

**LANA`I PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE MEETING
OCTOBER 4, 2014**

*** All documents, including written testimony, that was submitted for or at this meeting are filed in the minutes' file and are available for public viewing at the Maui County Department of Planning, 2200 Main St., Suite 315, Wailuku, Maui. ***

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Lana'i Planning Commission (Commission) was called to order by Chair John Ornellas at approximately 9:02 a.m., Saturday, October 4, 2014, in the Lana'i Senior Center, 309 Seventh Street, Lana'i City, Lana`i, Hawaii.

Chair John Ornellas: Can we bring this meeting to order, please. Let me pull my what you call it. This is the meeting on October 4, Saturday. That just made it worst. This is, hopefully, the final CPAC review for the Lanai Planning Commission. It's been a long haul. It's now 9:02, and everybody's here: Bev's here, Bradford's here, Stuart's here, Stacie's here, of course, Kelli's here, and I don't know where Shelly went. She's getting food? Okay. Suzie, when you see her, can you just add her to the list? Thank you.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Alright, so let's go to items A and B. I'm going to -- we can have public testimony starting off, and then during our proceedings, if a hundred people shows up between now and then, then we'll keep it to a few comments at a time so that way we can move forward. So let's start off with -- see Ron's got the mike, so he's first.

Mr. Ron McOmbler: No. I don't have to be first.

Chair Ornellas: Yes, you do.

Mr. McOmbler: I don't think you want me to be first.

Chair Ornellas: Nah, that's okay. I'm sure we can handle that.

Mr. McOmbler: Good morning. My name is Ron McOmbler. I'm a CPAC member, a member of LSG, a member of LWAC. I am here today to protest this hearing going on any further without more information about the desal plant and some of the other things that we were given as information as we did for CPAC. We went through months and months of CPAC work. When we first started CPAC, we did not have any idea what Mr. Ellison was going to do to Lana`i. So as we started the CPAC, and it was apparent that Ellison had taken over the island, we asked Kurt Matsumoto to please give us an idea, an overlay of what their grandiose plans was for Lana`i.

Well, as you know, as you've seen the maps, as you've seen the information, it's unbelievable. We did not know how to attack that or use that or address it, but we did it I think in a very professional manner. We asked a lot of questions. We got a lot of answers. Now it comes to show that some of it was B.S.

The most important thing to LSG and LWAC was the idea that they were going to put in a desal plant, and that took a very big thorn out of our side that we've been fighting Castle & Cooke and David Murdock for twenty-some years, and I thought what a relief that is. My guard went down immediately. What else could they do? They couldn't do anything wrong if they were going to do a desal plant.

Well, as we see now, and in the recent weeks and months, not only is the desal plant going down the toilet, so is the runway, and I would assume that the landing will probably go down 'cause they're going to have to do desal plant for that. This was going to be a sustainable island. Let me enlighten you on something. They tore Koele up, took all the grass out of it, sold it, gave it away, and they went down and planted a sod farm. They're using our drinking water to water that sod farm because their piping that they have in place and their pumps that they have in place cannot service that. They can't use R-1 water. They can't use water from Well 9. And besides that, talk about R-1 water, their sewage treatment plant is in such bad shape that they couldn't produce water if they wanted to. If you talk to Matt, with the county, they haven't taken water from him for months and months and months, so our drinking -- our water for the golf course at Koele or whatever, R-1, is being thrown away. This really upsets me because if the CPAC had been told these things, had been told that we were not going to have a desal, they weren't going to do what they're doing with the R-1 water, we would have had a say-so in it. But no where in those papers do you see us having any statement about that. We passed it forth to you folks with the understanding that all those things that they told us were going to come to fruition. Now we see they're not. And I, as a member of CPAC, am very disturbed about that.

This is our 1998 community plan. Damn good community plan. We're now working on the 2014 community plan and it's just unbelievable the difference. You folks, and I don't know what you can do about it, I've been told all kinds of stuff from the company, from other sources, that I want to know where did this 30-year thing come from that killed CPAC -- I mean killed the desal plant. I'm hearing it came from the county. The county said we'll give you 30 years. Who asked for that 30 years? Did the company ask for it? Or did, randomly, did the county just come up with that number? If not, then somebody ought to investigate that because that is not, and you're going to hear Lynn McCrory say, hey, the county does that all the time. They give permits for all kinds of plants and dredging and all this 30, 40-year contract. This is Lana`i, we need to know what's going on and we don't need a 30-year thing to do that. But that's beside the point. I want to know who gave them the 30-year. Who came up with that? Was it the county? And nobody here can answer that. Corp. Counsel's not here. I talked to David. David doesn't know. I've asked

somebody to look into that. But as a member of CPAC, I am totally, totally disapproved that you guys okayed this thing today. We need to know more. I don't care if it goes on for two more years. We need to get this cleaned up. And you cannot send this package forward the way it is without having more input from the owners. He may dump it tomorrow. He may get all huhū and say we're disrespectful, and pull out, and sell it to somebody. We don't need that folks. And from my heart, I've lived here for 45 years, this is my second CPAC I've been on, nobody loves Lana`i more than I do, and I don't want to see this perish. And the things that we see going on down at Manele, the thing that happened in this room the other night, telling they're going to tear Manele down, put in three or four swimming pools, where are they going to get the water? They gotta come to LWAC to get that. So we need to find out what's going on here. This is not carte blanche. But they're wasting our water, and it's a total disrespect to Lana`i, to LWAC, and to the community. Thank you for letting me ramble on.

Chair Ornellas: Thank you, Ron. Anyone else in the community would like to speak, testify? Seeing none. Oh, go ahead, Nancy.

Ms. Nancy McPherson: Aloha, Commissioners and Chair. Nancy McPherson, Department of Hawaiian Homelands. I have some testimony that it was emailed to the planning office, Planning Department and -- but not in time for you guys to get -- oh, you did get copies? Okay. Well, I made copies and I also have color maps and -- because Mary suggested that we do that, and then I'd rather just talk about it or read it, if you had a chance to read it, when the item comes up, when the Land Use section comes up, if that's okay instead of taking up your time right now?

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, I'll give you a chance to talk when --

Ms. McPherson: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Ornellas: When we come up on Land Use, yeah. Anyone else in the community would like to speak? Alright, so let's close public testimony for now.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 27, 2014 MEETING

Chair Ornellas: Members, and so let's go to agenda item C., approval of the minutes of the August 27th, any comments, Members? Seeing none, all those in -- can I have a motion to accept the minutes of August 27? Good morning.

Ms. Kelli Gima: I'll make a motion.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, Kelli makes the motion. Bradford will second. Anymore discussion on the minutes? Hearing none.

It has been moved by Commissioner Gima, seconded by Commissioner Oshiro, then unanimously

VOTED: to accept the minutes of the August 27, 2014 meeting.

Chair Ornellas: That's everybody. Unanimous. And Joelle is absent. You know. So let's go to item D, complete chapter final reviews and approvals, so let's go -- I'm color blind so all this is just one -- these colors and stuff are just -- okay, so let's go to the yellow and orange sheet, and, Mary, that's where you come in?

D. LANA`I PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE AUGUST 2014 DRAFT LANA`I COMMUNITY PLAN

- 6. Ch. 1 Introduction**
- 7. Ch. 2 Vision + Principles, etc.**
- 8. Ch. 3 Environment**
- 9. Ch. 4 Hazard Mitigation**
- 10. Ch. 5 Historic, Cultural & Scenic**
- 11. Ch. 6 Economic Development**
- 12. Ch. 7 Infrastructure**
- 13. Ch. 8 Public Facilities & Services**
- 14. Appendices**

Ms. Mary Jorgensen: Okay, these two sheets, the yellow was in the packet that was mailed to you, and that is a listing of everything you discussed at the September 24th meeting, but there wasn't an approval of those items at that time or the chapters, and so this is just a record of your recommendations for Chapter 9 and Chapter 13, which we'll discuss later, so that's on the yellow sheet.

The orange sheet are just our way of identifying Planning Department recommendations that are remaining, and the one is -- was what was not completed last time, you also have in front of you, this was emailed, and this was mostly for us to just track where we're at, you know, what's been done on the different chapters so we make sure we cover everything.

1. Ch. 9 Land Use

So Chapter 9, you went over all the text, and Appendix 9.1 was restored as the one that had the ordinances, and then 9.2 and 9.3 were the county land use designations and their definitions, and we also reviewed Maps 9.1 through 9.9 last time.

So what we have remaining is the discussion to complete on -- on the -- well, it was in your original document as 9.4, I'm not sure what the current numbering is, but it's the one where it was an example from the 1998 plan, the text, so you need -- so that's a decision or discussion that you still need to have to complete Chapter 9.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so let's go to Chapter 9 then in our books.

Ms. Jorgensen: The appendix that's under discussion is only in the spiral bound, the original December, your first draft that you had. If anyone needs a copy, I have mine here, and Jen has one. Does someone need one?

Chair Ornellas: Yeah. I get too many binders at home. Okay. Okay, so we're on page -- that's the -- we're looking at December 2013 draft.

Ms. Jorgensen: Correct.

Chair Ornellas: Page A-27, Appendices. Okay, so is there anybody that want to take this page and just -- do we see anything on here that shouldn't be there or you feel that should be changed?

Ms. Jorgensen: We did add planning standards and principles within Chapter 9; that's what's on this orange sheet, so it's on page 9.3, so from the Planning Department, we felt we addressed what was required by 2.80B, which was the requirement to have planning standards within the plan, and so we don't see a need for this additional appendix and, you know, from our side.

Ms. Beverly Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Sure, go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: I think the discussion last time was that even if they're not called "land use standards," that they be retained somehow just for historical purposes, and that's where we were last time. And I just wanted to point out that item c. is actually -- has been adopted by ordinance. I looked through the ordinance book the other day, and it's number 2895, so it's actually an ordinance. I think there was some discussion that these things couldn't be enforced or something, but that's an ordinance.

Chair Ornellas: So, Members, you have any objections to what Bev just said? Okay. Nobody's -- so we'll accept that, what Bev said. Can you add that to the --

Ms. Jorgensen: Add -- so to retain it as a historical -- so then I would suggest that we eliminate the first paragraph, which is referencing what we need to do 'cause that was their

guidance for the CPAC, and then -- and then the second paragraph where it says, "The text below is from the 1998 Lana`i Community Plan . . .," that could be retained and to give context to why these are in here.

Chair Ornellas: Any objections, Members? Go ahead. Shelly, go ahead.

Ms. Shelly Barfield: So but wasn't it Corp. Counsel had mentioned that it's not a legal thing to have in here and just we're referencing it as a historical thing?

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, but they're not here today. We'll just -- are you objecting to that? Okay, so, Bev, can you do a motion please?

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, I make motion to retain the items on A-27 with maybe perhaps not item f. because that's already happened, right? I think we decided to delete that one completely, but a. through e., retain it for historical purposes perhaps in a footnote or something to that effect, but to keep it in our community plan.

