Council Chair Danny A. Mateo

Vice-Chair Joseph Pontanilla

Council Members Gladys C. Baisa Robert Carroll Elle Cochran Donald G. Couch, Jr. G. Riki Hokama Michael P. Victorino Mike White



COUNTY COUNCIL

COUNTY OF MAUI 200 S. HIGH STREET WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793 www.mauicounty.gov/council

January 25, 2012

Mr. William Spence, Director Department of Planning County of Maui Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Dear Mr. Spence:

SUBJECT: MAKENA RESORT - CHANGE IN ZONING COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS RELATING TO ACCESS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION (PC-21)

At its meeting of January 23, 2012, the Planning Committee discussed Condition 32 of Ordinance 3613 (2009) relating to park expansion at the south end of Maluaka Beach.

May I ask that you please provide the Committee with a map that clearly identifies the following:

- 1. The area comprising Maluaka Beach, and all associated tax map keys ("TMK").
- 2. The exact portion of TMK: (2) 2-1-06:057 that is zoned PK-1 Neighborhood Park District.
- 3. The exact portion of TMK: (2) 2-1-06:057 that is zoned PK-4 Golf Course Park District.
- 4. The area discussed by the Planning and Land Use Committee at its meetings of March 18, 2004, April 12, 2004, and April 14, 2004, to be designated for the park expansion. (See attached excerpts of minutes, and accompanying photos submitted by Roy Figueiroa).
- 5. The area proposed by ATC Makena Holdings, LLC for the park expansion.

May I please request your response no later than Wednesday, February 1, 2012. To ensure efficient processing, please include the relevant Committee item number in the subject line of your response.

Mr. William Spence January 25, 2012 Page 2

Should you have any questions, please contact me or the Committee staff (Kimberley Willenbrink at ext. 7761, or Clarita Balala at ext. 7668).

Sincerely,

DONALD G. COUCH, JR., Chair

Planning Committee

Don Coule

pc:ltr:021apl01:kcw

Attachments

cc: Mayor Alan M. Arakawa Director of Parks and Recreation

1	
2	
3	in the property of the propert
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	MINUTES
11	Planning and Land Use Committee
12	Council of the County of Maui
13	Council Chamber
14	March 18, 2004
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	RECONVENE:	4:43 p.m.
2	PRESENT:	Councilmember Wayne K. Nishiki, Chair Councilmember G. Riki Hokama, Vice-Chair
3	u den	Councilmember Robert Carroll, Member Councilmember Jo Anne Johnson, Member
4		(1v 3:20 a.m.) Councilmember Dain P. Kane, Member
5		Councilmember Danny A. Mateo, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
6		Councilmember Michael P. Molina, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
7		Councilmember Joseph Pontanilla, Member (1v 3:20 a.m.)
8		Councilmember Charmaine Tavares, Member
9	EXCUSED:	None
10	ABSENT:	None
11	STAFF:	David Raatz, Legislative Attorney Yvette Bantilan, Committee Secretary
12		Ken Fukuoka, Director of Council Services
13	ADMIN.:	Alice Lee, Director of Housing and Human Concerns
1.4		John Buck, Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation
15		Ann Cua, Planner, Department of Planning Michael Foley, Planning Director
16		Ellen Kraftsow, Chief of Planning Division Department of Water Supply
17		George Tengan, Director of Water Supply Brian Moto, Corporation Counsel
18	OTHERS:	Roy Figueiroa, Makena Resort Corp.
19		(applicant's representative) Gwen Ohashi Hiraga, Munekiyo & Hiraga, Inc
20		(applicant's consultant) Aki Sinoto (applicant's archaeologist)
21		Additional attendees (25)
22	PRESS:	Ilima Loomis, The Maui News Tim Hurley, Honolulu Advertiser
23		Gary Kubota, Honolulu Star Bulletin Akaku: Maui Community Television, Inc.

- below has another paragraph in it that says
- essentially that we will treat you like any other
- 3 corporation, if there's water available you will get
- 4 service, if there's no water available you will not
- 5 get it, or some -- something to that effect.
- 6 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: So there's no guarantee.
- 7 MR. MOTO: Not as -- not as I read it.
- 8 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: Thank you.
- 9 MR. MOTO: But, you know --
- 10 COUNCILMEMBER MATEO: Thank you, Mr. Moto. Thank you,
- 11 Mr. Chair.
- 12 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Any other discussion as to language
- on the water condition? If there are no objections,
- 14 we'll include that language.
- 15 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Object.
- 16 COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: No objection.
- 17 CHAIR NISHIKI: Thank you.
- 18 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Objection.
- 19 CHAIR NISHIKI: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. We'll have that
- discussion when we deal on the vote. Is that okay,
- 21 Riki?
- 22 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: That's fine, Chairman. Thank you.
- 23 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Thank you. We'll move -- maybe
- this is a good time because we asked Roy to address
- 25 what Charmaine had proposed in regards to parks and

- whether the developer tonight has any language in to
- offer. What -- what perhaps, Roy, you've thought
- 3 about in regards to parks.
- 4 Also you have that letter from the Parks
- 5 Department that was submitted to us from Mr. Correa
- 6 here also, yeah. Okay. Yeah.
- Is Parks Director here or his representative?
- 8 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Deputy right there.
- 9 CHAIR NISHIKI: Oh, there you are, Mr. Buck. Thank you.
- Do you have anything to pass out to us or is
- it pretty clear? Roy?
- 12 MR. FIGUEIROA: Me? No.
- 13 CHAIR NISHIKI: Nothing?
- 14 MR. FIGUEIROA: I do not have anything at this time.
- 15 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Go ahead.
- 16 MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay. Are we on number -- from 35 on?
- 17 Well, I'm --
- 18 CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah. You know, the last time
- 19 Charmaine --
- 20 MR. FIGUEIROA: -- I'm not sure where we're on on the
- 21 list.
- 22 CHAIR NISHIKI: -- had a --
- 23 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Thirty-five.

