

Meeting Summary - Moloka'i CPAC Mtg. 11, July 16, 2015

CPAC Approved August 19, 2015 as Amended

Attending: Community Plan Advisory Committee

Steve Chaikin (Chair), Lance "Kip" Dunbar (Vice-Chair), Dathan Bicoy, Robert Stephenson, Deldrine Kauinohea Manera, Gregory Jenkins, Lori Buchanan, Debra Kelly, John Sprinzel, Glenn Teves, Edwin Mendija

Absent: Pi'ilani Augustiro, Carl Adolpho

County of Maui – Planning Department

Pam Pogue, Long-Range Planning

Jennifer Maydan, Long-Range Planning

Michael Napier, Long-Range Planning

David Yamashita, Long-Range Planning

Mary Jorgensen, Long-Range Planning

Call to order at 3:05 PM outside the OHA conference room. The meeting was then recessed and reconvened at Kalaniana'ole Hall.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Steve opened testimony to the public: None

ACCEPTANCE OF SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE JUNE 3 AND 4, 2015 MEETINGS:

June 3, 2015

Kaui Manera asked for correction on Page 4, bullet # 10: Should read "Kaui stated that a lot of people on Molokai don't pay, or are not required to pay taxes."

Glenn Teves asked for correction on Page 2, second paragraph under Public Testimony: delete "west of Kauhale (?)" and add "east of Kaunakakai".

Glenn Teves asked for correction on Page 4, bullet # 1: Glenn did not say this.

June 4, 2015

Glenn Teves asked for correction on Page 2, bullet #6: delete "Kepuha" and replace "Dixie's with Pohakuloa".

Page 5, first bullet: Replace "top right area of town" with specific description of where this is referring to.

| | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|
| ✓ = Yes/Aye, N = No/Nay, A = Abstain, R=Recuse, cross-out = Absent, First = 1, Seconded = 2 | | |
| Motion: Accept the June 3 and 4, 2015 summary minutes as amended | | |
| Unanimous | | |
| Steve Chaikin | Kip Dunbar | Pi'ilani Augustiro |
| Dathan Bicoy | Lori Buchanan | Gregory Jenkins 2 |
| Debra Kelly | Glenn Teves 1 | Deldrine Manera |
| Edwin Mendija | John Sprinzel | Robert Stephenson |
| Carl Adolpho | | |

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS: DRAFT COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

CHAPTER 7, Community Design

David Yamashita provided an introduction on the concept of mixed-use residential and used the example of the Project District (PD) site in Maunaloa. He also showed a hypothetical diagram of the PD and how it could be divided into specific residential categories to allow for different lot sizes, housing types, and layout options. In doing this, there could be a range of housing choices that correspond to different life stages and income levels. Each of the PD categories could, like a zoning code, spell out building heights, setbacks, lot coverage, and other regulations that are specific to that site and PD.

Glenn Teves is concerned that mixed-use could push out single-family and increase property taxes. David explained that mixed-use includes a mix of residential, commercial, park and public quasi-public uses, as well as a mix of different types of residential uses, including single-family, duplex, multi-family, ohana, small lot, large lot, residential over commercial, etc. The Future Conditions – Planned Growth section of the land use chapter will also include descriptions of the intent for each future growth area. The description could state “primarily residential” to make it clear that commercial uses should dominate a particular mixed-use area.

Lori Buchanan wants to ensure that park space will be provided in mixed-use. Jen Maydan explained that park is included in the land use description for mixed-use and the description for future growth areas can clearly state that adequate park space to serve the neighborhood shall be provided.

Kip Dunbar asked if the mixed-use concept will work with the BCT. Planning staff responded yes.

Dathan Bicoy is concerned that mixed-use could be dominated by commercial. Again Planning staff explained that the intent of mixed-use is to encourage a mix of uses to support a neighborhood and that the intent of each future growth area will be described in the Future Conditions – Planned Growth section of the land use chapter.

Kip Dunbar asked if there is a conflict between LEED and BCT guidelines. John Sprinzel responded that LEED has very specific rules to be rated green and read Policy #9 to show the difference with Policy # 1 that addresses the BCT Design Guidelines. Suggestions to edit or delete Policy # 9 were made but the Policy was retained. Staff reminded the CPAC that action 7.01 revises the BCT guidelines to address concerns. Rob Stephenson noted that the revision of the BCT guidelines, Action 7.01, would include input from the [business and local planning professionals'](#) community.

~~Rob Stephenson noted~~ and that some of the policies only apply when there are rules, such as in the BCT of a historic district.

