

County of Maui Water  
Supply

**BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY**  
**COUNTY OF MAUI**  
**JOINT WORKSHOP WITH THE**  
**MAUI PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2004**

Held at the Planning Department Conference Room,  
First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building, 250 South High Street,  
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, commencing at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday,  
October 12, 2004, pursuant to Notice.

REPORTED BY: JEANNETTE W. IWADO, RPR/CSR #135

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY:

KENNETH M. OKAMURA, Vice-Chair

GINNY PARSONS

SALLY RAISBECK

RALPH JOHANSON

MICHELE McLEAN

BOARD MEMBERS MAUI PLANNING COMMISSION:

RANDY PILTZ, Chair

DIANE SHEPHERD

SUSAN MOIKEHA

SUZANNE FREITAS

NICK CASUMPANG

WILLIAM IACONNETTI

JOHANNA AMORIN

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL FOLEY, Maui Planning Director

JAMES GIROUX, Deputy Corporation Counsel

EDWARD KUSHI, Deputy Corporation Counsel

ANN CUA, Staff

JEFFREY PEARSON, Deputy Director

ALVIN NAKAMURA, Engineering Program Director

STEVEN PARABICOLI, Wastewater Use Coordinator

ELLEN KRAFTSOW, Water Resource Manager

MILTON ARAKAWA, Deputy Public Works &

Environmental Management

\* \* \*

BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY, COUNTY OF MAUI

JOINT WORKSHOP WITH THE

MAUI PLANNING COMMISSION

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Planning Commission is back in session for our workshop with the water department. At this time we'd like to have Ken Okamura. Would you introduce the members of your committee, commission?

MR. OKAMURA: Thank you. Will this meeting of the Board of Water Supply please come to order. I'd like to introduce our members that include Sally Raisbeck, Ralph

Johansen sitting there, Michele McLean here, Ginny Parsons.

And is that all that we have? There are just five of us.

My name is Kenneth Okamura, I'm the Vice-Chair, and our

Chair is not here with us today.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: All right.

MR. OKAMURA: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if you could introduce the County resource people that are here.

We have the Deputy Water Director Jeff Pearson, and Ellen

Kraftsow from the water department, we have the division

chief for the Wastewater Reclamation Division, Tracy

Takamine with the Department of Public Works and

Environmental Management. And we have several

representatives from the Maui Fire Department here, Scott

English, and they can serve as our resource people.

I thought if maybe we could start off with the Wastewater Reclamation Division and Tracy Takamine on the issue of reclaimed water.

MS. RAISBECK: Point of order, Mr. Chair. Would you mind introducing the members of the Planning Commission so that we know their names?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay. We have Diane Shepherd, we have Susan Moikeha, we have Susan Freitas, Nick Casumpang.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: You got it right this time.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: William Iaconnetti, Johanna Amarin, and I'm Randy Piltz.

MS. RAISBECK: Thank you.

MR. OKAMURA: Excuse me. I forgot to introduce Ed Kushi, who is from the Corporation Counsel, and he helps -- serves with the Water Board or is the Corporation Counsel representative to the Board of Water Supply, right in the back. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay. Are you going to moderate this portion of it?

MR. TAKAMINE: My name is Tracy Takamine, I am the division chief of the Wastewater Reclamation Division. I want to, first of all, thank you for inviting us here. We were originally asked by Clayton to be just a resource staff for questions. However, we felt that in order for us to do that maybe you need to be given an informational briefing on what the Wastewater Reclamation Division does in terms of recycled water, where we started from, what we are doing

now, and what we are going to do in the future.

What we plan to do is have Steve Parabolicoli, who is our wastewater use coordinator for the division, he's an expert in his field and he's given numerous presentations nationwide. In fact, he just came back from a national conference in Phoenix, Arizona.

So I'll turn it over to Steve right now and he will give you a 10 or 15 minute briefing, at which time he can answer your questions.

MR. PARABICOLI: Thank you, Tracy. Thank you very much. Thanks for your interest in recycled water. I think it's somewhat unappreciated yet underutilized resource, but we are actually doing a fairly good job of recycling and reusing wastewater here on Maui.

We will have a short Power Point presentation to tell you about our program, what we're doing, and where we're going to go. Perhaps we could dim the lights here so the audience can see the slides.

(Brief pause in proceedings)

Thank you. Can you hear me? Okay, I think recycled water and water reuse in general should be viewed

as a very key component of sustainable water resource management. Just to define a few terms, water reclamation is the treatment of wastewater to make it usable; recycled water is the end product of water reclamation; and water reuse is the beneficial use of recycled water.

Okay, water reuse provides many benefits. It can extend potable water resources. We have already displaced a fair amount of potable water in Maui County that was previously used for landscape irrigation, and we displaced it with recycled water. It's a drought-proof water supply. You know, we don't have to have rainfall to generate wastewater, we produce wastewater every day and we have to treat it. And the recycled water either can be reused or it must be disposed of. So it is definitely drought-proof.

It stimulated economic development, and that's sustainable economic development here in Maui County. Just the availability of recycled water, particularly in South Maui, has attracted businesses to Maui. They have established thriving industries, they've hired employees, they've hired contractors. So this recycled water system that we've developed has brought in a lot of good things, a

lot of money into Maui County.

It provides environmental benefits. There are some nutrients present in recycled water. It's not nutrient-rich, but there are some nutrients, and these nutrients can be utilized by the vegetation that we irrigate, thus reducing the need for synthetic chemical fertilizers. So it's a good way to recycle the nutrients present in recycled water.

Finally, it's a very environmentally sensitive effluent disposal option. Instead of discharging effluent into the ocean, through outfalls, or into injection wells, which a lot of people feel is not a good thing, we can, you know, dispose of our effluent through water reuse, whether it be landscape irrigation or other types of reuse. And there really are all types of ways to use recycled water, not just landscape irrigation.

The Department of Health established water reuse guidelines in 1993, and updated the guidelines in 2002. And they recognized three recycled water classes: R1 is tertiary treated recycled water that can be used without restrictions. This is the highest level of recycled water that the health department recognizes, and this is primarily

what we produce here on Maui. Most of our facilities are R1.

Some of the approved uses for R1 water include landscape irrigation. You don't have to have any buffer zones, you can irrigate any time of day or night. You can also use it for direct spray application of edible food crops. And we follow the lead of such states as California and Florida that have been reusing tertiary water on lettuce and broccoli and crops like that. And in fact, most of the vegetables that we import into Hawaii are grown with recycled tertiary treated water. So that's a pretty -- quite a statement as to the safety of the R1 water.

Some other uses, we sell it to Haleakala Ranch. Their cattle have been drinking this water for many years. It can be used as a source of water for commercial laundries. And of course we use it for other uses as well, industrial and things like that.

R2 is disinfected secondary treated recycled water, and this is the most common type of recycled water used in Hawaii today. It's traditionally been used on golf courses, either spray or irrigation. The Pukalani Country

Club upcountry has been irrigating its fairways and greens with R2 water since the late seventies.

Now, with R2 water there are some restrictions.

You must have 500 foot buffer zones between the project that's using the water and the neighboring homes. And you only can irrigate at night. Now, there are some grandfather projects out there that have been using recycled water for many years before the health department issued its guidelines, but they're grandfathered from some of these restrictions. But primarily R2 water does have some limitations on its use.

R3 is un-disinfected recycled water with very severe restrictions on uses and applications. And currently there are only two projects in the whole state that use R3 water, and those are primarily like pasture irrigation in remote areas where people do not frequent.

Just to give you an idea of what's going on statewide with the use of recycled water, there currently are around 67 projects in the state that use recycled water of various grades. As you can see, Maui County is doing quite well. We have about 28 of those projects right here in our own county. Most of those projects are supplied the

recycled water by the County's wastewater facilities.

In fact, Maui is considered the leader in Hawaii when it comes to reusing recycled water. Our program has a very strong foundation, and we are considered pioneers in the field.

Statewide, Hawaii treats about 150 million gallons per day of wastewater, and of that amount 24 million gallons a day is being reused. And Maui County's percentage is around 26 percent. So we're about a quarter of our wastewater. We treat a little bit under 16 million gallons a day, and we're using a little bit under 4 million gallons a day at this time.

The majority of recycled water has been used, as I said earlier, for irrigation of golf courses, and also agriculture. But we're seeing more and more of the R1 water that's being produced being used in the urban environment. Now we're irrigating parks, school yards, you know, condominiums, multi-family housing, shopping center landscaping, places where people frequent. And the R1 water allows us to do that without, you know, any concerns for health or welfare.

This is just, as you know, a map of Maui County showing the locations of our wastewater systems. Of course, in Maui our largest systems, starting in Central Maui, we have our Wailuku-Kahului facility. It's an R2 facility, but actually the water from this facility meets R1 standards, but it's not considered R1 because we don't have the equipment recognized by the Department of Health in place at this facility to classify the water as R1. We treat about 5 million gallons a day. We only we have one small reuse project in this area.

We've held off on developing reuse in Central Maui. As you may be aware, there's a study on going right now to determine the feasibility of actually shutting this plant down and building another plant further inland away from the tsunami zone and salt air corrosion. Until that decision is made, it probably would not be best to develop a reuse system at this location.

Kihei is, you know, an R1 facility. It's been really a hot spot for reuse in Hawaii. We treat a little under 5 million gallons a day. We're using close to half of that water right now. Several projects, and I will show you a map later on of all the projects that use the recycled

water.

Lahaina is also an R1 facility, but we're limited to 3 million gallons per day of R1 capability, because we only have one ultraviolet disinfection channel at this time. The remainder of the 5 million gallons which is treated is R2 quality.

On Molokai we have our Kaunakakai facility, it's an R2 facility. We do use a little bit of water for the Department of Transportation to irrigate a portion of the Mauna Loa highway going into Kaunakakai.

On Lanai we have an R3 facility, but we send the entire plant flow, about a little under 300,000 gallons per day, to the Lanai Company and they upgrade the quality to R1 at their own treatment plant, and use all that water on the golf course at the Experience at Koele.

Our program has been developed over the last 10 or 12 years, and as I said earlier, it has a very strong foundation. In the early '90's we conducted feasibility studies to determine which areas of Maui County would fit, or Maui, the island of Maui, would best support water reuse. Those studies indicate that, you know, South Maui, Kihei and

West Maui, Lahaina, due to very dry climates and also not a whole lot of water resources available in those areas.

Those areas really best would support water reuse.

In 1993 the position for which I occupy, the water recycling program coordinator, a position was created. And this is important because you really have a person whose primary focus is to promote the use of recycled water in the community, to educate the community. I probably conduct close to a hundred presentations per year about water reuse and wastewater treatment and water conservation to schools, community groups, et cetera, and generally this has been a good thing for Maui County. The City and County of Honolulu has followed our lead, and they've also hired a number of people to coordinate their reuse program.

In 1995 and 1996, based on our feasibility studies we upgraded the Lahaina and Kihei facilities to R1 capability. In 1995 Maui became the only county thus far in Hawaii to establish an ordinance which requires R1 recycled water to be used at commercial properties if the water is available.

If you are a commercial property and you are within 100 feet of an R1 distribution line you must hook up

to the system within one year and use the recycled water for landscape irrigation.

In 1996 we passed our rules for recycled water service, and again, we are the only county thus far to do that. In 1997 we established a community-based committee to come up with a rate structure which was pretty innovative, because we recognized at this time especially the use of recycled water addressed two key issues here on Maui.

One was the fact that recycled water does supplement water supplies, but it also addresses concerns about effluent disposal. As you may be aware, we have a lot of seaweed blooms, algae blooms in West Maui's waters, and also South Maui's coastal waters. And because of that disposal issue we were really kind of pushed into reusing this recycled water instead of throwing it away into injection wells.

As a result, our rate structure was very fair. We recovered monies for our program from both recycled water users and the sewer users. So we kind of share the burden of this expensive program over a wide base, and that's enabled us to set our rates at fairly low levels. And I

will show you a slide later on about our recycled water rates.

Here is the map that I mentioned earlier. This is our West Maui system. This is the treatment plant. It's right across from the Embassy Suites in Honokowai. When the plant was built in the mid-seventies we had like a 20-inch pipeline that ran up the hill 700 feet in elevation above the treatment plant. Back then we pumped R2 water to Pioneer Mill, and it was used for sugar cane irrigation.

