed use residential with three different names that were discussed during the process so, you know, they're more descriptive -- Lana'i City Expansion, Manele Mauka, and the -- the Harbor. And all three of those are mixed use residential. So the Lana'i City Expansion name didn't go away. It's just that we were not going to create in a Maui Countywide land use designation something that was just for Lana'i as a title in the -- in the general description.

Mr. McOmber: Ron McOmber here. I don't know if you guys are aware of this or not and I brought it up before and I reported it to the EPA a long time ago, but there's a huge dump site mauka side of that development. And we need to find out exactly where it is in relation to that development going to be. Because they dumped everything out of the ...(inaudible). . . huts in

that site, and it's a lot --. Right down, right in that area somewhere and we need to find out exactly where it is in relation to that before they go forward. I think it behooves the company to do that. I witnessed it, I saw the stuff in the ground, I talked to the driver that dumped this stuff out of the . . . (inaudible) . . . huts and it was DDT, it was all kind of stuff. Full barrels. If you're going to do a development there, you better find out where it is in relation to that -- that development.

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Mr. Ornellas: Go ahead Bev.

Ms. Zigmond: Just to bring you up to speed, Mary had suggested that we combine 9.8A, B, and C, and put it just as Mixed Residential.

Mr. Ornellas: Mixed Residential, is that what you said?

Ms. Jorgensen: Mixed Use Residential, dash, Manele Mauka. So it has a common name and then the County land use designation name first.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Members, what's your wishes? You okay with changing it to that? Alright, go ahead and change that Mary. We all agree. Yes, sir, David.

Mr. Yamashita: Dave Yamashita. Just a question. So, do these designations go away, Mary? The -- so this becomes one color.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Yamashita: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: With respect to what Ron just said, Pulama would like to take a ride out there with him, and he can show you guys where, and then you guys can, later on, decide whether to do a soil testing or whatever? Alright. Thank you. Wait, you got that Ron? Alright. And they'd be more than happy to go with you. Alright, so let's move on to Kaunalapau area, and that's 9.8A, 9.8B. Repeat that with the mic.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, since we combined 9.8A, B, and C, 9.8D now becomes 9B, and we have not yet spoken to that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. So Rural Residential. There's 76 acres proposed for rural housing. Any questions, statements pertaining to that? It's 76 acres. Do you guys want to just leave it as written and move on or is there --? Nobody have any question. Okay, we'll move on. We accept that. Then we'll move on to Kaunalapau area, 9.9A, 9.9B, and we're using the map 9.9.

Alright, so 9.9A Ocean Resource Heavy Industrial -- obviously that is Kaunalapau Harbor. Let me ask Kurt, Pulama, any more information about Ellison doing his sailboat kingdom down

there?

Mr. Matsumoto: Kurt Matsumoto. I believe you're asking about the Americus Cup? Is that what you're referring to? The Americus Cup will not happen on -- on Lana'i. If it occurs in Hawaii it will be on another island. My speculation is if it does come to Hawaii, it will likely be on Oahu.

Mr. Ornellas: Understood. But they were talking about using that in Kaunalapau as a training facility or --

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, we would not be asking to do that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Okay, and the heavy industrial, the 10 acres that's being talked about that's, of course that's up the hill. Is that where the quarry's at? I think that's -- that's where the quarry's at. I'm blind. Okay any -- any objections or comments about 9.9A? If not, then we'll move on 9.9B, Kaunalapau Harbor Residential.

Ms. Jorgensen: This is the third one that I would suggest that the County designation be mixed use residential so that you could have the corner store rather than running up to Lana'i City for a quart of milk.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so it's 50 -- approximately 50 acres. So this is -- this is above and beyond Kaunalapau Harbor Camp? It's beyond that, right? Above and beyond. Harbor Camp is --

Ms. Jorgensen: I'm not sure where the -- you mean the existing residential that was down there?

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah. Right there.

Ms. Jorgensen: I believe it's in this area along the lower road. The rural park originally was down in here. Do you know where those houses are?

Mr. Ornellas: No. It's where your hand is.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, somewhere --

Mr. Ornellas: Just go -- keep going -- keep going up. Along the shoreline. Up, up, up.