Chair Ornellas: Can I have a second? Alright, Brad. Brad made the second. Anymore discussion? Hearing none.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Oshiro, then

VOTED: retain the items a. through e. on A-27, with item f. being deleted completely, retain it for historical purposes perhaps in a footnote or something to that effect, but keep it in the community plan.

***(Assenting: J. Ornellas; S. Nefalar; K. Gima; B. Oshiro; B. Zigmond)
(Dissenting: S. Barfield; S. Marlowe)
(Excused: J. Aoki)***

Chair Ornellas: Five. Passed. Go ahead.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, that completes what we have for Chapter 9. We've covered every part of it, and I believe Nancy McPherson asked to speak during this time, before you go on --

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: To approve it.

Chair Ornellas: Nancy, you want to come up, please?

Ms. McPherson: Aloha. Thank you, Chair. Nancy McPherson, DHHL, on behalf of the director of DHHL. I wasn't at your last meeting on the community plan update so I wasn't clear on whether you had adopted all the maps already, so it sounds like you may have adopted the maps, or I'm not sure about that. Anyway, we're mainly just reiterating past testimony because we figure this might be our last opportunity to do so, just for best practices in planning and to sort of put it on the record, so again, it's Map 9.5, and we do have comments on 9.5A, mixed use residential, just basically talking about working in a collaborative fashion with the major landowner of the island to plan for that area because we do have our residential homesteads in that area, and we are going to be building that out, so just to work, you know, collaboratively to look at impacts and, you know, mainly I guess we might be concerned about traffic but, you know, it's Lana`i so it shouldn't be hard to mitigate those concerns. We're also concerned about the bypass road because of its location south of Kaunalapau and that it may, you know, impact the ten acres of commercial that we're supposed to get transferred into our inventory in the future. Also, the gateway park designation because, again, that impacts our ten acres of commercial although DHHL does have the power to waive consistency with community plan and state land use, so it's just that we would like to do, you know, be consistent as much as possible with county planning and county standards so that's why we're making these comments. We don't want it necessarily create inconsistencies for future actions. But we understand that that's what the CPAC wanted for that area and we want to make sure whatever is proposed, whatever happens there is something that, you know, we work closely with Pulama Lana`i and the community so that everybody's ultimately pleased with the result. We do support the university because it's an opportunity for higher learning for our beneficiaries, but again, we'd just like to work collaboratively regarding any potential impacts to homestead lessees in that area. And also the buffer area at Paliamano Gulch, as long as when that area is implemented that our beneficiaries are made aware of what's going on because it's directly adjacent to the homestead area so that, hopefully, they can be included in -- and that it's sort of a community-based effort to make that are nicer. And then -- would you like me to wait till you cover Chapter 13, Implementation, for my final comment? I can do that.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah. You can do that.

Ms. McPherson: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: We'll have opportunity to speak.

Ms. McPherson: Okay. Thank you. Any questions, Commissioners?

Chair Ornellas: Members, any questions for Nancy? Thank you, Nancy.

Ms. McPherson: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: So for Chapters 1 through 8, you just did a general approval and then went on to the next chapter, is that what you'd like to do?

Chair Ornellas: I think we've beaten 1 through 8 like a dead dog. Any questions about Chapters 1 through 8?

Ms. Jorgensen: No, no, no. I'm saying would you like to do the same, you know, where you just approve it. You didn't do motions for any of those. You just recognized that you approved it and then that -- for chapters -- do the same thing for Chapter 9?

Chair Ornellas: We can. Just Chapter 9?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, just Chapter 9.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: And then we're done with Chapter 9.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so let's -- can I hear a motion to accept Chapter 9 as written with the exceptions, with changes? Can I hear a motion for that? Brad will make that motion. Anybody second? Stacie seconds. Anymore discussion on Chapter 9? Hearing none.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Oshiro, seconded by Commissioner Nefalar, then

VOTED: to accept Chapter 9 with changes.

(Assenting: J. Ornellas; S. Nefalar; K. Gima; B. Oshiro; B. Zigmond)

(Dissenting: S. Barfield; S. Marlowe)

(Excused: J. Aoki)

Chair Ornellas: It's accepted. Next, Mary?

2. Ch. 13 Implementation

Ms. Jennifer Maydan: Jen Maydan. So next we're moving on to Chapter 13, which is -- well, you've already reviewed the chapter, the text, of 13; we're moving on to the Implementation Table, which is one of your handouts from the last meeting.

So at the last meeting, we went through it and we got to 7.24, I believe was the last one we reviewed. We have two recommendations the Planning Department would like to make, just to start out with. We actually, in error for the timing column, the timing that's 2020 to 2030, should actually be 20 -- I'm sorry, 2022 to 2030, should actually be 2022 to 2035. So we'll make that change throughout on any that are identified as that time period.

And secondly, we would like to make a recommendation that the column -- well, throughout, actually throughout the Implementation Table as well as throughout the Action Tables in all of the chapters, we would recommend sorting it by Lead, and we would say either lead, the Lead County Agency, or when in the case that it is an other, like a private entity, Pulama, or if it's -- there's a case where it's HawaiianTel, when it's in the Telecommunications chapter, that it's clearly identified that it's not a county responsibility for implementation. So we would like to sort this table as well as the tables in the chapters to clearly identify these are county, these are other lead.

Chair Ornellas: Any objections, Members? Go ahead.

Ms. Maydan: Okay, so we went through 7.24, but we also noted that we would come back to 7.02. So I apologize on this table, it doesn't have page numbers, but it's on the fourth sheet on the backside action, under Infrastructure - Water, Action 7.02. You indicated that you wanted to come back and discuss that at this meeting.

Ms. Zigmond: John, it's the Implementation Table. Do you -- okay, so we're looking at 7.02 and, you know, I, personally, don't see a need to develop an MOA between Pulama and the community to create a Lana`i Water Use and Development Committee because we already have a Lana`i Water Use and Development Plan, which was actually established in the 1998 community plan, and that's my story and I'm sticking to it. I don't think that needs to be there.

Chair Ornellas: Anyone else? So we do have LWAC, so LWAC does actually monitors and implement it; that's part of their task for the Water Use and Development Plan for this island along with the Lana`i Water Company, and quorum, and County of Maui so -- so if there's no need for it, then let me have a motion for -- to have 7.02 removed. On -- I don't know if you've got this sheet, Ron. It says, 7.02 is: Development a Memorandum of Agreement between Pulamana Lanai and the community to create the Lana`i Water Use and Development Committee that would monitor and implement the Water Use and Development Plan. I'm saying that, and Bev's saying, that we already have LWAC. Don't need to create another community organization to --

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Say that to the mike so --

Mr. McOmber: As long as LWAC is still the functionary organization that looks at that water. We gotta have that between the company and the community.

Chair Ornellas: And as it stands, as of today, LWAC is still there so --

Mr. McOmber: It better be there. We can't do this without that. That water's very important on Lana`i.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So we're going to remove 7.02, at least the motion says that we're going to remove 7.02. Are you -- oh yeah, go ahead, Nancy.

Ms. McPherson: Hi, Chair. Thank you, Chair. Just that our comment from DHHL supports the LWAC, that that continue, so, you know, we wouldn't -- we don't really have a comment on this particular action but I thought this was a good point to reiterate the written comment that was submitted to you earlier.

Chair Ornellas: Thank you, Nancy. So we have a motion, and did we have a second? Okay, Kelli seconds. Anymore discussion?

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Gima, then

VOTED: to remove Action 7.02 from the Infrastructure - Water Table.

(Assenting: J. Ornellas; S. Nefalar; K. Gima; B. Oshiro; B. Zigmond)
(Dissenting: S. Barfield; S. Marlowe)
(Excused: J. Aoki)

Chair Ornellas: There's five, so it's removed. Okay, Jen, anymore?

Ms. Maydan: So on this Implementation Table, we can start at Action 7.25, Infrastructure - Energy. And when we had concluded last time with reviewing this table, we had asked you folks to review it and to really focus on the Priority and Timing columns, so if it works, we could go page by page, and if anybody has any comments on Priority and Timing, and just to remind you, you know, these actions are what are in the chapters, and for 1 through 9, you know, you've had your final review and approved them, so we just really want your feed back on Priority and Timing.

Chair Ornellas: Where do you want to start on this 'cause we've done some of this already?

Ms. Maydan: 7.25

Chair Ornellas: Alright, so Infrastructure - Energy, 7.25, create a smart grid. Okay. Okay. Any changes, Members, for that whole page, from 7.25 to 7.38. Any changes to the Priority or to the Timing? So let's, Jen, so 7.33, as far as Lead Agency, you're going to change that from -- you're going to remove "State Department of Transportation, and just put "other?"

Ms. Maydan: Actually, yes. In this column, it should just identify --

Chair Ornellas: It'd be Public Works, Planning.

Ms. Maydan: It should really just identify one county agency to be the lead.

Chair Ornellas: The Lead Agency. Alright.

Ms. Maydan: And in the chapters, we also have that column for Partners --

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Maydan: So we will clean that up; that in the Implementation Table, it will only identify the lead county agency, but in the chapters, it will have the lead as well as the partners, whether they are other county agencies or private or nonprofit, etc.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Alright. Anything else? Do you see any problems on this page? No? We'll accept 7.25 to 7.38. Not a problem? Alright. So then I guess we turn the page over for 7.39 to 8.11, and 8.11 -- 8.01 is Public Facilities & Services, so, you know -- you know, 8.01 and 8.02, I'm a little bit hesitant because Lead Agency is Parks & Recreation, Planning, and Planning Department for 8.02, and then the first 8.01 is master plan for island parks, recreational facilities, and programs. Survey residents to find out what their recreational needs are. And then 8.02 is prepare a Dole Park master plan that improves and preserves the park's recreation, urban design, and social functions. You know, the community should have, not only should the lead be the county, but also Pulama as well as the community. I mean it's very important that the community is involved with the -- especially the Dole Park master plan 'cause, you know, during the last 20-something years, I mean all kinds of stuff was planned for Dole Park and the community actually had to step up and fight some of those because, you know, our park is our signature, it's our personality, and when people drive by or visitors come and they see this park in the middle of town, I mean they just go ga-ga over it and they wish that this similar park is in their neighborhoods no matter where they're from. So putting anything into the park should be a community -- the community should have also a say in it, so I don't want somebody on Maui saying, oh yeah, that sounds like a good idea, let's do this. And then, all of sudden, we start to see it on pieces of paper that the county wants to do a platform or something

for performing arts, or something like that, so -- or the expansion of the bowling alley to include it as a new bowling alley, so, you know, things like that just the community should have a say in what goes into our park or how our park is developed.

Ms. Maydan: Can we recommend to, in the chapter, in Chapter 8, under Partners, currently as it is, it has Planning Department as lead and Pulama Lana`i as partner, add "community," or "community groups," or whatever language you want?

