

County of Maui Water
Supply

BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY

County of Maui

Regular Meeting

Thursday, December 21, 2006

9:00 a.m.

Planning Department Conference Room

First Floor, Kalana Pakui Building

250 South High Street

Wailuku, HI 96793

I. Call to Order

Chair Kenneth Okamura called the December 21, 2006 Board of
Water Supply meeting to order

at 9:15 a.m.

II. Attendance

Board Members Present:

Also Present:

Michael Howden

George Tengan, Director

Carl Holmberg

Eric Yamashige, Deputy Director

Michael Victorino

Edward Kushi, Jr.,

Deputy Corporation Counsel

Kuilauokalani Lester

Alva Nakamura, Engineering

Program Manager

Marion Haller

Holly Perdido, Fiscal Officer

Scott Luck

Helene Kau, Assistant Fiscal Officer

Vice Chair Lee Aldridge

Alan Murata, staff engineer

Chair Kenneth Okamura

Gaye Hayashida, Commission

Support Clerk

Excused:

Ginny Parsons

III. Announcements

A. Resignation of Michael P. Victorino

Member Victorino announced that this is his last Board of Water Supply meeting. He begins

his term on the Maui County Council on January 2, 2007.

Member Victorino thanked the Board

members for serving with him and allowing him to be the chair for the last 2 years.

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. November 1, 2006 Budget Workshop

Motion: By Member Michael Victorino to approve the minutes of November 1, 2006.

Second: By Michael Howden

Discussion: None.

Vote: Ayes - Unanimous. Motion carried.

B. November 16, 2006 Regular Meeting

Motion: By Member Michael Victorino to approve the minutes of November 16, 2006.

Second: By Carl Holmberg

Discussion: None.

Vote: Ayes - Unanimous. Motion carried.

V. Testimony from the Public

A. None.

VI. Unfinished Business

A. None.

VII. Communications

A. None.

VIII. Director's Report

A. None.

At this time Chair Okamura asked about the copy of the bid for Kaupakalua Well Storage

Tank that the Board members received in the mail. The Chair was informed that this was

for the members' information only.

IX. Other Business

A. Discussion/possible action regarding Draft Results and Rates Design Options from R. W.

Beck.

Fiscal Officer Holly Perdido explained that the goal of the cost of service analyses is

to estimate the cost of providing water service to customer groups which are Single Family,

General Service, Agricultural and Non-Potable classes. The Single Family class was added

for FY 2008.

The economic theory behind the cost of service rate is that customers will be more inclined

to use the resource in an efficient manner if the price of using that resource is close to

the actual cost of providing the resource. The methodology for calculating the cost of

service is based on the AWWA industry standards. The cost of service estimate for each

customer class involves identifying the level of water system service provided to the class

in terms of volume of water use, peak demand required and customer service assistance. The

difference between the customer class cost of service and the customer class revenues aids

in the development of the proposed rates.

The purpose of this is 1) to find out which option the Board prefers for implementation in

FY 2008 and 2) should the cost of power be a separate line item on the bill.

The rate options are based on the 18% increase as proposed in the budget.

At this time, for the benefit of the Board members, Ms. Perdido reviewed R. W. Beck's

Department of Water Supply 2008 Rate Study Summary of Draft Results and Rate Design Options.

This was previously mailed to the members by the Department.

Table 1, Summary of Draft Results - summarizes the preliminary results of the revenue

requirement analysis for budget year '08.

The debt service coverage should be between 1.15 and 1.25 as a minimum amount, though the

finance director had suggested that for bond ratings it would be better if the debt service

was higher, between 1.6 and 1.9. The debt service coverage is the total revenues divided

by the debt service that is owed for the year.

Director Tengan stated that a correction needs to be made. It is not the total revenue

divided by the debt service. It is the revenue after expenses (available revenue) divided

by the debt service.

Chair Okamura stated that if we could cover the debt service by the net revenue then we

wouldn't have to raise rates to pay debt service. Ms.

Perdido stated that is correct but

the transfer to CIP would not be included, there are other factors that are not included

in Table 1, Summary of Draft Results.