Ms. Jorgensen: Up here?

Mr. Ornellas: Yeah.

Ms. Jorgensen: Closer to the harbor, okay.

Ms. Zigmond: So Mary some uses other than the corner store or a little coffee shop or something that could go in that mixed residential would also include what?

Ms. Jorgensen: You could have a -- well, parks and they would be -- that -- that -- they would be proportional to the number of residences that were built. And you could have -- well, you could have a public building if you wanted to have -- if it was a school or library ext -- you know, a little office. Yeah, so, mixed use -- is there something else we had in --? No, I think that covers it. Yeah, so it -- it's residential, neighborhood parks, and business commercial.

Mr. Ornellas: When -- if you -- if these houses were to be built, what -- what -- do you have some idea what configuration? Are they going to be acre lots, five acre lots? Is this something that people can afford or --? Okay. I got --

Mr. Matsumoto: To be honest, we haven't really thought about what this would look like. We -- we were putting things out there for -- as alternatives, so this -- this is not intended to become like a second home development. It's -- it would be residential. So it could become workforce housing and like we were talking about giving people options instead of just in Lana'i City and having something ocean view.

Mr. Ornellas: And these -- and these will be considered a single family or multi-family units?

Mr. Matsumoto: Again, you know, when we get to that point we would look at what would be the best use of the land, considering the activities in the area, and what the population need at the time.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Thank you. Alright, so, members, mixed use? Yeah, Mary recommended doing that change. You did recommend yeah?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Any objections? No? We've got --. Yeah, okay. Okay, let's take a break till two o'clock, okay, and then we'll -- we'll take that vote.

(The Lana'i Planning Commission recessed at 1:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m.)

Mr. Ornellas: Before we left we were still -- did we have a motion done? No. Okay, so -- well, we don't really need a motion. Okay, we were going to change this to what type of zoning again? Mixed Residential Use.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah. It's not -- it's not zoning. It's the County's land use designation of mixed use residential.

Mr. Ornellas: Sorry. Poor choice of words. Alright, so any objections to -- to changing it to that? Everybody okay with that? Okay, so, you can go ahead and make the change. Thank you. Alright, so let's -- I just want to let everybody know that we're going to continue on with Chapter 9. We'll skip through this until we get to the point where we're -- we get to the map changes

and that kind of stuff and we'll stop. The map changes and Chapter 10 will be moved to the next -- the next meeting date, July 9th. Okay. Alright? So let's go to page 9-10. This is Issues and Strategies. Okay, State Land Use designation -- Issue 1, "State Land Use designations and Lana'i Community Plan designations are inconsistent." Strategy 1, "Identify State land use designations that are inconsistent with the Lana'i Community Plan land use designations and work to bring them into agreement."

Ms. Jorgensen: We --

Mr. Ornellas: Any --. Go ahead Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: We did all that now in the plan so that Issue and Strategy-- I suggested deleting it especially after you see the map changes we can maybe come back and see whether you really want to keep that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Any more comments members? Okay. So we'll -- we'll leave it stand, but then we may have some more discussion when we bring the maps forward on our next meeting. Issue 2, "Interim zoned lands lack specific zoning standards." Strategy 2, "Conduct a comprehensive review of interim zoned lands to be re-zoned appropriately to implement the updated community plan land use designations." So will this be part of the other --? No, we can just leave it as is? Can we just leave it as is, members? Alright. Then Issue 3, "Wetlands, riparian areas, forest." What does riparian mean?

Ms. dela Cruz: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: What's that?

Ms. dela Cruz: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. "Forest and -- or -- and traditional land uses have been degraded or lost due to development." And the Strategy, "Identifying and map natural and cultural resource areas and provide guidelines for development such as Best Management Practices to ensure protection of significant natural resources and traditional land use." We okay with that, members? Just shake your head yes. Thank you. Okay, we'll accept that. And then, so Issue 4, "Maui County Code Chapter 19.70 Lana'i Project District 1, Manele, and Project District 2, Koele, require agreements and conditions for approval. Still need to be fulfilled." Hey, that is your change if -- am I right? That is the County's change?