Greg Jenkins stated that Page 7.1, Lines 36 – 38 are confusing. He asked if Policy 6 applies to single-family homes. Dave Yamashita replied no. Greg requested that this be clarified in the text.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Steve opened testimony to the public:

Gary Zukeran, DLNR Hunter Education, requested the CPAC to consider adding to the community plan the need for a shooting range on Molokai. He stated that Molokai is a hunting community and that for safety purposes a shooting range is needed on the island.

CPAC continued their discussion of Chapter 7:

Steve Chaikin recommended that a bus stop be installed in Kaunakakai. Staff recommended that an action be added to Chapter 8 Infrastructure, Transportation section.

Lori Buchanan and Dathan Bicoy expressed concern that Policies 3 and 8 promote growth of Kaunakakai but this conflicts with sea level rise so changes need to be made now. Jen Maydan responded that Lori brings a valid concern and noted that the planning standard for sea level rise in Hawaii is 1 foot by 2050 and 3 feet by 2100. The community plan horizon is 2035 so the question is how to address sea level rise in this update of the community plan. Jen recommended that a statement could be added to the plan acknowledging sea level rise as an issue of concern and stating the intention of transitioning the population and commercial center out of Kaunakakai over time. Future community plan updates may address the issue more directly given more precise information on sea level rise. Dathan Bicoy suggested that Kaunakakai be maintained but not re-built.

Policy 3 – Revised to: Maintain Kaunakakai’s business development and historical character.

Policy 4 – Revised: Promote and support projects that create a pedestrian-friendly environment with street trees, benches, and other features ~~that encourage people to frequent Kaunakakai~~ [in Molokai’s country towns](#).

Policy 8 – Revise: Concentrate future growth in and around existing development [that maintains county rural standards, and is located outside of the flood inundation zone](#). ~~to avoid sprawl—and to minimize the cost of infrastructure development.~~

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Steve opened testimony to the public:

Nancy McPherson suggested that rural standards be adopted to reduce infrastructure costs.

CPAC continued - Actions (Page 7-4)

Add new action – Greg Jenkins’ recommendation: [Develop practicable incentives for Moloka`i businesses and property owners to implement sub-area development plan projects purposed to preserve, maintain, and enhance buildings, structures, sites, viewpoints, pedestrian ways, and streets.](#)

Action 7.01 – Revise: ~~Update~~ [Amend](#) the 1993 Moloka`i Country Town Business Design Guidelines. Add “Moloka`i Business and Design Professionals and Community” to Partners.

Rob Stephenson noted that the revision of the BCT guidelines, Action 7.01, would include input from the Moloka`i community.

CHAPTER 2, Moloka`i’s Future – Vision Statement

David Yamashita provided an introduction to the vision statement packet, which is the same one that was seen at an earlier meeting. At that point, the committee wanted to be more positive and provide a fuller description of where the island should be going. He also summarized the basic differences between the four versions.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Steve opened testimony to the public:

Noelani Yamashita stated that she agrees that the vision statement should be positive and proactive but that she cautions against changing the existing vision statement that was created by the larger community. Pam Pogue responded that the Planning Department has made great efforts to get more community involvement in the plan update process. She asked Noelani for suggestions on getting more community input. Noelani responded that the plan update process was started years ago and then stopped so the community is confused and frustrated. Pam explained that the Planning Department understands the community’s frustrations but that the decision to postpone the Molokai community plan update process was out of the control of the Department.

Greg Jenkins reminded the public that there will be additional opportunities to participate in the process. Pam stated that the draft plan will be reviewed by the Moloka`i Planning Commission and County Council, both of which are opportunities for the public to participate. Pam reminded the public that the draft plan update, CPAC meeting schedule, as well as other pertinent information is available on the County webpage.

David Yamashita asked the CPAC members to identify which version of the vision statement they wanted included in the draft plan.

Lori – Original or Steve’s version

Dathan – Steve’s or Dunbar/Stephenson version

Steve – Steve’s version

Edwin – Steve’s version

John – Steve’s version

Greg – Steve’s version, with suggested revision of 3rd paragraph, last sentence: delete “the future of the island” add “Moloka`i’s future”

Glenn – Original and some of Steve’s version

Kauai – Steve’s version, but the original is very important too

Rob – Steve’s version

Deb – Steve’s version

Edwin Mendija noted that the CPAC is using the best parts of the existing vision but there is always improvement to be made on the past. Pam Pogue suggested that a preamble and/or dedication could be added before the vision statement to acknowledge the 2001 vision and its authors. The CPAC asked Planning staff to draft text for their review.