Table 2, Existing and Proposed Monthly Usage Blocks - increases the life-line to 15,000

per month, and adds a 4th block to the Single Family Rate.

The Director corrected Ms. Perdido by stating that the life-line rate is up to 5,000 per

month and up to the 15,000 is the general household average use.

Ms. Perdido stated that anyone using more than 100,000 in a two-month billing will be

charged a higher amount for Single Family Rates.

Options 1, 2 and 4 include the 4th rate block of more than 100,000.

Option 1 sends a stronger conservation signal for higher users in the Single Family Rate.

There is an ag subsidy in the third block. The general customers are not subject to the

increase in the 4th block.

Option 2 minimizes the bill impact on lower usage customers.

Option 3 is an across the Board rate increase of 18% and maintains the existing rate

structure with no 4th block.

Option 4 charges all ag customers \$1.10 per thousand gallons.

Cost-of-Power Charge rate will not be charged until the

following year. Right now the

cost of power is \$.90 but ag customers are paying only \$.85.

Ms. Kau stated that what is most important is to determine which option the Board is

leaning towards. When the budget is finalized, the rates that are now before the Board

will probably change when the selected option is fine tuned.

At this time Vice Chair Aldridge asked if Ms. Perdido could walk through and briefly explain

in summary the general impact of each option.

Option 1 proposes to increase service charges for each block.

Member Howden asked who are the General Rate users? Ms Perdido replied that they are those

who are not Ag, Non-Potable and Single Family. This includes businesses, hotels, apartments,

condominiums and all those who do not fall under ag and single family.

Member Haller asked how is she going to know that she can impact her water bill if she

doesn't see that she is paying way more for a little more usage?

Vice Chair Aldridge agreed that whatever rates they recommend, the bill should reflect a

clearer indication of the rate structure and what the impact is to the user. If the Board

adopts an energy surcharge then it has got to be clear that it is an estimate of an annual

energy costs.

Member Haller stated that she was going to suggest a proposal to the County Council to

annually approve a formula that could be applied so that when the rates fluctuate, the

formula would allow them to adjust it every month.

Member Victorino stated that Member Haller is crossing areas that most will not touch.

Member Haller stated that she gets an energy surcharge on her MECO bill every month. It

fluctuates dramatically depending on the cost of gas. It is not more difficult to

understand that then it would be to understand it on this water bill. We are all used to

seeing fluctuating energy surcharges on a bill.

Member Victorino asked how do we approach that when you are talking energy costs for

Upcountry being sizably more for pumping charges than it would be for town or for other

areas? Better make sure we think it through because it is very important that the public

understands what we are trying to accomplish.

Member Haller replied that if you move to an arid neighborhood and you are using 4 times

as much water as you should for the type of climate you've moved to, then you should move

to Haiku where you don't use as much water.

Member Howden stated that the Board and the Department have always supported the Upcountry

agriculture and that we have to support the sharing of the costs throughout the county.

Ms. Perdido stated the Department bills out daily, so when do we adjust the energy costs?

Ms. Kau added that Ann Hajnosz of R. W. Beck alluded to semi-annual or annual adjustments

based on known actual costs incurred, then adjust the following year's rate accordingly.

Otherwise it would be horrendous for the fiscal section to adjust the rate every month.

It would be more equitable and administratively manageable adjusting it once maybe twice a year.

Member Victorino stated that MECO has a whole different system and we cannot be comparing

apples and oranges. Doing it on a monthly basis would not be feasible. Doing it semi-

annually is something that everyone could accept.

Chair Okamura suggested having a base rate for fuel then adjusting it up or down.

Member Howden stated that even though the energy surcharge may be more than what the actual

costs are, the profits could be used for debt service and things like that. This would

bring down overall operating costs for the Department.

Option 2 introduces the Single Family Rates and is similar to Option 1 with a 4th block,

but this option minimizes the bill impact on lower usage customers. For the Single Family

and the General Rates, the lower usage charges are lower. The other blocks are higher.

This option maintains the ag subsidy in the 3rd block and the Non-potable Rate.

The Chair asked, what is the rationale for not having a 4th tier under General Rates? Ms.

