

MOLOKAI PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2016

A. CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting of the Molokai Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson, Michael Jennings at 304 pm, Thursday, January 14, 2016, at the Mitchell Pauole Center Conference Room, Kaunakakai, Molokai, Hawaii.

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

Ms. Maydan: In your November 12 meeting you have 5 meetings going forwards starting today. With today being Chapters one, two and three. Chapters one and two sets the stage for the plan, the introduction and the vision for the future. Chapter three, which we will review today, four and five, which we'll review at the next meeting set the challenges and the constraints and kind of the base line for the future. Then we move on to land use, community design, which is kind of the what, and the where and the how of future growth, and then we move into infrastructure and public facilities and implementation at the last meeting. So as I said the CPAC had 22 meetings, you've lined up five meetings. You have a heavy task to get through in these but I believe you can because this plan has been very vetted through the CPAC and the community. So we'll have a very structured schedule for each meeting to get through our task and stay on schedule. If we do not get through what is on our agenda at a meeting it will not roll over to the next meeting. If need be it'll roll over to the last meeting of March 10. So on today's agenda, as I said, we have three chapters and we're actually going to go out of order, we're going to start with chapter three. The reason we're doing that is we're fortunate, Morgan Davis, the Maui Archaeologist from the State Historic Preservation Division, has come over for the evening. She has to catch a flight back at 6:25pm so she's only available, she has to leave about 5:30pm. So we're going to start with chapter three.

Ms. Dudoit: Chair I have a couple questions. First, I'm sorry that I wasn't here at the meeting when you folks approved the minutes, but I was pretty sure that we took note that, so I just for the record, where's Planning Department, oh they're not here. So I'm still going to be able to attend the meeting, Uncle Ron and I, our term don't end until March 30, right? Because I just wanted to make clear that you guys are keeping me on until we could finish the final vote. The second is I know it doesn't pertain to this meeting but Debbie Maples submitted a testimony advising the commission that they weren't going to be finish with their East End Plan until March. So I don't know if the department needs to send a written acknowledging that our last meeting isn't on March 10 so that perhaps they can bring a draft to us prior to that so that we can actually know what they're doing will not be for nothing.

Ms. Maydan: Deb Maple did call me. I had a conversation with her within the last week because she's on my regular email list and she received a schedule and after she received

the schedule she gave me a call and said they're ramping up their review. And she hopes to be able to present recommendations on an updated East End Policy Statement, they hope to be finished with their review at the end of January and they will bring it to your body hopefully in February.

Ms. Dudoit: So throughout this process just to be clear, if the East End community is not prepared with their final draft for us to review and put as part of our final recommendations, is there an opportunity for the commission to include general statements saying that we want to include an approved plan or..

Ms. Maydan: Anything that is put into the plan needs to be reviewed by the Planning Department by Corporation Counsel, and it's ultimately up to the County Council to decide what goes in there. Nothing will be blanket, included without review. So the East End community has the opportunity, if they do not finish their recommendations by the end of your body's review, they have the opportunity to present their recommendations to Council for consideration.

Ms. Swenson: Didn't they have the opportunity and shouldn't they have already done this during the planning process of twenty some odd meetings that you had?

Ms. Maydan: We did have many members of the east end, the East End Policy Statement was discussed at a number of meetings. We were told that an update was being worked on. So there has been opportunities.

Mr. Jennings: In the first question that you asked and I said something to you this morning. Yes, very definitely I want to have you and Ron there until this is over. I'm glad that this is being taped because yes, it's something, you've been through this, Ron's been through this and you need to have an input in the voting and everything we do. Jennifer and I talked just a little bit ago and I think as board members you need to know that they tried, very, very hard to get a meeting on the East End. All of the facilities that they went to were all booked at the same time that we wanted these meetings. You asked this morning at our commission meeting if we were going to have anything on the east side. We will not, they will follow the schedule that we have here but they did try to get something on the east side.

Ms. Maydan: Actually one more comment on the schedule, we may make one additional change, we may flip the subjects that are on February 11 and 25th. Chair is not going to be available and I would like to have him here for when we review the land use chapter so we are likely going to move land use and housing and community design chapters, 6 and 7 to the 25th. Move infrastructure, public facilities and services to the 11th. Once we confirm that I will send out a revised schedule.

Ms. Dudoit: Just for the record I just wanted to say that it would be also my recommendation that when we start talking about land use and housing that it be in a centralized area like Kaunakakai. Because that was a very controversial subject.

Ms. Maydan: I'll make a note of that and we'll see what we can do. Back to today's agenda we have three chapters to review and as I was starting to say we're going to go out of order and we're going to start with chapter three, natural, cultural, and scenic resources since we have Morgan Davis from SHPD here as a resource. As we go through the chapters in your packet that was mailed to you there was a one sheet handout that has three recommended revisions from the Planning Department to chapter three. So as you go through the chapter I'll just make a note when those come up and you can consider those revisions. As we go through the chapters we will briefly give just an introduction to the chapter, Mary and I will do that.

Mr. Jennings: I just want to say that the testimony from everyone because of the long period of time that we have here and all the information we need will be limited to three minutes. I will hold to that very staunchly. I think it's stated on here that three minutes will be for your presentation. So with that...

Ms. Dudoit: Chair for organizational purposes should we just remind the community that we specifically talking about chapter one, two and three?

Mr. Jennings: Yes, that's all we're going to do today, is chapters one through three. Like Jennifer said, because Ms. Morgan's here we're going to start with chapter three and if she'd like to get up and speak and give us her input at this time in case it goes a little longer, please do that. Thank you.

- B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY – At the discretion of the Chair, public testimony may also be taken when each agenda item is discussed, except for contested cases under Chapter 92, HRS. Individuals who cannot be present when the agenda item is discussed may testify at the beginning of the meeting instead and will not be allowed to testify again when the agenda item is discussed unless new or additional information will be offered.

Ms. Morgan: I'm Morgan Davis, I'm the lead archaeologist with the State Historic Preservation Division for the Maui section involving all of the islands of Maui County. I was asked to come here by Annalise of the CRC following discussions we had when she first asked me to review the community plan and concerns I had with potentially publishing the location of the archaeological sites on the map that's listed as 3.3. A couple of the concerns I have are related to, I know it's not a comprehensive map and it's not real specific to locations, we've had trouble before when these things were published. Well I sat down and I figured out it was three separate reasons. The first one being that

we actually have since 2009, we've issued 237 site numbers for Molokai but that doesn't necessarily mean that they all still exist. The process is that every site is encountered and evaluated, is significant during an archaeological inventory survey, or as a result of archaeological monitoring will be issued a site number but the recommendation following that may be for preservation, may be for data recovery, may be for no further work. So I don't actually know if all the sites that are shown on the map are still present. The second and key item that I encounter specific to Molokai is that most of the people who have sites here who are private land owners have asked us not to release that information. Even the ones that are on the National Register of Historic places. We have two locations out of 25 that are on the National Register where the location is available to the public, the rest is restricted. So I don't know how many of these sites might be on private property but a consideration would be whether or not the land owner's would want that to be published for other people to potentially come on their property. The third issue would be regarding any sites that may be burials. I would advise that we consider whether or not any descendants of those burials would want to have that in the public record. Again these are just concerns that I've run into on other islands with the issue of how much public information do we want to have out there. It's available in the reports if people really want to come and get it. The idea of putting it out there some where, something that might be up on the internet, there's other concerns that I simply wanted to raise. It's not my call, if this is what people have decided they want to do or want to decide to do in the future, that's fine and I'll work with you. I think I'm under the three minutes.

Mr. Jennings: Any questions for Ms. Morgan?

Ms. Dudoit: Hi, is there a standard policy or procedure from your department throughout the state that kind of blankets your decision making on this kind of thing? Do you guys have something issued that you follow that says, we can't be the only community plan you reviewed right?

Ms. Davis: Correct.

Ms. Dudoit: So has anybody else asked for those things to be published or is it just us? Have you had these instances before and what's been your practice?

Ms. Davis: I'm going to answer that in two parts. The first is no, nobody has specifically asked me for my input before in this instance. The second is all of our archaeological inventory surveys are public. Meaning if you came, once they're published, once they're approved they are available in libraries, people can get to that information. Generally it's separated from the GO location data. So the list that we have that shows exactly where something is located, something where you can pick up your phone and go what's the GPS coordinates for this, that's separate from what is published in the documents.

Mr. Jennings: Any other questions? Is there any other testimony at this time which anyone would like to give?

Ms. Dudoit: Chair I not sure but through this process are we able to question potential expert witnesses or like people from the CPAC committee that are here to ask questions regarding some of the things that she just said?

Ms. Maydan: Are you asking whatever subject, if you can ask a CPAC member to provide testimony or information? Yes a commissioner could ask that.

Ms. Dudoit: Can I ask Mr. Jenkins, I'd like to know, if you could recall, what was the discussion about and why did the CPAC recommend publishing something that was out of the ordinary for other community plans.

Ms. Maydan: Sorry if I can interrupt. You can ask questions but I would recommend that we conclude public testimony, if it's done for now, and then we can move on to the discussion of the chapters, is what I would recommend.

Mr. Jennings: Again is there any other public testimony at this time? Ok seeing none, then Zhantell?

Ms. Dudoit: While he's getting to the microphone I just wanted to state for the record that the commission acknowledges how hard the CPAC has worked so we don't want to recreate the wheel, I'm just wondering if there's an expert witness from Historic Preservations that has those concerns of what would have over ridden that concern in your discussion as a CPAC committee to ask for such.

Mr. Jenkins: Thank you Commissioner Dudoit. My name is Greg Jenkins and I am a CPAC member. For the record I would like to state that Debra Kelly is also a CPAC member, she's in the room this evening. As well as one of our consistent testifiers which was Nancy McPherson from DHHL, she has a background in this particular area as well. One of the questions I just asked the SHPD representative was when we have known archaeological sites then it comes under the jurisdiction of the burial council. When it's an inadvertent comes under SHPD. One of the concerns that we had was that this was not accurate to all of the community known sites. I would concur that it was our concern that we did not identify places that were of cultural sensitivity because of course we wanted to protect those sites among a lot of other issues. However, what we're concerned about is inadvertent versus known, that's the challenge. We show this very small amount of cultural and archaeological sites on our island that came from one published report that SHPD uses and not others that have happened since they've started to use this one report. We have an inaccurate picture for Molokai. So it could show up a

private property owner having no cultural sites and frankly our community was not very trustful of SHPD, forgive me, as being that attributor if you will verses the burial council. So it's important for us to find some way to document but not release sensitive information if that makes sense.

Ms. Dudoit: Did Corporation Counsel or your legal advisor give some kind of advice or direction as to the private landowner's request not to be published and what kinds of legal implications that would cause?

Mr. Jenkins: For the community plan? That's an excellent question. I conferred with Director Spence earlier, one of the challenges that we faced as a CPAC as we were not with the exception of the Sunshine Law related given any guidance or consistent representation from Corp. Counsel. The department took that responsibility which me as a CPAC member I will say I was very concerned with and still in disagreement with, I'm actually concerned about it for your process since this is a special meeting and Corp. Counsel is not present for these type of questions. So no we did not confer with Corp. Counsel.

Ms. Dudoit: Jen is there a reason that Corp. Counsel wasn't present there nor are they present here?

Ms. Maydan: Yes, they felt that there was no need for them to be there. We asked multiple times for them to attend CPAC meetings as well as this meeting in particular and Corp. Counsel felt that there was no legal issue that they needed to address so they didn't feel that they needed to be here. They may likely come to one or two meetings in the future, but we invited and requested and they did not come. I don't know if you have anything to add to that Will.

Ms. Dudoit: I guess my concern to that as Will is making his way to the microphone is that the Molokai Community Plan generally supersedes other types of policies and especially in decisions that we make as a commission and sort of reigns as the law when we look at land use and those kinds of things. So my concern is that if a community plan has not been reviewed in legality then where does that leave us when we're making decisions based on such documents?