In the early eighties sugar was discontinued in the area and this pipeline was essentially abandoned. Recently, in the last couple of years the Maui Pineapple Company has been using a small volume of R1 water for irrigation of pineapple off of this system.

In the mid-nineties, mid to late nineties we constructed a pipeline that runs down to Kaanapali Resort and golf courses, and this is in fact our largest customer. They use up to 1.2 million gallons per day for irrigation.

One problem we're having out here is the fact that we don't have any off-site storage that we own. If we can pump up the hill to elevated storage we would be able to pressurize this pipeline 24 hours a day, which would enable

a multitude of other commercial properties to hook up to this system and use the R1 water for landscape irrigation.

Now this is very expensive. We just had a West Maui recycled water master plan completed that identified four phases of expansion that we need to do of improvements both at the treatment plant and off-site to develop more pipelines and other storage facilities. The price tag is estimated to be about \$46 million for these improvements. So it's not cheap.

The South Maui system has storage. In the old days -- we still use this old pipeline that goes down to Kalama Park and the library and the fire station -- but in the late nineties, mid to late nineties we developed our core distribution system.

Here is the Kihei facility. We put in a 16-inch line that runs up the hill to a 1 million gallon covered storage tank. This tank is about 200 feet in elevation above our treatment plant. And we had such a good deal during the construction of this that we ended up building a 12-inch line that runs all the way down currently to the Piilani commercial center where Safeway is.

This elevated storage allows us to pressurize this system 24 hours a day, and as a result we can see all the projects that are using the recycled water now and also some future projects, near future projects that will hook up to the system in the very near future.

Of course the oldest project is Elleair Golf Course. This course was built just with the idea of using recycled water. We also have other projects. Goodfellow Brothers has been a major user of recycled water for dust control over the years. Haleakala Ranch has intermittently used the recycled water, and they've got some plans to use it for pasture irrigation and possibly other uses, Bioreal, Maui Earth Composting.

This 12-inch line right here is basically a lot of small projects that use between 20 and 30 thousand gallons per day. But all these projects either used to use potable water for landscape irrigation or could have used potable water if recycled water was not available.

You can see a lot of these future uses, the Kihei Regional Park, Wailoa Village, which is kind of a test case. We were hoping to use this water for single-family lot irrigation, which is not currently being allowed by the

health department. Hope Chapel is under construction right now. Haleakala Greens subdivision, and on and on and on. So you can see, pressurized systems really makes this water usable.

Okay, expansions. We put this pipeline in the ground last year down Waipuilani Street, and this year we are going to be connecting the two segments of line right here (indicating). Possible expansion would be we were actually going to do this; we had a design all set up. It was to put a pipeline in South Kihei Road during that road widening project. But the project was cancelled so we had to kind of shelf these plans.

But I guess one option would be to go across South Kihei Road and go through that Waipuilani Park with that pipeline, and then we would be able to provide recycled R1 water to a number of the condominiums.

Another expansion that we're currently looking at, we are having a study done right now which is being funded by the Department of Water Supply, is to extend our system to North Kihei to the beginning of Monsanto's -- the beginning of Kihei where Monsanto grows corn. You can see

the corn fields as you enter Kihei. That entire farm and a couple of other farms in the area, they all use potable water for landscape irrigation. I think it's about 300,000 gallons per day, on average, and sometimes up to a million gallons per day of potable water.

Now Monsanto established this farm here, and they're using the R1 water, and it's working out very well for them. If we were to build this pipeline, Haleakala Ranch and Ulupalakua Ranch, and who knows who else could hook up to the system and use this recycled water for irrigation.

I just want to show you a couple of slides of some of the projects that are currently using the system off of our Piilani system. This is that 12-inch line that runs down to Safeway, Kihei and Lokelani Schools. These are the first two schools in Hawaii to use recycled water for landscape irrigation. Prior to recycled water being available they used to use potable water. And I guess they didn't have very good pressure because when one school irrigated its campus the other school couldn't flush its toilets.

So now -- in fact, these fields were nothing but

dust bowls, and the kids would go out and play and come back all dirty. But now you can see they're nice and green and lush and it's working out very well for them. Of course we did some extensive public education before we started using recycled wastewater at this location.

Piilani Villages, this is a single-family subdivision in Kihei. And again, I mentioned the Department of Health has not yet allowed the use of R1 water for landscape irrigation at single-family lots, but they do allow it in the common areas, such as park areas along the roadways and sidewalks, yet they do allow it for multi-family irrigation.

This is the Piilani Gardens, and you can see we're irrigating right up to the edge of the lanais and buildings, and this irrigation system is under the control of a single landscape entity, like a maintenance person or a landscape contractor. So, you know, that's some of the allowable uses.

There's quite a debate right now going on with single-family versus multi-family. Piilani Village is a good example of the integrated use of recycled water, all

the way from groundbreaking to landscape irrigation. Not only did they irrigate, but they used over 91 million gallons of R1 water during the construction phase of the shopping center and the surrounding areas. They used it in dust control, street cleaning. They even used it to mix the mortar to build the buildings. Why not?

And the reason I'm pointing these uses out is just to have you think out of the box. We don't just irrigate with this water, we can use it for all kinds of things. Of course, the end result is landscape irrigation. You can see we irrigate all over, right next to where the car is parked, and it's been very successful at this location.

Bioreal is a subsidiary of Fuji Chemical. They were attracted to South Maui because of the abundant sunshine and the availability of the recycled water for cooling. They basically grow this algae, this micro-algae in these domes from which they produce this antioxidant called Acidathum (phonetic), which is a super product that's used in the health food industry. It's like 40 times stronger than vitamin E.

Anyway, they sell all of this material in Japan, but they use the recycled water for cooling. They use about

20 or 30 thousand gallons a day. But again, this water has attracted sustainable economic development to Maui County.

Maui Earth Compost is an established greenways composting company in Central Maui. They desired a location in South Maui. They leased some land from the ranch, Haleakala Ranch, right next to the treatment plant, and they're just starting up their greenway composting operation. They also practice permaculture, where they compost white paper, wastepaper which used to be thrown away in the landfill, and is now delivered to them by Maui Recycling Service. And they use these little red wiggle worms that basically decompose the paper and produce just a wonderful soil amendment. We are not only creating a renewable resource from previously disposable materials, but we're also freeing up some landfill space.

Monsanto seed corn, as you know, they have several farms both here on Maui and on Molokai. They established this 200-acre farm above our treatment plant just because the recycled water was available, and they leased land from Haleakala Ranch, and they use about 220,000 gallons of R1 water a day. And, you know, they utilized genetic

engineering to produce various forms of seed corn. This is not edible corn, it's corn that's used for cattle feed.

They also utilize R1 water for landscape irrigation, toilet and urinal flushing, and fire control at their bagging facility and office building, and will be expanding the use of recycled water for these purposes at a new building that they will be constructing in the near future.

This is probably what you asked us to come here for. This is kind of a chart of what's going on right now with wastewater treatment and water reuse in Maui County. If you look at the facilities, the design flow of each facility, the average current flow, how much R1 water is being produced, the current use of the water, and what's left over.

By the way, I do have handouts for you folks, so I'm sorry, I should have -- you don't have to take notes, I should have handed them out earlier. I'm sorry about that.

Anyway, in Kihei, all R1, we have a design flow of 8 million gallons a day. We are currently treating about 4.6. All of it is R1. We are currently using about 1.7, sometimes it goes as high as 2 million gallons per day. And

we have close to 3 million gallons per day left over at this time, although this number will be going down in the near future as some of those projects hook up that I showed you earlier.

In Lahaina we have a design flow of 9 million gallons a day, currently treating about 5 million, only 3 million gallons of R1, which is limited by the ultraviolet disinfection capability. We are currently using about 1.5 million, and about 1.5 left over. Wailuku/Kahului design flow 7.9, average flow 4.9. Again, it's all R2. A small amount of this water is being used to irrigate the Kanaha Cultural Park, which is right next door to the treatment plant.

And then on Molokai we have an R2 facility, and very small amounts being used, et cetera, et cetera. Here is Lanai. You can see we basically treat about 300,000 a day, and it all goes to the auxiliary plant and is being used on the golf course.

So we basically treat about 15 million gallons a day; we're using a little bit under 4. And so we still have quite a bit of water left. We are about 25 percent, 26

percent reuse.

As far as our rate structure, we have three classes, major ag, ag -- which includes golf courses -- and all others. And what we did was we developed this rate structure, we looked at what these user classes were currently paying for their water. Major ag was paying about 12 cents per thousand, and some were paying less and some were paying more, so we set ours at 10 to provide an incentive.

For agriculture we looked at how much golf courses typically pay to pump brackish water from the ground. Back then in 1996 they were paying about 24 cents per thousand, so we made ours, we set ours at 20. All others we set at 55 because we looked at the cheapest potable water rate, and that was the ag rate back then. At that time it was 62 cents per thousand gallons. We are looking at actually increasing our rates this coming year, and we are probably going to look at this particular class, the increase, because most of the users in this class typically use potable water from the County of Maui or private water purveyors, and they're paying anywhere from \$1.50 to \$4.00 per thousand for potable water used for landscape

irrigation.

So I think if we were to increase our rate to about a dollar per thousand that would still provide a significant savings for these customers, and help us recover some money for our program.

What we did was we also increased sewer user fees slightly to help share the burden. We have connection fees and avoided cost clause. The avoided cost clause, basically if a golf course, for example, comes in -- this if for the Kaanapali Golf Course. They said, "Well, why should we pay 20 cents per thousand? We're only paying 16 cents for brackish water." Our avoided costs clause allows us to match that rate, so it's kind of a -- I think it's a very fair approach.

Connection fees were also established for South Maui and West Maui. This is basically to help recover capital infrastructure costs. And finally, meter fees. Whatever it costs us to install a meter we basically back charge the user. That's about it. Any questions?

MR. FOLEY: Steve, I have one. The Planning Commission recently reviewed a couple of very large projects

in North Beach in Kaanapali. And during our hearing recently we heard one of the developers say that they would be glad to hook up to recycled water, but there was a pressure problem. And I think what I heard them say is that they need to have a storage tank placed higher on the hill to create the storage.

MR. PARABICOLI: Right.

MR. FOLEY: Can you tell us approximately how much it would cost to have the storage tank and the line that would be required before we could require them to hook up?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, the first two phases of that West Maui recycled water master plan that I referred to earlier, that identified both in-plant storage that we need at the plant, and also additional ultraviolet disinfection capability.

In addition, I identified the pipelines we needed to lay and the storage tank. And I believe those first two phases came out to about \$26 or \$27 million. I know there was actually a developer did call me, and I don't want to mention any names, but they were even considering putting their own storage tanks on site, so that when we pump water to the golf course they could fill up their tanks at that

time. I don't know how aesthetically pleasing that would look at a hotel.

MR. FOLEY: How big do the tanks have to be?

Would it be feasible to put tanks on the roofs of these buildings?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, it depends on how much water they need. If they were only using 20 or 30 thousand gallons a day, that could be a possibility, or some other place. These landscape irrigation projects, you know, they have a lot of hotels and condos, they have a lot of asphalt, so their use is not as much as you would think. Most of our projects seem to be in the 20, 30. There are a few that are maybe 40 or 50, but most of them are about 20 to 30 thousand gallons a day.

MR. FOLEY: Can the tertiary treated water be used for swimming pools?

MR. PARABICOLI: I believe in California they allow that, but the Department of Health here in Hawaii does not allow that.

MR. FOLEY: Because one of the resort -- one of the time-share projects the commission just reviewed had a

vast amount of water in water features. They weren't all accessible for swimming. So maybe they could be used in water features that weren't for swimming.

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, actually we do have one project, the Haggae Institute in South Maui, they use the water for landscape irrigation, but they also use it for their fish ponds and also water features like waterfalls and things like that. It's allowable for those types of uses. . Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Iaconnetti.

COMMISSIONER IACONNETTI: Does the recycled water remove the pesticides and herbicides?

MR. PARABICOLI: The recycled water? Well, we typically test our recycled water fairly frequently. We send it out to a certified lab. We normally don't see those types of residuals in there. Every now and then you might see a little trace amount, but generally we don't see the pesticides or herbicides.