Ms. Barfield: Well, isn't Dole Park -- Dole Park is private. Only that little sliver is county. So Dole Park should be only Pulama.

Chair Ornellas: No.

Ms. Barfield: Yeah.

Chair Ornellas: It's community.

Ms. Barfield: I can understand that, but the community going fund it?

Chair Ornellas: No. No. But the community has to have a say --

Ms. Barfield: Right.

Chair Ornellas: As what happens into that -- that goes into the park.

Ms. Barfield: You can -- you can still put that but Pulama should be the lead.

Chair Ornellas: Then they are. Didn't she just say that?

Ms. Barfield: No. It says county. Read.

Chair Ornellas: No, but didn't she just say that?

Ms. Maydan: In the Lead --

Ms. Barfield: It's county. It says Planning.

Ms. Maydan: For 1, it says Planning Department and Parks; 2 is Planning Department with Pulama as a partner.

Ms. Barfield: 8.01 is county so that's their facility.

Ms. Maydan: The community should definitely be an active contributor to any plan that's done for the park, absolutely. So putting the community in as partners in Chapter 8 in the table would be a good recommendation.

Chair Ornellas: You okay with that?

Ms. Barfield: We're looking at the leads. It'll be notated somewhere else where it says, "Partners."

Chair Ornellas: So you want Pulama instead of Parks and Rec and Planning?

Ms. Barfield: Because they own the land. Do you -- I mean they're the ones that own it. Why you going to put county here when they're not the one?

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Okay, so any objections to putting -- removing Planning and County of Maui from 8.01 and 8.02, and put Pulama?

Ms. Maydan: 8.01 should probably still be the county.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, 'cause they do have some --

Ms. Maydan: 8.02 being Dole Park, the recommendation would be to change Pulama and as well as add "community" as a partner.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah. Any objections? Shelly? Thank you. Okay, so anything else on that page that --

Ms. Zigmond: I just have a question, please. 8.08, it's a Priority 2, but the timeline is typically what's been put for timeline 1 for Priority 1. Is that a mistake?

Ms. Maydan: No, actually, not everything that's Priority 1 was the first timeline. I mean if you see a need for a change, please let us know, but no, it wasn't -- that 1 was always the first timeline.

Ms. Kelli Gima: For Action no. 8.06, "Provide Lana`i orientation training classes and support for police staff," I would recommend that that should be an ongoing. It shouldn't start and end. 8.06. It's a Priority 2, but, you know, I was just thinking that it should be an ongoing orientation training classes and support.

Chair Ornellas: And should the police be the lead on that? I agree with ongoing, but I don't think the police will be responsible to provide training. Pulama has done a great job in

training their employees as well as contractors that have come to the island and they made that a -- they're more apt to handle that than the Maui Police Department.

Ms. Maydan: I think it does make sense to keep police as the lead, but they would -- they could partner with Pulama. They would probably be funding ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, but I can't remember the last time the Maui Police Department held a community orientation meeting. They only show up when the chiefs on the island. I think they're the wrong person for that so --

Ms. Jorgensen: They may contract someone or work with somebody else to provide that training, but as a county agency, it would be their responsibility because it's in this community plan to make sure that their new police staff are trained, and that's what this is saying. And so by putting it as the Lead Agency, then it calls out to that agency that this is something they need to do. Who does it is up -- you know, can be determined later.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. That can make sense. So on the other -- Jen, so on the other partners, it would be police, Pulama Lana`i. I mean unless Pulama doesn't want to be part of that. Okay. Yeah, community groups can be added.

Ms. Lynn McCrory: Lynn McCrory, Pulama Lana`i. The partners are listed as Pulama Lana`i and CDFL in the chapter.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So then I guess we add Maui Police Department. They're the lead. So, okay, CDFL and Pulama Lana`i. That should cover it. Any objections, Members, to the change? Okay. You got that, Jen? No change. Alright, good. Oh, yeah, ongoing, yeah. Okay, anybody else for that page ending in 8.11? Hearing none, let's move on to the next page. Okay, so 8.12 to 8.26. That's my next page. You guys can share, yeah? You guys can share? Oh okay. Okay.

Ms. Gima: There's a couple on that page that I would like to see go from a Priority 2 to a Priority 1, with the first one being 8.21, "Develop a master or strategic plan for health care services on Lana`i," 8.23, "Prepare a master plan for the Lana`i Community Hospital and related medical facilities," and 8.25, "Develop a plan for provision of services for seniors to age in place." Like I understand like with plans, the time frame, you probably need a little bit longer, but I want it to reflect that that is a priority for our community to have those very specific issues to be addressed and to be planned out.

Ms. Maydan: So that was 8.21, 8.23, 8.25, changing to Priority 1?

Ms. Gima: Yeah.

Ms. Maydan: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: On 8.25, you're changing the Priority to number 1, can you change the date to 2016, please? Any comments, Members, for the changes? Okay. We'll go along with that. Any more comments on -- for that page, 8.12 to 8.26? Okay, so we'll go on to the next page, 8.27 to 9.08, and then 9 is Land Use.

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: Action numbers 8.27, 29, and 30, I also would like those to reflect a Priority 1, and 8.30, I would like to add "sex assault" to domestic violence, sex assault and families in crises.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, give me that again?

Ms. Zigmond: Okay. 8.27, Priority 1; 8.29, Priority 1; 8.30, Priority 1, but to add the words "sex assault" after "domestic violence."

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Members, are you agreeable to that? Alright, go ahead. We'll add that. So anything else on this page?

Ms. Maydan: I'd just like to point out what's highlighted in yellow is the same changes that are in Chapter 9 that you've reviewed and approved. And just to be clear, the red italics, Excel doesn't let you do the strikeout so it's red italics indicates deletion.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, any comments for this page besides getting the county a newer computer?

Ms. Barfield: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Well, get Shelly a new computer. Alright, so let's move on to the next page, and that is .09 through 10.08.

Ms. Maydan: So actually, I want to make a clarification. On the last page, when you were looking at 9.05 that was highlighted in yellow, that is a the change that you've reviewed and approved 'cause we've gone through Chapter 9, but when we turn the page and we start going over Urban Design, Chapter 10, where there's highlighted changes in yellow, those are Planning Department recommendations, and we still need to do your final review of Chapter 10. We'd like to make a recommendation, if you'd like, maybe hold off on this until

you've reviewed and approved 10, 11, and 12, just so that you can review our recommendations in more of a assisting faction in the whole chapter rather than --

Chair Ornellas: Any objections, Members? Alright, we'll do that. So it's back to Mary? It's still Jen. Okay. And, Dave, you came here for what?

Mr. David Yamashita: ...(inaudible)...

3. Ch. 10 Urban Design

Ms. Maydan: Okay, so Chapter 10 was in your previous packet, was in your September packet, and the reason we provided you with a further revised copy, beyond what's in your binder, is because we went through it and did a bit of -- there was a bit of duplication, especially in the Issues and Strategies as well as Policies and Actions, and we tried to just make it a little more clear. So I think just as we come to those yellow highlights, those are Planning Department recommendations, and I can address those, but we'll just start with page 1.

Ms. Zigmond: Jen, excuse me, on the Chapter 10, if that's what we're doing, is it where it says, "August 2014" on it at the bottom?

Ms. Maydan: Correct.

Ms. Zigmond: Thank you.

Chair Ornellas: Do we need to take a break, Members? Should we? Okay, we'll come back at 10:10.

(A recess was called at 9:59 a.m., and the meeting reconvened at 10:12 a.m.)

Chair Ornellas: Alright, let's call this meeting to order. So, Mary, you have a copy of that? Okay, so this is proof that LWAC is legit?

Mr. Jorgensen: I am not an attorney and so I -- we did request to know what the status was because it was brought up several times as we've gone through this, and they did not have time where they're out of the country and out of the state right now, so when they come back, we'll see if we can resolve just, you know, get something official. But you have that, that comes from Corporation Counsel, and what we were asking is: Did the council make some action on it?

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: So we'll just leave it. It doesn't affect -- it can just stay as it is right now. We'll try to find -- we'll try to find out more just because -- you know, for the general question and try to bring that back through Corporation Counsel to your regular Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. What we're talking about is -- it's a November 5th memo from the county, Jeffrey Kuwada, with Ed Kushi's signature on it, explaining what -- back in 2012, we wanted a decision as far as LWAC, and so this was their decision, and so if somebody wants to read it, I can let them read it. Okay, so that's what Mary and I were talking about. Alright, so let's continue.

Ms. Maydan: So we're on Chapter 10, Urban Design, and we can just go page by page and see if you have any -- anything else and if we can approve the chapter.

Chair Ornellas: We're on 10-1, Urban Design. So again, then the blue is what Planning added?

Ms. Maydan: Blue is your changes that you've approved, your changes from your past review; yellow highlight is Planning Department recommendation.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, so 10-1. Any comments? Everybody okay with 10-1? Okay, so let's move on to 10-2. Alright, so blue is your -- is your addition, Planning Department?

Ms. Maydan: Blue is Planning Commission addition.

Chair Ornellas: Oh, Planning Commission.

Ms. Maydan: Correct.

Chair Ornellas: Oh, okay.

Ms. Maydan: So on 10-2 and 10-3 are the Urban and Rural Design Principles, which you reviewed and accepted, and so that's why it's in blue, you reviewed and accepted it in July. The yellow was revised by the Planning Department. I believe Kurt brought up a concern with how it was worded previously, that it was a little bit too strong for preservation of historic structures, so Dave actually reworded it to make it so that it words that historic -- preservation of historic structures is encouraged, but without making it be really -- to inhibit, you know, changing buildings and such, so Dave --

Ms. Barfield: He actually worked.

Ms. Maydan: Oh, he works hard.

Chair Ornellas: I didn't say that ...(inaudible)... for Shelly.

Ms. Maydan: So no. 3 is just a revision of what no. 3 previously was.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, Members, any comments about 10-2?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: This is so incredibly manini but my proofreading eyes say on line 8, I think you have to take out the first "t" that looks like it's black, yeah.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. That's not a problem. Anything else for 10-2? 10-3.

Ms. Maydan: So 10-3, we just added in to clarify on 8 and 9 that it's within commercial areas.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So Issues and Strategies, everybody okay with that? Okay. So let's go to page 10-4.

Ms. Maydan: On 10-4 and 10-5, there are notes, like on the yellow highlighted on 10-4, Strategy 2C, that's highlighted in yellow, at the bottom, in parenthesis it says, "Moved from Strategy 5," and when you flip the page, you can see in Strategy 5 where it was there, we just read through it and tried to make it a little clearer, there was a bit of duplication in the Issues and Strategies and we just really tried to make it clear, and where there was duplication, take it out.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. Everybody okay with 10-4? Alright, 10-5. Nobody for 10-5? So we'll move on 10-6.