Ms. Jorgensen: That is the County's change to add -- to add that in there because we -- we discussed these agreements a lot, and actually Ron kept bringing up how there were agreements in the past. And that is what you'll see in appendix one, it's all the agreements with the County that are either ordinance. I think they're all codified as ordinances in appendix -- it should be 9.1. It's mislabeled as 9.4. There apparently -- and I believe when Ron was mentioning or other CPAC members where they're saying, well, we had these agreements. They were not with the County government but perhaps with Castle & Cooke. So we don't have

a record of those, and we just included the County agreements. But, nonetheless, there was a concern by the CPAC that maybe some of those original agreements that were tied with the project districts were not completed and they wanted to review. So that's what this is.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, that is -- so an MOA that was done in 1987 between Castle & Cooke and the community should -- should be part of this?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, that's a separate agreement. It's not an agreement with the County. It's an agreement with -- between community members and Castle & Cooke, a private company. So, we can only, as County government, have what's in here as either something that was put into the code as a zoning or -- because each of the project districts got their own specific zoning for Manele and Koele, and then they had, subsequent to that, they had ordinances that modified that original agreement.

Mr. Ornellas: There are MOAs that are in effect that were -- were approved by the County of Maui because we had to go through them for the approvals of these to make -- turn -- turn some of these things into ordinances so shouldn't that be included?

Ms. Jorgensen: If it's included in an ordinance, then hopefully we found it in this list of ordinances that's in the back, in appendix -- what should be 9.1, but it's currently mislabeled 9.4 -- which is on pages A-11 through A-22. So it has all the ordinances that we could find and also a time line for the Koele Project District history. I don't know why there isn't one for Manele. I guess we didn't have one. And we put -- we put this together because there was -- you know, it's just -- well, what happened, what's out there, and so it was a collection, you know, that Doug Miller did a -- you know, he found all these so we could better understand what occurred over time. But if there's separate agreements between Castle & Cooke and the community that were not going through the County, we don't have a record of those.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Alright, I'm just trying to figure out a way how we can -- may not -- let's just -- we'll just stick to the way it is now. I mean we don't have to --. I mean, this is an issue that we can bring up at our next meeting too as far as these ordinances. I did glance through this a while -- a while ago, but I'm going to make sure I read the next time we meet and see if I can -- and see if I can find some of the MOAs and stuff and see if we may want to put that in these appendix.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah. And I think it was, like, a first step in just resolving some of those agreements whether they were between -- whether they're in the County's regulations to find out, have those occurred. Or, if they were between the past company of Castle & Cooke and the community, that this would help start that discussion.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Alright. Ron, you have something? Alright.

Mr. McOmber: The reason -- the reason -- Ron McOmber. The reason you don't have them in your records is we call MOAs, or memorandums of agreement between LSG and Castle, and we have several of those. And if you'd like to see copies of that, I'd be glad to give it to you.

That's how we have Hulopoe Beach Park. That's how we have lots of things right now that we wouldn't have got if we didn't have an MOA with Castle.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so if we get copies, I mean, we can discuss it and put it in -- put it in as part of the appendix?

Ms. Jorgensen: No. I don't think it goes -- this is a County document so this is -- it's helpful the community to see them and maybe gather them up and, and have someone that has them that you know that can -- and then have those discussions with -- with the current company and say, well, these were from Castle & Cooke. Maybe they'd want to honor those. But -- but as far as the County government and the County document, to put agreements between a private company and the -- and the community, this would not be the document to put them in.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Okay, Issue 4 and then the Strategy 4 is "Work with landowners to review MCC Chapter 19.70 Lana'i Project District subsequent ordinances determine if actions are needed to meet required agreements and conditions of approval." Any comment, members? Questions? Move on? Nod your head. Alright, let's move on.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Could I -- can I add one more issue, a new issue and strategy would be -- the issue would be "The existing zoning code does not accommodate mixed use development." So we just created this category, but right now the zoning -- there's no zoning for it. So Strategy 3 would be "Consider revisions to the zoning code such as implementing the form based code or other mechanisms to facility the development of mixed use, pedestrian oriented communities."