We have the aeration process at the treatment plant where you pump a lot of air into the system, and that tends to volatize a fair amount of these organics and pesticides and things like that. Every now and then we do

see very, very small amounts. But, you know, when you consider that a lot of the fruits and vegetables that we purchase in the store are laden with that type of stuff, I wouldn't be overly concerned about that.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Moikeha?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: What about for fire protection?

MR. PARABICOLI: Yes, we have a number of projects that use the recycled R1 water for fire protection, including Monsanto, Bioreal. We also have a number of fire hydrants, purple fire hydrants on the old Welakahao Road that have been in fact used by the fire department for putting out brush fires in the area.

For recycled water to be used for fire control it must be of R1 quality, though, because of the generation of mists and things like that. So we have a lot of that available.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Shepherd?

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: We have started requesting that developers have dual water systems set up, and our frustration is that when it will be available, when they

will hook up. So our problem is getting the lines to them.

MR. PARABICOLI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: So do you have any idea of a time frame? It seems to me you mentioned raising the sewer rates, and that does seem to be a more fair way to go about this because you can spread it out further. But for instance, the Monsanto line. When is the study going to be done, and then we need to build the line. And Monsanto I would think would be wanting to make a contribution to this line, or should.

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, they haven't actually volunteered. The study should be done probably I would say I think they have about 180 days to complete the study. It hasn't quite gotten started, but it should be very shortly. We are just waiting for the contract to be finalized. And then we have to determine whether it's something we can afford to do. I guess we really can't afford not to do it, right.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: That's it, we can't afford not to do it, but on the other hand we can't afford to do it yet.

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, we have it in our CIP, we

just have to get that approved by the Council and the Mayor. That's the same thing for West Maui. These -- we have got projects in CIP for the next two or three years down the road.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: So where do you see the funds coming from?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, I think the best approach would be to kind of integrate a number of sources. Connection fees. We need to perhaps get some -- typically we have used state revolving fund loans, low interest loans. There's -- I wish there were more grants out there. A lot of the grant money is not -- is not accessible, but there's still hope.

I have been researching a number of grants, including Title 16 of the Bureau of Reclamation. They have finally recognized that Hawaii is a state in the United States of America and have decided to send money this way (Laughter).

There's also some other federal funding sources that we might be able to get. I believe if we were to offset potable water then the Department of Water Supply

should help contribute to our system. And possibly from private developers, if they really want the water then they should help us build the system.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: Well, I asked for a voluntary contribution from a developer to the recycling line, but didn't get it.

MR. PARABICOLI: Yeah, well, I mean I think it's -- we all have to come to a consensus that, you know, we live on an island and water is, you know, we are not really running out, but it's just getting it from point A to point B, which is the issue, it appears to me. But if we have got this water, this recycled water available, why throw it away? Let's use it.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Casumpang?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Yes, in line with Commissioner Shepherd's question, you know, from Wailea to down to the Kihei school every square foot is open space are coming here for development. And we always have been asking that to have a dual, I mean some water uses for the claim, but since the funding is not normally available. And I was wondering if we can include that in assessment fees for a developer.

MR. PARABICOLI: Yeah, I guess we could do that.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Is that by ordinance or just an SMA condition?

MR. PARABICOLI: I really couldn't answer that question. I know that we have our connection fees set up. So if you basically want to use recycled water, when you pay a connection fee you are helping somewhat to pay for the infrastructure that we have built.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: First of all we need to address if it's legal to assess the developer for impact fees.

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, you know, I think they are paying impact fees for sewer development. So it's something that the County would have to look into as far as assessing impact fees for recycled water system development.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: That's the only way we can get the funding unless -- I don't think the County has got millions of dollars in excess.

MR. PARABICOLI: No.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Freitas?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: I still want to know is

that through ordinance or we can do it in an SMA?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: No, Nick, before we can impose anything it has to be by ordinance, and then that can be an imposition. But right now legally we are not allowed to do that. But, you know, it doesn't mean that we can't start bending some ears in the Council and getting our legal department ready. And they have to actually do some kind of survey with your department so that they can come up with costs, and that's probably part of the costs or imposition of the impact fees that we have on track is that the studies are not complete.

So, you know, what comes first, we need it first and then we say let's get the money. But since they do have a connection fee, it doesn't stop this commission by saying you have to pay for that fee, connection fee. We are just saying you have to be readily available. But I would say that if we now say in the SMA you have to pay for the connection fee for reuse of water, now I think they'd be more apt to move forward in getting reused water, because they're already paying for something they can't use until it's connected.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: That's what I am leading

into, because some provision of the SMA, I believe it's a state law, and some provision of the SMA is the authority of the Council.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Well, you're right. Since they do have a fee schedule for the water meter for reused water, that can't be an imposition by us. But we'd have to go through our legal counsel to make sure that we're not stepping on anybody's toes.

Yes, go ahead.

MR. OKAMURA: I had a quick question. About how close or, you know, your revenues, about how much of your expenses does your revenues cover?

MR. PARABICOLI: Not a whole lot. Actually, that's why we had to bump up our user fees a little bit. But I think we just did an analysis on how much it's costing us to produce and deliver recycled water, and it came out to about a dollar per thousand gallons. And as you can see, if we only charge 10, 20 and 55 then we have a shortfall there. And that's where the theory was the sewer user fees would help offset that difference.

The thing is our rate study initially called for

an increase in -- a slight increase, just pennies per month, not very much at all. But it's supposed to be increased three years in a row, and they were only increased the first year. I guess that was an election year or something (laughter).

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Freitas?

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Turning the R2 into R1, is it the ultraviolet system, is that part of it?

MR. PARABICOLI: That's part of it, yeah. When you have to turn R2 to R1 you have to have filtration. It could be sand filtration or media filtration, or some type of filtration. You also have coagulation capability, which means that if the turbidity of the R2 water, the water coming off our secondary clarifiers is fairly turbid, we have to have the capability of injecting palimer or some type of a flocculent into the water to help capture the particles that are causing turbidity.

And we have that capability in all of our plants, but we don't normally use it. But you have to have that capability. And then disinfection. It can either be UV, ultraviolet, or chlorine disinfection. But chlorine has to be excessive amounts, really high residuals for extended

periods. We chose not to go that route because of safety and environmental concerns. That's why the ultraviolet really is the way to go. It's a lot better for the environment, and you don't have that big concern of storing large amounts of liquid and gaseous chlorine on site, and then leaks.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: So again, it's just a matter of money to get the ultraviolet in the purifying systems to the R2 lines?

MR. PARABICOLI: And at the Lahaina plant. We only have one ultraviolet channel that has 3 million gallons per day of capability. If we want to really increase reuse in West Maui we would definitely need to add definitely another two channels, one to help produce water to meet demand, and another as a backup.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: And do you have any idea of what the cost of something like that would be?

MR. PARABICOLI: Off the top of my head, I think they were about, boy, \$6 or \$7 million. I don't remember exactly what it was. But we have to pour concrete and buy the system. And the bulbs and things are rather expensive,

the UV bulbs. They're about -- we have several hundred that we use per channel, and I think they're about \$40 each. So there's a lot of equipment that you have to put in. If you want, we can look that up in our rate study, in our master plan.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Well, you know, I was on a golf course, I was at a house that was on a golf course in Pukalani, and there were all these biting flies all over the place, all over the grass. And the realtor said that it was because of the water that they were watering the grass with, and that it was this, you know, I guess R2, yeah.

MR. PARABICOLI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: So what's that all about?

I mean --

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, that's a perception thing, you know. People have their opinions. That is an R2 water that again it's a project that was grandfathered.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: That's why there is, there isn't that buffer because it's grandfathered.

MR. PARABICOLI: Most of the golf courses on Kauai, the Big Island, having using this type of water since the late seventies, early seventies, you know. No one is

getting sick. The biting flies thing probably has nothing to do with the water being used. It's probably, you know, did you think the recycled water makes them more aggressive?

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: I don't know, I guess they like it, I don't know.

MR. PARABICOLI: I don't really know how to respond to that.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Yes, go ahead.

MS. PARSONS: Increase usage caught did you tell down done the cost of that dollar per thousand. So it would always remain that.

MR. PARABICOLI: It would probably go up, because we'd have to pump more water. We'd have to build more pipelines. Yeah, it would go up.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Wouldn't there be a point of diminishing return? If you use X amount, after you get to a certain point then it becomes economically feasible.

MR. PARABICOLI: Oh, sure, that's down the road. Once we've got our distribution systems all built and all that kind of stuff, yeah. But initially it is very expensive but, you know, again it's a decision that the

community has to make, whether we want to take on this economic challenge. But, you know, we are going to reap some long-term benefits.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Freitas?

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: The new plant, the plant that's over there in Kahului.

MR. PARABICOLI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: You said that you are not going to improve it now because it may be moved or relocated. Is that the one that they're talking about on Mokulele Highway, that area there?

MR. PARABICOLI: Yes, that's it.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Do you know anything about a timeline on that?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, I guess the study is going to be done within a year or so, and then at that time a determination will be made. It's going to be -- that's going to be a pretty expensive proper something, to shut down the existing facility. And we'd have to relocate the pipelines and sewer lines and then also distribute, put in recycled water distribution lines, in addition to building the facility.

(Addressing Mr. Takamine) So do you want to address that?

MR. TAKAMINE: I'm Tracy Takamine again. I can answer that. Actually, the study is, I guess, planned to be completed sometime next year, just before Council budget cycle. The study will just give us an idea of what we want to do, it's not going to tell us whether we are actually going to move the plant. We're getting the community involved. We want input from the community to develop different scenarios. It might be to move the plant, it might be not move the plant. And also if it is move the plant, where should it be put?

You mentioned Puunene. That was back in the early nineties when we were looking to doing that. Since then technology has changed, things have gotten more condensed and smaller, so it's basically an open ballgame and we're looking at everything. And based on this study we will come up with a set of maybe six or seven different options that we might look at and then present that to the County Council and to the Mayor and the administration.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: So then while you're

studying to improve that plant, we just wait until all this?

I mean there's no pressure to get that plant improved?

MR. TAKAMINE: At the current time, no. No, we don't. In fact, we just recently completed this year or early last year \$12 million in upgrades in terms of liability to that plant to keep it going for another 10 or 15 years. But everything we design and we do to that facility, we take into account a 20-foot tsunami. So it's all designed to supposedly withstand a 20-foot tsunami, to be in operation after that, or with minimum work to get it back into operation.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Thanks, Tracy. Commissioner Nick?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Mr. --

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Takamine.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: -- Takamine.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Another question for you.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Yeah. What happened to that plan to move to the old airport?

MR. TAKAMINE: The Puunene airport?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Yeah.

MR. TAKAMINE: That's the one I mentioned. Back

then, there was a study done back in the early 1990's by Austin Tsusumi and Kam, Dresser and McGee. But back then the plan was to move the facility from the current location to a site near the old Puunene airport.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: The same plan.

MR. TAKAMINE: Yes. And in that plan it was to divert some of the flow from Kahului and North Kihei and combine it and treat it at that location, and develop a recycled distribution system from there.

But since then, you know, things have changed, like I said. Technology has changed, a different administration, different thoughts. So all that has been basically scrapped, and we're starting over again.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: At the CAC the department presented and we agreed to swap land from the state, because the old Puunene is state land, to make this plan a reality, and you just scrapped it like that? I don't understand.

MR. TAKAMINE: I am not familiar with that.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: They came to the CAC for zoning approval just to get that plant built over there.

MR. TAKAMINE: I'm sorry, I don't know anything

about that.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Let me ask a question. I mean just say, for instance, that site was chosen. My understanding though, if sewage is always downhill, sewer goes downhill, but then that's uphill. Because I know we did a project for Maui Land and Pine, and they had to pump. Just up to the mill was about a 25 foot uphill. So you would have to have pumps pumping all the way out there.

So it's a matter of economics. If you have got to pump everything out there it's pretty expensive, especially if it's all flowing downhill, and now we have got to turn around and pump it up there. So hopefully they will find a someplace at a lower elevation.

MR. TAKAMINE: That's correct. If we do anything, at that point what we'll do is we will get into a more in-depth engineering study that would take into account how many pump stations would have to be built, you know, what's the distance of pipeline, the distribution system, the collection system. All that will come into play.