Ms. Maydan: Again, on 10-6 and 10-7, under the Goal and the Policies, again it was just an effort to clarify any duplication. We edited the Goal of it to just -- to make a little more clearer.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so we okay with 10-6? 10-7? Alright.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Hang on, Ron. We'll get you a mike. We'll get you a mike. What's that? Where we at, Ron? Alright, let's go. Yes, sir, Ron? You're on the right page now. Thank you, Jen.

Mr. McOmbler: So we're on -- what are we on, the Action on 10-7?

Chair Ornellas: 10-7, yes.

Mr. McOmbler: That's not the thing I was looking at. I'll comment when I get to that.

Chair Ornellas: Thank you.

Mr. McOmbler: Members, anything on 10-7? Alright, hearing none, let's move to 10-8, Actions. Alright, any comments on -- any comments on 10-8? Alright, moving on. We'll go to 10-9. Any comments on 10-9? Hearing none, that's -- that's it for this Chapter 10. Yes? Yes? Yes, Nancy, go ahead.

Ms. McPherson: Hi. Aloha. Nancy McPherson, DHHL. I was just wondering about, it looked like Action 10.09 was deleted and that it's covered in 10.04 and 10.06, but does that refer to subdivision standards? Is there anything in here that will require the county to amend its subdivision standards to reflect Lana`i City's existing grid system and lack of sidewalks and all of that because that's one reason that the DHHL subdivision went the way it did was because we were meeting county standards for subdivisions, and I'm not sure that the subdivision standards is covered in 10.04 and 10.06, but please correct me if I'm wrong. I'm seeing design guidelines for structures -- oh, I'm sorry. Okay, the numbering is getting me off. Okay. What used to be 10.07 is now -- okay. Okay, disregard my comment. Thank you.

Mr. McOmbler: I'm glad to see somebody as confused as I am.

Chair Ornellas: Nancy, you want to go sit next to Ron? Okay, so that's it for Chapter 10? Do we want to adopt it, or just move on?

Ms. Maydan: You could, as we did with the other chapters, you could say that you approve Chapter 10, and we will go back to the Implementation Table probably after we do 11 and 12 as well.

Chair Ornellas: So do we want to just continue and then come back and approve everything? Shelly's nodding. So let's continue then.

4. Ch. 11 Housing

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, Chapter 11 is in your binder. There's been nothing changed since the August 2014 binder was sent out. Yes. And in there, any -- any additions or strikeout is what you reviewed at the July meeting and so it reflects your recommendations.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, so when you guys take this road to Molokai, you kinda know that maybe you guys should take back all the paperwork with you, change it, then send it back to us; that would eliminate this stuff - going between binders and changes and that kind of stuff. Anyways, it's a good practice run, yeah? Okay, so we're on Housing, Chapter 11, in our binder?

Ms. Jorgensen: Correct.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. So let's -- 11-1. Page 11-1. Any comments, Members? It's just an introduction. It doesn't -- alright, so nothing on that, let's go to 11-2. Alright, any problems with 2? How about 11-3? And I think 17 through 22, well, 11 through 16 covers Hawaiian homes and what has happened so far. And then 17 through 22 is we just did that on the regular -- remember we did the short-term, long-term, bed and breakfast? So that kinda takes care of that, which we just looked at. So page 11-4, Issues and Strategies.

Ms. Jorgensen: So there's some new language in Strategy 3 from the Planning Department.

Chair Ornellas: That the yellow is Planning Department change?

Ms. Jorgensen: The yellow is, since your July meeting, when we were preparing this binder, we put in some additional that's marked in yellow.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. Looks good to me.

Ms. Zigmond: One small little thing.

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: On line 29, could you replace "kids" with "children?"

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, then anymore? Nope on 11-4? Let's move to 11-5, and this is Goal, Policies, and Actions. Any problems with 11-5? How about 11-6? Yeah, 11.09 is that it would be short-term, long-term, vacation rentals, and we did that. So -- but, you know, that's something that's going to be looked at -- should be looked at within the next 10 years so - again. By that time, Ron should have about 50 units.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)... they're all rented out to construction workers.

Chair Ornellas: There you go. Okay, any questions for 11-6? Then 11-7. Okay, while we're on the subject of housing, I just want to let everybody know that LSG is putting together a housing summit with all the players, Pulama, county, and we're looking at kick-starting using paddles to get that county affordable housing units down at off of Fifth Street, so we're going to see if we can get that thing started and start putting names and action items for people to get it done 'cause we all know that we are hurting for houses, so it's about time the county steps up to the plate and starts doing what they said they were going to do so --

Mr. McOmbler: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Many years ago. That's exactly right. Alright, so we're okay with -- yes, go ahead. That's okay, Nancy. I want to make sure you get your money's worth coming over here.

Ms. McPherson: Nancy McPherson, DHHL. I just wanted to mention to you that we do get federal funding from HUD for affordable housing on DHHL land for folks 80% or below area median income who are on the waiting list, so we're targeting our applicants with these funds, and we are looking at different options including the possibility of prefabricated homes, so we're going to keep Pulama Lana`i and the county apprised of where we're at with all that, but I thought I just wanted to make a point that we're also going to be pushing getting those last 16 lots built on in the next couple of years.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Great. Thank you. Okay, so what's next - 12?

5. Ch. 12 Governance

Ms. Maydan: Chapter 12 is Governance, and it is in your -- from your packet, from your September packet. And actually, the footer and the watermark on it are incorrect. I apologize for that. It still notes CPAC/Planning Department Draft, and it really should say, "LPC Review Draft."

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so that's this one, right? Okay, so page 12-1, any problems with the Introduction? How about Issues and Strategies? And this is for Governance. Now, this is a very short one.

Ms. Maydan: When you move onto page 12-2, I want to point out, at the bottom, Policy 6, line 41. Previously, there was a question of whether that policy applied to the County Council, and no, it does not apply to the County Council, but according to 2.80B, it is a requirement that the County Council does have a public hearing on Lana`i regarding the community plan update.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, I confirmed that with Councilman Hokama so -- so that's another -- that's another time they're going to have hearings after. From here, it goes to Maui County Council, and then they will have their hearings and they will come back to Lana`i one time to listen, and then they'll go back, and then they're supposed to make a decision to accept or change it or so. So it's important that members, CPAC members, Planning Commission members, you know, we spent a lot of time and effort so we gotta show up at these meetings, especially the public hearing, and give them what for as far as them doing any changes to this without -- without consulting the CPAC or the Planning Commission. Alright, so any problems with 12-1? Nope. Alright, so then 12-2. So noted on the boards and commissions. Alright, so let's move to 12-3.

Ms. Maydan: On 12-3, at the bottom of the action table, 12.08 and 12.09, I apologize, those are actually supposed to be blue. Those were Commission additions, both of those policies.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so the 12.08, "Provide the Lana`i Planning Commission with annual status reports as described in 2.80B . . ." that is the status of the community plan.

Ms. Maydan: Status on implementation.

Mr. Yamashita: And we have an Implementation Division now that's been setup to focus solely on implementation of MIP and other plans, so it should be something that can be provided pretty easily. So it's not just Planning Department, but, you know, the specific division.

Chair Ornellas: Does that division will handle all implementation for all nine plans?

Mr. Yamashita: That's our understanding is they were setup to deal with making sure the things that are in these plans actually happens.

Chair Ornellas: Can the Planning Commission request a specific date by when this update should be -- should be presented that way they have -- they can't wait for the last minute and then something else happens and we don't get it.

Mr. Yamashita: I think it may be required. I think the timeline is in the 2.80B. Yeah, okay, it has to do with the budget cycle and -- so but I think, John, getting an annual report would be -- that'd be a real achievement. I mean --

Chair Ornellas: Oh, I understand, but I'd rather see it specifically like at the end of October or the end of November; that way, it can go on somebody's calendar as we owe the Lana`i Planning Commission --

Mr. Yamashita: Yeah, and I don't want to speak, I don't think anybody can speak for the Implementation Division, which is being headed up by John Summers now, so I think all we can do is to maybe pass on the recommendation, but I don't think we want to promise anything.

Chair Ornellas: Well, I don't want you to promise. I just -- can we add it to 12.08? I mean, you know, and then you guys -- if Implementation doesn't like it, then they can go to the county council and fight to have it removed, the date. But I want something in writing saying that, you know, well, the county doesn't usually fulfill some of their obligations, so I don't want this to be one of them because it's very important to this community that this plan gets implemented, and that's been the bugaboo for the last 20 years, the '83, '93, '98.

Ms. Maydan: In 2.80B, under Status Reports, it states that each agency shall prepare a status report on its implementation and enforcement of the general plan, which general plan is the umbrella and that includes community plans, which shall be transmitted to the Planning Director at the same time the agency submits the third quarter budget implementation report pursuant to section 3.04050 of this code. The Planning Director shall also contact persons outside the county government for status reports on appropriately assigned implementation actions. The Planning Director shall issue a report annually providing a detailed explanation of the implementation enforcement of the general plan and the community plans to the mayor and the council. So the timeline really is spelled out in 2.80B, third quarter budget implementation reports.

Chair Ornellas: So it would be January of every year? Alright. Why couldn't they just say, "January?" I'm going to put it in my calendar here then. By end of the January, we should have a report. I mean, obviously, not this one, but January of 2016. Alright, Commissioners, any additions or discussion on 12-3? Okay, so we're on to 13, Implementation and Monitoring.

Ms. Maydan: We left off on the Urban Design section of the Implementation Table, Action 10.01. So again, the highlighted changes in yellow are what you just reviewed in Chapters 10, 11.

Chair Ornellas: So we're starting from 10-1? Alright, so any -- any concerns, Commissioners, on 10-1, page 10-1? I think we already went through this.

Ms. Maydan: Not page.

Chair Ornellas: Oh.

Ms. Maydan: In your Implementation Table. So in your Implementation Table, and again, I apologize, it does not have page numbers but we're three-quarters of the way through it,

Action item 10.01, under Urban Design, and we can go page-by-page and get your feedback on Priority and Timing.

Chair Ornellas: So any comments about 10.01 through 10.08? Alright, so let's move on to the next page, 10.09 through 11.06. On 11.03, can we change that to a Priority 1, please? And that's changing the Workforce Housing Ordinance to consider revisions to address Lana`i's particular situation. Okay, so hearing nothing, so 11.07 to 11.11. 11.08, Change the Priority to no. 1, change the dates to now, 2016 to 2021. And also 11.07, change the Priority and change the date. Okay, we're done with 11.11. Oh, next page, 11. -- no, hang on. So the next page is 11.12 to -- I guess we'll go to 11.15, and then we'll go back to chapter -- Governance. We did it? Okay, so then we'll go through to 12.09. David, so will 12.09 create a Lana`i Community Plan implementation planner position? Will that be part of that team for implementation department?