Mr. Spence: First off I was in discussions with Corporation Counsel regarding their attendance at the CPAC meetings, what Jen is saying is correct. They felt like, ok no need, the CPAC is making a recommendation, that recommendation comes to the planning commission, the planning commission makes a recommendation to the County Council. Ultimately it's the Council that is going to vote to adopt after additional public input etc. Corporation Counsel was very comfortable with the advice that staff would be giving here and to the CPAC. We talked to them about the issues that were coming up,

what about this, what about that, what if the map shows this or that, they were very comfortable with the advice that this department would give to either the CPAC or to the planning commission. To me, if I could just offer an opinion on this issues about putting things on the map or not, first off everything that comes before this commission whether it be SMA permit, or change in zoning or something where this commission is going to consider and act on it, normally it's sent to SHPD for review. Not SMA Minors, not exemptions or stuff like that. But anything that's going to have some ground alteration is going to them. So whether you put it on the map or not it's still going to go to them. Whether this blob which is, the scale of the map is a couple hundred yards wide, it shows on the map or not, its not all that meaningful on the map, but you have to remember the world is getting smaller and smaller, you have treasure hunters out there who their thing is, if you've ever heard of geocaching, people go and they hide something and they'd travel all over the world to look for little items that somebody else has hidden and there's something you can do online. We have people out there across the country, in the world, this kind of thing is their hobby. Personally I don't like drawing attention to, via a map, oh there's something there I don't know what it is, but there's an inspiration for the treasure hunters in the world. I know when I used to look at archaeological surveys and knowing Maui, knowing Molokai some what, knowing Maui much better I could look at a survey and I'd know exactly where that place is. I choose not to go and mess with anything. I don't know, my opinion, my preference would be not to draw attention to the particular sites, particularly because this community holds their sites so dearly. That's ultimately up for discussion and the recommendation of this commission.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you Mr. Spence and thanks Greg, I appreciate your comments. Ok, are there any further questions or any, yes, please.

Ms. Kelly: Hi I'm Debra Kelly. I sat on the CPAC. Ok, cultural sites. There was a lot of discussion in our meetings and one of the main reasons why we decided, or we wanted to keep it as part of the plan, was to make sure that everyone understood that the cultural sites was very important to our community. The first map that we saw did not include some of the public sites. So we wanted to include those. Listening to some other community members and understanding that yes we wanted to protect some of these sites, but it was, if this map is not for the planning commission, if you don't know where some of the sites are and you have something that you have to vote on, this is something that you can use as your reference, unless you're going to go and, SHPD decides to get your own research to find out that some home that you're going to approve is located next to a historic site. Where I work, I sometimes have complaints come in that we have to consider cultural sites. Whether it's just a rock wall or a historic sites, whatever it may be, we have to be careful how to address it. We have to protect it. When we develop conservation plans, we have to do extensive research and it's difficult. We sometimes have to go out to the landowner and if they're a new landowner, I'll go and ask neighbors or whatever to find out is there anything on the property because I have come across

where some new landowners will destroy some sites. Sometimes unknowingly, sometimes knowingly. To put dots on this map is not using GPS. We are just putting dots and it might not be exactly where it is but we want it, as some members on the CPAC wanted to make sure that any one would understand how these sites are important to our community. That's why we wanted to include it.

Mr. Jennings: Any questions for Ms. Kelly?

Ms. Dudoit: Maybe just clarification from the department. From my experience and what I understand, what you said is that if somebody comes in with an application and your department initially checks for any type of historical or archaeological sites and in my experience when you apply for a building permit and you are applying for a permit and you're going to dig and you have grading permits and all those kinds of things, those trigger also very extensive, or at least, to get a letter from the department stating there are not archaeological sites available. So we don't necessarily see the map but it does, it might not be present here but I do know in the building plan permit process that it is something, one of the approving agencies that looks at and is required to get the department's recommendation. Do you see it too before it comes to the commission? When you make your recommendation to us for a project, have you already reviewed any potential archaeological sites?

Mr. Spence: What the planning department does, when an application comes in we go ok, if it's downtown Kaunakakai, probably not anything there so no need send it to SHPD. If it's East End, if there's dunes, if it's undisturbed ground we will send the application to them. The applicant should be akamai enough, they would contact them first. Normally the landowner comes in and says hey I want to do this and I want to do that, we go ok, you're in the special management area, you know you're going to go before the Molokai Planning Commission, it's undisturbed ground, in a sensitive area, you should go talk to an archaeologist. It's all part of the process.

Ms. Dudoit: So you don't necessarily check and review if there's any..

Mr. Spence: We're not the experts but we recognize sensitive areas, we recognize some things, people with long history of Molokai, we know pretty much where the sensitive areas are and we'll give a landowner direction where to go, who to check with.

Ms. Dudoit: This is just for my knowledge, so if the department makes a recommendation to the commission and along the way it's not reviewed and you didn't know there were any archaeological sites and later on when they're digging they find it, who the holds the responsibility for what needs to be done? Does it go back to the landowner or the approving agency?

Mr. Spence: Depending on what kind of permit, there's a pretty standard condition on all permits that are approved by this commission that say, if you encounter any cultural sites or burials during construction you stop work immediately in that area and you contact State Historic Preservation Division. I really appreciate the CPAC's view, Debra Kelly's view on this so to me it's going to be a recommendation of this commission and on to the Council. So I'd voice my opinion.

Ms. Swenson: Will, what about all of the grading and buildings that are going up on the East End without permits? It's like the wild west out there.

Mr. Spence: Technically, without knowing specifics but just on a face view of something like that, they would be in violation of all kinds of stuff.

Ms. Swenson: I know and then we have all these homeless people in the bushes doing God knows what out there. Nobody's paying any attention to any of it.

Mr. Spence: That's not really a zoning issue. I would let the Mayor's office know because the Mayor is concerned about the homeless situation and the State and our islands. If there are specifics, well everybody goes no enforcement, no enforcement, but if somebody calls something in we will send somebody over to the island. Better if we can make a trip worth it with a number of inspections but if there's something going on, people need to call them on. People don't often call them in.

Mr. Racine: I'm sorry this is directed to you, Ms. Morgan. I'm looking at the map and the distribution of recognized cultural sites is concentrated on the coastlines and a few of the high places. I understand this island had considerable population at one time. These large open areas of no cultural sites, is it because they haven't been found yet or the surveys have been done and its been cleared? There's just a few in the homestead areas, the west end, they're concentrated on the coastlines, but there's lots of hill tops and habitable valleys and stuff on that west end but nothing is indicated in these large open areas with no cultural sites. Again, is that because they haven't been found yet or the surveys done and they're not there?

Ms. Davis: If it's state owned the surveys have not been done. We may have more identified in DHHL lands because they are occupied and they're looking into that themselves and they take that responsibility. Definitely it's a gap with large public lands where we haven't had that done. I will say for the coastal areas that's true with every island, that we're going to have the majority of sites that are on coastal areas may be identified both because of population and because the earliest surveys were done on coastal lines in the early 1900s. That was specifically to the fish ponds and the heiau. People looking for the big things, the things you can't miss even if you're looking at it from a boat. The inland areas came later, everywhere.

Mr. Jennings: Is there any more testimony please?

Ms. McPherson: Hi, Aloha Commissioner's, Nancy McPherson, DHHL. Just a thought, if a landowner really desired to not have a site shown on the map shouldn't they submit testimony to request that either at the CPAC stage or the planning commission stage? Request that that be taken off? I mean to me if a landowner is really concerned that, if I was a landowner that's what I would do, submit testimony making that request. Thank you.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you Ms. McPherson.

Ms. Dudoit: That's an interesting point. For the record I would also like us to consider that what if it's mapped and I buy a piece of property and no longer want it to be mapped? So there are two sides of that discussion as well. Just so we can keep that in mind.

Mr. Jennings: Does anyone have a recommendation as to they want to keep the map the way it is or change it?

Ms. Dudoit: Ok because this is our first meeting I just want to clarify. What's on the map right now is what the present map looks like, or is that we want it to, so I'm not.

Ms. Maydan: What's in your binder, what's on the map, is what came out of CPAC. So that is what's currently in the draft plan update.

Ms. Dudoit: And this whole discussion with recommendations from the department of what...

Ms. Maydan: Our recommendation and Morgan's, SHPD's recommendation, is to remove the red dots, remove the cultural sites layer that is on the map, or remove the map in a whole. We would recommend having a cultural resources map but having it contain the other items that are on here. Remove the cultural sites, have very well known cultural sites called out by name that are on here that are referenced in the chapter, to have a link between the chapter and the map. To have the ahapua'a, but to take off the red dots, the specific cultural sites from SHPD's inventory. That would be the planning department's recommendation.

Mr. Jennings: Ok with that explanation, is there any more public, yes sir, step to the microphone and state your name please.

Mr. Naki: Aloha my name is Palmer Naki and I'm from the east side. I've been listening for a little while to, I forget, his name and her name. I have concerns because you guys are trying to put these dots on this map, expose our archaeological sites and all of these things, for what reason, what are the reasons? To put this on the map and to expose all of this, is this for some kind of treasure hunt? Is this for a treasure hunt? Or is this for some kind of buildings, is this what they want to do? Enough desecration has been done, enough. Our island is, the way it is I love it, leave it alone. It talks about corporate, he's my Kupuna, he's considered corporate. We seek advice from people like uncle and elders. When I listen to you guys say heritage and all of this, what is you guys heritage? We know what is ours and we protect 'em and we love 'em. As far as, what is madam's name over there, as far as desecration of the land, there's a lot of bulldozing been going off on the east like how she said. Nothings been done about it and who ever is giving these permits needs to stop. There's a lot of old walls that they're demolishing it now as I speak and I don't know what's the purpose for all of this desecration. It's hurtful for me because I am a descendant and I don't like to see this kind of stuff. If I have anything more to say I'd love to speak again. Thank you.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you Mr. Naki.

Mr. Racine: This map right here says the Planning Department recommends deleting this map entirely. It says so right on top the map.

Ms. Maydan: Under tab 11 in your binder is where the maps are. This is map 3.3. On the top of the map there's an asterisk in red text, it says the Planning Department recommends deleting map 3.3 in its entirety or removing the cultural sites layer. The cultural sites layer refers to the red dots.

Mr. Racine: Please understand I know my heritage and my people seek its (inaudible) even mention the names of those who passed and we're discussing this for the right purpose to make sure that this sensitive information remains protected and that's why this notice here and we're discussing to agree with this recommendation.

Ms. Dudoit: Chair can I make a recommendation? Have you closed public testimony?

Mr. Jennings: Yes, please.

Mr. Jenkins: Greg Jenkins again, thank you Chair. I just want to make one quick point. I was answering Zhantell's question before but the one point I wanted to make out from your discussion is that on page 3-12, if you look at the first three action items, 3.2.01, 3.2.02, and 3.2.03, they make no mention about a map. I can agree and empathize about the issue that concerns a map but what we're more interested in is the archaeological **JS** inventory of sites. That could be executively held so that we do not desecrate these sites

where they exist and continually to have inadvertent discovery where we know these places are known. That was, as far as the CPAC member, my primary concern.

Mr. Jennings: Greg, thank you. Is there any more public discussion? If not I will close the public discussion.

MOTION: I MOVE TO REMOVE THE CULTURAL SITES LAYER OFF THE MAP WITH THE EXCEPTION OF WELL KNOWN CULTURAL SITES THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN ESTABLISHED BY NAME.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Ms. Maydan: If I can just clarify when you say the well known sites.

Ms. Dudoit: Well I kind of repeating what you said because I thought that was a good idea and then to include all the other parts like the rivers and streams and water falls with the exception of the cultural sites.

Ms. Maydan: So deleting the red dots, the cultural sites layer but leaving on the ones that are called out by name, like Malama Cultural Park, etc, that tie to the chapter text.

Ms. Dudoit: I guess either Will or Morgan can kind of make sure that we're on the right track. The department does have a list and a map of these things and for the sake of ensuring that somebody actually knows where they are, I know that there has been extensive work done throughout the history of our islands to ensure and it's ongoing, to ensure that those sites are mapped out but it's just not published. So you do have one that is accessible for the community or people to see, but it doesn't necessarily put on sensitive cultural sites that you have in your inventory but are not publicly published, right?

Ms. Davis: We do have an internal GIS system on our Oahu office. It's not available on line, I actually can't even access it from Maui but we do have it.

Ms. Dudoit: I guess I'm just trying to establish that somebody does have it. It's not like we're taking off all these dots and we're never gonna know where they are. Somebody actually does have it and through a process or proper approvals we are able to access that if it was necessary.

