

Maui County Council
Planning Committee Meeting
July 25, 2018

7/24/18

Mahalo! I will acknowledge the early infancy of the development of the Molokai Community Plan in 2010-2016 in which the CPAC and MoPC in my opinion have done a tremendous job and sacrificed countless hours. I am here to state how disappointed I am in a process that went bonkers in 2017. The key of developing a Community Plan is the COMMUNITY.

My concerns are that testimonies that are done via phone at the County Office on Molokai are testimonies that were scripted by others, self interest groups, and the lack of community announcements that have prevented the community members from participating in the process.

Supporting Documents at follows:

1. County Communication 16-98 and Implementation and Action Items 06142018
 - Planning Committee held a total of 28 meetings, of which 25 were devoted to the Community Plan Update.
 - Written testimony by Keani Rawlins-Fernandez dated 10/4/17,
 - Described the lack of organization and work productivity
 - Failure of including the Community
 - Lack of announcement and/or advertisement
 - Further Indications:
 - Same people attend the meetings at least a group of 27
 - Repeated testimony from same group of individuals
 - Small group of 20 people complete surveys

2. Appendices 6.1 and 6.2 (Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance) 07-18-2018
 - Written testimony by Greg Jenkins former Molokai CPAC Member dated 2/15/18 and 6/14/18.
 - Addresses the lack of community involvement and as indicated by the Planning Department recommendation to return action to the Community of Molokai to vet through issue and to avoid implementation of specific land use in zoning district.
 - Also, supported this was Ms. Crivello via her flier dated 2/2018.
 - From 2/15/18 and 6/14/18, there were 4 months delays why?

No further discussion or action was taken by the planning committee. Now, today (7/25/18) the same issues at hand. So who's circumventing our plan and community process?

Never the less, after viewing the Molokai Proposal and Lanai's template I am in support to utilize the Lanai's template format for Molokai as it is less confusing.

RECEIVED AT PC MEETING ON JUL 25 2018

Greg Jenkins

3. CBSFA was insert:

- Nowhere in the minutes from the CPAC or the MoPC did they ever include the CBSFA with the plan. It recently been a discussion but no decision were made.
- CBSFA is an incomplete document just like the GIS East end mapping which Planning Committee also included into the Molokai Community Plan.
- Why would we want unfinished documents referenced into a long-term plan?

Conclusion:

- To insert Appendix Disclaimer for the Community Members of Molokai to Oppose the Molokai Island Community Plan for lack of public announcement, unfairness, and dictatorship which failed to include the Molokai Community Members

- Again, Malia Akutagawa does NOT speak for the island of Molokai as she lives on Oahu and never vetted information with the Molokai Community

For the Community,
Cora Caparida-Schnackenberg
PO Box 418
Hoolehua, HI 96729
808 646-0051

Subject: Re: Planning Committee meeting on July 25, 2018 at 1:30 pm



Date: Friday, July 20, 2018, 9:19:07 AM HST

2018 MAUI COUNTY COUNCIL MOLOKAI SPRING UP COUNCIL MEMBER STACY HELM CRIVELLO



MOLOKAI AT A GLANCE

FY2018	\$14,900,000
FY2017	\$23,300,000
FY2016	\$16,800,000
FY2015	\$22,000,000
FY2014	\$17,700,000

MOLOKAI AT A GLANCE

2018	\$22,000,000
2017	\$17,700,000
2016	\$16,800,000
2015	\$23,300,000
2014	\$14,900,000

MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

The process of updating the 2001 Molokai Community Plan began in 2010 with meetings on Molokai to engage the community in the process and gain input. A reauthorization of the plan by the Council sidetracked the Molokai plan until 2014 when the community meetings were resumed. The Molokai Community Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) was established with 9 members appointed by the Council and 4 appointed by the Mayor. The CPAC reviewed the draft community plan from March 2015 to October 2015 and recommended revisions. In November, 2015 the revised plan was transmitted to the Molokai Planning Commission for further review and scrutiny. The community has continued to participate by sharing their marao. The commission's recommendations were forwarded to the County Council on May 4, 2016. The Council's Planning Committee started our vetting process of the draft plan in February 2017. The Council's review is almost done, however at my insistence, the revised Appendix 6-1 (authored by the Planning Department) which compares the Molokai Community Plan Land Use designations with typical zoning districts will be referred to the CPAC for their review. The Council has until June 30, 2018 to adopt the plan.