Mr. Yamashita: Right now, they're funded with just one planner, so this planner works with John Summers to look at implementation for all of the community plans, so we don't have anyone that's -- I mean I guess it could, but right now, I mean it's just -- well, and this division was just established as of October 1, so it's just opened its doors a few days ago, so it's very new. This also, John, I mean to do this, to create a position, I mean it takes, as anybody here knows that's dealt with the county, I mean it takes -- it takes a while so, you know, this is, in some ways, this is what we call sometimes an "aspirational goal," but it could take a while. I just want to be straight that it's, you know, it's not something that the county typically does and so it's -- it is something that may take a while.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, but that was a CPAC recommendation and it's also our recommendation too so --

Mr. Yamashita: Yeah. No, I understand. I just want you to understand the context and the background of how this may happen or --

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So I guess would it -- if we asked, during our regular meetings with Clayton and those guys, we can ask for a status? Would they be able to get a status as far as the implementation planner I mean later on down the road? I mean would he be able to -- would they be able to tell us?

Mr. Yamashita: Well, I mean he could.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Mr. Yamashita: I think -- I think anybody would know.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Mr. Yamashita: It's one of these things that, John, I think if -- if this was initiated, that you would -- you would know about it. I mean I don't think it's something where you would have to continually ask people.

Ms. Jorgensen: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Yamashita: Yeah, or I think the other way I think, as Mary said, is just check-in with the Planning Director as well. But this is something that would come up every budget cycle. I mean it's the kind of -- that's when this request would be initiated.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. Thank you. So I guess we're done with 13?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, we've completed the review, the final review of those chapters, for 9, 13, 10, 11, and 12. If you'd like to approve those, then all individual chapters, I mean subject to the changes of today, then all individual chapters will have been approved. And then we have some corrections on the chapters that you've already approved, Chapters 1 through 8, that we can then do. So just to complete this part so that that would -- if you approve Chapters 9, 13, 10, 11, and 12, subject to the changes, then you will have approved each chapter individually.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, Members, any comments about that? So can I have a motion to approve what Mary said, to approve chapters - what again? What's the numbers again? Okay, so 9 through 13. So can I have a motion to accept or approve, please? Alright, Stacie makes the motion to accept 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. Can I have a second? Kelli seconds. So let's discuss, open the floor up for discussion. Members, you want to discuss 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. Thank you. Nobody wants to discuss it? Alright.

Ms. Gima: I just kinda -- to want to touch upon what Uncle Ron had brought up earlier today in terms of the desal and when putting I guess the plan together, there was that assumption that that was going to go through and, obviously, that's not the case, so what is the status with that so -- I mean I think that needs to be taken into consideration when looking at reviewing -- I mean accepting the plan all together.

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead, Kurt.

Mr. Kurt Matsumoto: Kurt Matsumoto, Pulama Lana`i. So the status of the desal plan is just we stopped investing at this point, but we have to explore our options. So we haven't canceled the plans. Based on the LPC's ruling, we have to think about what we would want to do at this point, and how we would go about doing it. So we don't have an answer, specifically, for that right now. As to the question about how that impacts the plan, it's a fair question, but I think I would have to ask the LPC or even the CPAC members who are here, what are the components that you would adjust if you didn't have the desal plant?

What would be different? So Ron referenced the 1999 plan. The 1999 -- sorry, 1994 plan. The 1994 plan references a population of 12,000 people. This plan references 6,000. And just to be clear about the 6,000 number, it's not a number that we have put forward and will aggressively pursue. This plan process calls for a number to be stated, okay, and it wasn't really our responsibility to come up with a number, but during the CPAC process I was asked, so we came up with what we thought would be a number that could be seen as a target for the future, or, look at it differently, as a cap. So we have no plans to reach that number in the next ten years. None at all. And it would have to happen organically in order for that number to be reached.

Ms. Zigmond: Kurt, I have a question, please. So is what was being said earlier that the company was not going to pursue the desal process and you're capping the wells and removing equipment, and not we're hearing that you're stopping investing and exploring options, so, number one, I'm -- to me, there's a disconnect between those two things, and number two, if you're not stopping it, then the clock on your permit is ticking away now, right?

Mr. Matsumoto: So I don't know where you get the information that says that we had abandoned the project. Is that what you're saying?

Ms. Zigmond: I heard you're not pursuing it anymore.

Mr. Matsumoto: And where did you hear that from?

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

Mr. Matsumoto: Where -- where -- I never said it. To my knowledge, none of my representatives have said that, so we've never said we were going to abandon it.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, then there is no disconnect then.

Mr. Matsumoto: I think there's no disconnect. I think there is no disconnect.

Ms. Zigmond: So then your -- the clock is ticking on your permit, and I'm asking Planning Department too, where is the decision and order because its supposed to have been done in 30 days, that's my understanding, and it's longer than that?

Chair Ornellas: I don't think these guys are the ones that prepare the decision, but it's the other group.

Ms. Zigmond: I know. I just wanted to get it out there.

Chair Ornellas: Good.

Mr. Bradford Oshiro: Okay, the thing about this plan is it's just a community plan for the future. Pulama, whoever, Hawaiian Homes, whoever wants to build anything, somebody wants to put a swimming pool down at Manele, guess what? They still gotta come through this Commission to get approval. So this here is just a future plan, it's just a plan, it's not something that's going to happen, okay. So whatever, whoever in the community wants to build something, they still gotta come in front of this Commission to get it approved. So today's, what we did for the last six, seven months, is all just future plan, so, you know, to say that we're not going to approve what we already did in the last so many months, doesn't make sense, and too, like I said, whoever wants, in the community, wants to build or put up something, they going have to come in front here. So, you know, that's all I got to say.

Ms. Zigmond: And, Brad, just a point to add on to that, but if it's not in the community and somebody wants to do something, they have to come back for a community plan amendment so --

Mr. Jorgensen: I'd just like to clarify that the -- that we still have open a few things, it's not approval of the whole plan, I thought you would be doing that later; we have one map in Chapter 7 as well.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Then let's proceed then.

Mr. McOmber: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Oh, yes sir, Ron?

Mr. McOmber: Where Kurt's asking where this came from, it's all over this community. I can't imagine that anybody would viciously start a bogus thing like that when we see them pull all their equipment off of it. We're done. We didn't get our 30 years, and we're pulling out. Now, if that's not shutting it down, I have no idea what it is. There's so many things going on on this island right now that Pulama started and hasn't finished. They give us indication that we're wondering if they really understand what they're doing, Kurt. This is the thing that bothers me. I watched pipeline being run by thousands of feet that you can't use, I see a sewage treatment plant that is broken, you can't process water, and yet you're throwing our drinking water on top of a sod farm, our drinking water, which was supposed to have R-1 or from Well 9, and that's not working, so I don't know, Kurt. You better find out what's going on in your business because it's hurting you because this community is really small and we see what's going on. And as far as what I said, everybody has heard this, the desal is done, and if we had addressed that at that CPAC meeting, there would have been a lot more questions about it, what your intentions were, and maybe we would

have know how many years you needed at that time, but we didn't hear a drop of that at the CPAC meeting, Kurt, and I think that's unfair to the CPAC members. Thank you.

Chair Ornellas: Thank you, Ron. Okay, Mary, we're going to proceed? Okay, let's proceed. What else do we want -- what else do we need now? Review the map?

Ms. Jorgensen: You currently have a motion open.

Chair Ornellas: For?

Ms. Jorgensen: Chapters 9 through 13.

Chair Ornellas: Nine -- oh, okay. Boy did we stray. Yeah, alright, so the motion was to approve 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Nefalar, seconded by Commissioner Gima, then

VOTED: to approve Chapters 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

*(Assenting: J. Ornellas; S. Nefalar; K. Gima; B. Oshiro; B. Zigmond)
(Dissenting: S. Barfield; S. Marlowe)
(Excused: J. Aoki)*

Chair Ornellas: It passes. We've got five approved; negative would be Shelly and Stu. Okay, so we just approved that, and so next.

Ms. Jorgensen: Was it unanimous? I'm sorry.

Chair Ornellas: No. It was five. It was Bev, Brad, Shelly, Stacie, me, Kelli and -- the negatives were Shelly and Stu.

Mr. Jorgensen: Okay. Thank you. Okay, so that was the, yeah, that was the first review, so I'm -- there are a couple things that we had on the -- well, I think really just one that's in Chapter 7, so even though you've already approved it, we have this incomplete on the map that we discussed at the September 24th meeting, there was one where we illustrated -- there was a map that we just used as an example that showed what would happen if you had some name changes and the process of how that needs to go through the State Office of Planning for name changes, and in your pink addition sheet, we show the new language within Chapter 7, Transportation. So then as a follow up to that, that was for the transportation map. Originally, there was just -- there were two maps, 7.2 and 3, I'm not

sure on the numbering whether this new one is 7.2? 7.3, okay. And they -- one covered existing, one covered proposed, and they were nearly identical, so what we're saying is just have one map, so if you look at your two maps in the spiral bound copy, you'll see they almost look identical, so that's all this is is combine them and re-title as "Transportation: Existing and Proposed." And there were some questions on -- I remember we -- on whether the road was private or state or county, but this is just the way this map is is what we have in our database and it's going to be a longer process to resolve it and that's what we put in that transportation additions that are on your pink sheet.

So nothing? Okay, so the one other thing is on chapters -- on those, when you were reviewing the Implementation Table, any changes you made within the Action, such as the action to remove 7.02, we will make those changes as well within the chapter so that whatever -- so that they're consistent between the chapters and the Implementation Table. There should be no difference.

Mr. McOmbler: Excuse me a second? Can I make a thing on this map? There is a connecting road between Awalua and Lapaiki. It isn't just a trail. You got it as a trail marker. There is a road that actually goes between those two points at the beach. Awalua and Lapaiki. There is a road, it's a dirt road, but it's passable.

Chair Ornellas: You see that, Mike?

Mr. McOmbler: Between Awalua and Lapaiki.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, gotta -- Mike, do you see what he's talking about?

Mr. McOmbler: Well, it's the last two roads that you see on your map there going north by Awalua. There's Awalua, and there's the road going down to Awalua, it's a trail, it's a hunting trail, it's not paved, none of them are paved over there, and then there's a road backtrack by the lighthouse that goes back to Lapaiki. There is an actual road that goes across there, right between here.

Chair Ornellas: Mike, could --

Mr. McOmbler: There's that coast guard lighthouse ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Yeah. Yeah, Mike has got control over the --

Mr. Michael Napier: Thank you. Yes, we do have four-wheel drive roads and it's not on this map. We could add it in there if you prefer. We do have all of the four-wheel drive roads; it's just not included in this map. In fact, I might be able to pull it up right here. Let's see -- I'll have to add it in. Let's see. I'll show you.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, do we need to, while Mike is adding that, I mean there's no objections of putting it in, right, Members?

Mr. Napier: You can see it up on the screen.

Chair Ornellas: Oh, so it is there? Okay.

Mr. Napier: I mean I just added it in.

Chair Ornellas: So what Ron is looking at is 7.3 and it's not that map there?