Ms. Davis: Yes. We can definitely take a look and you were saying, you would to have well known sites or ones that are open to the public already, we can help you identify that if it's something that you'd be interested in.

Mr. Jennings: Any further discussion? So we have a motion on the floor.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

C. MOLOKA'I PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO THE NOVEMBER 2015 DRAFT MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN:

1. Chapter 1 Introduction
2. Chapter 2 Moloka'i's Future
3. Chapter 3 Natural, Heritage, and Scenic Resources

Ms. Maydan: Ok well we dived right into the chapter and I'm going to step back for a second and give you a little bit of an introduction to the structure of the chapters. So like I said we're starting with chapter three. Chapters three through 9 are really the substantive chapters and they're all arranged in a similar way where there is an introduction to the chapter, discussion of existing conditions, the key issues are called out. There's a goal and there's policies and actions. So you'll see as we go through the plan over the course of the meetings, that's how the chapters are structured. Chapter 3 has three sections and we're gonna jump into section 3.2, Heritage Resources which starts on page 3.9. But as we go through the sections we will strongly recommend that you focus on the policies and actions for your recommendations. The CPAC did a wonderful job of vetting the introduction language and the exiting conditions. We had great discussions and great changes that happened, that were made in those sections. The policies and the actions are really the heart and the meat that take the plan forward. The policies are, they're structured to provide guidance for government agencies, developers, landowners, organizations and the actions are specific tasks to be implemented. Programs, changes to regulations, projects, they're specific tasks to be implemented by county agencies. Perhaps in partnership with state agencies, community organizations, etc. So as you provide your recommendations I would advise you to not get hung up on a lot of text but focus on the policies and actions. As you go through it, like I said, I'll call out where we have a couple of recommendations.

Mr. Jennings: If there's any discussion like Jennifer or recommendations, Zhantell?

MOTION: I MOVE TO ACCEPT ALL THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT IN CHAPTER THREE. TO BE SPECIFIC, 3-9 LINE 36 AND 38, ELIMINATING APPROXIMATELY 120, THE NUMBER 120. REPLACING

ROUGHLY 75 OF THOSE TO NUMEROUS MOLOKAI AND 3-12 TO ADD THE NEW POLICY, AND 3-13 TO ADD NEW ACTION.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER MARSHALL RACINE

Mr. Jennings: Discussion?

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Mr. Jennings: We'll go on and do Natural Resources, 3.1 and I believe Mary Jorgensen, please.

Ms. Jorgensen: Thank you I'm Mary Jorgensen. I'm with the Long Range Division. You have as Jen said, the introduction was incredibly well vetted by the CPAC and Debra left but she was instrumental in making a lot of changes, Glenn Teves, Lori Buchanan all heavily involved with natural resources as well as many other CPAC members. I do want to address, because you received, some public testimony that was sent to you from, it came from Ed Misaki and Stephanie Dunbar. In it they had a couple suggestions for the introduction section to give, not only the current, which is what we're labeling existing conditions, but also historical conditions. The nature of the community plan is to look forward into the future. So our focus is the existing conditions. There is a very brief intro, a paragraph that talks about this island over time has degraded, where you're going to have more degradation of your natural environment. That's the key purpose. You, as the planning commission, as you go through all of these chapters are going to be looking at how do these actions or these policies, as later on when you're doing your normal work as the planning commission, how can you use these? Are these policies going to help you when you want to make a decision as somebody comes in with some change in development, or anything that you might see that comes through your planning commission. So the nature of this chapter here, both in the natural resources and the cultural resources and scenic, is to give you that list of policies that you can use and then also the actions are to help carry forth the protection or restoration of these resources. It comes out of our, legally we're required under 2.80B, which is what guides the community plan process, is to look very carefully at what are the environmental and social impacts of any future growth that you might have. Future growth isn't like some big new subdivision coming in, it could just be your children, or your neighbor's children, your grand children, they're going to build a new house. There's just things that are going to change the environment. The world is, we're getting more people. There's going to be more people that move here. As you look at any of these policies that are in this chapter, the environment, the next one, hazard, or even economic development, those are big picture background to give you the guidance so that you can do your job as

planning commissioner's, as you review site work. So I think in this chapter it does cover enough of those conditions. The other thing that they look for, when we get to the policies, this is just adding a policy about planning and I'll get back to that later because I think it was a good suggestion under testimony. So I didn't get it out in time for Jen's mailing of the packet, I apologize for that, but I did put together this little two page sheet and the first is ecosystem's, it's from the appendix. You already have this in your binder but I wanted it out in front of you with this, appendix 3-1, ecosystems services. This is what has been going on now for about 20 years. They have started to look, even longer then that but in terms of the name and a lot of discussion in government, the things that we have been building like pipes to move water or to filter water, the natural environment did that for a long time. They're trying to look at more, instead of just engineering, like channel your water in a big concrete channel down the mountain and put it out in the ocean, they're looking at how do we build or design and work more with nature. That's because, unfortunately for our culture, there's a dollar value for it. We're government, we have a limited amount of dollars and there's other things natural environment can do for us that they've been doing for free. Filtering our air, filtering our water. But we don't know as our testifier said. It's really, the environment is dear to our heart and we want to make sure it's protected over time because we are part of it. So we're looking at, I just wanted to call it out this lists everything the environment does for us for free. They have now calculated out it's worth billions and far beyond that. So you'll find in the chapter, and maybe you've read it, it goes over your basic endangered species on the island, all the different plans that are available and these are just examples. We can't put everything in this plan. We gave you an example of what are some of the state plans where they cover for protection, and then how and what are they doing and what are some of the main conservation efforts on this island. There's quite a lot. There's just an incredible amount of effort that is going to keep Molokai in a good environmental condition as it is currently. So that is a charge for this group as you're doing your future work is to work with what is existing for protection and restoration and make sure that it's actually being adhered to when you're approving any particular site plan. So maybe we can just jump right into the issues if anybody has any questions, those are on page 3-6. It's a summary of the issues that came up originally through community meetings when there was kind of a scoping meeting. There's some, the CPAC added a few too, such as issues 5, 6, and 7, those three were written by the CPAC in entirety and they added other changes through the issues. Particularly in issue one, at the end of the sentence you see the human effects because we have to start looking at we as humans, how do we live better with the environment. So they put emphasis on that. So does anyone have something that they want to comment on, on the issues?

Mr. Rogers: Yeah on issues number 7, the wharf. It's pretty clear that the cause way as it exist now is jamming up the natural flow. There should be some culverts there so the water can flow, right by the canoe club. The cause way, it's like a big dam. The impacts of the wharf are not well understood, they're pretty obvious though.

Ms. Jorgensen: So there's study, I think it needs further study, but it's obvious

Mr. Rogers: The solution is pretty obvious too. I'm surprised that nobody every brought that up. A few culverts would make a world of difference right there. Just a few pipes to let the water flow underneath.

Ms. Jorgensen: So your recommendation is to remove this issue? Or to change the wording in some way?

Mr. Rogers: Yeah. Something should be done about it. We should look into it.

Mr. Jennings: So do you recommend that this be taken out or?

Mr. Rogers: No clarified.

Mr. Jennings: Clarified, ok.

Ms. Swenson: Well I have a question related to that because I was on the planning commission once before and maybe Will you can answer this. It came before us, I don't know how many years ago it was on the drainage plan for Kaunakakai and we approved, were you there Zhantell or am I losing my mind? But part of it was the culvert under the wharf road and that was to be the fourth phase of the project and we approved it and it was budgeted, I thought, but it never happened.

Mr. Spence: I wouldn't know the status of that project that would be Public Works. I know when you start getting into the wharf you start getting the Army Corp. and Department of Transportation and there's a whole lot of other agencies involved. So we can try to find out if really needed. I think the question is real good. Maybe one of the commissioner's could submit recommended language for this particular issue?

Ms. Dudoit: Chair, just so that we can stay organized and move efficiently. So Mary's standing up there, is she making basic recommendations, are we discussing this and when we bring up a subject do we bring it to the floor as a motion to change and then already have the verbiage that we want to do, because we just made a motion on something. So are we just discussing?

Ms. Maydan: Mary's up here to provide, just to orient you this chapter, to provide an introduction 'cause she worked on this chapter very heavily. She's up there as a resource and asking if you have recommendations or discussion.

Ms. Dudoit: So my concern is when she's asking if we have recommendation do we take it one thing at a time like Doug's issue and do we make a motion on it and then discuss it? Because we're going to have to change it? Does he need to make a formal motion?

Mr. Jennings: Yes, we would make a motion and then we would discuss it after it's second. So Doug you made the motion?

Mr. Rogers: Yeah Diane said at one point it was approved so what happened?

MOTION: I MAKE A MOTION THAT WE ADDRESS #7, THE DRAINAGE AT THE WHARF.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Mr. Jennings: Now we can discuss it.

Ms. Dudoit: I think the sensitivity and the importance of this line is to make sure that there is on going concern about the ecological impact of the Kaunakakai Wharf. So do we really want to take the whole thing out or do we want to say there are mitigations in process or there is some information and we want to make sure it's highlighted as a priority?

Mr. Rogers: Yeah I think so because if you look over there by the canoe shack, it's pretty obvious the impact that it's having.

Ms. Jorgensen: I could suggest some wording from what you're just saying. That the ecological impacts of the Kaunakakai Wharf are a continual issue or something like that, continual concern or not being fully addressed.

Mr. Rogers: More specifically it's the cause way out to the wharf, the way it's constructed. It's acting like a dam.

Ms. Dudoit: I think the issue we're having Doug, is they need to have a general statement that can encompass all of that when we're addressing specific issues on the wharf. But she's asking if we would take the verbiage that says, try again Mary.

Ms. Jorgensen: Ok Douglas was saying that it's not well understood. But it is well understood and it's more of the ecological impacts of the Kaunakakai Wharf have not been fully addressed?

Mr. Rogers: Mitigation is...

Ms. Jorgensen: have not been fully mitigated.

Ms. Dudoit: And is an on going concern.

Mr. Rogers: Definitely.

Ms. Jorgensen: Ok.

Ms. Dudoit: We either got to vote down your motion or you got to amend your motion to say that.

Ms. Jorgensen: What was discussed was the ecological impacts of the Kaunakakai Wharf have not been fully mitigated and are an ongoing concern.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE LOOK AT THE ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS OF THE KAUNAKAKAI WHARF WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN FULLY MITIGATED AND ARE AN ONGOING CONCERN.

MOTVED: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Mr. Jennings: Any further discussion?

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Mr. Racine: Excuse me, if we're going to do this in an orderly fashion maybe we ought to address, like call out an issue one at a time and then we're gonna need issue with the issue. Number three, cumulative impact to surface and coastal waters from pollutants including sediment, home and business chemicals, herbicides, and fertilizers are not well understood by many in the community. And the policy is to encourage or educate and then the action is to encourage and educate and I've got a lot of years experience with environmental impact and users. I was on the municipal and industrial land being forced upon by government because they could. We got the deep pockets and we were right there and they could get at us. But the general public is the number one polluter. It's really nice to really say it and it's a pie in the sky. It has to have teeth. The general public, awareness does not change behavior. The behavior model has got to be something that makes them uncomfortable, there has to be some teeth to this. We have to give this to somebody and make the responsible party, who has regulatory authority to start reviewing and sighting and making people change their behavior. Because the

average house owner dumps a can of paint on his lawn, or pours waste gasoline in the gutter, or drives a car that leaks. Businesses, if they're not watched, they stock pile waste oil until the barrels rust and leak all over the ground. First good rain, that ends up on our reefs. So yeah, education and awareness don't fix the problem. I think in our action plan it has to have a little more teeth. So if we go issue three and I find the policy, #7 support significant increase in public outreach and education, stewardship. Again awareness doesn't change behavior. We need to increase that language to where we, whatever regulatory and enforcement. The action plan I think when you actually put an action to it, it was 3.1.12, a tool box. There needs to be somebody appointed to and empowered with writing tickets. You show up at the dump and you start unloading paint cans that are still wet, somebody in the dump says you can't do that. If you're going to do something on awareness or community based level you have waste chemical collection days. Real tools and something with teeth, for the abusers. Otherwise you're not going to change the behavior and we're not going to improve the environment. Thus first flush to our reefs.