Mr. Ornellas: And that is gonna be, what, 3?

Ms. Jorgensen: That would be Issue -- well, we can renumber -- yeah, it would be Issue no. 5. And if we take out 1 later -- I'm not sure what happened with Issue 1, Strategy 1, then it would be Issue 4, 5.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so next meeting, this will be -- you'll have this as a draft for us to look at?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. Great. So this -- this page, (B) Issues and Strategies for Chapter 9, you're gonna give us a draft to look at.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. At our next meeting. Thank you. Anything else, members? No? We're gonna move on? Okay. Let's go to page 9-11. That's Goals, Policies, Actions. Retain and -- the Goal -- "Retain and enhance Lana'i's rural character, respecting its vast open space lands and small island town environment which are unique in the State of Hawaii." So -- so we -- you guys took out objectives.

Ms. Jorgensen: We took out objectives and merged those either into the policies or into actions -- depending on what they were.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. You know, just looking at the policies, I don't see -- I just see words being supplemented. I don't see sentences, like -- so was this -- this was -- this was included in the --?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah. Like can you take second objective, "Important agricultural lands are maintained and protected from urban development." That overlaps with Policy No. 4, "Encourage conservation of existing Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii." Yeah, so, so some of them, they were just -- they're duplicated what was in the policies. Like, okay, the first objective, "Urban expansion and development occurs in areas planned for such uses." That -- that's what Policy No. 1 is saying -- urban development -- sorry, I said the ag one which is the second objective is in Policy No. 4. And then the third objective, "Urban development occurs in a coordinated manner consistent with the Community Plan, and in conjunction with the provision of infrastructure." What? Jen's saying that it's in no. 9 and 11? Yeah, Policy 9 and 11. So we were trying to make it a little more concise and we're getting direction to not have anything that was duplicated.

Mr. Ornellas: Members, any questions, comments -- on policies? You want to go through each one or you want to -- you're okay with the whole page? Okay with the whole page. Alright. So that's it for 9-11. Let's move on to page 9-12, so it's a continuation of the policies for Chapter 9. Hello, yes, Debbie?

Ms. dela Cruz: . . . (Inaudible) . . .

Mr. Ornellas: Come, come to the microphone please.

Ms. dela Cruz: Number 3 is got a second runway?

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, that would be changed since everything that we did for that is now moot, and --. So anything that mentions the second runway will be removed from the plan. And will be -- will reflect the statement that we previously said for the airport, okay?

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Alright, so page 9-12, and that is continuation of policies for Chapter 9. We okay with the way it's written? Yes, okay. Other members, are we okay? Continue on? Alright, let's move on. Nothing there. So, page 9-13, these are Actions for Chapter 9. Okay 9.09 we have -- you took out basically everything that the CPAC said and you went with a new statement.

Ms. Jorgensen: Because we -- wait a minute -- revised. That was in working with Corp Counsel and the Planning Director, we could not as a County we don't -- we don't initiate a change in

State Land Use generally. So, it's up to the -- the developer to go to the State Land Use board. So I think -- I'm sorry for the confusion there to put the of them together but one of them was that there's no relationship between those two -- the strike out and the addition. I think that was just using the same box. You know, it's not like a revision of one. It's deletion of something we weren't going to use and then I put in a new -- a new action related to that. The strategy that we were -- I mean, the issue and strategy were talking to about a few minutes ago where there were all those agreements that are in the ordinances and working with the landowner.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright, any objections to that change, members? Butch, you have something to say?

Mr. Gima: I know you guys almost pau hana, so I wanted to go on record, again, that the Lana'i Planning Commission support the recommendation that the County of Maui create a position on Lana'i to implement this Community Plan. Without that, the Community Plan is probably just going to sit on someone's -- all of our desks and shelves so I don't want all this work to be "poho" so I would ask for your support. Once it gets to County Council that they fund the position to ensure implementation of this, the work in this plan. Thank you.

Mr. Ornellas: Thank you. Butch, did you guys put that in? It's in the Community Plan. Is that in -- at the end? At the policy -- is that -- Mary?

Ms. Jorgensen: If it's not in here, we could add something -- maybe bring some language for the Governance Chapter.