We will have rough numbers. In fact, the study will come out with rough numbers. We'll have -- there are figures tied to these options, in their orders of magnitude,

but you will see what the costs will be. And again, that will be a deciding factor, whether we go that route or leave the plant where it's at now, or take into consideration when and if a tsunami is going to hit, can it withstand it. What's it going to cost to bring it back online. Is it worth moving the plant. All that is going to be taken into consideration.

But the Kihei plant, actually what Steve showed you, that's an elevation of 100 feet. Everything in Kihei flows from north and south to a central pump station, Pump Station 6 at Kalama Park, and we pump that 100 feet up. Not necessarily -- we don't locate the treatment plant at the lowest point.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Casumpang?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: In the study you just mentioned, how much did that cost?

MR. TAKAMINE: The study, what the cost is? We are paying \$500,000.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Any other questions for Mr. Takamine? Thank you. Any questions for this gentleman?

Go ahead, Johanna.

COMMISSIONER AMORIN: I just wanted to ask the ultimate question. Because of all these studies and improvements with recycled water, is there down the road for human consumption?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, it's actually already being done on the mainland. What you have to do is you take this quality of water that we produce and then you would put it through reverse osmosis and, you know, some nutrient removal type processes to take out nitrates and things like that.

And typically what's done then with that water, it's blended in with raw water that's put through a treatment facility. It was actually -- San Diego actually looked at doing that, and the advocates -- not advocates, the folks who were against the project labeled it the Toilet To Tap project, and they ended up drumming up enough opposition to shelf that idea.

But it's being done elsewhere. It's being done I think in Virginia and some other states as well, small applications. But in fact, even the water we're putting out now actually, believe it or not, meets many drinking water standards as it is. It's not approved for human

consumption, but there have been some cases of cross connections on the mainland. And people typically don't get sick right away. But you can see the cattle, you know, cattle are allowed to drink it, farm animals are allowed to drink it, and that's an approved use here in Hawaii. So they seem to be doing okay.

COMMISSIONER AMORIN: And we are eating that cattle, right?

MR. PARABICOLI: Well, we're eating the cattle and we're also eating lots of vegetables which are direct spray irrigated with this tertiary water.

COMMISSIONER AMORIN: Right. (Inaudible)

MR. PARABICOLI: Yeah. Actually, there was a big study done in California years ago that was called the Monterey Wastewater Study for Agriculture, and they looked at tertiary treated wastewater, secondary treated wastewater, and also just standard surface water sources that were used. And they actually found that the surface water had much higher levels of contaminants than the recycled wastewater. And, you know, they did a long-term study, and based on that study the California Health

Department allowed recycled water to be used for spray irrigation on crops.

And when our guidelines here in Hawaii were issued in 1993, we didn't allow that. But then based on the success of what's going on in California and Florida we amended our guidelines, health department guidelines in 2002, and now we do allow that use.

COMMISSIONER AMORIN: Thank you for that information. A lot of people probably will benefit from this, thank you.

MR. PARABICOLI: You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay, Commissioners, let me draw your attention back to item E, topics to be discussed. Item number one, relationship between the Maui Water Use and Development Plan, the Maui County General Plan, and the Community Plans.

So we have asked many questions, as we have agenda items coming up, and we'd like to clarify some of these items, now that we have the Board of Water Supply here and the Commission. So if we move forward into asking you what kind of questions we'd like to ask the members of their commission.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: I have got one.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay, go ahead, Commissioner

Casumpang.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Almost every meeting we

had with regards to approving any development we always question about development as being good for without even clarifying if they will have a water meter in the future after the development is being completed. So is that, can that be addressed today, as to why the meters is later on? Accepting, and then later on we will give you the meter?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: I think we have some people from

the Board of Water Supply that can attempt an answer to that.

MR. PEARSON: Good afternoon, Commissioners from

the Planning Commission, and Board of Water Supply members. My name is Jeff Pearson, I'm Deputy Director for the Department of Water Supply. I can give a brief two minutes here, and then I'll introduce Ellen Kraftsow. She is the water resource and planning division program manager.

So she'll -- what I'd like is if Ellen could do a

brief description of the items one through six. We don't

have a power point presentation. Working, you know, earlier we thought we'd not have a high tech preparation here, but we are going to be brief. And then after that point, maybe that would be a good time for you to direct your questions.

Also here is Alvin Nakamura, the engineering program manager. He's here to answer any questions, mostly maybe near the end portion where you discuss issues of fire flow and fire protection.

I want to comment on a couple of things Steve said. I agree that reclaimed water is a source. We look at it as a source. Steve said, you know, we're helping with this study for the water line that leads towards the Monsanto plant. We are fully committed to working with wastewater to help with the funding. I know he's looking at other funding, but we will definitely be a source of that funding. Because, again, that's just another source.

And if it takes a million and a half or million to drill a well, and you get a million gallons a day out of that well, and you can do the same or better for reclaimed water, of course you are accomplishing the same task.

Let's see here. I've just got notes. I'm happy that we're getting this workshop together. I know it took a

little time and a little effort to get all of us coordinated, but I think it's a good step in the right direction. There's always the problem of communication working together, so in my mind communication is the magic word. So if we can communicate better and work together, it's only going to help everybody else.

So again, Ellen, Ellen Kraftsow is going to come up here and briefly discuss these items. And if you give her just a few minutes, and then from then on we can answer any questions you may have.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Is this good enough? Greetings Commissioners and Board Members. It's off? No, it's on. Can you hear me? It's green. Okay, too high tech for me, sorry.

I have a list of questions, if we could just be prepared to answer them briefly. So I apologize that we don't have a presentation. But in terms of the Water Use and Development Plan, using a 20 year time frame, basically the plan is meant to look at existing resources and uses, not only of potable water systems, and not only of public water systems, but of all water uses to inventory those and

look at anticipated demands for water throughout the County, and then come up with a plan for how these needs will be met.

This plan needs to be consistent with the general plan and the community plans, as well as various state plans, the State Water Projects Plan, the State Agricultural Plan, the State Water Quality Plan, the State Water Resources Protection Plan. There's a whole list of plans and policies that the Water Use and Development Plan is required to be consistent with, and that much is in the State Water Code, Chapter 174-C.

In addition, now there's the framework for establishing the Hawaii Water Plan, and that requires a very extensive and robust public process in developing these plans. It is a time-consuming process. It has to be credible and documented, and basically it's an IRP planning process. And we are about to embark on the public process. We have been doing some preparation, and we are about to embark on the public process for Central Maui and Upcountry. We're actually a month or two behind on that, on doing that facilitation contract issue.

The next question I was asked is what's the

current potable use. The water department uses about 35 million gallons a day. Last time I checked Kaanapali and Kapalua, I didn't do any extensive preparation for this, but combined they use about 5 potable and Launiupoko and Baldwin and others combined, probably about 2. That's in the public water systems. That may be a little bit off, but the order of magnitude is about right. So you are looking at about 40 or 45 potable for islandwide.

Available water in Iao and Waihee. I am assuming you mean on the central system. Just yesterday we started the use of an additional filter. We added a filter. We had two filters at our Iao treatment plant, one of which had to always be on standby, so we were only allowed to use half of the capacity. Adding a filter enables us to use both of the filters we have, and so we have more capacity, and that started up successfully yesterday with all its approvals.

So the available water, if we stick to the 4 million gallons out of Waihee until we get Kupaa, we have about 748,000 gallons available on the central system. If we were able to use our full installed capacity. I don't mean full installed capacity, by standards I mean within the

limits of the aquifer, full installed capacity, we'd have more like 3 million gallons available right now. There are different assumptions that can go into that, but that's where the system is standing right now.

CIP projects to improve capacity in Central Maui.

As I just mentioned, we added a third filter to our Iao treatment plant. We anticipate the Kupaa well to be on line at the end of 2005. That will be probably close to about -- I'm ballparking this. It's about a million gallon a day well. But as you recall, we already had 6.6 million gallons of capacity in the Waihee aquifer, and 90 percent of the sustainable yield will be 7.2, the sustainable yield of that aquifer.

So because all of our existing capacity is in the southern half of that aquifer, the state has asked us to keep it down to 4 until we get to the northern half. Except Kupaa is close enough that they said that at that point we can go to 4.5. So versus what we're taking now, it would add another half million gallons, even though the capacity will be about a million.

We have some other wells that will enable us to -- our capacity will equal or exceed the sustainable yield, but

really the effect that they will have would be more to distribute withdrawals within the Waihee aquifer, but that's important because that will allow us to take up to 7.2. And those are the Camp Maluhia well, which we expect around 2008. That will be another million gallon a day well. But again, it will just distribute. Waialae well and Waiolena well and those are around 2010 and 2013, roughly, or 2009 and 2013, depending how fast they go.

And so those are additional wells that will bring our use of the Waihee aquifer up to the 7.2, or 90 percent of that aquifer. Right now we are not assuming that we can get any more than 90 percent. We'll try to stay within that 90 percent limit.

As far as elsewhere, we have a Waiale treatment plant that is actually not in Waiale, it's above Hoopoi Chute (phonetic). We expect that capacity to be around 5 or 6 million gallons a day. That's being developed and dedicated by a developer for a project, however we would pay the difference in size and increase the size to also meet our needs. And we expect that --

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Where is this, I'm sorry? Where

is this?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Above Hoopoi Chute. It's sort of above where Waiale is, up there, and it's 5 or 6 million gallons a day. We expect it around 2007 or 2008.

And then of course there are the Hamakuapoko wells. We expect them to come on line with about 700,000. They are able to come -- they already can serve drought Upcountry, and is serving drought Upcountry. We expect them to also be able to serve the Central Maui system, so that will add flexibility to the system, and those will be added in 2005.

Other options, of course, include conservation, desalt, East Maui. And then further down the line another treatment plant in Waihee that we're looking at. Also in terms of distribution and withdrawals in Iao around 2007 the Waikapu Mauka and Iao tank set wells are due.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Do you have a question for one of the Commissioners?

MS. PARSONS: Could you -- somehow if we could go back over this several times -- could you explain us to us treatment of what? Are we looking at treatment of groundwater, treatment of surface water?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Oh, surface water.

MS. PARSONS: This is all surface water that you were talking about?

MS. KRAFTSOW: The Waiale and Waihee treatment plants that I referred to, yes, those are treatment.

MR. FOLEY: Ellen, did you address West Maui?

MS. KRAFTSOW: No. Actually, this list of questions just talks about Central Maui, I'm sorry. But I mean I can give you roughly.

MR. FOLEY: Could we take a minute to just address Central Maui? I mean maybe if you could just briefly address West Maui because, you know, we also have a lot of development applications in West Maui.

MS. KRAFTSOW: We do, okay. West Maui is problematic because actually the build-out estimates of the projects that you guys have approved -- well, you guys, sorry, have approved -- I guess you're all over the place, is between 10 and 11 million gallons a day. That would be the build-out of the discretionary projects that are pending.

However, the natural demand trend would indicate

that we actually have enough source for several years. But we're already at a point where we're considering whether we need to stop giving out reservations of water because the requested demands are so high. Even requests for reservations. So it's a weird thing, it's growing much faster than the demand curves indicate that it would be growing.

We have a couple things going over there. One is a possible increase in size to one or both of the plants. That's not showing in the capitol plan yet, it's still under negotiation. Another, and part of it, one of them, one of the plants was designed for this increase, and it was designed and sited and sized to accommodate this increase, and it would just be a matter of actually taking the water.

Another, we have a Lahaina source and site optimization study that's in this current fiscal year that we expect to issue. I think the engineer that I'm working with said he would probably start with the contract in November, and so it will probably be ready to issue in early next year or mid next year. I don't know what his other project load is. And that's to look at not only the possibility of wells and surface water, but also some of the

references that came up.

Even though we haven't completed the public process for West Maui, we had started when the new guidelines came out. And so we stopped the process and we won't be going back to West Maui until Upcountry and Central Maui are finished with the Water Use and Development Plan. But we know that we are going to need source sooner than the demand curves indicated.