Ms. Jorgensen: I think there's something in Solid Waste that addresses that in terms of having it more hazardous waste collection for paint and toxic chemicals.

Mr Racine: I didn't see that.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's in a different chapter, it's under infrastructure for Solid Waste where that would address what goes to the landfill and having collection sites and addressing the hazardous wastes and toxic substances that way. Education, I do understand that it does take a long, long time but if you have a monetary incentive it will change a little bit faster. But in terms of household waste it's an educational issue unless you say you can't put it in your garbage can.

Mr. Racine: You go to the mainland and there are four waste basins, waste retainers on the curb side with recycling, mandatory recycling and they are identified haz-mat and what not. You don't get to just throw whatever you want in the trash. If you get caught you're fined. Some is over the line but that's the way you're going to change behavior. It doesn't happen with public awareness.

Mr. Jennings: Marshall, thank you. I think we'll hold off on that till we get to that section.

Ms. Dudoit: He's addressing issue #7 in this chapter that's why. But can I ask for, for organizational purposes, if we have a question for Mary that would probably help. If we making statements we wait until a motion has been made and discussed so that, otherwise we going have our opinions going back and forth and it doesn't really carry the issue any

further. If we have a question for the department we can ask. If we have anything that we want to voice to persuade the vote then let's make a motion and have that discussed.

Mr. Jennings: Ok, so next.

Ms. Jorgensen: It would be whatever policy someone wanted to look at. These policies are going to be your guidance about the natural resources as you're looking at sites. So if there's any one that you think you'd like to see a change in or want to recommend a change, these policies represent the CPAC's final version. You may want to add something. You might want to add #12 which would be coming from Ed Misaki and, it was encourage adequate funding and they didn't finish it. Have something in there to encourage adequate funding but to keep it broad or inclusive you could have something like encourage adequate funding for ecosystem protection and restoration. Or some other wording. But what they were looking for was guidance because most of this is done by the state and as a county government we can encourage them to have enough funding for what we have in the plan.

Ms. Dudoit: Did Stephanie or Ed do testimony and ask CPAC to include that? Is this letter from Stephanie and Ed coming to us because it's a new development or is this something that they asked the CPAC and they didn't include?

Ms. Jorgensen: No, it's a letter that came after the CPAC and it was addressed to the planning commission as their comments on the CPAC draft of things they saw.

Ms. Dudoit: So both of them never addressed the CPAC with this concern before?

Ms. Jorgensen: No they did not.

Mr. Jennings: Is there a motion on Mary's recommendation which was, Mary if you could go over that again please.

Ms. Jorgensen: It'll be policy #12, encourage adequate funding for ecosystem protection and restoration.

Ms. Dudoit: And that's it right? Because when I'm reading the letter it also has to do with naming more people like the east Molokai Watershed Project. So you're specifically sticking to what you just said right?

Ms. Jorgensen: I was just taking one request that they had within that letter for how it would fit as a policy.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE WHAT IS ALREADY HERE AND TO INCLUDE POLICY #12 AS STATED.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DIANE SWENSON

Mr. Jennings: Any further discussion?

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Ms. Jorgensen: Ok the final section for this natural resources is the action table. So if you want to take a moment and look at that and see if there's any actions that you have, something that you want to change.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE ACTIONS IN THIS CHAPTER.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DIANE SWENSON

Mr. Jennings: Any further discussion?

Mr. Lasua: Mary you say partners up here but who's going to oversee all this?

Ms. Jorgensen: The responsibility for the implementation is in a chapter, I think it's tab 1210 in your binder. Where it breaks out how it will be funded, when it might occur and what's the lead county agency and so all of that is under the responsibility of the various county agencies and they are coordinated through a new division within the planning department which is the Planning Implementation Division that was formed about a year ago. So every year, to track that there's certain measures that are in that implementation section and there'll be an annual report on the progress.

Mr. Lasua: Thank you.

Ms. Dudoit: Chair I know we have a motion on the table but if there are late community members who have come after you've closed public testimony, is there an opportunity to reopen so that we can hear testimony? Well we had public testimony in the beginning.

Mr. Jennings: What we're going over right now.

Ms. Dudoit: Yes. And it was asked, I know at our regular meeting if we could have public testimony on each chapter but it was through the recommendation, I don't know from who, but that we do everything all at once. So my question now is this meetings were held at 3pm specifically for the working people to be able to attend. So if people come during the course of our meeting and have missed the opportunity to testify in the beginning can we reopen public testimony so that we can hear from the community?

Mr. Jennings: Ok since Jennifer says it's up to me and I think it's only fair the question you asked and I would say yes to that.

Ms. Dudoit: Because I want to hear what they have to say I want to rescind my motion and take it off the floor.

Mr. Jennings: Ok, fine.

Mr. Ritte: Mahalo. I think that it's important that we as the public listen before we talk because you guys might cover stuff and then we might just double duty. But listening to this chapter three I had couple comments. Natural heritage and scenic resources. They left out a very major resource that we have on Molokai. I went through this chapter and maybe I missed it but there's very little about the North Shore of Molokai. That's probably one of our most important natural resources. Especially for food security in the future for Molokai and for the State of Hawaii. So there needs to be an addition, something needs to be in this chapter, what's your name again? Mary, that describes the North Shore of Molokai. What was the historical value and what is the future value for this natural resource. We all understand how important the North Shore is and I was really surprised that it's not even mentioned in this plan at all. Maybe we could also say a little bit more about the South Shore of Molokai. That's the major two natural resources we have on this island. 14,000 acres of reef and four valleys that has like millions and millions of gallons of water, not only water but pristine water. So also under existing conditions when we talk about the North Shore we need to mention we have invaluable wall to wall terraces that was built by our Kupuna and they all in tact. They all there, nobody bombed them like they did on Kaho'olawe, nobody came in there with bulldozers and busted them all down. They're there. And if we had to go build those things today it would be cost prohibited. So we have this tremendous amount of natural resources in the form of taro terraces built by our Kupuna that goes from one side of the valley wall, stops at the river, goes all the way up to the other side of the valley wall. So these are some of the existing conditions. The taro terraces, and the millions and millions of gallons of pristine water. I don't know how all of this got left out but they got left out. Under issues I wanted to talk little bit about issue #3 again. It talks about cumulative impacts to surface and coastal waters from pollutants. It only talks about home businesses. It does not mention one of the most highly used pollutants coming out of mono cropping agriculture on Molokai. That needs to be in there, that's like duh? They

pumping chemicals and fertilizers daily and it's going down hill when it rains, and it's going down hill in the dust and it's ending up on our most important reef system. So that needs to be in the plan somehow, you can't have a blind eye to the most obvious threat. So maybe the wording can be changed or added. It says are not well understood by the community. We could add words that says presents large potential negative impacts. If we want to treat these GMO guys lightly, we can use those kinds of words that doesn't like tell them to get off Molokai kind of words. Issue #5, it talks about the things being threatened and the list should include over grazing. There's no mention of over-grazing. Over-grazing has been the number one pollutant on Molokai for the past 50 years. Molokai Ranch, they stopped a lot of the things they were doing in the past but damage has already been done by over-grazing. So over-grazing needs to be in there. Mono cropping needs to be in there and excessive pesticide and fertilize use needs to be in there, under issue #5. Over-grazing, mono-cropping, excessive pesticide and fertilizer use, all those things part of that.

Mr. Jennings: Excuse me Mr. Ritte, Diane?

Ms. Swenson: Walter can I ask you a question? We were supposed to just review the CPAC work because they're the ones that did all of this, did you present this information to CPAC and they refused to do it or?

Mr. Ritte: No because those guys had meetings like 9 at night and it's like you know what, forget it. This guys a slave driver you know.

Ms. Swenson: These guy's worked really hard on this plan and I don't know, it's not our job to just pull it all apart and redo it.

Mr. Ritte: I'm not asking you to pull it apart, I'm just simply adding some things that they missed. They're going to miss some things.

Ms. Swenson: Well I'm just wondering why they didn't do it.

Mr. Ritte: Me too. They had some good people on there and they worked really hard. There's no way a normal person would have gone through that.

Mr. Jennings: I guess from Walter, is there anyone of the commissioners that would like to make a motion that would put in. Walter. I'm sorry I believe his three minutes are up.

Ms. Swenson: I would like to see what he has, I'd like to see it in writing not just make a motion and say we're going to adopt what Walter says. I think we need to see it in a chart form, we need to see it in writing.

Mr. Ritte: My job is to come to you guys as a community member and express my concerns. So I'm not much of a writer and if you're gonna start making it hard for us, this guy made it hard for us to testify in the first place, you know. Four, 5 hours worth of testimony, we gotta listen, listen, listen and at the end they give us three minutes and then they get mad because we go past three minutes, and they talking for 7 hours. The community has been mistreated in this process and I'm trying to be nice. It was really bad. If it wasn't for the aha getting involved there would have been very, very, little community input because it was not set up for community, it was not set up for us to participate. We were like the enemy. So I don't want to be treated like the enemy here either. I can only put enough time to say, at least I'm reading this thing and say, wow they missed this whole thing, they forgot the North Shore, the most important thing.

Ms. Swenson: No. Walter I'm not arguing with you. What I'm saying is that you said a lot of things and I don't want to just say, oh, we make a motion to accept what Walter says, I want to have it clear exactly what we're doing.

Mr. Ritte: I'm willing to take it one point at a time and have you vote on each one. That's fine with me. However you folks want to handle it. I just want to make sure that at least.

Mr. Jennings: Marshall?

Mr. Racine: I hear what he's saying. Issue #3, it looks like...

Ms. Dudoit: Chair, can we allow him to finish his public testimony and get organized so we can discuss and we can write stuff down and then we can ask if we don't feel comfortable voting on this we can defer it and refer to our minutes of this meeting at some other time.

Mr. Jennings: Walter I'm sorry.

Mr. Ritte: Under policies I wanted to add #12 which is ensure base line data collection of South Shore water quality and coral reef conditions. The problem we're having right now is that there's impacts. Whether it be from grazing, mono cropping, whatever the list was, we cannot understand what the impacts are because we have no baseline data to compare it to. It's always, it was always there. So we need to make sure we understand what is there today so we know what the impacts are later on. All these things I'm saying, I'm sure this lady right here who's responsible for this chapter is writing it down, I hope she is, help me out. But we need to get a baseline data for what's on our reefs, what's in the water, what chemicals are in the water, what's the condition of our corals and all of that stuff. Somehow we have to understand some of that. There's studies done by NOAA that are this thick and this big and it calls our reefs a national treasure. That's

what the government is calling it. So there's information in there that you can see whatever is there and find out what's not there. We need to understand what is on our reefs so it needs to be part of our planning process that we go ahead and find out the base line data that's out there. I missed it, she does have it in there 3-1-10. The only thing I would add to 3.1.10 then would be the partners. The partners need to be those people, especially corporation that are impacting. They need to pay their share of what needs to be done, not only the public with our taxpayer's money, but the people that are actually impacting. So I would add the corporations to the partners. They need to come up with some funds to figure out some of these impacts.

Ms. Dudoit: Uncle for the record you can state on the microphone what corporate partners you mean so that we can get them on here and we can look at.

Mr. Ritte: Molokai Ranch if they over grazing, the GMO companies if their stuff, the dust and the mud and everything is going on the reef, what chemicals are going into the reefs. Nobody can say that the chemicals are not going because they're in the soil. So they need to help with the baseline data, they need to put some monies into the base line data. On 3-11, issues, I have page 3-9 and 3-10. When I read that page there was a list of cultural resources, Halawa Valley, Ili'ili'opae, Mapalehu, Makahiki Ground at Naiwa, I found it really strange that they did not list Lanikaula. Kuku'i Lanikaula is the second most sacred site in all of Hawaii and it's not listed. So that should be listed. Is there a reason why it's not listed?

Mr. Spence: It's private property.

Mr. Ritte: I don't care its historic sites. What is this private property stuff? This is the most sacred site in Hawaii.

Mr. Jennings: Walter could you wrap it up so we could discuss it, please?