Mr. Napier: Right.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Mr. Napier: Well, this is -- okay, this is in the GIS, so I've added -- I've rectified map 7.3 just so you're familiar with it, and I've added the four-wheel drive roads layer on top of that map. I'll turn it off right now so you can see.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Alright. I know you can't see that. Neither can I. Okay so --

Mr. Napier: It's not a big deal if you want to add it in. We can do that.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, yeah, just go ahead and add it in.

Mr. Napier: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: Yes, sir?

Mr. Oshiro: You know with Kahalepalaoa, anyway, they got a private road or public road that goes up towards the mountain and come back near between the landing and Lopa - there's no such road.

Chair Ornellas: Awehe?

Mr. Oshiro: There's just the beach road, the one that -- the dark road that goes along that way is the only road that you got, but there's another one that comes up there like right there, on the top right of the map. There's no road there. It cruises right around the island over there, along the beach, but there's no private road that goes from point A to point B.

Unless somebody just built it just recently, like this week, because I just came from Naha Monday morning and there's no private road there.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. That was proposed. Alright. Do we want to take a ten-minute break and then -- what?

Ms. Jorgensen: Could we just clarify real quickly, when Mike showed the entire four-wheel drive layer of roads, you want to add all of those in there, not just the one that Ron was --

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so that would be -- can it have its own map, 7.3.A or 3.B?

Mr. Napier: I mean it wouldn't look like this. I can --

Ms. Barfield: You really wanna add that map so everybody can go down there? I mean you want it publicly known that -- so everybody's going to go down there and just trash the whole place. I mean you want it to be secluded. You want it to not everybody know. You want the Lana`i people to just keep it to us. Right? So you don't want it on the map. I don't think you want that. You just want what the major roads are and what's out there in the government maps.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Stacie Nefalar: Something to think about would be you may want -- you may want it somewhere to not have people make their own roads. You know, people from off-island, they're going to go walk -- they're going to go driving around there, yeah hunters off-island, hunters, we want to keep them on the roads that are already there and not make their own. I mean it's something to think about.

Chair Ornellas: Alright. So what do we want to do? Do we want to add the four-wheel drive map?

Ms. Barfield: No.

Chair Ornellas: I know what your vote is but -- okay, so can we make a motion to add the four-wheel drive map to the community plan? Do I have a second? I mean do I have a motion -- somebody to make a motion to add that map? Alright, so then that doesn't go on. Sorry, Mike.

Mr. Napier: That's fine.

Chair Ornellas: So, Mary?

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, so I think we only -- that Mike had a couple more map things, we are expecting lunch about 11:30, so do you want to take a break, and then have lunch, and come back, or you want to finish?

Chair Ornellas: No, we'll wait till the food gets here then we'll take a break.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: Lunch break.

Mr. Napier: Okay, I have two areas that I noticed that CPAC had approved on Map 9.9, Kaumalapau, there's a parcel right here, you can see up on the map, it's in the light-industrial area, on the point of the harbor, and it is in -- it's community plan conservation, the state land use underneath it is urban, so I'm not sure why that parcel was deemed conservation in the CPAC and it's inconsistent with our state land use convention now that we've taken all the conservation areas in the state land use and conformed with those. I do have the imagery. Let me turn on the imagery. Ron said it was a coast guard lighthouse but it shouldn't be in conservation if it is. Yes. That's correct. It's light-industrial, the community plan is, but this right here is conservation. Right there. That parcel. That small parcel. Okay, let me turn on the state land use and community plan. This one right here. Okay, I have the imagery loaded up here. So the area we're talking about is right -- right here, and that's the parcel, so it's --

Chair Ornellas: So there's a sliver that goes down to the bay, right?

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: Is that the --

Mr. Napier: Let me turn on the --

Chair Ornellas: The pump house? Is that the pump house by the tanks? There's a separate -- you know where, as you just pass the tanks, there's a parking lot above Young Brothers -- above Young Brothers, and then there's a road that goes up and around that back side that's below the tanks or south of the tanks. I don't know why --

Mr. McOmbler: ...(inaudible)... goes up around the tanks.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah.

Mr. McOmbler: Right ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Yeah. Oh, okay.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)... the old village, there's a road back there ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, but this is not -- this is not down. It's not by the old village. This is above -- to the left of the village.

Mr. McOmber: Where Henry Aki used to have that gulch right there where he had goats ...(inaudible)... in that gulch right there.

Mr. Oshiro: ...(inaudible)... where the state, the highway workers hauled their equipment ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Oshira: ...(inaudible)... would that be it?

Chair Ornellas: But that's conservation, right? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Napier: No. I have the state land use layer on now, underneath, and it's state land use urban, this gray area here is. This is conservation here. In the CPAC plan, and it transferred over to the Planning Commission, it is -- this is conservation. I have transparency on. I'm sorry. It's a little confusing. I'll turn that off.

Chair Ornellas: So even that sliver that goes down to the bay is --

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: Part of the conservation.

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: I wonder who did that and why they did it.

Mr. Napier: I have no idea; that's why I was questioning it. And it doesn't --

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Napier: That's it. That's what we're talking about.

Chair Ornellas: I don't remember ever talking about that, and we didn't see it in the '98 plan. Kurt, do you remember? No?

Mr. Napier: Let's see if it's in the '98 copy here. Let's see what's there.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Napier: Nope.

Mr. McOmber: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: I don't know. Does anybody have -- maybe we should --

Unidentified Speaker: Is that where that houses are?

Chair Ornellas: No. That's -- the houses are above that, yeah.

Mr. McOmber: There's no way to get from there to those houses ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Why don't we just, for now, leave it as is, and then maybe if you can send that to me, and I can forward it to Kepa and then see what Kepa says. There's gotta be a reason for that to be there so --

Mr. Napier: Well, the other thing is is the state land use is urban underneath so it wouldn't be consistent in our mapping because we have all of the state land use conservation as conservation, but not county conservation, just as state land use conservation.

Chair Ornellas: So we're going to have to match -- we're going to have to match the state -
-

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: And so the county --

Ms. Jorgensen: No. No. We don't have to match the state if you have a different recommendation. What we couldn't have an inconsistency in is if it's conservation, then we can't put -- it is the state has jurisdiction over conservation, that's the only one that we had to be consistent with. The others, you can indicate something different. So for you to find out what is there and then -- and then once we know, we find an appropriate land use designation for that so that if it's conservation, we put conservation on it. If it's something else in there, we just find what is appropriate.

Chair Ornellas: So we just -- we can -- I mean it's appropriate just to leave it as is and find out later? Or do you want --

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes.

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Mr. Napier: Yes.

Ms. Jorgensen: It is.

Chair Ornellas: Maybe that's where the military was going to put its missile silos. Could be. Okay, so, Members, we'll just leave it as is and move it on, and then make sure that I will get with Kepa and find out what that is. Can you forward that to me?

Mr. Napier: I can. Yes.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. I'll give you my email address.

Mr. Napier: Okay. Yeah, I'll check with other people too. That's a good idea.

Ms. Jorgensen: Mike, you had one other ...(inaudible)...

Mr. Napier: I have one more.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah.

Mr. Napier: And let's see if I can find it. No, actually, this is on Map 9.9, I believe. I mean, excuse me, 9.2. I'm sorry. This is the existing land use map. Yes, and we added the stables into a -- into the category -- well, it's Stables, Project District/Golf Course. We just lumped it into -- and Mary can maybe expound on that since you had the request.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes, this was a request from Lynn McCrory at the last meeting that the project district was around that stable area, so we're just verifying if that's the correct -- and it was matching the 9.5, so you know that that change was made.

Chair Ornellas: So the pasture land around the stables is also project district?

Ms. Jorgensen: That's correct.

Chair Ornellas: And so how far down does it go?

Ms. Jorgensen: That's the shape of it, and it's also on Map 9.5.

Chair Ornellas: And what's the different -- what's the shade --

Ms. Barfield: Purple.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, but there's a light spot. What is that? Is that the stable, the building itself?

Ms. Barfield: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Oh, that's where the corral is. Oh, okay. I'm color blind so -- alright. Okay, is that it then? I mean any problems, Members?

Ms. Jorgensen: So we could break for lunch and then come back and discuss the --

Chair Ornellas: Is it here?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, it should be here shortly. And then discuss anything in terms of the overall approval.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Okay. Alright, so we'll break for lunch. We'll be back at -- well, lunch is not here, how about 12:30? Or how about quarter to one? Quarter to one.

(A recess was called at 11:33 p.m., and the meeting reconvened at 12:45 p.m.)

Chair Ornellas: Alright, let's reconvene the Lana`i Planning Commission. It's now 12:45. And, hopefully, everybody had a good lunch. I know we did. If anybody falls asleep, they're get a hammer thrown at 'em 'cause --

Ms. Barfield: And you're going to get right back.

Chair Ornellas: And I'm going to get it right back. Okay. Alright, Mary, Jen, where are we?

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, what we have remaining is -- oh, Debbie's back? I don't know if you would like to mention those or you want me to?

Ms. Debbie Dela Cruz: ...(inaudible)...

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, she found a couple things in Chapter 7 that would be on 7-16, under Land, in the binder, yes, so page 7-16 in the Transportation section, on -- under Land, on line 41. It says that -- the sentence is, "Where there's no public transit system on the island, Pulama Lana`i runs shuttles from Manele Small Boat Harbor and Manele Resort to

Lana`i City and Koele Resort and the airport." So Debbie's comment is those shuttles are not operated at this time so --

Ms. Dela Cruz: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Let's get this on the record so mike. You wanna -- Debbie has it.

Ms. Dela Cruz: This is Debbie Dela Cruz. I thought that the shuttles were only for hotel guests and that they were -- people supposed to go to private carriers if they're not hotel guests.

Mr. Matsumoto: Yeah, that's correct. And I think Rabaca Limousine has been filling in that service.

Chair Ornellas: That's true. I'm losing money while I'm here.

Ms. Jorgensen: So should we just edit it to say that so that it would be Pulama Lana`i is running shuttles for hotel guests and Rabaca is providing private -- and private transportation. Okay. Okay, so that's that one.

Chair Ornellas: It's -- Kurt, it's Four Seasons, not Pulama, right?

Mr. Matsumoto: Correct.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: So it's Four Seasons providing transportation for their guests, for their hotel guests. And then private transportation is taking care of others. Castle & Cooke -- Pulama transportation is going to go away? Is that what we're -- because there's two Mercedes buses running around; one that says hotel, the other one is --

Mr. Matsumoto: You're going to have to be a little specific about your question. We still have a transportation department.

Chair Ornellas: And that transportation department handles who?

Mr. Matsumoto: We transport the Four Seasons employees right now.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. And then --

Mr. Matsumoto: From town to Manele.

Chair Ornellas: Oh, okay. So that's all they do?

Mr. Matsumoto: That's currently all they do.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. And then Four Seasons buses take care of just the guests?

Mr. Matsumoto: Correct.