24	CHAIR	NISH	[KI:	Charmai	ine i	had	a r	esoluti	on i	to .	a		a
25		swap	between	giving	you	the	25	acres	for	ho	te:	1,	and

1		then as part of the parks assessment the 10 the
2		10 acres fronting the proposed hotel rezoning would
3		be park. And so then I guess the Committee asked
4		you if to take into consideration perhaps another
5		proposal that we may look at that you can we can
6		rely on from where you stand. Go ahead.
7	MR. F	IGUEIROA: Well, we did take a look I must say
8		that I actually I do have some pictures of the
9		area that I do have that I could pass out now that I
10		recall as far as the particular area we're talking
11		about as far as perhaps expanding the existing park
12		on the south end of Maluaka Beach.
13		We do not think it's we do not think it's
14		fair that there be a for the condition of
15		approval of the 28 acres for hotel, H-M Hotel-zoned
16		property, that we trade in our existing 11 acre H-M
17		Hotel-zoned property. Saying that, we did look at
18		an area that perhaps could be used to enhance the
19		public's use of Maluaka Beach and adjacent to the
20		south of that by lateral access reaching to the
21		Oneuli Beach or going into that direction.

22	So what I did was try to look at what area
23	was available in the area that's being rezoned. And
24	part of the area that's being rezoned is the PK-4,
25	which is the golf course zoning along the beach.

1	And at the north end of that particular area there
2	is a a portion of the property that perhaps could
3	be developed further for park use. We do not have
4	much area there, but it is a a significant
5	picturesque site that could be used to extend that
6	particular beach park.
7	If you'd like I could pass out the the
8	picture of that area, plus the area along which the
9	lateral access could extend. We did have someone
10	from the State DLNR walking that property today. It
11	belong to the portion of the DLNR that does trails.
12	I'm trying to remember the exact name of that
13	particular part of the DLNR forestry division.
14	VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Na Ala Hele.
15	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Na Ala Hele.
16	MR. FIGUEIROA: Na Ala Hele, that's right. Okay. So we
17	walked that area to see where that trail lateral
18	access could be. And so there were some good ideas
19	that they shared with us, and we can see how it

20	would work through a portion of that property along
21	the golf course. So by the extension of that beach
22	park further south to take in the point out there
23	toward the ocean, and then from that point have a
24	lateral access to the sand area at the south
25	toward the south end of the golf course.

PLU 3/18/04 113

When you reach the very southernmost limit of the area to be rezoned, then there is a problem with the grade in that area, sharp drop-off from the golf course hole. So therefore, in that area we'd recommend as Ms. Nohara did, recommend that that trail go until the sandy area, stop there, and then you could travel along the sandy area and continue that access toward Oneuli Beach. So that was another component of what we would propose.

In the area of -- I -- I still believe that the idea we had of providing a -- a plan for the State Park at Makena, recreational plan that would include some parking, I thought it was a good idea.

And I presented that to DLNR representatives, and they said they would encourage and support that idea of creating a -- a plan whereby that plan would designate where the parking areas could be.

18	Because right now as even as we looked at
19	Oneuli Beach, you could see cars that were driving
20	almost to the sand on that beach because there's no
21	set parking area for them for that particular beach.
22	And then we believe that when they as the each
23	project comes on, at that particular stage by having
24	that plan as a basis, then it could determine what
25	improvements could be assessed each project toward

15

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

114 PLU 3/18/04

1	the implementing of that particular plan for that
2	Oneuli Beach.
3	And as I said earlier, it was if it was
4	determined and and we would be doing this plan
5	for DLNR. In other words, it would still be
6	something that they would have to adopt and
7	implement. And then the County could, as I said,
8	judge each project and see how much they would
9	contribute judging on the the scope of that
.0	project toward the development of that plan, whether
1	it'd be parking or facilities that could be applied
.2	to that lot.
13	And if there weren't enough space there, then
4	then that plan should look at other areas that

could be developed beyond that park or across the

16	street, as Mr. Nishiki mentioned.
17	There is an area further down that is within
18	the community plan that is not part of this
19	application yet, and I think that also could be
20	satisfied as far as creating an opportunity for
21	beach use. And this is mainly for the fishing area
22	further to the south before you reach La Perouse. I
23	believe we have set in the community plan about 2.2
24	acres in that area.
25	I haven't gotten the response. I I guess

PLU 3/18/04 115

I forgot to run that by the Parks Department, so I'm
not sure how they would react to that particular
lot, but that could also be available.

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

There is an area that you're looking at as far as park use that we designate I believe it's one
-- a little over one acre at the south end of our change in zoning. If someone could point that out,
I'd appreciate that. Yeah, right there.

Now that -- the reason we only ask for that much is because that's the only part within the urban boundary. However, that -- even that could be expanded to what the community plan says would be a 4.4 acre parcel eventually in the community plan.

.4	So that's another area that could be used.
15	In response to the Makena Landing, I we
16	still have a difficult time understanding that that
17	would be a practical suggestion to implement. We've
L8	talked it over with the Parks Department. They have
19	the same concern we do. As far as increasing the
20	ability to use that particular park or in that
21	particular beach is very limited in size.
22	So you may want to ask the Parks Department
23	again how they feel about that. As I said, it's a
24	a suggestion that we feel will not be to the
25	benefit really of the general public.