CHAPTER 2, Moloka`i’s Future – Appendices 2.1 – 2.3

Planning staff explained that track changes to Appendices 2.1 – 2.3 included clarifications and corrections.

| | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|
| ✓ = Yes/Aye, N = No/Nay, A = Abstain, R=Recuse, cross-out = Absent, First = 1, Seconded = 2 | | |
| Motion: Approve Appendices 2.1 – 2.3 with revisions | | |
| Passed, with one abstain. | | |
| Steve Chaikin | Kip Dunbar 2 | Pi`ilani Augustire |
| Dathan Bicoy | Lori Buchanan | Gregory Jenkins |
| Debra Kelly - A | Glenn Teves 1 | Deldrine Manera |
| Edwin Mendija | John Sprinzel | Robert Stephenson |
| Carl Adolphe | | |

CHAPTER 6, Land Use Maps

Jen Maydan provided a brief overview of the process to review the draft land use maps. The maps to be reviewed tonight are based on the CPAC's recommendations from the June 4 mapping workshop. The purpose of today's review is to confirm CPAC recommendations and to further discuss the proposed future growth areas. Jen noted that this will be an on-going process and the maps will be reviewed at future meetings including, August 6 and 20. She noted that both Director Spence and Clay Rumbaoa are confirmed to attend the August 6 meeting.

Glenn Teves asked what role water availability, including desalinization, plays in identifying future growth areas. Pam Pogue explained that the Water Use and Development Plan will inventory projected water demands to ensure that the future water needs are met. The WUDP should set forth the allocation of water to land use and maintain consistency with county zoning and land use policies. The WUDP serve to inform future land use planning and provide guidance to the Commission for decision-making on water allocations and water reservation requests.

Debra Kelly reminded the CPAC that she had previously recommended adding an area for small scale commercial in Holomua. The CPAC discussed the pros and cons of this proposal, including potential threat from possible dam failure and impact on surrounding agricultural lands, and in the end did not include the recommendation.

Kaluakoi

Planning staff reminded the CPAC that they did not reach finish the discussion and requested information of Molokai Ranch on the area to place a new hotel designation in exchange for open space on Kaiaka Rock; therefore there is no change to the Kaluakoi map at this time.

Lori Buchanan gave an overview of the coastal constraints in the area and noted that setbacks of 1500 feet have been discussed for the area. Mike Napier explained that the coastal hazards GIS layer includes the tsunami evacuation area and Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps (DFIRM). Lori asked for an explanation of the difference between tsunami evacuation zone and tsunami inundation zone. Pam explained [that tsunami evacuation zones are based on modelling \(typically Army Corps of Engineers\) and depict the areas to be evacuated if a tsunami is expected to make landfall. A tsunami inundation zone depicts those areas that may be flooded in the event of a tsunami. These are two different tools: one is used to evacuate people out of danger in the case of a tsunami and the other, the tsunami inundation zone is an area that depicts probably flooding to occur as a result of a tsunami.](#) Lori noted that she is concerned with development in this coastal hazard area because the soils may not be able to support a hotel.

Greg Jenkins noted that the West End basically has all of its entitlements and that the CPAC can't just take away the community plan designations because the County does not have the capacity to compensate the land owner.

Greg made a motion to leave Kaiaka Rock as is with hotel designation. Glenn seconded. Lori stated that there are significant environmental constraints on Kaiaka Rock. Glenn stated that the area is not feasible to develop. Kip stated that they may not want to go forward with the motion yet. Greg rescinded the motion and stated that he would make the motion at the August 6 meeting.

Maunaloa

Glenn Teves expressed concern about the potential density of population of the proposed mixed-use area at build out. He stated that he wants to hear from the Ranch regarding their plans before making decisions. Planning staff reminded the CPAC that Clay Rumbaoa will be attending the August 6 meeting.

Lori Buchanan expressed concern about allowing for too much public/quasi-public and commercial use in Maunaloa. Mary Jorgensen noted that the description for the future Maunaloa mixed-use area would come from the CPAC and could include language such as “primarily single family and multi-family, neighborhood serving park, and limited commercial and public/quasi-public use”.

Kala`e

Kaui Manera reminded the CPAC that she previously proposed small-scale commercial in Kala`e to allow for possibly a restaurant. Lori Buchanan stated that maybe there would be the possibility of having a restaurant at the Ironwood Hills Golf Course. Rob Stephenson asked what the golf course is zoned and if restaurants are allowed in the golf course zone. Staff is to provide this information at the next meeting, which will be on the land use maps. Staff also will send link to Maui County Code Title 19 Zoning if the CPAC wants to research zoning districts.

Lori Buchanan questioned why a recent subdivision in Kala`e is not showing new parcels on the map. Planning staff to research and provide answer at next land use meeting.

Kualapu`u

Greg Jenkins requested that the heading be changed to Kualapu`u/Ho`olehua”. He is also concerned that Kualapu`u Ranch, the owner of the land proposed for mixed-use, is not in the conversation. He also proposed considering mixed-use south of Farrington.

Glenn Teves proposed creating buffers around schools near agriculture fields.