Chair Ornellas: Okay.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Ornellas: Thank you, Kurt.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. Then the next one that --

Chair Ornellas: Debbie, is that -- is that a good enough answer for you? Okay. Great.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. On page 7-21, line 28 and 29, it seems to be an incomplete sentence, and it's the Policy 15. It says, "Encourage Pulama Lana`i to maintain a secondary and emergency access road between Manele," and it just kinda stops there, so I think that it would be between -- you'd put between Manele and the word "between" so -- excuse me. It would read, "access road between the Manele Project District and," and I wasn't quite sure what to put there.

Chair Ornellas: Are we talking about the construction road that Pulama said they would have done by December? Is that -- that's the other access road to the project district. Okay. So there's the main road, the state highway, that runs down to -- down to Hulopoe, and then there's a construction road that runs west of that, on the west side of the development, and it runs on the west edge of the project district, so Pulama was supposed -- had said that they were going to get that -- there it is on the map. There you see it? It's that one on the left.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so they were going to have that thing fixed and that will be an access for -- another access road to the project district.

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, this is specifically --

Chair Ornellas: Wait, wait, wait, wait. Okay.

Ms. McCrory: Lynn McCrory, Pulama Lana`i. No. The construction road is, at this point, is remaining a private road, and what we were doing was completely asphaltting over everything and installing a runaway area for that road, but we have it gated and locked and the only people using it are construction workers and -- or companies.

Chair Ornellas: In the future, once you repave it and put all that other stuff, it's going to still remain closed?

Ms. McCrory: Yes. At this point, yes.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So there's only one way, for the general public, there's only one way in and one way out, and that's the Manele Road, the state road.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes, but the policy is to encourage Pulama Lana`i to maintain a secondary and emergency access road between, and there it's unclear, between the Manele Project District and some -- the idea was to have a way that, in an emergency, you'd be able, like a fire situation, I believe, but I guess really the question is: What do you want to do? This doesn't -- it's very unclear here.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, if I'm not mistaken, that will be locked but yet, fire, police, it has a breakaway lock and so for emergencies, they could get in and out.

Mr. Oshiro: Yeah, but why don't you just put it from Manele to whatever the state highway, whatever the number of the state highway because that's where it connects, yeah? The access going be to the state highway.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah.

Mr. Oshiro: It doesn't have to go from Manele to the city, but to the state highway.

Chair Ornellas: To the state highway, yeah. It's the present construction road. Okay. So, yeah, 440?

Ms. Jorgensen: How about it just be access road between the Manele Project District and the state highway? Okay? So you've already approved Chapters 1 through 8 on August 27, and today, you approved Chapters 9 through 13, and there were a lot of small items, including the Map 7.2 today, and then other corrections that you gave us, so just overall approvals subject to the recommendations that were discussed today would be -- would make sure that we cover, you know, all these corrections, such as this one that we just talked about, and on the other page, and the changes to the action items, one was brought up in Chapter 13 that was correction to the table 8.01, who the leads were, you know, you discussed that, also on page 8-18, for the Action 8.30, "sex assault" was added into the

language while we were discussing 13 but we want to make sure that's also in the chapter's Action Table, so to cover all those small corrections, if you approve your recommendations as a whole, subject to all these changes, then that should be what we have remaining to do today unless you have something else.

Chair Ornellas: Is there any additions that we want to add to this?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead.

Ms. Zigmond: We have been -- we had some discussion about the desal plant and how it could potentially affect our plan because a lot of the plan was based on that, and even though we heard today that the company is not abandoning the desal plant but they have stopped investing in desal and are exploring options, that -- it's kind of like there's -- there's -- I mean we don't know if that's going to be five years, ten years, or whatever, and could still possibly affect the plan, and I was wondering perhaps if we could put a little footnote in someplace again that references that, I'm not sure on what kind of wording we want, but I just feel like we need to include some reference to the fact that it's, you know, up in the air and with no near future solution.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. There was a handout passed out earlier, I think everybody's got one, the Members got one, and it says, this would be the wording for the footnote, "In September 2014, Pulama Lana`i decided that it would not complete its proposed desalination facility in the Manele Project District. This decision effectively leaves the Water Use and Development Plan, as formally adopted in February 25, 2011, as the guide to inform future land use planning and water use for this island." And that's the footnote. And go ahead, Mary. Oh, okay. In talking to Planning, we would be able to put this footnote, basically, in chapters that deal when we talk with the desal plant so that way when it moves up the line, that they have some reference to this footnote. Go ahead, Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay, I think it's been a number of meetings that were with the regular Planning Commission on the desalination plant, and that is for project approval, but the discussion in Chapter 7 on water is at a more general community plan level where you'll first see in the Water section, on page 7-4, under Strategy 5, and Issue 5, where it addresses this about the Water Use and Development Plan. The Strategy is to continue the development of alternative water sources, such desalination, there's many -- you know, that's the wording, but there are many other ways that you can have alternative water sources, such as reuse, and so then it goes on to say, "Continue planning and design to direct the development of an alternative water source that will be used to supplement the existing high level aquifer water source." And that Strategy is followed through on -- in the Policies where Policy no. 8 says, "Support the planning, design, and development of an

alternative water source that must be used to supplement the existing high level aquifer and still maintain the integrity of the high level aquifer." So it goes into the Actions as well, in Action 7.12, "Continue planning, exploration, testing, and development of alternative water resources, such as a desalination plant." So that's the, for all I know, is the only mentions desal. It was mentioned as an alternative water source, so it encourages to look at it being like the specific project not being the broader intent of this because there are other ways that you can increase water and this plan is asking for that to be developed and resolving what's going to go on with desalination plant sounds like is more in the -- would be discussed at the regular Planning Commission.

Chair Ornellas: The only alternative water source has always been desal. I've never heard of somebody else bring to the table another way of doing that.

Ms. Jorgensen: I think it's also in here about R-1 water, you know, water reuse, water conservation --

Chair Ornellas: We're doing that now, so that's ongoing.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, but it could be more. You have programs, you know, to really educate people, distribution of those low-flow shower valves, there's --

Chair Ornellas: And it's being done now.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah. So I don't know what other alternative water resource, you know, there is, but --

Chair Ornellas: Without the desal plant, this development cannot proceed.

Ms. Jorgensen: And I think that there, again, it's probably confusing the actual development occurring, which will all come through, as Commissioner Oshiro said, all those development projects would have to come through here and then that would be the timing for discussing is or is it not going to happen, the desalination plant, rather than for this plan, which is saying the intent is, 'cause these are recommendations, the intent of the community is to have these alternative water sources, and then this is used when you're reviewing a project coming through, you would say, well, the community plan says we're supposed to have an alternative water source, now we're looking at project, is it going to have the water? And if it's not going to have the water, that's the time you would say, well, where, you know, where's your water? You didn't build the desal plant, or whatever, not -- but, really, this is speaking, this document is speaking to what the community would like to see, not into individual project approvals.

Chair Ornellas: Debbie, go ahead.

Ms. Dela Cruz: This is Debbie Dela Cruz. I can't speak for the entire CPAC and although there are only maybe two, the desal plant is only mentioned a few times in the plan, I think in the back of our mind, we were thinking that that five million gallons was going to be available, so when we talked about economic development, you know, developing more agriculture, when we were talking about expansion of the community and a whole bunch of more people, when we were talking about the development, the new hotel development, I think we all had in the back of our minds that that water was going to be available. So you may not change the rest of the plan, but I really think you need to put something in there that people were under the impression that there was a, you know, a good chance that this was going to go through, otherwise, we look kind of stupid that we approved the plan as is.

Chair Ornellas: David, you want to say something?

Mr. Yamashita: I mean I just wanted to, I think, echo some of what Mary said where there are alternatives, and I don't know if these have been explored or not, but using wastewater to produce drinking water is certainly one of them, and I'm not sure -- I mean it's been done. It's being done on the Mainland. It's not new technology. It's proven. There's a psychological aspect to this. But nonetheless, it is a technology that's available. But I mean to get at Bev's concern, maybe what we could do is acknowledge what's happened somewhere in the document that as of this date, this is the current -- this is what's happened and so there is -- you have some record of this at least and so it's not forgotten because it is part of the history of the whole evolution.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Thank you. Ron?

Mr. McOمبر: As I said in my opening statement, that would be fine except the county is throwing away thousands of gallons a day into an open trench because Castle -- I mean Castle -- because Pulama is not processing that water to send it out to either the sod farm or up to the golf course, which does not exist. So throwing away those gallons, we know what the alternative is, except it's being wasted. The sewage treatment plant is in very bad shape. And unless this company's going to get off their dime and do what they're supposed to do, and save all that water, put another 10 million gallon reservoir up there next to the 10 million gallon reservoir there now, and put covers on top of the reservoirs, which they haven't done yet; the 20 million gallon reservoir down at Manele should have a cover on it to protect that from evaporation, so, you know, we know what they can but they aren't doing it, and they need to do that, they need to get off their dime and do that. If they're going to throw away the idea of having the desal plant, then they better save every drop of water they've got 'cause they're going to need it. Thank you.

Chair Ornellas: Bev?

Ms. Zigmond: So going with what I originally said, and it seems supported by at least part of CPAC and even Dave's suggestion, I still again think we need to put something in the plan, it can be a footnote, whatever, just for the historical purpose again.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Thank you. Jen?

Ms. Maydan: I think we would just caution you that if you decide to put a footnote in, you want to make sure that what it says is very accurate to the facts that are going on. Pulama Lana`i decided it would not complete its proposed desalination facility, I think that would need to be revised based on the statements that Kurt provided, he stated that they're investigating their options.

Ms. Zigmond: Jen, he said they stopped investing in desal. I wrote it down as he spoke.

Ms. Maydan: Stopped investing and investigate options, explore options.

Ms. Zigmond: That doesn't give me a warm fuzzy about the future.

Ms. Maydan: But I think if we're going to put a footnote in here, it needs to be very accurate and it needs to not just have one snippet, it needs to address the situation.

Ms. Jorgensen: There is, in the Water section, which is where I was -- where the desal is mentioned that there's the existing conditions is given there so you could either put it right there in the existing conditions or a footnote to that section, but I agree with Jen that you want to have it be as accurate as to what is that -- what is going on.

Chair Ornellas: Go ahead, Butch.

Mr. Butch Gima: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think you have to separate this discussion into two issues: one, water, and, one, planning. I agree with Debbie that, throughout the process, there was the discussion about the desal, nothing was finalized, obviously, throughout the CPAC process, but a lot of discussions and potentially approvals from the CPAC were somewhat predicated on the development of desal, so I think you can include language in there stating as such without committing the Planning Commission to anything that would be controversial. I think it's important to note that that's what's happening during this process. On the water side, whether it goes or not, we have the Water Use and Development Plan, so I don't think you have to make any significant changes in language because you have the Water Use and Development Plan, you have the Lana`i Water Advisory Committee to address specifically water issues with or without desal. So if you're going to put anything in there, my suggestion is to take it from two separate perspectives. Thanks.

Chair Ornellas: Butch, so how would you -- I mean we have a Chapter 7, which is the Water, so for your planning, where would you see that, in Infrastructure or?