Mr. Ritte: I recommend this private property doesn't count with historic sites. You can list it in your plan if you want to and you should list it, it's the most sacred, second most, the Big Island has the most sacred sites. On page 3-11, there's issue #1 and #2. Cultural and environmental degradation. I wanted to add in there, to give some credibility as to why these things should be saved. Due to the Hawaiian Language not being a written language, these historic sites represent our libraries. That is the only thing that has been passed down generation, generation down besides the oral tradition, these historic sites. They are our libraries. So that should be listed why we should be saving our sites. That's the thing that really took off on the Kaho'olawe movement that these things were being destroyed daily by bombs and that was the only way, we didn't have the University of Hawaii, where we have Hawaiian studies today. But the historic sites was the only thing we could go back to explain what our Kupuna was doing in the past.

Mr. Jennings: Walter if you could please, then we could discuss this. If you can wrap it up please. Thank you very much for your testimony. If there's anyone here on the commission that would like to make a motion to what Mr. Ritte has gone through, now would be the time that we did it.

Ms. Dudoit: Before we make a motion does the department have any more recommendations on this particular chapter that we're going to review today?

Ms. Jorgensen: Sorry I was giving something to him. Can you restate that?

Ms. Dudoit: Are there any more particular recommendations that the department is making on this chapter today?

Ms. Jorgensen: Not for section 3.1, when you finish discussing that we can go over what's in 3.3 which is scenic which I don't have any recommendations. So it would be whether you did.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE DEFER ANY MORE APPROVALS ON CHAPTER THREE.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Ms. Dudoit: So from my understanding, according to what Jennifer said earlier, if we don't do this we'll address it at our last meeting which would be on March 10. So it'll give us time to review the minutes and other testimony made by the community.

Mr. Jennings: That's correct.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Mr. Jennings: We will discuss this at our March 10 meeting.

Mr. Spence: I'd like to make a recommendation, we'll have the minutes within our office prior to and staff can go through and make some notes or include it in the language or something like that, we can come back to you with the things that Walter was talking about. I'm trying to envision March 10, it's going to come up faster than you know. Rather than everybody bringing their minutes and going line 33, on page 56 and going through it like that, that's going to be really awkward and really time consuming. In order to get through this let staff get a draft of some of the recommendations and bring it

back to you for consideration at that time. Then you'll have it all in one place and you can go, I really like this or I like it except for, you know whatever.

Mr. Racine: Could we be more specific and say we would like to see Mr. Ritte's concerns listed and if they're already addressed, to what level, if it's not consistent with his concerns, per issue, policy and action, yeah, two charts side by side. If we already addressed it and it's already sufficient, we can decide that or if we want to strengthen the language per what Mr. Ritte said, then that gives us the opportunity to see it side by side and it will expedite the process.

Mr. Spence: We can come back with some comments. I don't know if we would want to go through the whole side by side thing, again it gets massively confusing. We can do color coding...

Mr. Racine: Mr. Ritte only made about 4 or 5 points. If we can look at them with chapter three, whether they're already addressed, if his concerns are already addressed in the language of chapter three, show us where it is. If we need to strengthen it based on his concerns then we can do that.

Mr. Spence: He brought up some other things that we could take a stab at including or what ever.

Ms. Swenson: I have a question for staff. One of the things that concerns me that he says is that the CPAC process did not allow for public testimony and the only time the public could talk was at 9 at night. I just want to know how that process happened and if the public was left out?

Ms. Dudoit: Since we're having discussion and I have the microphone. I went to a few of those meetings too and it was long. I think maybe for us as a commission as we're reviewing this too, it makes a lot of sense to me, and I don't know how you would work this out because we're making approvals as we go along, but when you're having a community process sometimes people need to be educated first before they can tell you what their opinion is. So when we have the public testimony in the beginning, and then they get to hear all this stuff that are happening afterwards, they really don't get to readdress the issue. I don't know how you would work that out but I will say that what Walter said was sort of kind of true cause I went too and I waited a long time to be able to have three minutes which wasn't enough by the time I wrote down all my 10 pages of notes from the discussion that was going on. So on this issue that we're voting right now, yes, I think the recommendation that Will made that having some verbiage over there would be good and I just wanted to clarify, is the reasoning behind not having anything about the North Shore, because I testified on the issue too. But the reasoning behind not having anything about the North Shore or specifically about the east because we were

awaiting the East Molokai, was there a reason that the North Shore was eliminated all together, no verbiage?

Ms. Jorgensen: A little less information. There is some in there in general where it talks about the State Comprehensive wildlife plan or water quality for the entire island. They have their coastal management plans. Those kind of plans talk about the entire island which in this community plan we are looking way up 30,000 foot level of what's going on and referring to these plans, some of them 100 of pages thick, and because we can't put all of that in a community plan, we can't say this is going to be a document. So things about the North Shore, we have examples in here, we can plan an example for the North Shore. I would suggest bringing back something similar to what Jen prepared for section 3.2 that you passed earlier, that sheet that says here's the revised language and track changes as well as saying if we haven't made a revision why that might be. I hope I got it all but I got to check with Walter and find out or look at the meeting minutes. I also suggest that we finish the chapter, section 3.3 and the more things get put off the longer those last meetings will be, which I think was the one you attended Zhantell. You get towards the end it starts stacking up. So if we can get rid of a few in terms of look at it now, then you won't have to come across it.

Ms. Dudoit: That's why I asked you earlier if you had anything else you wanted to recommend about the chapter before I made my vote. So you have other things you want to talk about?

Ms. Jorgensen: It's just in general, just taking a look at, maybe you feel that the commissioners have looked at the scenic resources and are comfortable with all those recommendations then I would not have any recommendations. I just want to double check on that. Also we have two maps that are associated with section 3.1, they're under the natural resources, they're in tab #11. You could look at those. Again these are to give readers an overview. They're not something that if you were going to have a subdivision come in, they're not going to use these maps. They're gonna get something that's in much greater detail. This is for the reader who knows nothing about what the, like in 3.1, what are the natural resources, oh, here's some of them, here's where they fall, where they're located to give a general overview.

Ms. Dudoit: Seeing that Walter had a lot to say about different areas of the chapter and to give the department time to place it in the places that need to be, I think it would kind of be a waste of time right now to keep reviewing over stuff. Because we've read it, I read it three, four times already, this chapter. So I don't think we need to go through all of that unless you have a specific thing, we noted the community comments on it and when we go through it with the department's recommendations using some of the community testimony I think that would help us better.

Mr. Jennings: I'm going to make a statement that I should have made before and maybe redid it. I need to make sure that we give the public a chance to speak before we get into all of this so that we don't have a lot of indecision or like Zhanell said. That's my fault and my responsibility. I apologize for that.

Ms. Maydan: We will move on to chapter one.

MOTION: I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE RECOMMEND THAT WE APPROVE PAGE 1-10, 18 AND 19 TO CHANGE THE WORDING FROM OVER 100 TO NUMEROUS SITES ON THE HAWAII AND/OR NATIONAL REGISTRY OF HISTORIC PLACES DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT THE ISLAND.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Mr. Jennings: Discussion.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Jennings: So Chapter one provides an overview to the community plan and kind of goes through the plan, organization, it gives an overview to the county general plan structure and how the community plans fit into that. It provides a list of problems and opportunities for the island. These are very broad and over arching and they're just kind of the key problems and opportunities as we saw, in the chapters you get into more detail. Chapter one does not have any policies and actions, chapters one and two do not have policies and actions like the other chapters. You already approved that recommendation.

Ms. Dudoit: We have another, I don't know if it was just a copy error, but you also have another highlighted on line 24, part of it, the global economy? Is that an addition?

Ms. Maydan: What page are you on?

Ms. Dudoit: Page 1-1, line 24.

Ms. Maydan: That's an error. That was from a previous copy, you can ignore that.

Ms. Swenson: On page 1.2 under 11 and 12 it talks about the resources on the various project on the island and Wavecrest was left out, was there a reason for that? The only resort designations are Kalua Koi on the western end of the island, Hotel Molokai and Molokai Shores, just outside of Kaunakakai. It doesn't say anything at all about Wavecrest. Technically I think it should.

Ms. Maydan: I believe it's not a hotel, it's a condominium.

Ms. Swenson: Neither is Hotel Molokai or Kalua Koi.

Ms. Maydan: Those are hotels, Will?

Mr. Spence: Molokai Shores is what they call a condo/tel, it's a short term rentals permitted but it's really condos. It's not zoned hotel, I think it's zoned A-1 or A-2.

Ms. Swenson: Ok my other question was under population and demographics. It should be complete, I mean you talk about 24% of the island being Hawaiian but what's the other 76%? Shouldn't it be broken? I mean if you're gonna put one in shouldn't they all be in?

Ms. Maydan: She's referring to page 1-3 the fast facts of Molokai and these are just kind of just quick snippets of highlights. If you have a recommendation of something you'd add, we could do that.

Ms. Swenson: I would think that if you're going to talk about the percentage of population that it should include the total not just one.

Mr. Racine: (inaudible)

Mr. Jennings: Any further discussion on that? If not we'll move on.

Ms. Dudoit: I don't know if it's appropriate at this time but I brought it up earlier this morning when you and I were talking, is there an opportunity through this meeting process for us to have public testimony after the introduction of each chapter? Then that way we would eliminate somebody, and then we can stick to the three minute.

Mr. Jennings: Yes. So if there is anyone that would like to make public testimony at this time, please step to the mike and just to keep three minutes.

Mr. Ritte: I have one suggestion under problems. It goes abcdefgh, I wanted to add "I" and put in there governances, Molokai's political clout is really, really small. Maui County elects our council person, Oahu elects our OHA trustee we have a problem with governance. We gotta figure out how we can solve that. Probably being our own county is probably the best solution. But I wanted to list governance as one of the problems that we have. Under GMO issue, Molokai voted one way, Maui voted another way and it went with Maui. So there's a lot of examples as to how our voices on Molokai are not heard. So I wanted to make sure that we keep that as an issue as a problem area. Under

opportunities, I wanted to list Molokai's subsistence economy as one of our opportunities, we make no mention about the subsistence economy being our second economy. 1/3 of all of the food that we eat here on this island comes from subsistence. That's inside of the State subsistence plan. Under cultural resources and traditions, I wanted to list four terms: Aina Momona, Pule O'o, Molokai Nui Ahina and Molokai No Ka Heke. Those terms need to be in this plan. These were the traditional sayings that guided Molokai, not the Friendly Isle that came from the Cook's when they were trying to figure out how to build tourism on Molokai. Aina Momona, Pule O'o, Molokai Nui Ahina, which should be first, and Molokai No Ka Heke. Maui No Ka Oi, but Molokai No Ka Heke, which means yeah Maui is top but Molokai is better.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you Mr. Ritte. Greg, yes please.

Mr. Jenkins: Thank you Chair, Greg Jenkins, CPAC member. I don't have a lot that some of the other cultural practitioners can add to this chapter but I'd like to do a little background based on the discussion I've heard. To me, you guys are the currently planning body and this document represents long range planning, however, in my opinion, contrary to what the department may tell you, it is used for current planning. What's important about that is that this document represents a great big EA. EA's have information. Whether it's due diligence the department and the information the CPAC was not provided whether it was just a lack of time, there are many questions that have no answers. This plan's purpose is to try to get the answers to those questions to make informed decisions, so we can have due diligence when we make planning recommendations, especially in current planning. The fact that Corporation Counsel's not here, the fact that there's no inclusions of some kind of recommendations by current planning appalls me because of how I know this document will be used. More bad planning doesn't fix bad planning. We have a history of desecrating this island, it's wrong. We have a history of incomplete planning that had good intentions that we have not fixed. We have to stop that and we have to purpose ourselves on what side of the coin we're on to make that effort happen. I believe that the answers that will come out of this document will help us to do that. You will see as the chapters go on. One other recommendation I would have from discussion I've heard and it was good purpose discussion and it took awhile for us as CPAC to kind of get in the groove of this, is really be careful to reference the actions to the policies, to the issues. Just impose that, really mix that up because you'll find that a lot of the concerns you have with a particular issue or policy is already been addressed in the action. For example, Uncle Walter's recommendation with regards to North Shore, it's limited mention of it but the water quality for example, is supposed to include the whole island. Diane for example, I'll give you one last comment, is the East End Policy Statement, this is going to come up over and over again, you're going to hear the community talk about it. We were led to believe all along that we'd be able to have this addressed, we'd believe all along that we could meet in that ahapua'a for the community. It's terribly disrespectful that we completed a

plan without it happening. Please don't make that mistake. Please don't listen to the department telling you that they can't meet Mana'e, that's wrong, we all know it, it's culturally insensitive. Basically everything east of Kaunakakai, Diane, is left out, unless it just happens to be generally there because of the rest of the plan. Major issues. So with that I appreciate the time to testify.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you very much Greg, thank you. Excuse me, are there any other testifiers? Seeing none, Zhantell?