And so some of the requests that people had were like if they could have water that had never had to be treated for the DBCP and so forth. Obviously this would be a lot more expensive. We'd have to go a lot further out to get it. But this study should look at some scenarios like that too and just see what it would cost so that we have costs to present to people.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: That particular water that you are talking about is from which area? Are you talking about coming out from Waihee, or is it surface water from West Maui mountains?

MS. KRAFTSOW: No, actually, in West Maui we have two treatment plants, one is on Kanaha Street above

Lahainaluna school, and the other is in Mahinahina. And the first candidate for enlargements would probably be Mahinahina, because it was built with an agreement.

And as far as wells go, like I said, we have a source citing an optimization study, so this fiscal year hopefully we want to take a better look at that. A better look at why the demand for project requests are so off kilter. And this is the first time we have come across that, actually, and do some more studies. But according to the demand trend, we have time to do this.

There's something else I wanted to say on West Maui. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: You had a question, Nick?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Yeah, going back to my question, you stated that there's a so high of the demand. The reason why we are approving project after project is because we don't get a clear words from the department, from the water department that we don't have water. All we are getting is develop, it's only a risk. We cannot guarantee a meter for you. That's not what we -- we don't know if we have water or not, because we have no clear words from your department to say that.

That's why now you are telling us that oh, we approve too much development and then we don't have water.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Right. In theory, all of our current responses say how much this project we anticipate it will use, and maybe we're not consistent enough about how much is already in use so that you can watch it grow.

But also I think you raise a good point. There was a time when the first -- it wasn't actually the first time the designation question was raised in Iao, but it was in the early nineties, or early or mid nineties, where we actually did recommend denial of some projects to avoid building demand. And were told, "Your job isn't to do land use planning, your job is just to do water planning."

So we backed off and decided, okay, we're just going to tell them how much we're using and let them decide. And for a while that made the Commissioners, different Commissioners several commissions ago step back and pay attention.

The department policy has been for decades and decades that we make no guarantee or commitment of water until such time as a meter is issued, and that's the point

at which we review. If we were to be reserving water for projects there would be additional administrative and resource and staffing costs to support something like that.

And one of the issues, one of the things that the Water Use and Development Plan is supposed to accomplish is to review several policy issues that have -- that arise in the community a lot. One of them would be the pacing of the use of water. Another would be at what time should water be guaranteed. Another would be who is responsible for fire protection.

Those kinds of issues are to be dealt with through the public process of the Water Use and Development Plan. But absent such a process we wouldn't really undertake rule making to change the way things are going at this time.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: We need to see the red flag to let us know that there's no more, so we can at least slow down development or practically stop it if we have to. We have to alert the people for water.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Right.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Just a minute. Go ahead. You have a question?

MS. PARSONS: Going back just to the same thing

that Nick was talking about, going back to that. You went through it really quickly, but the 780 thousand gallons per day available that you think we have for central valley, is that correct?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Roughly, yeah.

MS. PARSONS: Does that take into a -- I want a rundown of where that comes from, because I think we had less some time back.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yes, we did.

MS. PARSONS: And you said there were other scenarios that that could be lessened with. And also, does that -- is that a sustainable amount needed for drought?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Okay. I have, there's like a whole list I have more answers to whenever you're ready to move on. But okay, that comes from -- our Iao pumpage is -- this is a moving annual, so it will account for one summarize you will be familiar with Ginny. Even a moving annual doesn't go up and down a bit. But Iao pumpage is about 16.97, Waihee pumpage is about --

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Wait. Is that per day, per year, per --

MS. KRAFTSOW: Oh, sorry, millions of gallons per day.

MS. PARSONS: Well, we designated because we were running into a much higher number. That was the reason for designation. So was that in a period of a drought and we designated because we had a drought situation? And would we be a whole lot higher at say the 18, 19 mark? Honestly, Answer honestly.

MR. PEARSON: Ginny mentioned that we designated because there was a higher use. I wasn't around for all the commission meetings, but I understand and know that the reason for -- there was a bunch of triggers for designation. One of them was the chloride levels that arise. Maybe Ellen can talk in more detail, but I'll try to be brief.

But one of the triggers, as Ginny was talking about, was pumping out of the yearly average, the 12 month moving average. If it exceeded 18 million gallons a day at any one month, the full month moving average, once it exceeded 18 million gallons a day that was the trigger for designation. No ifs, ands or buts, bam, you were designated.

So that happened in June, I think, of '03, is that

right? So in June of '03 the Commission didn't have to make a decision, the decision was made earlier based on other Commission meetings on the triggers to designate. So that's been designated to take place.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: So 20 million gallons per day until there was an intervention to lower that down to 18.

MR. PEARSON: Correct. The sustainable yield, well, in the eighties I think the sustainable yield was in the 30 million gallons per day. From studies and whatever, the sustainable yield was lowered to 20 million gallons per day. And then the trigger was based on 90 percent of the 20 million gallons per day, which is 18 million gallons a day. So that's where the number came from.

MS. PARSONS: So my question was, was this at a drought period where we were in where we were using 18 to 20?

MR. PEARSON: Well, again, it's a 12 month moving average. And so actually if you look months before that we were using over 20 million gallons a day for certain months. But then, you know, in the winter months and depending on rains and so forth we were using -- and usage is lower, we

are using 16 or 15 million gallons a day. That's why they figured a 12 month moving average was a fair representation as opposed to a monthly average.

MS. PARSONS: So maybe what we ought to take is the last four or five years and average those out per month as something, rather than the last 12 months. Because it would seem to me like it would be more of a legitimate figure if we take in the last five years and average out the last five years and say, okay, we are at 17 or 18 million gallons, and that's one of the reasons why we designated. And that would bring this 780 thousand gallons per day down, correct?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Ginny, yes, 2002 and 2003 were extremely dry years. But in addition to that, there's some data review going on with our consultant which is just not at the point yet where it's ready for public discussion, that seems to indicate -- and I'm just going to say seems to indicate at this point that our production numbers for a specific period of time may have been overestimated.

And I don't want to go into that any further right now, because it just sounds, you know, without giving you the full explanation. But there's a combination. Those

were some very dry years and there may have been some historical recording errors.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: The dilemma that comes to us in the planning is that when we have a project that comes before us and it says that they're only going to use X amount of gallons and we see a number that's 800 thousand gallons available, we don't know how many other projects or how many other things that have been reserved to take care of that. So it might not be 800 thousand.

If you take all the projects that have come before us and you total all of those things up, and those that were in retrospect, such as the project that's going on over here in Wailuku that's 180 houses, which is 15 years old, and their commitments were way back when, does the new usage comply or did they have reservations for those? We know that that project was there back 15 years ago, but they're just building it now.

So what we really need to know is what's on reservation or what had been committed way back when. And I think we need our Planning Department to find out from you what really is, and not you know take it when it comes.

When your project comes up we will tell you if you have got it or not. That leaves us in the cold.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I think that you're raising a really important issue, and the issue is at what point do you guarantee water. But in terms of tracking the water, if you look at the community plan buildout, depending upon the assumptions you used from as little as 32 to well over 16 million gallons a day that were built out. If you look at the discretionary permits that have come through planning or are pending, 10, 11 million gallons a day.

But if you just look at what's reserved, right now we have 618,210 gallons -- not millions of gallons per day -- estimated in reserve meters. Plus another 63,900 that Hawaiian Homes is asking for Waiehu for their phase four, which they didn't reserve. That's what is outstanding in reservations.

And the available water amount that we gave you, that 800, that was beyond those reserved amounts. And what happened was when we got close, we were continually reevaluating that, and as we got closer, you know, the numbers were -- the pumpage numbers were going down and the treatment plant was about to be put on. So rather than call

the entire economy to a screeching halt, they felt that we could get by a little bit longer than the originally anticipated 800 thousand.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Moikeha?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Isn't that why it's so imperative that you have a development plan? And has the County ever had a water development plan?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yes. In fact, the community plan that was finished in 2002 was the update of the 1980 community plan. During the 1990'S's two complete Water Use and Development Plans were written based on that community plan, at which point the director at the time said there's no point in continuing to write Water Use and Development Plans based on community plans that haven't changed. Community plans and general plans that haven't changed.

So now we are in the process of updating the Water Use and Development Plan. We do have and have long had, you know, capitol plans and area plans and regional plans. But the Water Use and Development Plan is a specific long-range plan that's much like the general plan and the community plans, it has to be built with a great deal of public

involvement and public participation. So we wouldn't call any of our -- we wouldn't call any of our plans the Water Use and Development Plan that hadn't been through that process.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: So until we get new plans, based on the community plan review, we don't use what we have?

MS. KRAFTSOW: No, we are using what we have.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Have you ever seen the South Maui carrying capacity that was done by Long Range? And for Central Maui water demand in 2005 it will require 23.34 gallons, million gallons per day. Have you seen that chart?

MS. KRAFTSOW: I have seen that chart. Actually, we had a forecast expert do something that was a little bit more tailored to water, so our South Maui projection is more like -- which year were you looking at, 2005?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: I'm looking at 2005 at 23.34.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yeah, yours is a little bit higher than ours, than our base case, but it's pretty close.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Well, these numbers are

based -- first of all, the historical population is based on the census, and these particular numbers apply to those designated lands in the community plan of South Maui. So that's the relationship with those numbers to this chart. So you're saying this is a little high?

MS. KRAFTSOW: It's close, it's close for planning purposes. Our forecast expert did use both the census data and the SMS data that was used for developing the infrastructure assessment and the general plan process. He made some adjustments based on -- one of the things I think, one of the assumptions that was inherent was that growth would continue to divide by the same proportions that the communities are broken down now, whereas he instead assumed that growth would continue to divide according to the trends that they're dividing now, if that makes any sense. A few minor adjustments, but it's the same kind of forecast, basically.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: So if this is our forecast, are we going to meet that forecast?

MS. KRAFTSOW: For 2005, yes.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: We are going to have enough

source of water by the year 2005, what's needed?

MS. KRAFTSOW: You know, it is not simply a matter of planning, it's also a matter of implementing. So as long as these projects get built, yes.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Well, planning is the foundation, the first part of it, and implementing that plan is the next part.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Right.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: But what I always see in this County is we do a lot of studying and nothing seems to get implemented or we, you know, just set aside and someone else down the road wants to do another study. Where do we ever get anywhere is what I don't understand.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Let me ask you, when she referred to being built, we are talking were the projects that we're looking at. But are you talking about projects that the water department is looking at to build so that you have more capacity, is that what you are talking about?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: So the question is how far along in your projects are you so that we can know that the capacity that we're going to let loose to developments for

our people, that you are going to be able to coincide with us? That's really, you know, do you have enough funds that you can do that or is it on line? Do you have contracts out to build?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Well, the fact of the matter is there are plans in the water department that are older than I am that are still good plans that have never been built for lack of funds and lack of staff. And there are wells that have been planned for close to a decade that have not -- that have been budgeted repeatedly that have not been built for lack of funds or lack of staff. So that is a problem, and the water department is moving to address that problem.

I think that, you know, and I am not speaking department policy, it's just hard for me to refrain from saying this. This county has no resource policy. And with the existing financial structure and staffing structure that we have, it is in fact extremely difficult for the water department to keep up right now.

That doesn't mean that we couldn't make it possible, it means that with the current financial structure

and staffing structure that we have, it is very difficult to keep up with the pace of approvals right now.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: That's an aged problem, because when the water department was on a semiautonomous program they produced more in water development than we have since it's been given to the county again. So we're back to square one where they only did \$2 million a year, which was actually only repairing the pipes and that kind of thing.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I think with all respect I think you guys need to ask yourself another question, which is, even say we could develop all the water that we have, you all probably are very familiar with the amounts of water, about 470, plus a million gallons a day groundwater, and half a million in run-off, which would translate there to less than that in available surface water.

And you know, even if you could, that sounds like a tremendous amount of water. But depending upon the pace at which you increase how much you are using it, it could be used up much more quickly than you would expect.

Honolulu has similar quantities of water and expects to run out of new sources of fresh water by the year 2020, and has expected this for a long time. So the

question I would ask you to keep in mind is okay, there's X amount of water. One is the issue of how can we pace infrastructure. Another is how fast do you want to use it? It's not -- you know, how fast do you want to use it? And that's one of the questions that will be asked in terms of the long-term process.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Raisbeck?