1	So those are the areas, as I said, that we
2	could increase, for example, what's on the beach
3	side. If you'd like I can pass out the pictures
4	that I do have for that area, including a view of
5	where the lateral access would be so you could have
6	some idea of what it is.
7	CHAIR NISHIKI: Questions for Roy? And and and
8	maybe we should go area by area or I don't know how
9	this Committee wants to proceed so we don't jump all
0	over the place.
1	VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: May we request to see the photos,

- 12 Chairman?
- 13 CHAIR NISHIKI: Sure.
- 14 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chair?
- 15 CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah.
- 16 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Just real quick.
- 17 CHAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead, Dain.
- 18 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Does Mr. Figueiroa have a copy of the
- 19 March 18th letter that, I think, Director Correa of
- Parks has sent to you and this body, Mr. Chair?
- 21 CHAIR NISHIKI: I'm not sure. David, is there an extra
- 22 copy from Parks?
- David, we have any other pictures also of the
- 24 -- these areas for Committee?
- 25 MR. RAATZ: Yeah, I'll check.

- 1 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Maluaka first then, Roy, we have
- that. There's a picture there fronting Maluaka.
- 3 MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay. If we could start from the --
- 4 CHAIR NISHIKI: King's Road.
- 5 MR. FIGUEIROA: Okay.
- 6 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay.
- 7 MR. FIGUEIROA: That is the area of -- of what we're
- 8 showing here. You see where the -- just beyond that
- 9 sign that is shown there in the middle of the

10	picture? The beach access begins there coming
11	toward the south, and that's the public restrooms
12	that we built there on that picture numbered number
13	seven.
14	Then the next picture of the park is what we
15	developed as a park. That to is to the makai
16	side of the public restrooms. So that's the
17	existing area that we're asking for the change in
18	zoning. Part of this was hotel on the former zoning
19	and part of it was, I believe, open space. And so
20	we're asking for the change in zoning to the PK-1
21	designation for this particular park.
22	Now you see in that picture number nine, you
23	see there's a wall right about the middle of the

picture level with the bottom of that tree, see the

-- the crown of that tree? Okay. That wall is the

PLU 3/18/04 118

25

1	southernmost boundary of this particular park.
2	So then when you look at the next picture,
3	that would be the area which is number 11, that
4	would be the area to the south of that particular
5	park where you're getting close to the golf course.
6	And that is where we would say we would extend that
7	park into this area where you could develop this

8	again. And we would look at developing it in a
9	similar way to what you see in picture number
10	nine numbered nine where you have grassed area.
11	And then you're looking at picture number
12	11. If you look to the right edge, see, that's sort
13	of like a point going out toward the ocean. So we
14	believe right now that would expand this particular
15	park to one-and-a-half acres. We'll probably create
16	not only we wouldn't recommend taking down the
17	wall that was built there, but we'd probably
18	recommend creating an opening that we would do.
19	And again, this is something that we would be
20	doing because I don't believe the Parks and
21	Recreation Department would like to inherit this
22	undeveloped. And we recommend being able to do it
23	and then maintain it again as we do the existing
24	park area.
25	As you can see, it is a a beautiful area

PLU 3/18/04 119

1	that that could be used for additional as it
2	shows here some kind of picnic area. And and as
3	I said, that would increase that particular park to
4	one-and-a-half acres.

Now if you look at the tree in the middle of

6	number 11, that keawe tree right about in the middle
7	of the picture, the park would extend to about that
8	area. And so the lateral access then would continue
9	from that along the shoreline.
10	The next picture is continuing southward.
11	You can see how people are walking you see that
12	path in picture number 16? There appears to be a
13	used path between that stake and the keawe tree
14	toward the bottom right side of the picture.
15	But we believe by creating the park, we could
16	continue the access, the lateral access, closer to
17	the shoreline, which would alleviate our concerns
18	about being too close to the golf course. And right
19	now that would require some work along the shoreline
20	so we could get them closer to the beach.
21	Now if you look at the next picture, number
22	23, as we discussed with Ms. Nohara, this would be
23	probably the area she believes and and we believe
24	that the lateral access would come right to the

beach itself. And that beach connects to Oneuli

1	Beach to if you look in that picture number 23,
2	you see the stake with the white white stake with
3	the blue top would be around that area take it

right to the beach. And then from there you'd be walking along that beach as a lateral access, and that would take you right through to Oneuli Beach.

If we look at the next or even -- yeah, it would be the next picture, number 28, this is where if we did not stop the lateral access at the beach itself and took it up above into the vegetation, we get close to the golf course and then there would be a sharp drop to come back to the beach because of the -- the elevation difference. And that's why we concur that it would probably be best to stop it at the sand beach, the beginning of that north end of the beach.

If you look at number 30, picture number 30, the shoreline looking back, that shows you the type of beach that you would be walking along in order to continue the access toward Oneuli Beach. So in looking at picture number 30, you're looking northward, the opposite direction.