Mr. Ornellas: Yes. Okay, that's a good place for it.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah.

Mr. Ornellas: Because I remember seeing it in the plan.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah there's --

Mr. Ornellas: I just don't know where it's at.

Ms. Jorgensen: There is -- there is one action in there, but we'll -- we'll review it again . . . (inaudible) . . . bring something back we will.

Mr. Ornellas: And then also on 9.03, it says "Evaluate and establish zoning for airport land expansion, when needed for runway improvements consistent with the Community Plan. Evaluate lands between airport and Lana'i City for compatible land uses, particularly with respect to sound attenuation." Whatever. Whatever. I guess that has nothing to with -- it -- it's -- it has to do with the land between it so -- really nothing has to be done to that as far as airport expansion. Anybody see anything else in the page 19 -- I'm sorry, 9-13? We okay? Everybody? Somebody shake their head. Okay, thank you. Alright so I think that's going to be it for today. Please come forward.

Ms. Cachola: Thank you. Julie Cachola, Hawaiian Homelands. I just want to go on record to -- to piggy back to our relevant narratives on page 9-2. I realized now in organization of this document, this is under existing conditions, but really it should be under plans growth, so recommend that line 24 to 31 be taken and put in -- inserted into the Plan Growth Chapter. Secondly, that in 9.5, we add a 9.5B titled Hawaiian Homestead Residential Development, and we can provide language as how that would be defined, similar to what is here. And that we add a 9.5H, which is at the end of the 9.5 series, indicating DHHL or Hawaiian Homelands commercial. I think the language to -- just mirror the language on the other commercial. It says to service -- I'm just taking it out of the Manele Mauka Commercial Section -- and we can just say Commercial -- "to service the Lana'i City community approximately 15 acres of commercial land is planned, is identified for this area." And that's kind of just taking the language out of the Manele Commercial narrative. Just to mirror that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so you're saying 15 acres now. I thought it was 10.

Ms. Cachola: 10 acres. 10 acres of commercial lands is identified. We can come up with details on that. I'm just looking at trying to just mirror the language in the other areas. And I already put on record the 9.7, I think, X or E, for the DHHL industrial development.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so for our next meeting, we're gonna sit down and -- the County's gonna give us -- you and the County and Pulama is going to work on getting a GIS location of those 25 acres that's down there. Go ahead Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. I had difficulty following that, so perhaps I can -- I'll give my card and you can e-mail what you're suggesting. When we come back and we can look at in terms of both the map and then the suggested changes of where they might be.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so, Mary, you guys got -- staff, you have anything else to say?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, it depends on --. You ready -- end of day because we do have -- it looks people are --. Okay, this has been a lot, but we -- yeah. I just want to make a couple of notes. For those and actually if anybody could get it to Kelli it would be great. I did make all the revisions on the table 8.5 that came out of the May 7th meeting notes. So, we were just going to do a quick review of that in light of whether we got them all right, and because there was even in the meeting notes is a little confusing. And then there was at our May 28th meeting we had a handout given that added to this table as well, so -- so we would just like to have people check this. I think that -- that would help. And then in terms of we're going to be discussing the planning principles and standards at the next meeting. If you would look at what was in -- the end of this chapter, in Chapter 9, there was the old planning standards, I think, were put in as an appendix, as appendix 9.4. We did review the first ones that are in there, under land use standards A through D, and Corporation Counsel thought we couldn't do that. You can't have something in here that says the landowner's going to sell something fee simple upon development. And then for E, he said that would be covered by a tree ordinance. And then, I think, F is already completed. So, these -- these standards that came from the 98 plan were basically saying they either would not be advisable to carry forward or --. So you might want

to look at them and see if there's anything there you think, yes, we need to have that.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay.

Mr. Yamashita: John?

Mr. Ornellas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Yamashita: On -- on the land use principles, I think, Ron had some suggestions, right? What's that? Anyway, just get them to us and I think if the committee members and anybody else in the public has comments on the principles because we really -- I mean, like, Ron said -- what's that? The design, urban design guidelines as well. Thanks. Because we really -- we didn't give people an advance -- enough time to review them, so I think we'll be reviewing them, but we'd be interested in your comments as well.