MS. RAISBECK: Ellen, the Water Stakeholder's Committee is developing a proposal for new rates, and they have been given a great deal of data about use, about water use. And I understand that there are certain percentage -- that are for their purposes they have been given a percentage increase in number of meters and a percentage increase in amount of water use to use in their planning.

Now, I looked at those figures and figured out that really they're talking about increases countywide of something like less than 600 meters a year. And I thought to myself, you know, with the projects that are planned, how can they be planning less than 600 meters a year increase for the purposes of this Water Stakeholder's Committee, which is not Board of Water Supply, it was appointed by the

department.

But they have been doing you might call it financial planning for the water department in order to come up with new rates, and I don't see how those figures match the kind of information that you've been giving.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I am not sure if I understand if you're saying we are not growing as fast or --

MS. RAISBECK: No, I mean you are projecting -- for the purposes of that committee, you are projecting say over the next five years there's going to be a certain growth for the purposes of that committee. There will be a certain growth in the number of meters, and a certain growth in water use. And the number of meters does not compute with what the Planning Commission works with, and it seems to me that they could use some of that information themselves.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Well, but then what we have too is that you have one meter and one project that comes in with 200 units, or like the one we had this morning which is 156 units. It's only one meter. So, you know, out of 600 if you had an average of 100 users or 100 units per 600 you would have 60 thousand units coming on line possibly.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I don't -- also I didn't do that projection, Sally, but I think that it was based on historical trend, and they used some sort of estimated percent growth based on historical trends.

MR. PEARSON: I think the percentage growth was 2.5 percent, based on the last four or five years of growth, meters. Not just the five-eighths inch meters, but the larger meters also.

MS. RAISBECK: I think they're using figures that are less than that.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Go ahead, Commissioner Shepherd.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: I had a question for Mr. Kushi. We have on several occasions asked developers, "How do you feel about this clause that says you can go ahead and you can go through all of this, but there's no guarantee there's going to be water." And they always say, "Well, I'll take the risk."

Now, nobody is going to take that type of risk unless they feel very sure that the water will be available. So my question to you is, legally what's the status of somebody who has gone through all these steps and gets to a

certain point and says, "Well, yeah, but I wouldn't have gone this far unless I thought there was water." I mean can they turn around and say, "Hey, I went through all this, you need to give me water"?

MR. KUSHI: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman also. I don't know the answer, but I'm sure we'll find out shortly, because it's coming to that point, it will come to that point. But as the department has said and Ellen has confirmed, that all your projects you get a letter from the water department, and I believe you make that part of your record if you approve a project.

And there are a lot of projects out here closer than you think that are ready to hook up, and they don't have reservations. And once that 700,000-plus gallons is gone, it's gone. But I will find out.

MR. FOLEY: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to add one thing with respect to what Ed just said, and that is that the Planning Commission approves projects, other projects are approved by the Council, and the staff approves a lot of projects. We process thousands of applications a year. What we don't know is when the projects are going to be developed.

We have projects such as the one someone referred to over here below Wailuku Heights which was approved 15 years ago, and then this year they decided to build. And so there are a lot of projects on the books, but it's impossible for us to tell exactly when they're going to be built.

And that's the problem that gets us into the procedure we have now, where the water department says, you know, "We don't know whether you're going to have water or not until you come in to build," because they don't know and we don't know who is going to come in first.

And what Ed just said is there are a lot of large projects out there, and if the large ones come in instead of the small ones, we have a problem not only in Central Maui but we have a problem in West Maui.

So, you know, I just wanted to point out that we don't control when projects start, and we have some projects that have been on the books for 10, 15 years that may or may not proceed, but we -- usually financing is the reason they're delayed. But quite often the projects disappear and we never know why, they just don't come back. So there is

an unknown with respect to this timing.

MS. KRAFTSOW: So, you know, if it is determined that the will of the public throughout the community in general is to make it such that project approvals come with water commitments, then obviously water commitments and approvals of projects would have to be subject to some different standards. And so that would be maybe a bigger step than people realize.

Now, it's not like you can say, "Okay, approve it and we will commit the water now." We would need to know up front when will you build. Approvals, if they weren't built on time, would need to lapse. There would need to be some funds and staffing for tracking both on the planning department and the water department side to keep it -- you know, it would solve certain changes.

It may -- in fact, because we don't get any tax money, it may also affect rate or fee structures. So it's a bigger question than it may seem like, although it's still worth discussing.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay. At this time I'd like to take a ten minute break and give our stenographer a chance to take a break, and for the rest of us. Let's recess for

five minutes.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken)

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay, the Planning Commission is back in session. At this time -- I have been neglecting one of our Commissioners, and she has really something very important to ask, so let's have it.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe this goes to Milton, although I am not sure. You may redirect it. Milton, that one-liner that comes in for us all the time that says, you know, the remarks from water, you know, when they apply for a building permit, okay. To change that, does it actually go to water first and they really do see if there's water available, or have a comment on it, how do we change that? Instead of it coming like that and then going back for a building permit. Because on it it has water usage. They know what's going on.

MR. ARAKAWA: Well, I think that question the Commission needs to wrestle with, or the County as a whole has to wrestle with, is at what point are you going to guarantee the water. And that's the question Ellen brought up earlier. If you guarantee it too early, say at a change

in zoning, it may be years before any development happens.

So you could do it in an SMA level, but that's also not a guarantee that a development will start, you know, construction shortly. There are some that for which SMA Permits have been granted and it's been years before it actually starts. In fact, you have seen a number of time extensions before you on that. So that's the basic issue.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: But Milton, if in fact it goes to water and they say okay, you are allowed this much and we have it and everything and there's a time on it, can't they determine but if you don't call for your water within a certain amount of time, or something, you go to the back of the list?

I mean I just can't believe that something could not have more control, and I believe it's at that end. If they have a problem with staffing or whatever, different issue. But for us to receive it like this the only thing that I can see happening here is that we are going to have to start refusing these projects. And if we start doing that, then these developers are going to have to go to water and let them beat them up.

No, the other thing too is I have to say all this

about, oh, we don't know what will happen if a developer does put his system in and calls for water and water isn't available. I was there, Milton, you know, and when we were ready for water on our subdivision and water wasn't available and it was a drought, we had our infrastructure in. And I walked into the Director and said, "Give us our water, we put all this money in, or we're going to sue you. And we got our water." That's what these guys are going to do.

Now, let me just be clear. If in fact they are planning to add surface water to Iao to supply all these things that we are approving, and they do it the same way that they do in the Upcountry water, we have another problem going on. And I can't see approving anything knowing that that's what they're going to do. And they're going to pollute it like they polluted us up there. I can't do that to Central Valley. So again, we are back to not approving projects.

MILTON: Let me throw out something to you. I think we discussed it on the Commission level awhile back, and this goes back to I think a broader question as to I

mean what is it we want to see. I mean how do we envision Maui to look like in the future?

This has come up in the general plan. The general plan was updated in the early '90's. The theme too, I brought it here today, theme two says, "Prepare our directed and managed growth plan."

Let me read this short paragraph to you. It says, "Amendments to the general plan would preserve the desired quality of life where area and urban settlement must be managed and directed within a framework that consistently and concurrently balances both demands against human service needs and physical human infrastructures apply."

This plan was never done basically, so we have been basically going like a rudderless ship for the past decade, and the results have been pretty crippled.

So I think what needs to be done is try to get an overall plan which balances what resources we have available to provide infrastructure. And that plan needs to tell us the rate, where development would be desirable, and things of that nature. And I think that is what hasn't been done so far, and that's what needs to be done.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Now, this gentleman from

the State Health Department was up at my house and tested my water. And I was talking to him about the projects that we're approving in South Maui and he told me that, you know, just like the gentleman that was here earlier that said that the treatment plant, do we put money into it and improve it, or do we move it.

Okay, on the same level as that, this gentleman told me that if we force by what we are approving in these developments, if we force that surface water to be added to Iao now, that we are going to create another problem. That what we need to do is not all, not all this development, but improve that whole system. And if we add the surface water, make sure that it's done properly and not a lot of Band-aids, like adding a filter, wonderful, but really give the people good water, that we are not going to do it that way.

That we are forcing, by approving these projects, that to happen. And that's a scary thing, that we would do something like that.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I can comment on that, if I can. Actually, if you look at the build-out scenario in the community plans and, well, it's interesting the community

plans, a couple of them say don't take water from East Maui, and then the one from South Maui says take the water from East Maui. So right away it's hard to be consistent with plans that aren't consistent.

But if you are talking about that kind of build-out, we take all of Iao, all of Waihee and all of Haiku aquifer, you still don't meet build-out.

So yes, that is a fact. Unless you are talking about going way east, which is where the bulk of available water on Maui is, you are basically forcing the surface water issue by approving those quantities, that's true.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Don't we have an agreement that we no longer will develop East Maui for the next ten years?

MS. KRAFTSOW: We -- the agreement is actually posted on the web. I believe that it says we have put aside the East Maui development plan, and will not touch it again with the exception of Hamakuapoko, except in the course of the Water Use and Development Plan process that will be an option like all our options, and then it will be reviewed with new environmental work.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: But they put a ten year timeline on that, correct?

MS. KRAFTSOW: I don't recall. I'll have to check.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay. Let's go here to Ginny and then you.

MS. PARSONS: I think, Milton, one of my biggest concerns, and maybe you can help address this, is when you get a subdivision that comes in and it gets all the way through almost all of its approvals and then comes down to water and it has that little line on there, once they have gotten to a certain point, whether it's sitting there for ten years or five years or two years, they're able to go out to the public and they can sell lots to the public.

And what concerns me are residents unknowingly giving them thousands of dollars in a deposit for a piece of property that we don't have infrastructure on, and we might not have for several years. And that bothers me more than anything else.

In my personal opinion I think we should hit the water department first, and if we have the water available and they can put a deposit down for the meters, that they do that first and then they go forward. Because otherwise

their whole scenario is, I can develop, I'll put in all my infrastructure, and I sell it to 184 families. And now it's not just me knocking on the water department's door, it's 184 other folks with me and their families and saying, "Hey, we have to have water."

So I think, you know, it's a Catch-22. But we are putting the cart before the horse letting them expend all this money on big subdivisions and then expecting the Department of Water to come up with it, and we're real close to the line right now.

Putting on surface water, for example, and I am not sure that what our whole picture is in the longrun, but putting on surface water is a real chemical mix. And we don't really have a development right now that's developed to handle it. We're short of people, we're short four engineers, we're short people in the chemistry department, we're short people in the biology department. I mean we have to look at this. How do we protect the consumer, the resident?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Diane Shepherd.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: I have a question for both

water and planning staff. Is the worst possible scenario that I am going to go out some morning for my first drink of Iao Aquifer water and it's going to taste a little bit salty and the next day it's a little more salty? Are there checks where we are not going to overallocate, overlap that aquifer to that point?

MS. KRAFTSOW: I think that that is a worst case scenario, but hopefully -- we do monitor the chlorides. And the State Water Commission would tell us to back off on bumping, or we ourselves would back off on pumping before we reach that point. If development proceeds to a point where, you know, that's why I'm saying I think that yes, you know, our planning could be improved upon. Yes, we have plans sitting on the shelves, but we don't have a fully public process, recent Water Use and Development Plan. We are not process now.

But in addition, it is my personal opinion -- this is not policy of anyone -- that the County needs a little bit more discipline about the pace with which it grows. And even if it doesn't want to slow down, then it needs to do something to make it possible to go at that pace with

consistency, infrastructure consistency. Either that or slow down, but it has to do one or the other, because it's not working the way it's going now.

COMMISSIONER SHEPHERD: Well, we have got a gold rush right now.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Suzanne? Sorry, Susan?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Ellen, I have a report here that we always get every time an agency reviews, or your department reviews for a project, and as of June 16 we had -- your department had issued 529 gallons per day, meters at that capacity. So would this project if we approved it, which we saw today and we deferred it, it would require another 154 gallons per day. That's over 680,000 we are talking about. We don't have much room left. What happens when we get to the 800 number, what do you folks do?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Actually, we have already passed the 800 number.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: We have?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yes. The 800 number was based on -- and I can run those calculations for you on the board again if you want -- but it was based on at the time an estimate of what was currently being pumped both from Iao and Waihee,

what was being used from the tunnel, what was being used from the treatment plant, reservations on Hawaiian Homes, and meters issued since designation. And subtracting all that from available source we estimated at that time that we had 800,000 available.