Mr. Gima: No. I trust the Planning Department to put it in the appropriate chapter.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so the present -- the one that I read, so did you hear the footnote?

Mr. Gima: Yes.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. So how would you change that to fit, basically, what you said? How would you change that footnote or not change it at all, or don't even add it?

Mr. Gima: Well, I don't have any specific language but I mean you don't have to have any specific language with regard to the water because there is something that already exist, so if it's not broken, don't fix that language. I mean the Water Use and Development Plan, LWAC's in existence, it will continue to do what it needs to do whether or not the desal plant moves forward. In terms of the planning, I trust that the, if, you know, you guys agree, then Planning Department can insert language to, you know, what I just suggested and, basically, what Debbie suggested.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Jorgensen: I just took what Butch had suggested and tried to come up with a sentence, "The CPAC predicated their decisions on the availability of water for the future development proposals." And that could be both in Chapter 9, before those, you know, you have that section on the future, all the different proposals, and you could also have it in Infrastructure, under the Water section somewhere, 7-3, and we can take this as a -- I'm just throwing out a start and see if you have other language or different version.

Chair Ornellas: What did -- repeat the sentence again?

Ms. Jorgensen: "The CPAC predicated their decisions on the availability of water for the future development proposals."

Chair Ornellas: Based on the Water Use and Development Plan?

Ms. Jorgensen: No. They just thought --

Chair Ornellas: No?

Ms. Jorgensen: They were looking at development proposals and they were thinking that they --

Chair Ornellas: Based on the desal?

Ms. Jorgensen: Not on desal. That there would need to be water so because the language was desal is one of the alternative water sources, but they did talk about desal at the CPAC, but it was more like looking at all these future development proposals, there was an assumption that there would be water would be coming. Correct me if I'm wrong.

Ms. Dela Cruz: I mean I think you just need to be really clear that what we were looking at was significant additional sources of water, not just a little trickle from, you know, conserving because, you know, conservation has been on people's minds for a long time, nothing's really been done, so we were looking at something new coming down the pike, you don't have to say "desal," but I think we need to say that we were looking at significant additional water sources.

Chair Ornellas: Can that -- so if we added the "significant?"

Ms. Jorgensen: Okay. "The CPAC predicated their decisions on the availability of significant additional water sources for the future development proposals."

Chair Ornellas: Members, any questions to that? Additions? Bev, that kinda sums it up. I mean it's not as strong, but it does cover the point.

Ms. Zigmond: We'll ignore the white elephant in the room. Yeah.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so let's -- so let's -- can I get a motion to accept? No, this -- just this part we added to the chapter.

Ms. Jorgensen: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Sure.

Ms. Jorgensen: The pages would be under Infrastructure, Water, page 7-3, and then under Land Use, under Future Conditions - Planned Growth, on page 9-3, we would add, "The CPAC predicated their decisions on the availability of significant additional water sources for the future development proposals."

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so then will it go -- will it be an Action item? Will it also go into the Action?

Unidentified Speaker: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: No, she's not adding it as a footnote.

Ms. Jorgensen: I could add it into page 7-3, into the Existing Conditions, as a note there, and then there's a chapter -- I mean a section on page 9-3 that is titled "Future Conditions - Planned Growth," and it talks about the over -- you know, it gives an overview, there's five areas on Lana`i are proposed for future development by Pulama Lana`i, and then maybe, you know, somewhere in that paragraph I'd have to see where it best fits to add the sentence that we discussed. And that paragraph, the Future Conditions - Planned Growth, it does carryover between page 9-3 and the top of 9-4, so I would like to add it wherever it best fits within the actual text. And any suggestions are welcome as to where you would like to see it.

Ms. Zigmond: Perfect, Mary. Thank you.

Ms. Barfield: I mean being that Mary already, you know, did the verbiage so nicely in 7-3 in the Existing Conditions, you can just put a bold statement right at the end by maybe line 15 or 16.

Chair Ornellas: Can we do that, Mary?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes. And, Jen, is looking in Chapter 9 also, on page -- at the end of that Future Conditions - Planned Growth section, at line 16, on page 9-4.

Chair Ornellas: Any comments, Members? Okay, so can I get a motion to approve that, that change?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair?

Chair Ornellas: Okay, Stu moved it. Bev, second? Bev second. So all those in favor of motion? Let's discuss it if somebody needs to discuss it anymore. Okay.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Marlowe, seconded by Commissioner Zigmond, then unanimously

VOTED: to include the sentence, "The CPAC predicated their decisions on the availability of significant additional water sources for the future development proposals," in Chapters 7 and 9, as discussed.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, it's unanimous. Okay. So where do we go from here? We go home?

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, if there's anything else you want to add, and then, yeah, I was still looking as before for a approval of the document as a whole subject to all the revisions that were discussed today.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so we'll start off with adding to the plan. Anymore changes to this plan? Okay, so the next one would be adoption? Okay, so approval of the plan. Okay. We don't want to do this another month? Okay. How many months have we been doing this? Alright, so can I hear a motion to adopt the Lana`i Community -- the 2014 Lana`i Community Benefit Fund -- the Lana`i Community Plan, with changes? Can I hear a motion for that please?

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair, I move that we approve the 2014 Lana`i Community Plan with all the previously approved changes, or do we need to say that?

Ms. Jorgensen: All the previously approved changes and those that were discussed on October 4th.

Ms. Zigmond: Okay, and those discussed on October 4.

Chair Ornellas: Kelli seconds. Anymore discussion? Okay.

There being no further discussion, the motion was put to a vote.

It has been moved by Commissioner Zigmond, seconded by Commissioner Gima, then unanimously

VOTED: to approve the 2014 Lana`i Community Plan with all the previously approved changes and the changes discussed on October 4, 2014.

Chair Ornellas: Alright, unanimous. Finally.

Ms. Jorgensen: Well, thank you to all the Commissioners, and Chairman.

Chair Ornellas: I want to thank the Long-Range Planning, you guys did a fantastic job, and all your travel and going back and forth for us, for this community. I want to thank all the CPAC members for their hard work prior to this, so you guys did a fantastic job and, hopefully, we can keep it up, so don't forget, we still have -- there's one more process that's going to happen and I want to let everybody know, the Members know that when the Planning Department is finished with our draft, then before they send it off to the Maui

County Council, we are going to get a copy of it so that way we can review everything and then -- then when they come here for their public hearing, we can be prepared.

Mr. McOmbler: And the CPAC should get a copy of it.

Chair Ornellas: What's that?

Mr. McOmbler: And the CPAC should get a copy of it.

Chair Ornellas: I don't see any reason why not.

Mr. McOmbler: We should.

Chair Ornellas: You guys can make that happen? CPAC gets a copy of the draft? It will be available online, yes. The problem is, you know, they're so far behind sometimes that it never gets there. Oh, it will get there? Jen promised. Eventually it will get online but --

Ms. Zigmond: Mr. Chair, did you say we get a copy?

Chair Ornellas: Yes, we will get a copy of it and then --

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes, you will be sent a copy at the same time that we are transferring it over to council. And just to clarify what the process is, we have till October 31st, which is your extension deadline, to enter the changes that you have given us to date, and then we will make a clean version of that and that -- and make it into a spiral-bound document, it'll be mailed out to you at the same time we're mailing the council the CPAC September 30th final draft, your final draft, and then the department plans to put together a letter to accompany the transfer that would be any differences that we have. All of those will be -- well, the CPAC final draft is already on the website, your final draft and the department letter will also be posted on the website, and that I believe, even if we're transferring it, everything will have to be available for the public to view 30 days prior to when you have your public hearing, and we don't know what the schedule is right now for the council's planning committee when they're going to review it; that's all handled through Council Services and the council, and we are invited to attend but we are not responsible for that process.

Ms. Barfield: I have one more. How long that would you probably think that would take?

Ms. Jorgensen: I have no idea. You know, we don't regularly communicate with them on that. We talk to them about, you know, what is needed to transfer to them and that's the extent of it.

Chair Ornellas: So you guys kinda heed and hawed about getting the CPAC members a copy of our draft.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yes, we did. And that is really, you know, it's additional 13 copies to be -- it's up to our new administrator.

Chair Ornellas: See what happens when you sit in the back?

Ms. Jorgensen: There's always something that ...(inaudible)... I don't know.

Ms. Pam Pogue: ...(inaudible)... giving somebody their own special copy ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so it will be online the same time you mail it off?

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah, it sounds like the CPAC --

Ms. Pogue: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: Alright.

Ms. Jorgensen: Yeah.

Chair Ornellas: Okay, so I have you guys' number so --

Ms. Pogue: ...(inaudible)...

Chair Ornellas: That's okay. I can find you. And, Pulama, I mean you guys will be able to pull it off of the computer and stuff so -- okay.

Mr. Yamashita: Not to belabor this, but I do want to just I think express our thanks to the Planning Commission members and to CPAC members and all the people who have, from the public, who have come to the meeting. I think to Pulama Lana`i too because this hasn't been easy for anybody and Lynn and Kurt, and John, and everybody else there have been I think really -- I mean it's great to see landowners participate in the way they have and I think as I've said before, we don't always agree but we somehow figure out a way to work it out, but I just want to say that we, I think, have truly appreciated the time that you've spent doing this because this is hard work, there was a lot of information, we asked a lot of you in terms of meetings, and you've come through, and it really means a lot to us so thanks very much.

Mr. McOmber: John, the last thing we gotta remember is the people that we lost, the people that we lost, and the people that are recovering. They did it working on this plan.

And we can't forget them because we lost them on Lana`i, we lost friends and family, so we can't forget those folks.

Chair Ornellas: Can something be added to the community plan as far as --

Ms. Jorgensen: That's an excellent question.

Chair Ornellas: Yeah, a dedication or something?

Ms. Jorgensen: We had a nice memorial page within our HCPO conference and if you would like, we can put something like that within this document, and, yes, we definitely, like on the acknowledgment page as well.

E. Adjournment

Chair Ornellas: Alright, so hearing nothing else, somebody wants to -- you want to say something? Yes?

Ms. Barfield: Motion to adjourn.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. If everybody wants to --

Ms. Jorgensen: Not quite. I mean you're adjourned.

Chair Ornellas: Okay. Yeah, I mean, can we adjourn? Alright, there you go.

There being no further business brought before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

SUZETTE L. ESMERALDA
Secretary to Boards & Commissions

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Present

John Ornellas, Chairperson
Stacie Lee Koanui Nefalar, Vice-Chairperson

Shelly Barfield
Kelli Gima
Stuart Marlowe
Bradford Oshiro
Beverly Zigmond

Excused

Joelle Aoki

Others

Pamela Pogue, Planning Program Administrator, Long-Range Division
Mary Jorgensen, Planner, Long-Range Division
Jennifer Maydan, Planner, Long-Range Division
Mike Napier, GIS Analyst, Long-Range Division
David Yamashita, Planner, Long-Range Division