Ms. Dudoit: I have a question for the department on 1-9 under problems, section G, housing. What exactly does workforce housing affordable housing mean?

Ms. Maydan: I believe there needs to be a comma between housing and affordable. So it'll read, "the availability of workforce housing, affordable housing, ownership and rental".

Ms. Dudoit: What is workforce housing?

Ms. Maydan: Mary do you think that's correct? There is supposed to be a comma there, yes. Workforce, I don't know if I have an exact definition for it but it's not necessarily technically affordable housing that would be tied to a requirement. But workforce for the general workforce. Mary do you have a...

Ms. Jorgensen: They're related between the workforce and affordable and I think we had one term and they just want to make sure that they were both in there. The workforce would be, it's generally referred to your basic services. You want your policeman, fireman, teachers to be able to live in the community where they work. So that's when that term is used. They're generally referring to essential services, the people who do those are going to be able to have housing. Affordable housing has a whole range and it's defined and in chapter 6. It has a percentage of income and so it has guidelines when you meet that threshold of where housing is affordable for certain community, by community. So it has a more legal definition.

Ms. Dudoit: Can I ask how, so when you look at problems, those are just problems that somebody thinks are problems, or was there actual data that stated that we had a lack of affordable and workforce housing?

Ms. Jorgensen: There is data for that, but the problems and opportunities originated with the scoping meetings that were in 2010 that went out to the public to first identify what are the issues and opportunities and then as the draft plan was being written at the department level, they shaped those into these first statements which are required by the 2.80B, to have this section. So also in previous community plans. The CPAC did a lot of

work on these problems and opportunities, added some and shaped them up to what they thought represented the community. The work on that was pretty extensive.

Ms. Dudoit: So does the need for, I'm just trying to get my head around this because I disagree with this statement right here. But, does the need for affordable housing is it based on your current population or is it based on the sustainable yield of a certain community? Because if you base affordable housing on the size of your population, you don't take into account what happens to the natural resources of that community. When you base affordable housing and the amount or capacity that an island can sustain in its population and you base your need for housing on that number, then you got a viable community. So I'm wondering what is the meat behind saying that you need more housing? Is it because we have 7,000 people and we don't have enough houses for all those 7,000? Or is it for projected growth that going happen? Or is it because we want all our children to come, what is it?

Ms. Jorgensen: The statistics they take the existing population and they take the income levels for that population and then they say for this given population an affordable house at 30% of the average income, then they would be able to pay this much a month and a mortgage and this much a month if they were renting. They have tables that are guidelines for the whole range of affordability and a few fall into that need category. They're really driven by federal guidelines as well. The workforce housing, there's a county ordinance that exists to define that.

Ms. Dudoit: So this is something that you cannot take out even if you wanted to.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's pretty much by the data, it exist that...

Ms. Dudoit: So you cannot take this out even if you wanted to.

Ms. Jorgensen: It's a statement by this community as to what a problem is. As the planning commissioners if you want to propose, your recommendation would be to take it out then you could.

Ms. Dudoit: As a statement made by this community that said that we need affordable housing. I'm trying to make my point because I'm now seeing where Mr. Jenkins is coming from. We were told that this is for long range planning. But you're taking specific data to make a recommendation or to cite that a problem is we need affordable housing, yet the community plan is supposed to be a plan that ensures our future for this island. But more houses does not ensure a future for this island. So when you talk about affordable housing, you talking about a very specific income class, yielding productive based on citizenship on an island. I'm little bit, and this is something that I know a lot about and I'm just trying to figure out. This whole thing about the availability of

workforce and ownership and it talks about how there's not enough and it's limited and we need know and yet I haven't seen any data that says that more houses are good for our island and for the natural resources, for the water sustainability. What kind of environmental impact does more affordable housing have? I think that would help us to understand because when big projects come in and say I want to build a new subdivision, I like make more affordable, the county says I want to open the affordable housing behind the hospital, I mean, those things come in front of us after something like has already been said, then how do we deny? Yet, are we really doing something that is best for our community? I guess I'm just asking where the meat of this was coming from.

Ms. Jorgensen: I think you touched on the complexity of the issue 'cause there's two things that you have, there is whether somebody with their basic lives on this island, with their paycheck, can they afford to buy a house. Could your child or your grandchildren, neighbors, you know, will they be able to buy? Say they've been renting and they want to buy a house, can they afford it? The other is a value question, what is the impact and you're talking about carrying capacity of the land and like how much. Is it sustainable to have more building and what is the cost of that for the community? That's the difficulty that you face in your land use decisions, is to look at not just one aspect but try to pull as many of these together and it's a very hard task.

Mr. Spence: Commissioners first off it's identifying when staff reached out to the community. It identifies what the feedback that they got. When people are looking forward to what's the future of this island, do they want, kids are going to grow up, they're gonna need some place to stay. You don't want them staying with mom and dad forever. They need to be affordable for them. You don't want it to be like some of the places on Maui turned into where it's luxury estates and Ag dwellings with a price tag of 6 million dollars. If you're going to build housing on this island, the idea is it's for your workforce, it's for the people who live and work here, it's supposed to be affordable for the residents. This is no problem saying, oh my God we need 5,000 more homes, that's not what this is saying at all. This is saying that when we build housing here it should be affordable. This is not, the community plan is a whole document it's not a single piece identifying a single problem excluding everything else, the sustainability that you're concerned about. I think that's something we're all concerned about. At some point in the future you may have projects come before this commission that they want to build some housing. This document is going to be used to guide the decisions of the commission, it's going to guide the decision of the County Council if it gets that far. It's not, this is one of the required elements by 2.80B, I would personally, looking five years ahead, I would rather and there's an application before the commission when all these commissioners are off, I would rather see a statement in this plan saying what kind of housing do we want here. Rather than no statement at all, no guidance at all on this particular issue. This isn't a threatening this saying come develop the island. This is saying housing that's affordable for our residents, that's what we want.

Ms. Dudoit: Me and you can debate about this issue all day cause for me affordable housing is a joke and on Molokai if you going by the average AMI then go by the average AMI of our island residents as opposed to Maui County. Because we no can afford anything based on Maui County AMI anyway. So yes, you're absolutely right. I was kind of over exaggerating that I wanted to rip the whole thing out, but I was just saying that I so tired of us making statements and sighting problems that are really not there and make us as locals seem like we always default and like welfare recipients and that feel of things. We all workforce. What our people need to do is stand up and work, work their land. They don't have to go to a job but we talk about families coming back to Molokai, if affordable housing was really affordable for Molokai we wouldn't have a problem period, but it's not. So I was just looking at the way that, you right, what you're right about is when you put stuff like this in one plan, people use this for their development. We've seen one 16 apartment building come up before us in the planning commission sighting that the reason they needed to build this was because we need affordable housing on Molokai. That had absolutely nothing to do with the project. But because it's stated in our community plan and it's stated all over repeatedly that we need this and that was just my personal opinion.

Mr. Spence: I know the commission considered and in the staff report and everything considered the rest of the plan as well, it's not just this one little segment. Just me as a consultant I go through community plans and you look what's applicable, what's not applicable and all that stuff. I know the department is historically very good at considering the entire community plan, not just a single thing. The decision makers, this commission or the Council or whatever, they weigh, they follow these community plans, they weigh the value of all the different things that these plans say in their decision making. That's the purpose of this plan.

Mr. Jennings: According to the schedule here, I just talked with Jen, we're supposed to take a break at 5:30pm. I'll leave it up to you.

After a short break the meeting was reconvened at 5:35pm.

Mr. Jennings: Ok let's start because I know we all have better things that we'd like to get to here very shortly. I believe there is a motion on the floor? Ok, I stand corrected in that statement. Is there a motion in chapter one?

Ms. Dudoit: I would like to actually include on problems, on page 1-10, item J, and then you can help me Jen with the wording to this. Due to the political demographics and district designation, Molokai is not able to have a real voice in any vote or on its own future.

Ms. Maydan: I don't think I have anything to help with the wording.

Ms. Maydan: I would advise that it's already a pretty dense problem and if you do want something.

Ms. Dudoit: I would like to add Item J under political, is it political?

Ms. Maydan: It could be governance.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE INCLUDE UNDER GOVERNANCE, ITEM J, DUE TO THE POLITICAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND DISTRICT DESIGNATION, MOLOKAI IS NOT ABLE TO HAVE A REAL VOICE IN ANY VOTE OR IN ITS OWN FUTURE.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT UNDER 1-10, ITEM B, UNDER CULTURAL RESOURCES AND TRADITIONS TO ADD IN: MOLOKAI NUI A HINA, AINA MOMONA, PULE O'O AND MOLOKAI NO KA HEKE.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Ms. Dudoit: I have a question Chair, if we get done through this and as we're reading and reviewing and hearing public testimony, can we as commissioners come back at any other time and revisit a recommendation and vote on it?

Ms. Maydan: Are you asking within this meeting or in the future?

Ms. Dudoit: Within the process.

Ms. Maydan: If it is on the agenda it can be discussed. So if at the next meeting someone wants to make a recommendation to chapter three and it's not on the agenda, you guys cannot take action on it. But you have.

Ms. Dudoit: Then can I make a motion that we include in every agenda a subject line that says we can revisit any previous chapter already discussed to make recommendations?

Mr. Racine: It looks like in the 6th meeting, implementation and monitoring and final review. We were already saving chapter three for that meeting. At that point, any old business we could bring it up, that's what I see.

Ms. Dudoit: Well so my thing is time right? If we going be bombarded with everything and holding on to everything to there, then why can't we just make a small little section that if all of us have our recommendation prior to, that at the end of the meeting we can address it. It's up to you guys but it's going be like, kind of the same thing that it says on every, on the last one.

Mr. Racine: So you mean adding an old business at the end, to everyone of the agenda's from hear on out.

Ms. Dudoit: Well we can discuss it. But I'm just saying that if we know that there's something we're reading and we know that there's something that we missed, in here, maybe for the sake of time and efficiency we can bring it up at another meeting. I said this from the first time when we were planning the meeting, what if somebody from Mana'e who couldn't make it to Kaunakakai has something specific they want to say about chapter 5 and that wasn't here during chapter 5, but wants to talk about it when we're discussing chapter 10, there should be an inclusion for our community to add their voice to any part of this and for us to. And we said that but then the department was insistent on breaking it up by chapters. So I just really concerned cause I want our people to be able to voice their opinion at any part of the plan.

Ms. Maydan: I just want to remind you that you do have a time limit. That you have your last meeting scheduled for March 10 and this is a heavy lift. So to the extent that you can stay on task and try to get through something and complete it, I think that's beneficial. But we absolutely do understand the importance of getting the full public testimony and peoples abilities and schedules to get here. So you can absolutely do what you're requesting, to have more items on the agenda, but I will remind you that there's not going to be extension for the review. It will end. So we do need to stay on track.

Ms. Dudoit: Just for the record I appreciate you guys always reminding us about that. But I personally would rather run out of time than gyp my community the opportunity to say what they have to say. Then when the issue comes up before Council to say why did the Molokai Planning Commission run out of time, I going be the first person to say I proud that we took the time to listen to everybody and we couldn't make a

recommendation because we ran out of time. So, I would personally, let's put it in a motion if it gets vote down, it gets voted down.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE INCLUDE ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM THAT WOULD ALLOW OUR COMMUNITY MEMBERS TO ADDRESS PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED PORTIONS OF THE PLAN AND COMMISSIONERS TO BE ABLE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THOSE AS WELL.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER MARSHALL RACINE

Mr. Rogers: We should not tell somebody, you cannot talk about that at this meeting, no.

Mr. Racine: So long as its been before us already. If we're working on 6, 7, 8 and someone wants to talk about 10, I think that would be out of order and slow the process. But once we've discussed it, no problem it being an old business line. When we first get started, before we go into the new material.