Ms. Jorgensen: So we'll try to post those on Monday to the web. The planning principles that were here today, and the Urban Design Principles as well. And the Planning Commissioners received both of those in your packet that the community has only saw them, out here, in the handout table. So, yeah, just in preparation of the next meeting. Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright.

Ms. Zigmond: Mary? Mary, excuse me? The Chapter 8 from May 28, and Chapter 5 there's several different things. I think I have -- is that -- do you have an extra copy of that?

Ms. Jorgensen: The one that I -- that was given to us at the May 28th meeting, I think I scanned and e-mailed it to all of you. Is that what you're referring to?

Ms. Zigmond: Well, I don't know how Joelle got a printed copy of it.

Ms. Jorgensen: Right. This one? The public testimony from Valerie and --

Ms. Zigmond: No. It's May 28th, 2014 Lana'i Planning Commission Community Plan Update. There's Chapter 8, Chapter 5, there's something on National Parks on the next page, and then there's a table on the back page. That's alright. I'll get -- I'll get a copy of it. Never mind.

Ms. Jorgensen: Was it testimony from last -- from the last meeting? No? Okay. Okay, from the last meeting. Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Alright. Mary, that's it? One more thing. No, go ahead.

Mr. Napier: Just a --. I don't know if this is the proper time to do this. I'd like to give you all an update on Mark King if it's okay during the meeting? Okay. Alright.

Ms. Jorgensen: I would suggest for Mark's privacy that we adjourn the meeting and then we

give an update.

Mr. Napier: Okay. Alright. Okay.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, then we'll adjourn. But before we --. This is business so let's not adjourn. We have -- the County of Maui is giving us four slots at this -- four spaces -- at the upcoming planning conference over on Kaanapali. So Shelly and I are going and so we're looking for two more members to go.

Ms. Barfield: Who's going?

Mr. Ornellas: Stacie and I. Okay, so we have two more openings. Joelle, did you find out anything? Okay. The dates.

Mr. Yamashita: September 10th to 12th.

Mr. Ornellas: September 10th through the 12th at Kaanapali Beach. Yes. So we have -- we have two slots that we can fill so if anybody is interested, please call me soon so David guys can make their plans. Because we're having -- we'll be staying at the Kaanapali Beach Hotel so --. Yes sir. Use the mic.

Mr. Yamashita: It's at the Sheraton Resort Spa something -- spa and resort. Anyway, the Sheraton Kaanapali. What's that? Yeah, and it's September 10th to 12th. The September 10th, Wednesday, are the mobile workshops. One of which is the mobile workshop to Lana'i which many of you know. But the other ones are a walking tour of Lahaina for the historic -- review of historic district issues. A tour of shoreline erosion or of areas on West Maui that have had shoreline problems that have been restored. And the last one is a tour in West Maui or ag, ag operations.

Mr. Ornellas: So they'll pay for hotel. They'll pay for car? No, we pay for car. Nice try.

Ms. Jorgensen: Hotel and there's a dinner and lunches. I don't think it's -- the second night there might not be a dinner.

Mr. Ornellas: Okay. But mostly everything is paid for.

Ms. Jorgensen: There is one dinner and dynamic program. I'm saying that as we're all on the program committee and we think that it turned out fantastic so --

Mr. Ornellas: Okay, so members, if you want to go, let us -- let me know as soon as possible. Thank you. And then so this meeting now adjourned.

E. NEXT MEETING DATE: July 9, 2014 for review of the Lana'i Community Plan

F. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion brought forward to the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:35 p.m.

Respectively submitted by,

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

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Joelle Aoki
Shelly Barfield
Stuart Marlowe
John Ornellas, Chair
Bradford Oshiro
Beverly Zigmond

EXCUSED:

Kelli Gima
Stacie Koanui Nefalar, Vice-Chair

OTHERS:

Mary Jorgensen, Planner, Long-Range Division
Jennifer Maydan, Planner, Long-Range Division
Mike Napier, GIS Analysis, Long-Range Division
Dave Yamashita, Planner, Long-Range Division