And number 41 again shows you the -- going back to the makai side of the park that was already developed. And that wall is now between the area of

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

2	But it does if you see on number 41, the shoreline
3	does jut out toward the west. So there's a point
4	out there that it goes out toward that you would be
5	able to utilize for the beach public area.
6	As far as Maluaka also as the parking, I
7	believe there was concern that there was not enough
8	parking. We do have 30 stalls, and we believe that
9	probably another 30 could be constructed in that
10	particular area. And that would alleviate well,
11	not alleviate, it would encourage use of that
12	particular beach.
13	As I said, combined with well, if you want
14	me to stop at Maluaka, I'll I'll stop right
15	there.
16	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah. I think we want to we want to
17	stop there and and ask questions. So then you
18	could put 30 more parking stalls and also address
19	the lateral to Oneuli that was asked of and also a
20	path.
21	Questions from Members?
22	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: I'd like to hear comments,
23	Mr. Chair, from the Parks Department.
24	CHAIR NISHIKI: Parks?
25	MR. BUCK: We, from the Parks Department, cannot support

1 the -- what is some of the conditions. However, the 2 way the conditions were brought or -- or part of some of the conditions we had a comment on because 3 of the fact that it's inconsistent on what we're 5 doing now at other parks and recreation facilities --COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Wait, wait, John. MR. BUCK: -- and parking lots. COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: John, excuse me. Just on this 9 10 proposal. MR. BUCK: Oh, on this proposal? 11 12 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Yes, uh-huh. MR. BUCK: I think it's a -- a good plan, workable. It 13 gives us access. I think the only concern I have is 14 15 as far as what type of develop it's going to be. I 16 mean, is it going to be a natural path or a -- a -a six-foot wide developed concrete paved or we're 17 18 going to just kind of try to leave it in a natural 19 state. Because when you start cutting -- I think 20 one of our concerns may have been concerning the developer, if you start cutting into banks and 21 things, there might be the concern of erosion. 22 23 CHAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead, Roy. MR. FIGUEIROA: Well, we looked at the area with 24

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC.

Ms. Nohara and we feel that there -- there could be

25

-	areas that could be as wide as six rece. However,
2	if it were a hard path we don't know if that would
3.	be the best. We'd like to work with them, with the
4	DLNR, as to what type of path it it would be.
5	The other concern I forgot to mention is that of the
6	keeping it open 24 24 hours a day, seven days a
7	week because there was concern about the liability
8	in that area.
9	I believe she referred me to something in
10	Lanai about a memorandum of understanding as to how
11	the the fishermen's trail, for example, she was
12	going to get me a copy of that memorandum of
13	understanding. But I understand in that one it's
14	not a hard trail, but it does provide access. And
15	she was more accustomed to something like a
16	four-foot wide, around four-foot wide trail.
17	But as far as the areas I pointed out that it
18	would be difficult is where I have that sharp bank.
19	In other areas, it looks like as long as we are able
20	to and and this is something the Planning
21	Department can clarify because it it would be
22	within the shoreline setback area. And also, I
23	don't know if it would require an SMA permit to do
24	it.

PLU 3/18/04

1	is to how long we had to do it because I think your
2	condition said about six months and I don't believe
3	that's possible. Well, let's put it this way. It's
4	probably possible, but I shouldn't even use the word
5	probably possible. I'll let them comment. It's
6	it's very difficult. I can't see it happening in
7	six months.
8	I'm not saying I'm not willing to work hard
9	to get it done, but I don't think I can control
1.0	where it could happen in six months doing the
11	because of the process involved. So maybe they can
12	comment.
13	MR. FOLEY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Figueiroa is correct, it
14	would require a shoreline setback variance and an
15	SMA permit. However, we would be very supportive of
16	increasing shoreline access. But in addition to
17	processing those two permits, it also needs to be at
18	least preliminarily designed. So six months isn't
19	very realistic. They'd probably need, oh, a little
20	longer than that. Maybe nine months would be
21	accurate for design and approval.
22	CHAIR NISHIKI: Charmaine

- 23 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chair --
- 24 CHAIR NISHIKI: -- any other questions from --
- 25 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chairman? Oh, I'm sorry. I am sorry.

PLU 3/18/04 125

1 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: No. Go ahead.

2 CHAIR NISHIKI: Riki, go ahead.

3 VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Chairman, since Mr. Figueiroa did

4 mention a memorandum of agreement as we -- we call

it and use it on Lanai, I would just ask the Members

if they would look at page 11, which is under the

subheading just Park, if you look at the bottom of

8 the middle of the photograph, that -- that sandy

g area, that would be pretty close to what we have on

10 Lanai regarding the -- the Hulopoe area which fronts

11 the Manele Hotel.

It is an existing fishermen's trail, so it is

13 very rugged. It's maintained, but you need to be

careful of what you're walking on. It's -- it's

very much in its natural state. So again, you know,

16
I -- I -- I've heard the comments from Mr. Buck,

17 there is limited access because of the natural

condition and that if you're not careful you

19 definitely can get hurt.

But it works for us on Lanai. It's part of a

21	a resort development amenities. It is something
22	we we still use as residents for to get to
23	certain fishing spots, which I won't share with
24	you. But we use it still yet as as locals also.
25	So I think if the Parks Department, DLNR
	RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090
PLU	3/18/04 126
1	works with the Planning Department, I can see this
2	being a very work workable option for this site,
3	Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
4	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other questions, comments?
5	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Comment.
6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Charmaine, go ahead.
7	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I I like this
8	particular plan and effort so far that's been taken
9	to get input from DLNR. I think as we heard through
10	the testimonies, there were a number of testimonies
11	regarding access to shorelines, and I am in total
12	support of what Mr. Foley is saying about increasing
13	shoreline access.
14	But I think not only increasing shoreline

But I think not only increasing shoreline access because as you look at these pictures with the nondeveloped area, the wall, it's already screaming keep out, kapu. And I think we heard that people want to have what they had before, ability to

19	access without feeling like they were trespassing.
20	And I think with working together with the
21	Parks Department, DLNR, and Planning Department,
22	that a it can be developed to a point, not
23	overdeveloped, but developed to a point where it is
24	at least welcoming and and encouraging and not
25	giving people that feeling that they are in a place
	RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090
PLU	3/18/04 127
1	they shouldn't be.
2	So for for those reasons, I I like the
3	proposal and thank the developer for putting in the
4	effort in a rather short period of time to come up
5	with this.
6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other comments, Charmaine, that's it?
7	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: That's it.
8	CHAIR NISHIKI: Jo Anne?
9	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: As Chair of the Parks and
10	Agriculture Committee, I think that any opportunity
11	we can take to try to address the concerns that have
12	been expressed is really important.
13	The there was one letter that we received

and -- you know, about whether the path should or

should not be developed. And the letter that we

received was -- was from the Department of Health.