Ms. Jorgensen: That's similar to what I was thinking. If public testimony came up and you're listening to somebody, they can come in any public testimony and talk about what they want to talk about. They're asked to speak to what's on the agenda item. Like you're saying, they say something and you say oh, I'd like to see that included in the plan and then we take that information and say we're revising, maybe that was pertaining to chapter three and I was in the middle of trying to bring back chapter three, well I can take that. When it comes back to you it would have that noted, that we had these comments from the first meeting and this other part that you wanted to include and you'd be able to see it.

Ms. Dudoit: You're talking about instead of, so hearing the community but not making any kind of recommendation until you have it all put together at the end?

Ms. Jorgensen: It would be where you're listening to public, what I think you're asking for, or wanting, is to have the public being able to comment about whatever section in the plan they're interested in except for if it hasn't been discussed. And to make sure that gets incorporated into the plan. Maybe I misunderstood. So it gives the opportunity as you're listening to public testimony and you're going along with the process, you'd be able to say let's include this, whatever the person just testified on.

Mr. Racine: I think our goal is, we have someone that can't make this meeting. We talked about chapters one, two and three. The next meeting, four, five six. But someone wanted to comment on one, two, three, before we get started on the next set of chapters,

we can take that public comment, we can discuss it, we can act on that. That's what we're looking for. Old business of an agenda item that at any time someone can come and comment on what we've already covered, previous chapters so that there's always an opportunity for the community to comment on what we're doing here. Right up until the last night, everything, chapters one through 10, there's an opportunity for someone to comment and be part of the process.

Ms. Jorgensen: That makes sense.

Ms. Dudoit: Wait there was a lot being said, I was trying to process, sorry. I want to make sure on my wording for that was correct.

Ms. Maydan: No I don't think I can, sorry. To be honest. What I would say is, for what's on the agenda is we need to make sure that we are doing it per Sunshine Law. I would advise something along the lines of, we would have an item on them for either unfinished business, like Marshall said, or chapters that were on past agendas. We need to make sure that it's clear enough on the posted agenda that a member of the public will understand what is going to be discussed at the meeting. So probably what we would do is we would have the primary chapters that you're going to review, like next meeting on the agenda we would have chapters 4 and 5 and maybe under previous agenda items, or previous chapters, we would list chapters one, two and three. So the public would clearly understand that those are the chapters that are going to be discussed and that they can come testify on, not yet on chapters 8 and 9.

Ms. Dudoit: What about the people say who can only come to one meeting and not going be able to come to any more but want to talk about the chapters we haven't yet addressed?

Ms. Maydan: Per Sunshine Law people can testify on, it's helpful if testimony is directed towards what's on the agenda. They can testify to something that's not on the agenda but you cannot deliberate or take any action on it if it's not on the agenda. You can listen to it and you can address it at a future meeting where that item is actually on the agenda.

Ms. Dudoit: So in that case...

Mr. Racine: You will bring that testimony back to us when we address the chapters that they're testifying to? Cause I'm not going to remember it.

Ms. Maydan: If it was written testimony we would definitely give it to you. If it's in the minutes, if the minutes are finished by that point, yes, you would definitely have them.

Ms. Dudoit: So is there a reason why the minutes wouldn't be ready for us?

Ms. Maydan: Well that depends on staff work load. That would be if Nina can get them done by then. Our next meeting is two weeks away. Our mail out for you is a week before the meeting. Our mail out for the next meeting is a week away, I would be amazed, I would compliment Nina.

Mr. Racine: Could we ask that there a priority on out of phase or out of timed testimony if it's pertinent to the chapters that we're discussing that night? If someone comes up, I can't be here for chapter 10 but this is what I want to say about, can you bring that back to us when we're talking about chapter 10? If it's short term you give that priority over total minutes so that we can have it here.

Ms. Maydan: We take notes and if there's specific testimony, someone says I can't testify when this chapter is on the agenda, I want to testify now, we can take diligent notes to make sure that you have that. I would caution that by if 20 people come in and do that it would be difficult for us to have those detailed notes for you. So I just want to kind of caution what I'm saying. Yes, we would do our best to bring that back to you. But if a testifier is able to put their recommendation clearly into writing it really does help you analyze what they're saying.

Ms. Dudoit: My motion is that we include an agenda item that allows for the community, after we finish discussing all of our agenda items for that meeting, sorry our chapters for that meeting, that there's an agenda item that allows for the community to be able to come back up and readdress...

Mr. Jennings: Something we've already discussed or gone over?

Ms. Dudoit: Anything that pertains to any of the chapters in the Molokai Community Plan. I don't want to stick to just what chapters we've already reviewed because we not going make one decision on them anyway, but they should be able to talk about what ever chapters they want. I understand for organizational and time purposes we going address each chapter and all that but at the end, anybody should be able to testify to anything pertaining to the Molokai Community Plan that they wanted to. Other than what is already on the agenda for that day.

Mr. Racine: This one, after the call of order, there is at the discretion of the Chair public testimony. That's where anybody can discuss anything they want for three minutes. So we'll give them that opportunity at that time to discuss any chapter that they want.

Ms. Dudoit: But that doesn't work. So ok you open up, you give public testimony and that's what I was going to ask again. If we go through a chapter, and while you doing your introduction, my opinion, for us too as well, community members should be able to

testify on that chapter. Then we discuss it, we got their say, we might not have to go and revisit it again, they said whatever they needed to say, we close off and make our recommendation and done. Next chapter, you give introduction, community gets to testify on that chapter and I think it's going to eliminate the overage of time, it's going to do all that because they can concentrate on specific chapters and specific interest that they have in those chapters. At the end of our meeting, when we finish chapters four and five, there's a place where the community can come up and testify on things we haven't discussed on that particular day in regards to the rest of the book. This format is confusing for us. Cause me as a commissioner, I sitting up here somebody goes up there they get plenty for say on chapters one, two and three, they giving us, we trying to write, trying to write all these recommendations, I cannot even process what people are saying and it's really good stuff. So I think if we broke it down for our benefit it would help. What's so hard about giving people more time to talk on something that is as important as the future of Molokai? We shouldn't be scared of what they get to say? We should want to hear. If I can hear from somebody three times on specific matters rather than somebody standing up there trying to get 20 things they want to say because they running out of time, it's just...I just got to say this for the record. Time is really hard for me because in our culture time is the most important thing you can give somebody. That's what shows respect, is that you give people time for say what they gotta say. Our language wasn't written, it was heard and you can only hear somebody if you really sitting down and listening. So I'm just very, very adamant about we gotta, we gotta give time and if we run out of time as a board that makes the recommendation so be it. But I would never want to stand in front of my community and say, eh, I went rush all this through because I got forced and I ran out of time and I'm sorry you cannot talk anymore. That's all I got to say.

Ms. Swenson: Zhantell how do you balance that with what Walter was saying that the meetings were going till 9 at night and people couldn't stay that late to testify. So how do you balance that and make it fair for everyone?

Ms. Dudoit: We do what we doing right now. Because I think what happened to the CPAC committee is they weren't able to make their own decisions on how the meetings were going to be run. So I'm saying, now let's do something different. If we want different results we gotta change the path that we on. I refuse to be bound and I totally respect the department cause I love the work that you guys do and I appreciate you, but, I refuse to keep being told that we running out of time, yet we won't offer time to anybody, to dictate their own future. So we already get ripped off when it comes to voting cause of demographic, political demographic, let's not rip off our people when we sitting right here and just give them the time. I think that the reason the meetings run so long is that we have this kind, public testimony go on, 10 people say a hundred things each about what they want to do, then the poor group gotta sit over here and try shuffle through every single thing that's been said on the whole community plan. So what I saying is

let's come up with a different solution, if we gotta give 9 minutes in one meeting to one person and break 'em up so that they can give us specific details on each individual portion, and we can be focus on what we talking about, I think we going come out with a more efficient way of doing things. And, our community going feel like we gave them time, which they weren't offered before. I saying that because I was there and I tried to testify too.

Ms. Maydan: To the extent that testimony can be written down, like I said it really does help for the commission as well as the staff, I understand that ideas and testimony come up in a meeting and that's completely welcomed. But to the extent that testimony can be written down or even submitted ahead of time it is helpful. But that is not required, it is just helpful. You do have a motion on the floor and I think we can definitely work with adding an item on the agenda and encompasses the chapters that were previously discussed. I think your Chair is very open.

Ms. Dudoit: And to include testimony after each?

Ms. Maydan: The Chair has the ability to entertain public testimony throughout the meeting and I think he is demonstrating that he's very willing to do that.

Ms. Dudoit: I think that would help you too. Instead of trying to, that way even late comers have the opportunity to testify without you having to make that. So my motion is to add in that last agenda item after everything been discussed. So you got that. Also, to add in public testimony after each chapter only to discuss that chapter.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Naki: We all on introduction right now, right? Are we still on introduction? It says over here on line 28 where it says, after, Molokai has historical, limited economic partial due to the islands remote location, small population based on strong control by a few major landowners. It says some Molokai residents are very protective. I think we should change that word, some. It says some Molokai residents are very protective or their rural and traditional-based lifestyle. I feel that word should be changed to many or majority. But that's just my mana'o.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT ON PAGE 1-1 UNDER INTRODUCTION LINE 28, WE DELETE SOME AND LEAVE THE SENTENCE TO READ MOLOKAI RESIDENTS ARE VERY PROTECTIVE.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Jennings: Commissioner's are you ready to go on to chapter two?

Ms. Dudoit: I know we stay on chapter two but can I also make another recommendation? I like to move that if we going have this music going on during our meeting, we have our meeting some place else because this is absolutely ridiculous and I having one hard time concentrate and it's just hard to deal with the important issues.

Ms. Maydan: You just want to get up and dance?

Ms. Dudoit: No.

Ms. Maydan: This will not be our regular situation.

Ms. Dudoit: Ok, thank you.

Ms. Maydan: Chapter two, Molokai's future. Chapter two includes the vision, population growth forecast and a brief section on sustainability and climate change adaptation. The vision, the CPAC had numerous discussions on the vision and their ultimate decision was to retain the vision that was in the 2001 community plan as well as include a new vision that they crafted. So in here you see that there's a vision on page 2.2 and then on 2-3 it's 2001 vision statement. The chapter goes on with population growth forecast and then it goes onto a section on sustainability and climate change adaptation which is, those are very heavy subject matters of course, and this is covered in three pages. But the goal of this is to explain how sustainability and climate change adaptation are woven throughout the chapters of the plan and the main theme of the plan. So this section isn't supposed to be, supposed to really carry the weight of its title but it's supposed to give kind of an overview of how the subject matters are carried throughout the plan.

Mr. Jennings: I'll just open this up for public testimony. If anyone would like to make testimony.

Mr. Jenkins: Greg Jenkins, CPAC member. Real quick as Jen eluded the issues of sustainability and climate change etc. are woven in the plan and there are some real technical matters that we discussed that I could answer questions on as you guys bring it up. I wanted to commend you guys for talking about the time. Zhan couldn't have said it any better. This is why I voted against the Molokai Community Plan final draft because I felt that while the highlights was the input we got from our community and I felt that there was not enough time and I disagree with someone making the decisions for 180 days. I disagree with someone else such as the Maui Planning Department dictating this

islands future but not having enough time for our community to really understand what's going on here. The reason is due diligence. This department, the Planning Department has the burden to provide due diligence of information that helps you guys make informed decisions that pass a rational bases test. That's why again, I believe that this plan is a great big EA question document, it's purpose to get us answers to questions that help us make informed decisions later on. I do not feel that this plan in any way capable of resulting in land use changes or other things you're going to be discussing later based on the lack of data for us to make informed decisions. It would be remiss of us to do that, that's my opinion. Just briefly to stay on the vision statement, my opinion was that to support the vision statement of 2001 and that I felt the one from the CPAC, some members felt that it was important for them to have their own vision. I more considered the vision that you see in there now values that our CPAC had, not necessarily the vision, you guys can (inaudible) those two.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you Greg.