Based on the addition of the Iao treatment plant filter, which doubled the capacity of the plant even though it was just one filter, because there were only two and you have to leave one out. Also some valving in the system, which enabled us to make more use of, we didn't actually change the flows of the Iao tunnel, but we were able to take more of it into the system. And based on some research which I think will be made public very soon.

We reviewed the availability analysis looking at the current status, and I can give you what the current status is and how we came up with that. We still have 748,000. But we have given out, since designation, about 1.2 million actually in meters. That's why I don't know how far along, how far behind the Commission reviews are from our letters, but it's been several months now.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: This is June 16th. We saw

the project today. This is October.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Of '03 or '04?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: '04.

MS. KRAFTSOW: So we -- pretty soon you will start seeing projects without that statement any more.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Without what statement, how many we have?

MS. KRAFTSOW: About the 800,000 gallons, because basically at that time when we reached that it was do we make a statement that we are going to stop issuing meters and do a moratorium, or do we reanalyze the situation.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Are you going to keep going?

MS. KRAFTSOW: No, we have to continually analyze how is the pumpage comparing to our source. If we are getting new sources on line, obviously that changes the calculations. We just have to keep reviewing it. At this point the magic number would be the 748,000. And then, you know, once we get Kupaa on, that magic number changes again.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: So now we really have 748,000 available?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Actually, yeah, actually we have

more than that if we did not stay within the Commission's request to stay under 4 million gallons. But within that 4 million gallons we have some 48,000 -- 748,000.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Do you have to report these numbers to the State Commission, State Water Commission? are they aware that at one time you said you only had 800, and we used 529 up to June 16th. And now today we find out that we're way over that number, we used 1.2 million, and now the new number is 748.

MS. KRAFTSOW: We don't formally make a report of that because that's internal county policy to them. But I do discuss that with Commission staff and go over, "These are my calculations, what do you think of them," you know, that kind of stuff.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: So don't you feel that this is information we should know? I mean if you're giving us inaccurate information, you are painting a perceived picture that we're almost to the end here and you guys have been going along all around recalculating things, and now you have got new numbers. So how do we ever really know what the real numbers are?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Well, with the changes that we made to the system it's appropriate at that point to recalculate the numbers.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Is there a possibility that you could inform the Department of Planning, and therefore they could inform us while we're reviewing these projects?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yeah, I think actually back --

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: I mean your director got up and talked about communication earlier and how important that was. I totally agree. We're operating under false information here, and you wonder why people are a little concerned or they're leery of the numbers that are coming out of the department, or even the County. It's because when do you tell us these things?

I never knew this was publicized, and we're dealing with approving projects all the time, and now all of a sudden it's a whole different picture. It's pretty amazing.

MR. FOLEY: Ellen, you said at the beginning that the Water Use and Development Plan has to be consistent with the general plan. And you know that we're in the process of starting to update the general plan. I'm wondering when you

expect the Water Use and Development Plan to be completed.

Do you have a schedule?

MS. KRAFTSOW: We have a schedule. The entire schedule, it's roughly a little bit under, but roughly four years from the day that we start the public process, which we were supposed to have started in September. And as soon as we get this facilitation conflict issue resolved, hopefully we will be ready to go.

And so it will be about that time frame. And we will be working hopefully with your staff. And typically when we are running these meetings Planning Department staff participate.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay. Before the break Michelle, you had a question. Have you asked the question or do you need to go ahead?

MS. McLEAN: Thank you. I'm sort of half wearing a developer's hat and half wearing a board member's hat. Just a suggestion for the department. When the Commission gets agency comments from Public Works, from the Wastewater Reclamation Division, it's very clear as to the Wastewater Reclamation Facility that that particular project will be

utilizing what the design capacity is, what the current usage is, and therefore what the availability is. And they also say very clearly that capacity won't be guaranteed until the time of building permit issuance.

So maybe information like that from the water department would be more clear for the Commission in projects, like the information you are talking about, even though that's a few months old now. But to be more clear with how much available water they see on that system when they're doing an agency review for a project, so that you guys have a better picture as to what you are looking at.

And from the developer perspective a little bit, like you were talking about, there's a lot of risk involved in development, it's not just water. But I was speaking to Ellen a little bit during the break that it's water or roads right now seem to be driving planning more than planning itself is. Looking at stopping or denying projects or deferring projects because water is not available, or because traffic is -- the roads serving the project are already over capacity.

But it's because our island is growing we need more homes and we need more water and we need a better

roadway network to serve them. So one doesn't have to be a victim of the other, I don't think.

And if you are approving projects that are good projects and should go forward, we need to support the water department in the budget process for them to be able to implement the projects that Ellen described to serve the developments that are being approved.

And the same with roads. Even though some are state responsibilities, it's okay, we're approving these projects because we need them and we like them and they're good, but let's make sure that we're also doing what we can for the infrastructure to be developed to serve them.

So that's -- I mentioned to Ellen as a board member, that's what our responsibility is, is to support the water department during the budget process with the things that they need to keep up with the growth that we are approving.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Thank you, Michelle.

Commissioners, I am going to move to the next subject here. We have some resource people that have been waiting to make some comments, and there's one of the items on our list, and

it's item number 8, fire flow and fire protection.

Now, you have questions, you have had questions about fire flow and fire protection. We have the resource personnel here. In specific, I'll entertain questions on those. Anyone?

If not, they're not prepared to give any presentation other than answering questions, okay. Go ahead.

MS. PARSONS: We come up with quite frequently a lot of fire flow issues in front of the board with folks that want to build an ohana onto their property, and/or family subdivisions, you know, smaller kind builds.

And we sometimes see where they've been given fire flow infrastructure to the tune of oh, maybe half a million, maybe more dollars to build an \$80,000 cottage on the property.

Is there a way, I mean I understand that the fire trucks now from a pressure standpoint are pretty much contained, pressurized, is that true? Do you have your own pressure as long as you can get water?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Correct. The trucks are capable of pumping 1500 gallons a minute. Then we use

sources such as fire hydrants or standpipes refill, supply them.

MS. PARSONS: Well, a lot of our -- and I know we have got infrastructure problems within, you know, like even a three mile radius of the fire department. I think we have got something like \$65 million worth of infrastructure that needs to be cured. But rather than put this on the homeowner, do you see any way that we can turn this over to you to tell us whether it's sufficient for fire flow purposes, planning?

I mean instead of the department telling us that they have to put a big tank in the back yard, that now we're finding out that tanks might house bacteria quicker, or having to develop or find \$500,000 to put new pipes in the roadways. Is there something you can do when you start to review these and tell us whether there's sufficient fire protection?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Okay, basically when the subdivision comes to the fire department for review the fire flow is pretty much based on the zoning. So like for residential right now agriculture is 250 gallons a minute

fire flow. All the fire flows are based on a two hour duration, so that's going to be like the size of the tank, the holding capacity. Regular residential is a thousand gallons a minute and, again, on a two hour duration.

We adopted an ordinance back in 2002 requiring that all homes or new buildings be within 500 feet travel distance of a fire hydrant or standpipe.

And that's where, like I said, if some people have been living in some houses for 40 years, and like I said, they're maybe a thousand feet from the road frontage, when they come in for a building permit to build an ohana then they're way beyond the 500 feet. So now they have to either -- our code requires them to bring in a water source, put a storage tank, or put fire sprinklers in the house to meet our code.

On the other hand, when people are not on the county water system and they come in for like a third structure, the water department comes in and they -- that's their requirement and their codes to try and provide the required fire code for that new structure. And that's the water development's code, not ours.

MS. PARSONS: That's the one I'm talking about.

Couldn't you from the fire department side be able to look at these as well? I mean I have had people with a fire hydrant across the street and they've been asked to put in, you know, several lines, several thousand feet of pipe. I mean because they want 6-inch pipe rather than 8-inch pipe.

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Yeah. What's happening on most of these older subdivisions is the infrastructure that's put in doesn't meet our code right now. I mean like a 4-inch water line under there. So when it comes to the third structure, the third structure fire flow can't be met with the size of pipe that's in the front, that's serving the property.

So like the water department is requiring them to bring in a 6-inch water line from the nearest source to provide the fire flow for that third structure. Our code provides for sprinklers for the building, our fire flow is taken care of, but right now the building permit will not come to me for review, it will go to the water department and the water department will sign off.

MS. PARSONS: But a sprinkler system might be able to overcome this as far as the fire department is concerned?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Yes, our code does have that if the house is protected with a fire system, a fire flow. We are taken care of.

MS. PARSONS: So how do we enact that, then, get this taken out of the water department's bailiwick and put it back into yours and be able to say there's going to be a sprinkler system? Because I know homeowners right now that would definitely put a sprinkler system in right now, no problem, but they're being told no, they've got to put in massive amounts of infrastructure funds.

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: I am not really sure how. I don't mind taking on the project with a little help, but I think we have got to go back to the departments and get this thing -- maybe Public Works or Corporation Counsel to get this thing resolved.

MS. KRAFTSOW: I just would like to clarify. A lot of times when we're requiring that a larger line be put in, the line is substandard, or if they're pumping the line, or if there's a risk of leaks that make the system not able to protect. And what happens, a sprinkler is preventative. They say it will do a better job of saving the house than a system, because which the time the fire department gets

there, et cetera, et cetera.

On the other hand, if the fire were to spread, There needs to be a system that can also provide fire control. And I think that the issue is in some of these areas originally when the fire department was approving things that we weren't, they just assumed that the systems met standards.

So I am not sure whether -- you guys have your own standards too, yeah, that's got to be able to deliver. So if they can't deliver that many gallons they wouldn't be approving it either, I don't think, is that correct?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Okay, right now our standards, we need to update our standards in order to pass the fire code, and our standards to be in compliance with water. Because right now for example our zoning, ours still have at 250 million gallons a minute for a two hour duration required fire flow.

Water, the new standard requires pump it up to 500 gallons a minute. You know, our '97 fire code is still in the process of being adopted, so I'm still enforcing 250 gallons a minute.

As far as if the infrastructure cannot meet the fire flow when they want to build the third structure, our ordinance code that was adopted does have that if they put the sprinklers in the house they can go ahead and build the house.

MS. PARSONS: So Mr. Kushi, my question to you. How do we get this out of the department's purview and put it back to the fire department and help some of these folks out?

MR. KUSHI: Mr. Chairman, if I may try to answer that. There are two possible ways. Our requirements are found in our rules, the departmental rules, and you can change the requirements by amending the rules. The question is who would amend these rules? So we go back to the circular argument.

But also, if we did have -- somebody could change the rules, I believe the department would have to coordinate with the fire department and get some -- and the billing department to get some consensus as to who will do what and what will pass. Because of the standards, although the water department states they have adopted new standards, there are still the old standards in the rules. That's a

question by itself.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Raisbeck?

MS. RAISBECK: Yes, I don't know if the Planning Commission knows this, but the water department is not allowed to use what you pay on your monthly bill, that kind of money, to extend the system. And they have to extend the system, they have a water development fee that covers source transmission and storage, but it has nothing in it for distribution at all.

So that any changes to distribution lines, which are the ones that connect the transmission line to the home, those basically, if those are going to be upgraded the way they get it upgraded is by loading it onto -- this is the way it happens upcountry, okay -- that the first person to come in to request something that triggers the need to meet standards has to upfront pay the cost, and that's what Ginny is talking about, half a million dollars. They pay the cost.

If there are other people who can -- and sometimes it's, you know, 8,000 feet of 8-inch pipe and a big storage tank and so on for somebody who wants to develop

their property upcountry. We've been struggling with this on the board for the year-and-a-half I have been on the board, because it leads to such vast inequities. But that's the way the department pays for distribution lines basically, is put it on the people who want it developed.

Because they're not allowed to use rates, you know, your regular water rates to cover it, it has to come out of a fee. But there's nothing in the source development, in the fee that they pay at the time they get a water meter that covers distribution lines.

So part of the problem is that I think that the way they pay for distribution lines has to change so that the first homeowner to come in with a change doesn't, you know, doesn't get stuck with it all. They can get some reimbursement later if other people use it. But still, it's a major, major investment for an ordinary homeowner.