NEW MOLOKAI POLICE STATION AND PUKOO FIRE STATION RELOCATION

Cramped quarters, flooding whenever we have heavy rains, these are a couple of the problems facing the men and women who work at the Molokai Police Department. The existing Molokai Police station has been part of the Mitchell Paoulo Center campus since the 1970s. The facility has served its purpose over the years however, our island and its needs as well as the Police department's requirements have outgrown the facility and over the past two years the department has been in search of potential sites for a new station. To this end we have been exploring possible parcels for a new station. In FY17 the Council appropriated \$390,000 for land acquisition for a new facility. In FY18 the Council appropriated \$25,000 for the Department of Fire and Public Safety to begin their search for a new Pukoo Fire Station which sits on State land. I have been assisting the Fire Department in this process. Once a suitable site is selected the

Thank You Rosie;

The target should be to the Council Planning Committee. Kelly King has been doing more damaged than good and we need to expose her track record with Molokai and regarding the Molokai CP Update. Attached are the correspondence during the Planning Committee's review of the Molokai CP. Many changes, overhauls, and inserts were done during this time, yet of the 28 meetings were held from 2/7/2017 to current, they spend 25 meetings on the Molokai CP, Kelly King came to Molokai 3 or 4 times, and Stacy held 4 district meetings. For the amount of changes the Planning Committee did, is this sufficient for the Molokai island to have a voice/say. A lot of their discussion was either hear say, falsified/not accurate/wrong information, or mis-interpreted information. For example, the last meeting (July 5) they took a lot of time (wasted time) talking about Gregory Jenkins testimony he submitted on June 14. If you look at the list of correspondence, Greg Jenkins submitted the same exact testimony on February 15 (attached). Attached is the CM Stacy's flyer that was sent out to everyone in February 2018.

Maui County Council
Planning Committee Meeting
October 5, 2017
9:00a-12:00p

October 4, 2017

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN

Aloha Chair King and Committee members,

Mahalo for this opportunity to share comments today on the process of prioritizing the action items in Chapter 12 of the Molokai Community Plan.

Background

First, I would like to briefly share some background on how we got to this point. On Aug 23, Chair King flew over to Molokai with Council Member Crivello and a facilitator, Sam Millington, to help the community determine a methodology for prioritizing the action items in Chapter 12. Over 30 people attended this meeting, and together, we chose a method where we would group 10 groups of 10, resulting in 10 priority 1s, 10 priority 2s, and so on, to 10 priority 10s, 1 being the highest priority and 10 being the lowest. The community agreed to use surveys to indicate their ranking and would submit it to Chair King's office with a deadline of Sept 5.

Recognizing it as a monumental task, especially by people who have not been involved in the community plan process, I called a community meeting and invited members from the Community Plan Advisory Committee ("CPAC") and Molokai Planning Commission ("MoPC"), who were members during the process, so that community members who had not been involved could gain a better understanding by those who were directly involved. Three members of the CPAC attended, as well as the chair of the MoPC. It took us about five hours to carefully discuss each action item, the reasons it was included, what it meant at the time, and if it was still relevant now, since it had been drafted back in 2014-15. Although I encouraged everyone to prioritize items on their own, as we revised each time to be relevant and current, we came to consensus on the revisions and on the priority.

Two weeks later, Council Member Crivello held four meetings to go over the implementation items in Chapter 12 and the bill to cap short-term rental homes on Molokai. Chair King's Sept 5 deadline was extended to accommodate her meetings. I attended all four of her 2-hour long meetings on Sept 12, 13, 18, and 19. It was great that she went to the four districts. There was a total of 120 community members' attended the four meetings, some attended multiple meetings. It brought out some people who normally do not drive to Kaunakakai for meetings, and even though they didn't all speak, it was wonderful to have them there!

My Concerns

From the very first meeting, I had grave concerns about the direction it was taking. I spoke up here and there to help Council Member Crivello in making sure those in attendance understood the full scope of what we were doing and why we were doing it.

The follow is a list of my concerns regarding the four meetings.

- These meetings did not follow the methodology that the community came up with at the Aug 23 meeting.

- During instruction, the Aug 23 methodology was not presented as an option, so that attendees would know that there was another method to use to indicate their priorities, especially if they felt pressured into deciding on the spot without enough information.
- After an attendee asked about the other method, Council Member Crivello told the audience that Aug 23 meeting was not good because it didn't produce priorities and that Chair King agreed to her using her own methodology.
- There was no clear explanation of how the results from two different methodologies would be reconciled.
- Each of the four meetings were facilitated differently, so there was no consistency in collecting and recording the data.
- People often walked into the meetings late, after we went through the first few pages of action items. It not made clear how they would be able to voice their priorities at the meeting on the action items already passed.
- The meeting in Maunaloa did not produce priorities, because the community there had preferred to discuss the West End Policy Statement.
- There were no clear safeguards to prevent duplicate responses the people who attended multiple district meetings or if individuals participated in both the meetings and submitted survey responses following the Aug 23 method.
- At only one of the four meetings were the attendees polled to see who had knowledge of the community plan.
- Attendees were not made aware that they were not give the full list of action items (approx. 217), that instead, they only received half of the action items (approx. 106). The 106 action items were those that received a Priority 1 rating by the CPAC.
- Instead of remaining a neutral facilitator, Council Member Crivello influenced the process by 1) announcing and inserting her own priorities at each meeting, 2) suggesting that action items within each district was more important than those outside the attendees' districts, 3) inserted priorities from other meetings.