Mr. Ritte: It was very, very confusing about this vision statement but to be honest it got a lot of people in the community upset and started coming to the meeting. This was the lightning thing that got people interested in this whole plan because they were going to change the vision from our Kupuna to I guess the Molokai Chamber of Commerce vision of Molokai. So to me this shows there's a split in this plan and I'm hoping that you guys can kind of like put this thing together. There's no reason for two vision statements. What is that? So maybe one could be, change the title of one or some how unify this community over a vision, don't leave us split like this. I think it's a bad precedent for our plan. Maybe one is values, today's values, but the vision is important that came from 2001. These are very, very important values. Maybe add a few values from this side 2015 into it but don't allow us to be a split community. One last thing, the title here is Molokai future. In a Hawaiian community in order to know where you're going, you need to know where you came from. That's engrained in us as cultural people, you have to look back in order to know where we're going. To me that's really, really important for the development of Molokai. The reason we've been having wars all of these years is because people are coming here to this island with brand new ideas without any consideration as to where they are and the values of the people who live here. We've been having those wars for the last 30-40 years. So in order for us to know what Molokai's future is, we gotta know, and there's a Hawaiian saying and I'm sorry I don't have it with me, but there's a Hawaiian saying that tells us as Hawaiian, in order to know where we're going, we need to know where we came from. I'm gonna go find that saying and I'm going to give it to Mary and make sure that that's part of Molokai's plan.

Mr. Jennings: Walter thank you.

Ms. Ritte: Aloha. I just want to make it really simple that I would x out vision statement that starts, Molokai is an island steeped in tradition and just totally adopt the 2001 vision statement. This is what I feel really talks about aloha and what this island is about. If we can do all of these things, all of these words mean nothing. This would come out because of all of this that's on this statement. Mahalo.

Mr. Jennings: Any further public testimony? Public testimony is closed.

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE GET RID OF THE NEW VISION STATEMENT AND STICK WITH THE VISION STATEMENT OF 2001.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE LASUA

Ms. Swenson: You want to complete eliminate it or call it something else?

Ms. Dudoit: No. I was there in 2001 and there was a lot of thought and effort put into this, plenty of our Kupuna included their mana'o and heart felt testimonies towards this vision statement. This wasn't something that came out of one whole bunch of words or scholars, this was a vision that came out of a room full of people who just were born and raised and invested interest in the future of Molokai. If you really read line by line it encompasses what the new vision statement says and even more because it holds to it a responsibility that comes with each line of this vision statement. Plenty times, when I'm looking at the new vision statement it's trying to clarify what you mean and be politically correct in areas. I feel that this is our Molokai Community Plan, ours. If it offends people from the outside, then it offends people from the outside. This is an island rich in our Hawaiian culture, it's our host culture. Get plenty things about our future that is only here and the ability to go forward because of what was done in the past and given to us in the past. So when we look at statements that we who live here choose not to be a stranger in our own land that was significant. That came from our Kupuna. We will not live some place where the economic or structural changes or progress of the world dictate what Molokai was going to be in the future. So I for one, know where this came from, I know how much heart was put into this vision statement and to me, when you build one house, when you build a strong house, even when the walls and stuff get all jam up and the roof, you no change the foundation. You strengthen the structure but you no change the foundation. Because once you dig up the foundation it's a new building, it's a whole new Molokai and that's not what we wanted. What we wanted was to preserve what we had and make it better for our future generations with the fundamental foundational principles of where we came from. Not to create a new world.

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Ms. Swenson: I have a question about this population growth forecast. What's going to make it increase? I've been here 40 years and it hasn't changed in 40 years. Is there something going to happen that we don't know about?

Ms. Maydan: It is a forecast, it's just a forecast. It's based on past population growth and yes you're absolutely right, when you look at the 2001 plan the population that was forecasted never happened. The population growth that was forecasted did not happen. This is just a planning tool and it is not, it is not perfect. It is not a ball to look into the future, it's just a forecast based on past population growth. I believe it does kind of explain that here in the chapter that this is just a tool for planning but it is not an accurate prediction of the future, necessarily and it is not necessarily a policy goal for the future.

Ms. Swenson: What concerns me about it is, like the project we got for the 15 condominiums affordable housing thing and they come in and go this is part of your Molokai plan that you're going to have this so you have to approve this housing project. I mean I don't know.

Ms. Dudoit: And how often does the forecast get updated? If we know that the first forecast was wrong, does it go back to the drawing board and get re-calculated based on current data, or how many years out?

Mr. Racine: They offered three projections and honestly they show in the green line no growth, and to projected increases in population, two different formulas. Preparation for those increases if they come. But their honest and they say, because we haven't had anything changed in the last 15 years, we probably may not. So the green line shows that. I don't think it's holding us to anything.

Ms. Dudoit: Well I'm looking at the orange line that's going way up in the sky that says visitor population. So that concerns me. The forecast does because now somebody going come in and say, we going rebuild the hotel or we gotta expand the hotels or we gotta come in for change of zoning to make more resort district because according to the forecast we going grow in visitor population. Which we all know that's not true and has not happened for ever and ever, but, I guess I'm just wondering where all these stats come from and how often it's made and how accurate, if you're asking us to make recommendations on a good plan, how, do we take these into consideration when we're looking at it and how accurate are these that we can make an informed decision.

Ms. Maydan: So on page 2-4 on line 22-23, it does say, the population growth forecast provides a starting point for discussions about the island's future. This is not policy. This is using data to work towards policy, which is the rest of the plan. It's just a tool for us to say, we're look in 20 years into the future and the forecast tells us there's a

population at 1% growth rate could grow to this size. How would we plan for that? For our infrastructure, for our land use, for our resources, how do we plan? This is not a policy saying our community will grow to this size, we will have this many visitors.

Ms. Jorgensen: I'd just like to add, that line on the top figure, figure 2.1, that's orange color, that's not visitors, that's 1% annual growth. Maybe that's something that can be corrected since the chart right below it uses the same color for visitor population, but they're not connected, two different things.

Mr. Jennings: Anything else Commissioner's that you would like to discuss on that or in that?

Mr. Racine: The aging population rather than an increasing number of people, what did you base that? Folks are gonna get older, I just turned 60.

Ms. Maydan: This comes from the same data source referenced on page 2-4, the socio economic forecast. This is putting some data from that into a graph and it really is a dramatic growth in your aging population as well as your use and a decline in the middle years.

Mr. Racine: You have turn over throughout a population, yes we get older but we die off and we're replaced by younger people. A job I inhabit, I'm going to retire from it and a younger person's gonna take the job, that's just the natural cycle of things. To say that of the number of people here, we're all obviously going to become a more age in population, we're gonna have to shift our economy and our social services to support a bunch of old people. Do we have data from the previous 20 years to show the same?

Ms. Maydan: It's a natural trend. You have your baby boomers aging.

Ms. Jorgensen: It also reflects that a lot of the younger workers, which hopefully that will change, they tend to leave the island. What we were hearing in the CPAC is people that left the island for a job are coming back. So your original large baby boomer group is returning to the island that's gonna bring up the numbers. I don't know how statistically correct that is but it is reflected a little bit in these numbers. But we did hear that informally during the CPAC discussion of this. That, oh yeah they're gonna be coming back.

Ms. Dudoit: Not to sound like a broken record because I know you guys think I joking but I not, because it has to do with affordable housing. If you create an island where people who have an average median income on another island and making money can come over here to buy an affordable house and live, and retire, they way ahead of the rest of us who are already living here. So you get one booming of the population of people

and I in that industry so I know, who are moving here because it's easier for get monies through DHHL, through wherever, inherit a piece of property, buy a piece of land, buy a lease, whatever and live here because we have so much available, affordable housing on Molokai. To me that's where the trend gonna show that you have a lot of people moving here in this middle class and staying till they older. It doesn't necessarily mean this is our population.

Ms. Swenson: Zhantell, some of them, we've been selling property to people from Molokai that grew up in Molokai, that want to come home. They're retiring and they want to come home. So that is happening.

Ms. Jorgensen: The people that we heard from in CPAC, what I remember is that they were coming back home to be with their families. So they would be living in the family house. So in terms of affording your retirement, they were gonna come back home. So it's probably multiple, different reasons that they'd come back.

Ms. McPherson: I'm Nancy McPherson, DHHL. I'm sorry I didn't get this to the Planning Department before the meeting but I think in fast facts about Molokai, population demographics 2010 census, the first bullet point should probably be rewritten to say, because Kalaniana'ole Colony wasn't actually created in 1921, that's when the act was passed. But it took a few years to actually get everything going. So I would rewrite that as the first Hawaiian Homestead settlement was established on Molokai at Kalaniana'ole Colony, later Kalamaula, by passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1921. Sorry, page 1-3, am I on the wrong, you guys moved on? Sorry. Ok. I'll email that to them.

Mr. Jennings: Commissioner's do you have any more questions on chapter two?

Ms. Dudoit: I'm wondering if we can add on, so you know where you're on sustainability, page 2-7? It refers to the ability to meet presently without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their needs. It requires a consideration of long term environmental, social, cultural and economic cost. Can we add in subsistence?

MOTION: I MOVE THAT WE ADD IN SUBSISTENCE TO THAT LINE THAT SAYS IT REQUIRES A CONSIDERATION OF LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC COSTS OF PRESENT DAY ACTION.

MOVED: COMMISSIONER ZHANTELL DUDOIT

SECOND: COMMISSIONER DOUG ROGERS

MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Jennings: Any more discussion?

Ms. Dudoit: Jen when we look at, after sustainability, you have an appendix 2.2, sustainability, so when we change stuff in here, do we need to go back so that it's consistent in another area? Is that what it's telling us, that you have an appendix, 2.2 that goes, coincides with sustainability some where?

Ms. Maydan: The appendix that you're referring to, from the change that you made here it would not make any changes in the appendix. If there are core changes like the change you made to map 3.3 there will be a change in the text, we will make those changes.

Mr. Jennings: No more discussion on chapter one, Jennifer is going to tell us what we're looking forward to on January 28.

D. NEXT MEETING DATE: January 28, 2016

Ms. Maydan: So our next meeting is scheduled for January 28. We have Kaunakakai School Cafeteria reserved for that meeting. So we will not be here, it'll be down the road, hopefully there won't be any music.

Ms. Dudoit: Jen if I can make arrangement for us to have the community center in Kilohana on one of those, or on the 11th where you don't have one, can I let you know like by tomorrow or the next day? Because I'm part of the committee up there too and I know that what happens is that the halau blanks out like all these days and then you get one section for cleaning. But it really just warrants just talking to the Kumu and just asking her if it was possible.

Ms. Maydan: We had tried that a bit but yes, if you are able to, definitely let me know. You have to let me know in time for posting the agenda and everything. But for one of those meetings, if you're able to, definitely email me. So at our next meeting, January 28, Kaunakakai Cafeteria. On the agenda will be chapter's four, hazards and chapter five, economic development. Just as a resource if you feel like doing little more research on the county web site on the community plan update page is a presentation, actually several presentations that were provided to the CPAC. Hazards presentations as well as an economic development presentation. There is a lengthy economic development issue paper that's available on the web page as well as the County Wide Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. These are just some resources if you feel like doing some extra research as you review those chapters. It's important to keep in mind as you review those two chapters what the role of hazards and economic development are in the Community Plan. As Mary stated with the natural resources the County kind of has a limited purview for natural resources as well as hazards and economic development. There's a lot of plans

that are referenced and not everything is included in the Community Plan in its entirety. That's just important to keep that in mind of what's appropriate in the Community Plan. As far as on the agenda we will include on the agenda chapters one, two, and three as well as you requested. That's all I have.

Mr. Jennings: I would just like to thank, Mr. Spence, Ms. Jorgensen, Jennifer because she helped me greatly and she was supposed to be sitting over there and she sat over here with me, I appreciate that. All the people that gave testimony, thank you very much for coming. If there isn't anything else, we can go home. Thank you commissioner's for putting up with me. Have a wonderful evening and see you on the 28th.

E. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

NINA-LEHUA KAWANO
CLERK

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Present:

Michael Jennings, Chairperson
Douglas Rogers, Vice-Chairperson
Billy Buchanan
Zhantell Dudoit
Lawrence Lasua
Marshall Racine
Diane Swenson

Excused:

Ron Davis

Others:

Will Spence, Director of Planning
Jennifer Maydan, Senior Planner
Mary Jorgensen, Senior Planner