14

15

16

17	And it doesn't say specifically Clean Water Branch,
18	but, you know, I know that in this statement that
19	was made, June Harrigan Lum, who's the Environmental
20	Planning Office, wrote that they regretted they
21	didn't have enough notice or information about the
22	matter to be able to be you know, to respond.
23	And she stated that again, the same things
24	that Planning has stated that in this case she's
25	saying an EIS, EA, or Land Use application documents

PLU 3/18/04 128

were ordinarily provided.

So my concern and my only concern about her letter is that whatever's done in terms of whether it's a developed path, undeveloped path, I -- I just hope that we can provide that data so that we can get a response back from the Department of Health.

And also I didn't, and correct me if I'm wrong, I didn't see and I may have just missed it, I was looking for the OHA comments too because with the PASH rights and all of the access rights that native Hawaiians have, those two issues would be really critical.

I -- I really defer to Mr. Buck and the Planning Commission about some of the other issues

15	regarding what is appropriate, the amount of traffic
16	that can be handled in that area, because they know
17	the area much better than I do and they know what
18	the usage is.
19	But I just those would be my concerns,
20	Mr. Figueiroa, in those two areas, try to get some
21	kind of a response back both from the Department of
22	Health and also from Office of Hawaiian Affairs with
23	regard to the area being kept open for the practice
24	of native gathering rights.
25	MR. FIGUEIROA: If I may comment or ask a question. Are
	RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090
DIII	2/10/04

PLU 3/18/04 129

you referring to being open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, is that the --2 COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Well --3 MR. FIGUEIROA: -- condition? COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: -- with regard to PASH, basically 5 when people want to go fishing, I mean, they go at 6 7 all hours of the night. Sometimes there's other cultural practices that may take place during certain times of the year for religious ceremonies. 9 I think that in consultation with Na Kupuna or other 10 organizations and particularly OHA, I think that 11 they would have to look at whatever access was 12

13	open.
14	And I'm not saying necessarily that to all
15	other people it would be open 24 hours a day because
16	I don't want drug dealing and other issues, plus
17	just the visibility in that area, we don't want to
18	put lights all along that area, I mean, so that it's
19	it's really creating other problems with our
20	nearshore waters.
21	And I know that Mr. Molina's committee is
22	dealing with the the lighting near the ocean and
23	some of the shorebird issues. So just to have some
24	kind of comment I think would be really helpful in
25	looking at this.

1	MR. FIGUEIROA: We would welcome the input from the
2	different groups you mentioned and the agencies.
3	And that's why perhaps I'm not as optimistic as
4	Mr. Foley about nine months would be enough. I
5	believe if you gave me a year, I might say it's
6	possible. I still might not be comfortable, but
7	that's why I I believe the nine months is
8	probably very optimistic given the comments you've
9	just you've just made.
10	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: And and I would say that as

11	long as you begin the process within that period of
12	time, I think that's basically what the purpose and
13	intent of putting that condition in. Because just
14	from recent rulings we've had, even with our own
15	Parks Department with regard to our ocean recreation
16	activities, we're having serious concerns about even
17	being able to accomplish some of the charges that
18	we've been given by our own Council Members.
19	So it's not easy and Mr. Buck knows what he's
20	having to go through. Just ask some of the you
21	know, even our school which we thought might not
22	have as long a period of time, we're having
23	difficulty even completing that. So I think if some
24	language could be put in there that in working
25	towards this, that at least the process is embarked

PLU 3/18/04 131

1	on within a reasonable period of time.
2	MR. FIGUEIROA: Thank you. And I I think the Parks
3	Department as far as being able to we'd like
4	after we do this work that the Parks Department or
5	the County of Maui does accept dedication of this
6	area to the County.
7	And as far as the lateral access would also

be -- we would like to dedicate that easement of the

9	lateral access to the County. Maybe you'd like to
10	get the Parks Department's response on that. It
11	would be a requirement of the County, and we do have
12	some concerns on that liability.
13	You know, it's different from just allowing
14	how people just walk to the beach now, and it's
15	different from giving them an invitation by
16	establishing a hard surface toward that beach. I
17	think the liability, the the attorneys would have
18	to answer that, but it's I think they'd make a
19	distinction between people just climb over rocks or
20	whatever, rough trail as Mr. Hokama brought out,
21	it's different from if you invite them to take that
22	path as to who has the liability on that.
23	But we would like to cooperate in having this
24	done, and as I said, we would like the County to
25	accept the dedication of the area once it's done.

1	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: That basically would be from my
2	understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Moto,
3	acceptance of any land dedication would be in the
4	Council's purview, is that correct?
5	MR. MOTO: Mr. Chairman, yes, the Council would have
6	nurguant nurguant to Maui County Code Provisions

7	the the County Council would have to accept any
8	conveyance of an interest in real property.
9	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.
10	CHAIR NISHIKI: Riki?
11	VICE-CHAIR HOKAMA: Thank you, Chairman.
12	Mr. Figueiroa, so we can understand an
13	earlier condition that we we've discussed quite a
14	bit, but I want to bring it up again because since
15	this subject matter regarding your proposal because
16	I I have listened to Ms. Johnson's concern about
17	PASH, OHA, and so would this be part of your
18	Cultural Resource Management Plan as part under
19	the cultural component?
20	When you say access to specified sites, that
21	you're also including whether it'd be lateral or
22	beach shoreline access, that that would be part
23	would this be also a part of your Cultural Resource
24	Management Plan that organizations like Na Kupuna,
25	our County Cultural Resource Commission, our Burial

PLU 3/18/04 133

Councils would be part of the comment and review

process?