The meetings at Maunaloa, Kilohana, and Kaunakakai were filmed by Akaku and can be found here: Maunaloa (<https://vimeo.com/234405540>), Kilohana (<https://vimeo.com/235809218>), Kaunakakai (<https://vimeo.com/234604177>).

Conclusion

I question the results that came from these meetings. It looks to me that they were inflated and should not be combined with the results collected by the Aug 23 method without an accurate account of who each vote came from. While at each meeting, I could have easily count the number of people who raised their hands when asked if an action item was a priority. The count could not have been anywhere near 90.

The numbers themselves are questionable. When doing counts, most times it'll end up being a random number, like 92 or 97. The fact that so many numbers are 15, 20, 40 looks suspicious itself. Even if people submitted surveys after the meeting with numbers like these, every person who attended would have had to have submitted a survey. Again, the meeting in West Molokai did go over priorities, because they chose to break out into small groups to discuss the West End Policy Statement. It's a bit of a stretch for me to believe that over 20 people from that meeting submitted surveys.

Mahalo for this opportunity to testify.

Me ke aloha,

Keani Rawlins-Fernandez

Fax Confirmation

HP LaserJet MFP M426fdw

Jul-3-2018 9:30PM

222

Job

Date

Time

February 15, 2018

Kelly T. King, Planning Committee Chair
(PC-2) MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

My name is Greg Jenkins and I am providing this written testimony as a Moloka'i CPAC Member regarding County of Maui Council Planning Committee Agenda Item PC-2 MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE.

The testimony provided is focused on two main areas of concern related to your discussions/deliberations on today's agenda:

1. Proposed Council changes to the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update implementing actions DRAFT, Chapter 10 Implementation and monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft)
2. Inclusion of Updated Lanai Community Plan: Appendix 9.2 Comparison of Lanai Community Plan Land Use Designations and Typical County Zoning District into Appendix 6.1 of the Molokai Plan.

Based upon past public consultation process and review by the CPAC and MoPC of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, and comprehensive review of the content and context of existing conditions, issues, goals, policies and actions for each Chapter I am not in support for changing action numbers or descriptions and or removing or re-prioritizing the same for Chapter 10 Implementation and monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft). Additionally, implementing action priorities for the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update directly connect/relate to Moloka'i Appendix 6.1 and Lanai Appendix 9.2; please leave Chapter 10 Implementation and monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft) for the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update as is.

Based upon past public consultation process and review by the CPAC and MoPC of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, and comprehensive review of the content and context of existing conditions, issues, goals, policies and actions for each Chapter I am not in support for amending Appendix 6.1 Comparison of State Land Use and County Community Plan Designations and Zoning Districts of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update with language from Appendix 9.2 Comparison of Lanai Community Plan Land Use Designations and Typical County Zoning District of the Updated Lanai Community Plan.

Appendix 9.2 of the Updated Lanai Community Plan contains some language that is inconsistent and contrary to decisions made by the Moloka'i CPAC and MoPC as it relates to language in the same corresponding section of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update. As a Moloka'i CPAC member I recall discussions

RECEIVED AT PC MEETING ON 2/15/2018 1

during some meetings regarding the Lanai Appendix 9.2 language; but, as a CPAC we never fully deliberated or adopted the language of Appendix 9.2 into Moloka'i's Appendix 6.1 for specific reasons. Please see the following example.

EXAMPLE:

Mixed Use Residential Lanai Language is not compatible with PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, especially description/definition under "Typical County Zoning Districts and Uses Envisioned, " Until a new Mixed-Use Residential zoning district is established in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, a mixture of existing residential apartment, park, business, and public/quasi-public zoning **would correspond with and implement this community plan land use designation.**" In Moloka'i Plan the Lanai language was intentionally left out as to avoid implementation of this specific land use on Molokai until it was properly vetted through community consultation process for Molokai and established in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. This may be a back door effort to force this type land use designation, envisioned uses and corresponding implementation for Moloka'i. Any new/added/amended language to Appendix 6.1 of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update that creates "implementing powers of/to the plan" not previously enumerated in the Plan Update or existing County Code, such as Title 19, is suspect and needs to be vetted in proper content and context by the Moloka'i community.