Perdido stated that she believes conservation is the main rationale. General Rates are also

the hotels and condominiums where there are multiple families living there. The rationale

is that the single family (user) using over 100,000 should be paying for that. This way

the hotels that have been charged high rates in the past are not hit as hard. So, the ones

using the most in (the) single family(class) will be hit harder.

Member Howden stated that there should be a 4th tier for General Rates. We need to be

reasonable but should be realistic as well.

Ms. Perdido stated that right now, this is the easiest way to differentiate the various

types of users by the current records of the Department. In the future they may be able

to add on other blocks.

Member Howden stated that we should treat residents differently from transients.

Member Victorino agreed and asked, but how do we do it? They would have to do better

work on getting these meters rated as transient or resident. There are condominiums in

Kihei with long term residents along with transient vacation rentals.

Director Tengan stated that the intent is to eventually breakdown the General Class even

further to include hotels and commercial properties. But for now it was decided to break

out the single family, because this is the class that would have the greatest impact on

conservation measures by changing the rates.

Ms. Kau added that Ann Hajnosz said that about 90% of the current General Use customer

class is identified as single family. That is where the concern is, the financial impact.

Vice Chair Aldridge asked, is it 90% of "users" or 90% of the total "use of water", because

there is a big difference.

Member Luck stated that it was the number of "users" and the actual usage was either 1/3

or 2/3.

Option 3 proposes to maintain existing structures, increases all rates by 18% and includes

a 4th block. The rate impacts are balanced among the users and are the lowest for Ag and

Non-Potable Rates but the service charges are increased.

Member Victorino stated that he would like to see the 4th user class under General Rates.

The 3rd tier could be 15,001 to 100,000 and from 100,000 on up at \$3.85 or \$4.00.

Ms. Perdido stated that we could work that out if we picked one of the options.

Member Victorino asked, if on Option 3 we added 100,001 and up and made it at \$3.95 what

financial impact would that have?

Ms. Perdido replied that we can let Ann Hajnosz (R. W. Beck) know which option was selected

with a 4th block added, though we have to be careful because Single Family users in certain

areas use a lot of water.

Member Victorino stated that the 4th block would be only under the General Rates and not

Single Family.

Chair Okamura asked, why is the rate of \$3.35 the same for the 3rd and 4th tier under Single

Family?

Ms. Perdido replied that they did not add a 4th tier instead the service charge increased.

Ms. Kau added that Ann Hajnosz mentioned that when you introduce the 4th block then you

are subjected to elasticity issues. Depending upon the number of consumers in that block

it may have a significant impact on the revenue projection if they become too conservation

oriented.

Vice Chair Aldridge recalled that at the last meeting the Board had approved a letter from

the chair to the mayor voicing support for minimizing the rate impact on single family users

and agriculture users. No single option does both Option 2 minimizes the impact on the

single family user but it has a greater impact on agriculture users. Option 2 with an

introduction of a 4th tier to the General Rates would pick up some of the costs of the

agricultural customers. Then we would achieve what we had supported in that letter, which

is to diminish the immediate impact to single family and agricultural customers.

Member Holmberg asked if the reason why we cannot separate out

the transient facilities

from the General Rates customer is a software/database issue.

Ms. Perdido stated that she believes that the bill can allow for that but it just has not

been done. We have to send people out to the sites to make sure they are what they are

supposed to be and there would have to be a lot of research done. We have tagged on to

Honolulu Board of Water Supply's billing system and have done so for many years. They are

looking to upgrade their system as we are.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that it is important to have as much information on the bill to

help the customer understand and make decisions on how to conserve. Is the Department

capable of making changes to the bill so that this information is on the bill?

Ms. Perdido replied that she would have to check with the programmers in Honolulu.

The Chair asked Director Tengan if it was possible at the next meeting to get a report to

see what could be done as far as billing information.

Member Victorino stated he would like to go back to Option 2, under the 4th tier of Single

Family, instead of \$4.20 use \$3.65. Under the 3rd tier of General Rates change it to 15,001

to 100,000 at \$3.35, add 100,001 and up at \$3.95. Under the Ag Rates from 15,001 and up

use the current rate of \$.85. He would like to propose to send this back and see how

plausible these numbers are.