3 MR. FIGUEIROA: Right now this is part of our property and

our -- our study would include this area also. And

MINUTES

11	PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
12	Council of the County of Maui
13	Council Chamber
14	April 12, 2004

CHAIR NISHIKI: Discussion? Jo Anne, go ahead.

this	10 - COUNC	ILMEMBER JOHNSON: Once again, we went through
at	11	before; and part of the reason why we're looking
the	12	some of the elements that are contained within
said	13	developer's wording is that the developer has
	14	that they shall develop.
develop	15	In this one, if they're going to only
	16	a beach access plan but there's no mention of
mention	17	what they're going to implement. There's no
it's	18	of the area where it's going to be. So, I know
areas	19	getting late again; but this is one of those
	20	that we went back and forth about this. And I
paragraph	21	actually think that if we amend the first
that	22	of the developer's proposed conditions, I think
	23	we might be able to work with it.
the	24	And my my wording would take out in
we're	25	developer's originally I guess I know

165	PLU 4/12/0	0.4
	1	not on that subject now; but because we're
designate	2	discussing this, I think that we should
of	3	that they're going to help develop the expansion
Beach.	4	the beach park at the south end of Maluaka
	5	I think it should state clearly what the
it's	6	amount of the acreage is and just state that
that	7	for public use and for beach access. I think
	8	we did agree or the developer agreed that on the
expansion	9	time thing, that they would require the
in	10	within six months of the approval of the change
land	11	zoning and that if we just simply say that the
	12	area of the 1.5 acres would be applied as credit
park	13	toward satisfying a portion of the applicable
would	14	dedication requirements, to me, I think that
	15	be better than going back to what we've already
	16	discussed which really is just a plan. I think

way.	17	we're actually going backwards if we go that
discussion	18	So, that's my thought. That's my
Earl	19	CHAIR NISHIKI: You know what? I'm going to pull the
recess	20	Stoner conditions. So, I'm going to have a
	21	until 11:10. Thank you. (Gavel.) Meeting in
	22	recess.
	23	RECESS: 11:04 p.m.
	24	RECONVENE: 11:22 p.m.
Committee	25	CHAIR NISHIKI: Meeting please reconvene. The

PLU 4/12/04 166 will be in recess until 4:30 Wednesday. That is 2 MR. RAATZ: In the Council chambers? CHAIR NISHIKI: -- March --COUNCILMEMBER KANE: April 14th. CHAIR NISHIKI: -- April 14th, April 14th, Council 5 6 Chambers. MS. BANTILAN: What time? CHAIR NISHIKI: 4:30, yeah, p.m. Okay. Meeting in 8 9 recess. (Gavel.)

10

11 RECESS: 11:23 p.m.

MINUTES

	11	PLANNING AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
	12	Council of the County of Maui
	13	Council Chamber
	14	April 14, 2004
	15	The state of the s
COUNCILMEM	BER	KANE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Because
motion	17	Mr. Hokama is not here as the maker of the
amend	18	that's currently on the floor, can I move to
with	19	the main motion by substituting the main motion
your	20	the contents of your April the attachment to
Land	21	April 14th memo from you to the members of the
reflected	22	Use Committee and that the memo would be
	23	as the attachment itself, Mr. Chair? That's the
	24	amendment.
	25	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Second.

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

PLU 4/14/04

٩,

1 CHAIR NISHIKI: Moved and second that we amend the

	2	Condition 38 to include the language on the
	3	April 14th memo to this Committee.
	4	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chair.
	5	CHAIR NISHIKI: Mr. Kane.
marr	6	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chair, on your behalf, if I
may	7	read your April 14th memo?
	8	CHAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead.
Chair,	9	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you. On your behalf,
	10	your in your memo you state that "At the
	11	Committee's reconvened meeting of April 12, the
	12	applicant submitted a document entitled Proposed
to	13	Park Conditions" and that you "would be pleased
proposal a	14 1s	accept a motion to amend the applicant's
PARKS	15	reflected in the attached document, 'PROPOSED
	16	CONDITION-REVISED.' proposed deletions from the
bracketed;	17	applicant's proposed" "proposal are
	18	proposed additions are underscored."
	19	The "two major substantive differences
attachment	20	between the applicant's proposal and the
be	21	document, No. 1, the developer's costs would not
and,	22	counted toward park dedication requirements"
provide	23	"No. 2, the developer would be required to
just	24	perpetual traversable lateral shoreline access,

as applicant Earl Stoner was required to do for

his

applied as

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

5	PLU 4/	14/04
	1	Makena property in 2002, as referenced by the
	2	Corporation Counsel during the Committee's
you	3	reconvened meeting of April 12th, 2004. Thank
	4	for your consideration."
revised	5	And, Mr. Chair, would you like the
	6	one read into the record?
	7 CI	HAIR NISHIKI: Go ahead. Continue.
	8 C	DUNCILMEMBER KANE: Okay. And, Mr. Chair, the
shall	9	verbatim the amendment would read: "Developer
south	10	develop an expansion of the beach park at the
shall	11	end of Maluaka Beach, such that the beach park
	12	comprise of at least 1.5 acres of land area for
shall	13	public use and beach access. The developer
	14	submit the necessary applications required for
the		
the	15	expansion within six months of the approval of
	16	change in zoning. The land area shall be