The other thing is I wanted to pick up on what Commissioner Freitas said. I think we have reached a point where formerly water was considered as limitless and it was economic issues that drove development. And, you know, a changed Maui and a lot of people have been very happy to have the change in Maui that came with this development.

But we have reached the point where now it has to be water first and then development, if the water allows it. And partly we're behind, but partly we are an island and we are going to have limited water. So the change has to be that what you suggested, that first it comes to water. If there's water available, now they get a permit. And then it's what somebody else over here suggested, that permit is for a limited time so that it doesn't wait 15 years before it gets developed. And that way you are going to have development in pace with the water that's available at the time. You will have infrastructure concurrency, which is in all our community plans.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: But I disagree with you, because we have seen in the last several months three subdivisions that have come through here that have developed their own water and their own system because they can't wait for your system. So we are going to see more of that happening. As long as there's water in the ground that's available and the state is going to allow them to drill those wells, we are going to have the development.

So if the County can't develop the water, it's

going to happen. So you might want to put some restrictions on saying you can't do any more, but there's other ways of getting water and you don't have to wait for the County of Maui.

MS. RAISBECK: You also have to worry about the amount of water that's in the ground, because in Waihee they're doing exactly what you say.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: But we don't control that, the state does. And when they allow drilling to happen and that's their purview, you know, here we are. We're saying well, we don't really need to see more, and that's what's happening.

MS. RAISBECK: The county could support designating Waihee. The Mayor has come out for designating Waihee.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Then you are just stopping what's happening in Central Maui. It doesn't help Central Maui. It doesn't. So, you know, we are in a fix. We are trying to say what's coming now. Let's work together to let us know what's really available, and don't say, "Well, you know, if you develop it's up to you, and take your, you know, shoot crap at it." It's bull. I don't think it's right.

Commissioner Casumpang?

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Yes, thank you. Does the Department of Water doesn't collect impact fees?

MS. KRAFTSOW: We have a water service fee with every new meter.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Only the meters?

MS. KRAFTSOW: That covers source, storage and transmission. And actually, the problem with that fee is that at the time that we established it, politically we didn't think we could get a fee that would really represent the true cost of developing a system, but we figured some fee was better than nothing.

So the fee actually wasn't a buy-in to the existing system at the expenses that were already in. And so it doesn't even begin to cover the real cost of serving new water, and that's the problem with the fee.

Also, the County has an exemption for first and second homes from fire protection. Most municipalities, or at least many municipalities throughout the country don't have that exemption, and so you are not allowed to add anything to the system if the system is not meeting

standards.

That right now would be enormously expensive for the little guy to deal with. But had it been going on for years and years then the little guy would just have to connect to the next meter over, right, and in the end it would have been cheaper for them.

But to bring that up to standard now, there would almost have to be county agreed upon improvement districts, where you bring an area up to standards and from then on they have to do fire protection.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: To protect the little guy, impact is based on units the development produces, so if the little guy only built an ohana then they're only tagged with the ohana fee.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Right. No, I'm talking --

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: And if the guy develop a 700 unit hotel, then he has to pay the 700 unit hotel fee.

MS. KRAFTSOW: Well, the size of the meter does affect -- the impact fee is based on the meter size.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: That's the reason I asked that, is because we gave a lot of other agencies the preference to make their own figure. I'm talking about the

other amount. And on the SMA we could do that also, but we respect the other agency. Whatever they want, that's what they get. That's why I'm asking it's legal for us to collect impact fees for the water improvement system infrastructure or not?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Oh, yes, the water department does have an impact fee. And the thing I was saying about protecting the little guy was exempting first and second homes was done initially to protect the little guy and enable him to build a home on his lot. But it's gotten to the point where there's such vast areas of the system that are substandard that it's almost having the reverse effect in a way.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Sometime last week maybe there's -- I read some article that the Councilors introduced some ordinance that building would improve the water system. How was the department or the board receptive to this? Because they're asking for more public input for this. How receptive is the department and the Water Board to this?

MS. KRAFTSOW: I think that there are a couple of

bills you might be referring to. The one I think you're referring to, and you can correct me if I am wrong, basically states that the water department will have to coordinate with the Planning Department in developing its Water Use and Development Plan, and of course we would support that. We hopefully will be doing that.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: Is that the Council Chair proposal?

MS. KRAFTSOW: Yes, he made that proposal. I am not real familiar with the details of that proposal. I thought that the, you know, that the fundamental idea of having water planning and general planning integrated and coordinated certainly is always something that we always strive for.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Okay, Commissioners, we have got a couple more questions. We are going to draw this to a close at 4:15 because we have to get back to agenda items. We have a few items still on the agenda. And also note that at 5:00 we are going to lose three Commissioners and we will not have a quorum. So I will call this particular workshop to a close at 4:15.

Commissioner Moikeha?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: I just had a question on fire protection for private catchment systems. Why is it that the department doesn't comment or have standards to oversee standards for private catchment systems in reference to fire protection?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Is this for like a subdivision area?

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Yeah. Say you had a church and they wanted to -- and they had a private catchment system and they wanted to expand that church so they come to us for a permit. And what we have seen on some of these, on these types of permits is that we're told that there's no comment from the fire department because it's a private system. So we don't have an understanding of how much capacity is needed to contain a fire.

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: I guess most of the comments that come to us from planning, we are going to put down "No comment at this time" and we are going to defer to the building permit. Because if the building permit comes to me for review, then I am going to request a fire flow based on the proposed square footage of the building to be built.

Once that reaches me, then they have to provide me the capacity of water to provide that fire flow.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Why can't it be done before then? I don't understand that. I mean why can't we know what the capacity is before the building permit?

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: If they provide us with the fire flow, and the blueprint of the building doesn't change, then it should be the same. But until they actually provide us with a building permit, then we take the construction-type and size and then we can determine the amount of fire flow that's going to be needed. And that's usually done at the building permit time.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Okay, so then maybe we were misled to believe that the fire department had no comments. Because there was no comments that you had no jurisdiction over it, but apparently you do.

LIEUTENANT ENGLISH: Yes, it's done during the building permit process.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Well, that would have saved a lawsuit, wouldn't it?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Commissioner Freitas?

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Okay, Milton, I am going to

ask you to help me again. Okay, just direct me who is going to answer this, okay. To get it so that water and fire have to respond -- and like the gentleman just said, well, the building permit and if they change it, instead of that being our problem and let it be the applicant's problem, if he changes it then he's got to start over again, okay. It's approved by them. Let them approve everything, water meters and fire, if it works, and then it comes to us. And then if there's changes, whatever, alterations.

Now, to make that happen, switch it. Because I believe this whole thing needs to be turned around. If it's going to be counsel, let me know if Corporation Counsel can answer that. Where do we go to make that change? Because I'm feeling I think the Commissioners would support that, that it's backwards.

So let's figure out how to do it, and let's just do it. We've done rule changes, so this stuff that he says about oh, it takes a rule change and who can do it, we have done rule changes. And if that's what it takes we can move forward on that. This Commission will do that. Where do we go?

MR. ARAKAWA: Well, let me first say that if there's a discretionary permit that comes before the Commission, we instruct our staff to basically review the preliminary submittals and make sure that if there are major concerns that the Commission knows about them. It shouldn't be deferred until the building permit, because the Commission assumes certain things.

And if it gets passed, if it gets passed under certain assumptions, certain wrong assumptions, when the applicant comes in for the building permit then he might have to go back again to the Commission for any kind of possible redesign or change to the development. So we instructed our staff to bring out the major concerns at the discretionary permit stage.

I think a lot of the reviews that take place among the agencies in terms of a building permit, our agency is basically a hub. We would route it out to various other agencies for review, and a lot of that is done by discussion and agreement between the agencies as far as who gets to review what kind of permits under what kinds of situations. Those types of things we can handle administratively.

However, keep in mind though that there's also the

other side of the coin where we do have applicants that always have a concern about receiving their approvals on a timely basis, and whether or not agencies really need to review all of the permits that fall under certain types of circumstances. We're always evaluating what kind of a permit application needs to go where. But some of that we can handle administratively. Others as far as each agency, how each agency administers its own program may require an ordinance or rule change.

I think maybe Mr. Kushi can add more on that as far as the water department is concerned.

MR. KUSHI: Mr. Chairman, member Moikeha, maybe I can answer it this way. People come to you as the Planning Commission for discretionary permits, SA's, subdivisions, change in zoning, et cetera. Purely discretionary on your part. When it comes to Milton's stage, building permits, that is really ministerial action. If they meet all the dots and cross their i's you have got to give them. That's just the way it is.

So if you want to reverse the process I believe their staff will tell the applicant, "You go get this

Planning Commission approval first and then come see me."

Do you see what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: I know what you're saying,  
but --

MR. KUSHI: I'm just starting on the process.  
Now, for the water department, I believe they can give you  
comments beforehand, because they know the project, they  
know their system, and they can tell you if you get your  
permit from a discretionary body these will be the  
requirements. I believe they can do it if they have the  
staff, but it won't be a commitment.

COMMISSIONER FREITAS: Well, that doesn't really  
get to where I was going with it, okay. So evidently we  
need to do an ordinance or a rule change. But I think it  
can be done that way, and if the burden goes on them, that  
that's where it should be, you know. If it was misplaced  
for a long time, I think it's time to change it. That's  
just the way, you know, we're seeing things here. And if we  
have to just keep denying everything until water gets it  
straightened out, that's the way it's going to have to be,  
because they can give us more information. Just like fire,  
they can too. They have everything we have.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Let me comment on that. At one point in time the County administration used water as a planning tool. No more water, no more houses, no more development. And come to me and talk to me, and then maybe we will give you a development. And that was used, let me tell you. I've only been back to Maui 30 years now, and it was used since 1973, and we don't want to go back to that. We want to progress because we know that there's developers out there who would like to progress and keep this community growing, but we must use smart growth procedures.

And this -- I tell you what, this is a good meeting coming, together and understanding how we both work. We need to do more of this. And I don't want to go back to the old way of doing things where just government says no more water, no more building. I don't want to see that happen.

But then again, we don't want to see rapid growth and junk all over the place and nobody cares what the heck happens, just make a buck and go. Life is too short for that. I think we've grown some in this last decade, and as Commissioners we have an obligation. And you Water Board

Commissioners, you have an obligation. And I think we should be working together along with the Department of Public Works as to how we can progress as a community.

I've got to call this to a close, and this should not be the first and the last time that we meet. We need to do more of this, and we need to comment. Yes?

MS. PARSONS: Let's set a date for the next one so that we can keep this dialogue open. I think it's important for all of us.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Maybe we will go on your quarter.

MS. PARSONS: It might be a long time before you get an answer. Why don't we just -- why don't we do it in two months or four months or three months, two months?

MR. FOLEY: We already have our schedule. Our agendas are already full two months from now. But we can do it in three or four months.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Let's work with our scheduler and then say at least once a quarter we should be meeting so that we can coordinate the different projects that's on line and how you are doing with your projects, you know.

And it means funding for your projects. And so if it means that we have to talk with developers coming to us

saying, "Can you kokua us," that might be the thing.

Because we are not going to move ahead if we keep putting our heads in the ground and saying everything is great, just go ahead and do it. It's not going to happen.

Thank you again.

MS. RAISBECK: Chairman, could we set a date in January?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: We can try. That will be -- let's do it at the last meeting, the fourth Tuesday of January, okay.

COMMISSION MOIKEHA: Would it be appropriate to invite the budget chair?

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Very good, yes.

COMMISSIONER MOIKEHA: Since a lot of this hinges on funding.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: Yes. We can have staff do that for us.

COMMISSIONER CASUMPANG: How about the DOT?

MR. FOLEY: That's a different meeting.

CHAIRMAN PILTZ: That's another one we should take on too, the DOT and the DOE. But I think right now we are

talking within county agencies. Let's do that, okay?

All right, at this time we'd like to adjourn this part of the meeting and we will recess for a few minutes.

(The workshop was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.)

*"By Water All Things Find Life"*

Department of Water Supply  
County of Maui  
200 South High Street  
Wailuku, HI 96793-2155  
Telephone (808) 270-7816  
Fax (808) 270-7951

[\[Back\]](#)