Ms Kau stated that if we are going to separately list the cost of power then it becomes

even clearer that the general use people are subsidizing agriculture since the ag users

will not even be billed cost of power.

Chair Okamura stated that agriculture users do not need to have the water treated which

is a big cost. It is a county policy in the general plan to keep agriculture viable.

Member Howden stated that the Board should seriously look at a cost of power surcharge.

Whether we select Option 2 or 3, the rates can be adjusted accordingly.

Ms. Perdido asked if the Board is considering Option 2 and having the 4th tier in General

Rates?

Member Howden stated that we can work that out as long as you are addressing the cost of

power. If there will be a 4th tier in General Rates then you need to create an avenue so

people can apply for exemption for bona fide residential use rather than transient use.

The Chair reminded the Board of what position they took in the letter at the last meeting

and try to add to that. If we recommend a particular option it would be just like we are

standing behind that option which may not be what we all want.

Ms. Kau stated that is why we need that determination today because we are going to need

rates by January.

Motion: By Member Victorino to adopt in concept Option 2 and ask the Department to

come back with a 4th tier added to the General Rates, the 3rd tier under Agriculture dropped

to \$.85.

Second: By Vice Chair Aldridge

Discussion: Vice Chair Aldridge asked if Member Victorino will be proposing to include an

energy cost? Member Victorino asked to also include the energy cost surcharge in

his motion.

The Chair asked Member Victorino to re-state his motion.

Motion: By Member Victorino to adopt Option #2 with changes in General Rates - changing

the 4th tier to be 100,001 on up, changing Agriculture Rates on tier 3 to \$.85 and to

include an energy surcharge that will be clearly stated to the consumer what that costs

will be.

Ms. Perdido asked that the Ag Rates be at the cost of power rate of \$.90.

Member Victorino stated he had no problem with that and would change it to \$.90.

Member Haller asked if he would include the Non-Potable or leave it at \$1.15?

Member Victorino replied that it should be left at \$1.15.

Second: By Member Howden.

The Chair stated that it has been moved and seconded that the Board recommends that the

Department go back and re-do Option #2 adding the 4th tier for the General Rates at 100,000

and up, changing the Ag Rates over 15,000 to \$.90 and to include the cost of the energy

surcharge.

Discussion: Director Tengan stated that most of the non-potable water is being used at the

Kula Ag Park.

Member Victorino asked that the Non-Potable Rate be changed to \$.90

Motion: By Member Haller to change the non-potable water be at the \$.90 rate.

Second: By Member Howden.

Discussion: None.

The Chair stated that it has been moved and seconded to amend the motion to read that non-

potable water also be charged \$.90.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Okamura stated the main motion is to recommend that the Department re-do Option #2

with a 4th tier under the General Rates from 100,000 gallons and up, with the Ag and Non-

Potable Rates at \$.90 and to include an energy surcharge. The Chair asked for a vote.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Member Haller informed the Chair that the water bill does breaks down the charges by

category. The information is on the back of the bill.

B. Verbal Update on Pookela Well

Mr. Nakamura distributed a progress report regarding Pookela Well Development to give the

Board an indication as to why things are going so slowly. Part of the problem is coordination

with the people from Honolulu, from the manufacturer. A lot of times they must have half a

dozen people representing different organizations to witness the testing. There have been

problems with programming. Whenever they move forward, they also sometimes take a step

backwards because they find another problem.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that after looking at this report, it looks like it is not just

a software problem or a programming problem, sounds like an equipment problem.

Mr. Murata stated that the MCC (Motor Control Center) is supplied by Cutler Hammer. They

do all the internal wiring on the mainland, ship the product over then the electrical sub-

contractor puts the pieces together. A lot times they have problems determining if it is

a manufacturer's problem or an electrician's problem. Both are hesitant to accept

responsibility and fly over the necessary personnel only to find

out it is not their portion

of the work.

They are now trying to determine exactly if it is a design issue or an installation issue.

If it is a design issue then it is something more complex.

