

## PSLU Committee

---

**From:** Scott Shapiro <shapmaui@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2020 7:52 AM  
**To:** PSLU Committee  
**Subject:** PSLU 44 attachment  
**Attachments:** Jan 22 2020 Testimony PSLU hybrid update.docx

Please see attached

Scott Shapiro

PSLU 44 January 22, 2020- Testimony Scott Shapiro

I was hoping to discuss the proposed hybrid draft bill with the provisional South Maui Advisory Committee at our next meeting on 1/23/20.

Since this came back to PSLU, I emailed a survey to current SMAC members on the most important portions of the bill.

The results were mixed, but in general:

A.3 \*Most people favored at least 6 members to be appointed by the council. Two people wanted all 7 to be appointed by the council rep, as they felt the planning commission was already solely appointed by the mayor, as a potential check and balance.

I personally want this to pass, so I will leave this up to you on the number.

A.3 \*As far as district members appointing vs. general council member appointments, it was 90% in favor of the district council member appoint to the Advisory Committee. One with less. I wanted to know what the process would be for the general council to appoint members? How would they get names? By the district member? If so, then it makes sense to have district reps appoint. As a possible solution, I was thinking possibly, 5 members appointed from district council member, 1 from council, and 1 from Mayor.

D.2 \*For items to be reviewed, from most votes to least, were #1 Community Plan Amendments, #2 changes in zoning, duties delegated to it by the Maui Planning Commission, SMA permits ( I didn't ask major or minor),#3 district boundary amendments, county special use permits, all items within Title 19 which pertain to AC assigned area, #4 general plan amendments, conditional use permits #5 any amendment to Title 19, and in last place #6 Bed and Breakfast permits, TVR permits. There was one response that wanted to include infrastructure /public works projects proposed within the district and should have the ability to refer proposed projects to Cultural Resources commission for review.

D.3 \* On the time of 60 days v 90 days, half responded 60 days with amendments. Half said 90 days. A recommendation supporting 60 days were, creating a provision for 30 day extension with "good cause" such as in Land Use Commission rules, or "provided that the file on the subject item is complete". One person said start with 90 days, subject to revision in 1 year. I believe the Planning Commission has 120 days from the last hearing it has held.

PLEASE ADD

D.3(a) The Planning Commission to read in public the recommendations of the advisory committee during deliberations of the pertinent item at planning commission.