	17		credit toward satisfying a portion of applicable
	18		park dedication requirements. To the extent
	19		practicable, the developer" and I'm sorry,
"requiremen	20 nts."		Mr. Chair. There's a period after
	21	CHAIR	NISHIKI: Go ahead.
after	22	COUNC	ILMEMBER KANE: Okay. And I didn't see that
	23		the bracket. So, it reads, "the park dedication
	24		requirements." It continues, "To the extent
	25		practicable, the developer shall provide, in
			RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

PLU 4/14/04

in	1	perpetuity, traversable lateral shoreline access
	2	the area between the shoreward boundary and the
	3	mauka boundary of the Makena Resort Area."
year	4	And then it goes on to say, "Within one
developer	5	of the approval of the change in zoning,
development	6	shall initiate and fund a plan for the
Department	7	of the State Park at Makena for the State
Maui,	8	of Land and Natural Resources or the County of
shall	9	Department of Parks and Recreation. The plan

and	10	incorporate recreational, landscaping, parking
developmen	11 nt	facility concepts as a guide for future
	12	of the park."
	13	Under discussion as well, Mr. Chair?
	14	CHAIR NISHIKI: Mr. Kane.
understand	15 ding	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chair, is it your
actually	16	that that second or that last paragraph
	17	is what the intent of No. 37 in the April 6th
	18	document is trying to portray?
put	19	And in No. 37, that's the one where you
	20	forth to the body the developer should produce a
last	21	beach master plan. Because it seems like that
	22	paragraph is really what the intent of of the
	23	body was is to actually create a plan for the
	24	development of the State Park at Makena.
	25	And that's just a question, Chair.

PLU 4/14/04

- 1 CHAIR NISHIKI: Right. The answer is yes.
- 2 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you.
- 3 CHAIR NISHIKI: Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you for the discussion. CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other discussion? Charmaine, go 5 ahead. 6 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I heard some talk the -- when did we meet -- the other night that the park acreage -- that the 1.5 represented the portion that's already developed and an 10 undeveloped portion. So, can we get some clarification 11 about what the acreage is? And I think we asked if 12 there was a map available that showed this park but I 13 had -- I guess I forget now where I heard it, 14 but I 15 had heard that the 1.5 included the existing park 16 area. 17 CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah, I think I would rather not make that 18 statement. I think when -- the last time the 19 developer was here -- I don't have the numbers that I wrote of what the existing park was, plus 20 maybe 21 Roy could clarify what is now existing and the 22 addition, if there are no objections. COUNCIL MEMBERS VOICED NO OBJECTIONS. 23 MR. FIGUEIROA: Roy Figueiroa from Makena Resort. It 24 was 25 the intent -- I believe the existing park is about a

0	PLU	4/14/04
8		
	1	.8 acres
	2	CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay.
	3	MR. FIGUEIROA: plus or minus. And so, the intent
total.	4	was and we to make it at least 1.5 in
	5	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Total.
you	6	MR. FIGUEIROA: So, perhaps that could be something
acres	7	could consider the language of, at least 1.5
it.	8	of land area in total. Maybe that might clarify
	9	CHAIR NISHIKI: Thank you, Roy. Any questions?
	10	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: No.
	11	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other discussion?
	12	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Well, Mr. Chair.
	13	CHAIR NISHIKI: Charmaine?
you	14	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: If what he I understand,
acres	15	know, the .8 is already or approximately .8
to	16	is already developed and what they're proposing
	17	develop would be then, I guess, .7
	18	CHAIR NISHIKI: Right.

is	19	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: if my addition or division
	20	correct.
	21	And that is was represented to us in
those		
to	22	series of pictures that Mr. Figueiroa presented
	23	the body. And if we want to say that it shall
	24	comprise of at least the 1.5 acres of land area,
	25	that's fine; but I believe that only .7 or

PLU 4/14/04

	1	approximately .7 acres should be allowed to be
	. 3	credited toward their park assessment, not 1.5.
	Sound 3	COUNCILMEMBER CARROLL: Right.
ad may	4	CHAIR NISHIKI: Right. And, also, I think we could
no mak	ion 5	request that a map also be attached to the
	6	to show the additional acreage. If there are no
	7	objections, we could request that also.
	8	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: So, I'm not sure how we could
put		
the	9	the wording in there to make it clear that it's
CIIC		
	10	.7 that will qualify for credit towards the park
	11	assessment.
	12	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

	13 CHAIR NISHIKI: Jo Anne.
include	14 COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: My suggestion would be to
land	at least .7 acres, or whatever it is, of the
you're	area and then add it in there so that what
	doing is you're specifying what's going to count
that	towards the portion of their satisfaction. So,
going	would be where I would add in whatever they're
	to be credited with for their park dedication.
	21 CHAIR NISHIKI: Yeah, go ahead.
	MR. FIGUEIROA: Could I make a suggestion on this,
	Mr. Chair? On that, since, I said, it's plus or
the	minus .8 acres; and instead of waiting to find
	exact amount of what that expansion is, could we

PLU 4/14/04

development	1	say you see where you deleted "and
"and	2	costs of the expansion"? Could you just delete
read,	3	development costs" so that the sentence would
as	4	"The land area of the expansion shall be applied

I	5	credit"? Would that work for you? That's what
	6	that's how I would read it if I if I got it.
	7 COUNG	CILMEMBER TAVARES: Mr. Chair, I was just fooling
sentence	8	around with that section of the of the
-	9	and putting in the land area of the additional -
expansion	10	and that's (inaudible) the additional
expansion	11	to the existing park shall be applied or
	12	of the existing park.
	13 CHAII	R NISHIKI: Dain, go ahead.
	14 COUNC	CILMEMBER KANE: No objections to that being a
	15	friendly amendment, Chair.
	16 CHAII	R NISHIKI: Okay.
much	17 COUNG	CILMEMBER TAVARES: Oh, does Dain Dain is so
the	18	faster than I am. So, it would be that the
land	19	section the sentence that starts with "The
expansion	20 of	area," "The land area of the additional
	21	the existing park shall be applied as a credit
	22	toward," et cetera.
reading	23	I'm sorry. I have a little hard time
	24	that from here. I didn't bring my binoculars
	25	tonight. I'm sorry. Is that what it has?