Member Victorino asked, what is the best estimate to get this up and running?

Mr. Murata replied that until they nail down what the exact problem is and how to resolve

it they won't know. If it is a simple resolution, it could be a couple of weeks. If it

is more complex then it could be a couple of months.

C. Discussion on the 2006 Budgeted v. Actual Expenditures Report.

Ms. Perdido explained that this report comes from the IFAS system, the county's accounting

system as of June 30th, and briefly explained to the Board members how to read the reports.

Chair Okamura asked what happens to the grand total of \$9,727,334.12? Ms. Perdido stated

that is what is available or is carried forward to the next year for all funds.

Member Howden asked where does it show what we pay for water, for the water purchase? Ms.

Perdido replied that it doesn't show individually. If you look under Plant Operations,

Water Treatment, they have a separate line item, sub-object code 6178, Water.

Ms. Kau stated that each line item is used as a guide. It may

be over or it may be under

on a particular line in each program, as long as we are not over in the overall budget.

The Chair asked, what is Liquidating Expenditures (column)? Is that how much you use? Ms.

Perdido replied that shows the original p. o. amount, how much was actually spent, and how

much is still left.

D. Discussion/possible action regarding Water Conservation Plan Proposal to the County

Council.

Chair Okamura explained to the members that because the Board was concerned that the January

5th deadline was approaching and the Board was questioning what the council really wanted,

it was decided that Deputy Director Yamashige, Ellen Kraftsow, Vice Chair Aldridge and Chair

Okamura would meet with Council Chair Hokama and Water Resources Committee Chair Anderson.

From this meeting they got an idea as to what the Council wanted.

Ms. Kraftsow has done most of the different parts of water conservation plan and wrote a

draft which Vice Chair Aldridge worked on and is now being presented to the Board. This

is a compilation of work done by Vice Chair Aldridge, Deputy Director Yamashige and Ms.

Kraftsow.

At this time the Chair turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Aldridge.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated the meeting with Council Chair Hokama and WRC Chair Anderson

was to determine how steadfast and firm the January 5th deadline is. The response from

Council Chair Hokama was yes, it is firm. The second purpose was to get clarification on

what the Council intended by the ordinance which states that "certain elements of a water

conservation plan should be submitted." WRC Chair Anderson made it clear that what she

was looking for was something very elemental, very simple basic water conservation actions

that over the next 180 days the County Council could work to adopt.

Most of these water conservation measures were incorporated in the current Water Use and

Development Plan and the Board doesn't want to propose something that was contrary to this.

Ms. Kraftsow's original outline draft included regulatory and non-regulatory aspects of

water conservation. The County Council is only interested in the regulatory areas. The

non-regulatory parts are basically the internal procedures and guidelines that the Department

would utilize.

The draft letter is considerably shorter than what Ms. Kraftsow had put together. He felt

that it still felt short of what she had proposed. So what he did was to make some editorial

and substantive changes on that draft letter. The substantive changes were basically

material that were in Ms. Kraftsow's draft.

Motion: By Member Victorino to accept this letter to be transmitted to the Department

and the council with the grammatical changes.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that before a motion is made, in this letter he has one item

which is a question and would like to remove it. It is under Leak Detection and his comment

is "Does the Department not have a program to monitor distribution main leaks?"

Deputy Director Yamashige stated that the Department has a leak detection program which

has not been very active but the Department is working on it to bring it up speed. The

Deputy Director cautioned the Board that the council is a legislative body so you only want

to identify things that you want to legislate. The council's intent is to put this into

some kind of law. We don't want the council making laws that require the Department to

develop a program that we might be able to do or fund. That is why the leak detection part

was very difficult to address. What the department does and what is mentioned in the

paragraph is based on the consumption. If we notice a peak we will notify you that you

may have a leak.

Member Howden asked to amend the motion to get rid of this question and keep the statement

after the question.

Chair Okamura stated that there was no second to Member Victorino's motion.

Second: By Member Howden

Discussion: None.

Motion: By Member Victorino asked to amend his motion to remove "Does the Department

not have a program to monitor distribution main leaks?"