Dathan Bicoy stated that there appears to be options for expansion of Kualapu`u. Glenn added that Hoolehua could become the next Kaunakakai. Lori supported this idea noted that it was a plantation town.

David Yamashita stated that from a planning standpoint the proposed mixed-use expansion of Kualapu`u is a good concept. It creates a “20-minute neighborhood” which allows for a mix of daily uses within at most 20 minutes of each other.

Greg Jenkins made a motion to add the area south of Farrington Highway, from gulch at Lihipali east to subdivision at Kala`e Highway with the primary purpose being either single family or mixed-use. Glenn Teves seconded. Some CPAC members expressed concern about land owners, including Kualapu`u Ranch and Coffees of Hawaii, not being present. Greg rescinded his motion.

CPAC requested that landowners be contacted prior to August 6 meeting. Rob Stephenson said he is concerned about creating inconsistencies between community plan and zoning; [he also cautioned the CPAC on the issue of buffer zones; if discussed it should be based on factual information](#). Greg repeated the previous motion. Lori Buchanan seconded.

| | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| ✓ = Yes/Aye, N = No/Nay, A = Abstain, R=Recuse, cross-out = Absent, First = 1, Seconded = 2 | | |
| Motion: Add the area south of Farrington Highway, from gulch at Lihipali east to subdivision at Kala`e Highway with the primary purpose being either single family or mixed-use. Passed, with four No/Nay. | | |
| Steve Chaikin | Kip Dunbar - N | Pi'ilani Augustire |
| Dathan Bicoy | Lori Buchanan 2 | Gregory Jenkins 1 |
| Debra Kelly | Glenn Teves | Deldrine Manera - N |
| Edwin Mendija | John Sprinzel - N | Robert Stephenson - N |
| Carl Adolphe | | |

Kaunakakai

Greg Jenkins recommended that a fire buffer be placed around any community expansion in Kaunakakai. Planning staff responded that buffering from wildfires would be better addressed as a policy in Chapter 9 Public Facilities and Services in the Fire section, as well as in the future growth section of Chapter 6 that describes the Kaunakakai future growth area.

Greg Jenkins stated that he had previously recommended that designations above Ranch and Manila Camps be changed to Open Space. Pam Pogue explained that the purpose of open space designation is for undevelopable land, protecting natural and cultural resources, drainage, etc., and that these particular areas are more appropriate designated as park. Mary Jorgensen suggested incorporating the park area, between Ranch camp and the proposed mixed use, be added into the mixed use area to allow flexibility of design and to create parks around the outer edge. Debra mentioned drainage issues above the Ranch Camp area and concern that building above Kaunakakai would increase drainage issues in town. Lori and Glenn agreed and Glenn noted that there is less slope above Manila Camp.

Glenn Teves expressed concern about access to mauka mixed-use going through existing residential areas. Mary Jorgensen explained that the gulch area between Ranch and Manila Camps could possibly support a bridge connection similar to the one under the existing highway but higher up the channel where it would be above future sea level rise. Lori thought this would work and Glenn supported looking into the feasibility.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Steve opened testimony to the public:

Nancy McPherson stated that there was a bridge previously proposed at a higher elevation and it may be in the 2001 plan. She also noted that there are archaeological sites above Ranch Camp.

CPAC – Kaunakakai continued:

Mary Jorgensen noted that the two mixed-use areas provide options for future growth and/or relocation.

CPAC expressed concern about sea level rise and flooding impacting heavy industrial area in Kaunakakai. The CPAC discussed ideas about relocating uses elsewhere. Lori Buchanan noted that there is a

brownfield site in town and Superfund money may be available to clean it up. Glenn Teves suggested moving the heavy industrial to new areas, such as by the industrial area.

Rob Stephenson mentioned an affordable housing project in Manila Camp that is proposed but still very early in the process.

Steve Chaikin asked for clarification from Staff on the community plan update process as he is unclear about what will be forwarded to Council. He stated that the charter requires CPAC recommendations to be forwarded [to Council](#), ~~but doesn't say anything about~~ [and](#) the Planning Commission's [should forward their findings along with the CPAC's](#) recommendations. ~~to be forwarded to Council~~. Jen Maydan responded that 2.80B does require the Commission's recommendations to be forwarded to Council. Pam Pogue responded that the community plan is a County planning document that gets vetted through the community by way of the CPAC and Planning Commission. When the draft plan is transmitted it will include recommendations made by both reviewing bodies as well as an explanation of the big differences between CPAC and Planning Commission recommendations.

Pam Pogue stated that we are behind on the schedule and will need to schedule additional meetings. She asked if the CPAC wanted to schedule additional meetings now. CPAC requested that staff survey their availability and schedule additional meetings via email.

Meeting adjourned at 8:55 PM