If you have any questions or require more information please do not hesitate to contact me at 808.271.8722.

Mahalo for your consideration of this testimony,

Respectfully,



Greg Jenkins
Moloka'i CPAC Member

June 14, 2018

Kelly T. King, Planning Committee Chair
(PC-2) MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

My name is Greg Jenkins and I am providing this written testimony as a Molokai CPAC Member regarding County of Maui Council Planning Committee Agenda Item PC-2 MOLOKAI COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE.

The testimony provided herein amends my previous written testimony submitted on February 15, 2018; and, is focused on two main areas of concern related to your discussions/deliberations on today's agenda:

1. Proposed Council changes to the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update implementing actions DRAFT, Chapter 10 Implementation and Monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft)
2. Inclusion of Updated Lanai Community Plan: Appendix 9.2 Comparison of Lanai Community Plan Land Use Designations and Typical County Zoning District into Appendix 6.1 of the Molokai Plan.

Based upon the past public consultation process and review by the CPAC, MoPC of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, and in consideration of how rushed the CPAC was in the one meeting dedicated to rapidly prioritize Chapter 10 Implementation and Monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft); and in consideration of the public community input facilitation meeting efforts by Planning Committee Chair Kelly King that were well attended by the community and by Molokai Council Member Stacy Crivello; and through further personal comprehensive review of the content and context of existing conditions, issues, goals, policies and actions for each Chapter, I am now willing to support a Council decision to re-prioritize Chapter 10 Implementation and Monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft) with the understanding that none of the original action items or descriptions would be deleted.

I support the Council's authority to make changes to the plan at this time in the process and with consideration of the additional community consultation and input. I clearly also understand that we have an existing process in place to request future community plan amendments to change, if necessary, any implementing action priorities in Chapter 10 Implementation and Monitoring (Proposed Chapter 12 of Maui County Council Draft) if the final version of the plan did not get the priorities right. I still believe it is important to ask the Council to carefully consider that the implementing action priorities for the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update directly connect/relate to Molokai Appendix 6.1 and Lanai Appendix 9.2.

I appreciate the action oriented due diligence by Planning Committee Chair Kelly King who took to time to travel to Molokai on multiple occasions to actually facilitate community dialogue and focused input to improve the Molokai Community Plan Update (Approximately 7 times Chair King traveled to Molokai for Public and other meetings concerning the Molokai CP Updated, unprecedented!). Chair King has stated to me on multiple occasions that, "It is the Molokai Community's Plan, it's their plan and it should represent their input!" With Chair King's actions combined with Molokai Council Member Crivello's and the Molokai Community's input, I feel confident that the Planning Committee and whole Council will proceed wisely.

Based upon past public consultation process and review by the CPAC and MoPC of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, and comprehensive review of the content and context of existing conditions, issues, goals, policies and actions for each Chapter I am not in support for amending Appendix 6.1 Comparison of State Land Use and County Community Plan Designations and Zoning Districts of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update with language from Appendix 9.2 Comparison of Lanai Community Plan Land Use Designations and Typical County Zoning District of the Updated Lanai Community Plan.

Appendix 9.2 of the Updated Lanai Community Plan contains some language that is inconsistent and contrary to decisions made by the Molokai CPAC and MoPC as it relates to language in the same corresponding section of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update. As a Molokai CPAC member I recall discussions during some meetings regarding the Lanai Appendix 9.2 language; but, as a CPAC we never fully deliberated or adopted the language of Appendix 9.2 into Molokai's Appendix 6.1 for specific reasons. Please see the following example.

EXAMPLE:

Mixed Use Residential Lanai Language is not compatible with PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update, especially description/definition under "Typical County Zoning Districts and Uses Envisioned, " Until a new Mixed-Use Residential zoning district is established in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, a mixture of existing residential apartment, park, business, and public/quasi-public zoning **would correspond with and implement this community plan land use designation.**" In Molokai Plan the Lanai language was intentionally left out as to avoid implementation of this specific land use on Molokai until it was properly vetted through community consultation process for Molokai and established in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. This may be a back door effort to force this type land use designation, envisioned uses and corresponding implementation for Molokai. Any new/added/amended language to Appendix 6.1 of the PD, CPAC, MoPC DRAFT Molokai Community Plan Update that creates "implementing powers of/to the plan" not previously enumerated in the Plan Update or existing County Code, such

as Title 19, is suspect and needs to be vetted in proper content and context by the Molokai community.

If you have any questions or require more information please do not hesitate to contact me at 808.271.8722.

Mahalo for your consideration of this testimony.

Respectfully,



Greg Jenkins
Molokai CPAC Member
Former Molokai CPAC Member, January 2018?