Second: By Member Howden.

Discussion: None

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Member Haller asked for clarification on item A1b, No use of turf in median strips and

rights-of-way. Does this mean literally new roads not to have median strips? Vice Chair

Aldridge replied that he presumes that it means that for new developments, turf would not

be used in median strips, not that there would be no median strips.

Member Haller stated regarding item A4, that prohibition of hosing driveways and pavements

seems excessive. How does one clean the sidewalk in front of their store?

Motion: By Member Haller to add the word "excessive" on item A14, to read "Prohibit

excessive hosing off of driveways and pavements."

Second: By Member Howden.

Discussion: None

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Member Haller stated that on item 4.6 Restrict use of potable

water in water features, is

wonderful except that it is her understanding that to collect rainwater in a container when

you are on the county water system is not allowed and she was told that the Department of

Water Supply wants some sort of control over all the water. Is this true?

Deputy Director Yamashige stated that the department has no restriction on that. Though

the department does not want that system to be connected to the potable water system because

potential contamination. He cautioned that standing water has a tendency to breed mosquitoes

and there are a lot of other issues that must be dealt with.

Vice Chair Aldridge corrected Member Haller and stated that it is item 6 not 4.6.

Member Haller asked regarding item C, Reuse, what is reclaimed treated wastewater? How

does a school or recreational field use reclaimed treated wastewater?

Member Victorino replied, sprinkler systems. The golf courses do it right now and they

are going to do that with the new Kihei school. There is a wastewater reclamation center

out in Kihei, by Welekahao. They treat the water, clean it up and put it back in the pipes

and send it back to the golf courses.

Member Holmberg stated that reclaimed water is not strictly speaking potable water. Though

you could drink it and you wouldn't die, but it is not potable. Non-potable water is

supplied by the sewer guys.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that it is domestic wastewater that has been treated at a

wastewater treatment plant then further treated or disinfected so that it is suitable for

irrigation use and meets the Department of Health standards. It is limited generally to

agriculture, public parks and other public areas where it can be controlled with no cross

connection.

Deputy Director Yamashige stated regarding item Alb, No use of turf in median strips and

right-of-ways, is too restrictive. Once an ordinance passes it would very difficult to

back off on it. The Deputy Director asked that the Board not go too far and find out that

we cannot back off.

Member Victorino reminded the Deputy Director that this will go to the council and this

would be worked on and stated that he likes the idea of no turf on median strips.

Motion: By Member Lester to change item Alb to read, Restricted use of turf in median

strips and rights-of-way.

Second: By Member Howden

Discussion: None.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

Chair Okamura stated that the main motion is to accept this as the Board's water conservation

plan proposal that will be sent to the council.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried

E. Discussion regarding EMI Master Water Agreement and Amendments and the Proposed Findings

of Fact In the Matter of the Contested Case Hearing Regarding Water Licenses at Honomanu,

Keanae, Nahiku and Huelo Maui.

Chair Okamura stated that he has been asked by corporation counsel to postpone this matter

until such time that Jane Lovell be present. At this time the Chair asked Deputy Corporation

Counsel Edward Kushi to explain more on this.

Mr. Kushi stated that the main player, Jane Lovell, head of litigation, is not here to

discuss this matter. This matter involves previous long term water licenses in East Maui.

When these licenses expire in ten or twenty years, these license holders apply for renewal

with the state. Some groups contested the issuance of any license to any person for an

extended period of time. The county got involved because mainly the department/county has

an agreement with those license holders, to use the water for Upcountry. The contested case

hearing is not complete yet.

Mr. Kushi further stated that Jane Lovell may call an executive session because we are a

party to these actions. This administration's position was that we oppose any long term

re-issuance of the license.

A collateral issue is that the East Maui area farmers want stream restoration for their

farming operations.

Motion: By Member Howden to defer to the next meeting in January.

Second: By Member Haller.

Discussion: None.

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

F. Discussion regarding Possible Water Contamination of the Maui Lani Well by Junked Cars

at the Waikapu Dump.

Member Holmberg stated that he walked out there to look and take photos of the area.

There are about 100 junked cars still there and a considerable number of loose gasoline

tanks and crushed batteries lying about. His main concern is how much leaching there might

be in the future.

Chair Okamura asked if this falls under the Department of Health's responsibilities.

Mr. Kushi stated that the Department with the council's approval entered into an agreement

with Maui Lani to develop 3 wells. They would then dedicate it to the Department in exchange

for source credit reservations for their development. The agreement itself did have a

condition on contamination, not so much about junked cars or hazardous wastes but rather

more about pesticides and cow "residues." The provisions of this agreement require full

Department of Health clearance and provide for remediation efforts in the event after

dedication that these wells prove bad.

Deputy Director Yamashige stated if these things are potential contaminates and it is within

the wellhead protection area then they have to be identified and monitored.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that it is not what is in the water now, but what can migrate

into the water years from now. One should be as cautious as possible in terms of looking

at these wells.

Member Haller asked if they do soil testing when developing a new well or is it just the

water that is tested?

Deputy Director Yamashige replied that it is just the water that is tested. Based on the

water quality tests, they will then design the development of the well.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that you might not find the contaminates when you do the testing

because they could still be in the unsaturated zone above the groundwater table and migrating

toward it.

Member Howden stated that he hopes that we are not heading towards another Hamakuapoko

situation because you have historical use of pineapple and sugar grown mauka of this area.

Motion: By Member Haller to recommend to the department that in consideration of the

Maui Lani wells that they employ some geologic testing to test for potential contaminates

due to the prior use of that land before proceeding with the wells.

Second: By Member Victorino

Discussion: Mr. Kushi stated that when Maui Lani is completed with their research and testing

and wants to present it to the county, in the agreement itself, it does have the provision

that before the county accepts it, it has to go through the 9 yards, the ninth yard being

the council. If there are any concerns about the water quality he is sure the elected

officials will make sure it is a useable clean well. Before the system becomes part of the

county's system it has to be accepted by council, specifically the well tank site. Without

that the department cannot accept the system.

Vice Chair Aldridge stated that he still would like to propose what Member Haller suggested,

for the department to utilize all the resources possible.

Mr. Kushi stated that if this Board is asking the department to go and do its own independent

research that's fine but it may be a budgetary concern. The whole structure of the agreement

is that Maui Lani would do everything at their expense and present it to the county in a turn

key fashion.

The Chair asked Member Haller to re-state the motion.

Motion: By Member Haller to recommend prior to accepting the Maui Lani wells, the county

take into consideration the geologic testing done of the ground, of the soil mauka of the

well and surrounding the well, based on the fact that the use of that land in the past years

may have contaminated, may in the future contaminate the water and that that testing be

independently, if it's done by Maui Lani that it be independently verified or reviewed.

Second: By Member Holmberg

Vote: Unanimous. Motion carried.

G. Approval of Resolution No. 06-03 for outgoing Board of Water Supply Member, Michael P.

Victorino.

Chair Okamura read into the records Resolution No. 06-03 for Board of Water Supply Member

Michael P. Victorino.

Motion: By Member Howden to approve Resolution No. 06-03

Second: By Member Lester

Vote: Ayes - Vice Chair Aldridge, Members Marion Haller, Carl Holmberg, Michael Howden,

Kuilauokalani Lester, Scott Luck, and Chair Okamura. Motion carried.

H. Receipt of Board Member request for agenda items to be placed on future agendas.

1. Reports of private water well usage
2. Dual line and Na Wai Eha discussion by Jane Lovell
3. Propose setting agenda to clarify the members' roles
4. Invite the new mayor and present her vision
5. Amending Title 14 - the Board's authority.

X. Division Reports

A. Division Reports for November 2006.

B. Financial Summary for Fiscal Year July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007 as of September 30, 2006.

At this time Chair Okamura thanked Director George Tengan and Deputy Director Eric Yamashige

for their help and support to the Board and for their work at the Water Department.

XI. Adjournment

The November 16, 2006 Board of Water Supply meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Prepared

and submitted by:

Gaye Hayashida

Commission

Support Clerk

Approved on: _____

"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

[\[Back\]](#)