11

of

- 1 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Dave, is it blurry or is it us?
- 2 ?: It's blurry.
- 3 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. Let me read --
- 4 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Oh, additional.
- 5 CHAIR NISHIKI: -- exactly what the --
- 6 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: I think the word additional is
- 7 missing from there.
- 8 ?: Yeah.
- 9 ?: You don't need that.
- 10 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: No need, eh?
- 11 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: No need?
- 12 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: No need.
- 13 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Oh, okay.
- 14 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: No need.
- 15 CHAIR NISHIKI: That's not necessary, David.
- 16 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Okay. "The land area of the"
- 17 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Chair, go read, Chair.
- 18 COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Read it out for us, please.
- 19 CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay. I'll read the entire condition.
- 20 COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you.
- 21 CHAIR NISHIKI: "Developer shall develop an expansion
- the beach park at the south end of Maluaka Beach.
 - such that the beach park shall compromise of at

25 COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Comprise.

RALPH ROSENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090

12	PLU	PLU 4/14/04		
	1	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Comprise.		
land	2	CHAIR NISHIKI: "comprise of at least 1.5 acres of		
the	3	area and shall be acceptable" "accepted by		
	4	County of Maui."		
	5	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: No, no, that's bracketed, Chair.		
	6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Oh, excuse me. We're eliminating that		
	7	"land area for public use and beach access. The		
application	8 ons	developer shall submit the necessary		
the	9	required for the expansion within six months of		
of	10	approval of the change in zoning. The land area		
applied	11	the expansion of the existing park shall be		
	12	as credit toward satisfying a portion of the		
	13	applicable park dedication requirements."		
to	14	And then that's it. Then it goes on		
	15	say		
	16	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: No. So, that's it.		

	17	CHAIR NISHIKI: "To the extent practicable"
	18	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: We went through all that, Chair,
	19	already.
in	20	CHAIR NISHIKI: Okay "the developer shall provide,
in	21	perpetuity, traversable lateral shoreline access
	22	the area between the shoreward boundary and the
	23	mauka boundary of the Makena Resort Area."
	24	Any discussion?
	25	COUNCILMEMBER TAVARES: Mr. Chair?

	PLU 4/14/0	04
13		
	1 CHAIR	R NISHIKI: Charmaine.
for	2 COUNC	CILMEMBER TAVARES: Yeah, I think that clarifies
	3	everyone what shall be creditable toward park
	4	assessment. And I just want to read from you
to	5	know, we took out the part or we're proposing
	6	take out the part about development costs of the
	7	expansion would be also creditable; and we have
	8	taken that out.
under	9	And, Mr. Chair, in the Maui County Code
requirement	10 s	the park assessment park dedication

	11	out of Chapter 18.16 16.320, parks and
that,	12	playgrounds, it's Section D, E E-5 states
	13	"The subdivider shall improve the site with lot
	14	grading, grass planting, automatic irrigation,
	15	parking areas, adequate drainage and comfort
any of	16	stations, provided that the Council may waive
nearby."	17	these requirements if such approvements are
dedication	18	And so, with park ded park land
to a	19	comes already the expected development of that
in	20	certain standard. The standard is stated here
be	21	the Code. So, I don't believe that that should
	22	like a double double-dipping, so to speak.
	23	So, I think that there is a reason why we
hope	24	should be deleting this that portion; and I
	25	that the members can all be satisfied and you

PLU 4/14/04

14

1 know, basically satisfied with the way it's worded

2 now.

the	3	I thank you, Chair, too, for proposing
4		amendment.
	5	CHAIR NISHIKI: Thank you. Any other discussion?
	6	Jo Anne?
the	7	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Yes. My question was because
8 statements, I		main motion actually had some of these
38	9	believe, in it or on in basically was it
	10	that was the original main motion? Is that
	11	correct
	12	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Yes.
	13	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Mr. Chair?
	14	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yes.
main	15	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Because we now have a
language	16	motion that actually contains some of the
we	17	that we currently have in the amendment, how are
	18	going to address that or is this going to be an
the	19	amendment which actually would be substituting
	20	language in 38?
	21	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: It it replaces. It replaces.
	22	That was my motion.
	23	CHAIR NISHIKI: Replaces.
that	24	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. All right. And does
about 39	25	also then it would incorporate 37 how

PLU 4/14/04

	1	and 40? These are these to be dealt with
	2	separately, Mr. Chair?
	3	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yes.
	4	COUNCILMEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.
	5	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Mr. Chairman?
	6	CHAIR NISHIKI: Continue.
	7	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If this
	8	amendment is successful and the main motion is
	9	successful, then it would seem from your
response		
delete	10	earlier to my question that we would vote to
	11	No. 37 on the April 6th because it's already
been		
	12	incorporated into this one condition, Mr. Chair?
	13	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yes.
you've	14	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Okay. And then 39 and 40, as
	15	responded, is separate?
	16	CHAIR NISHIKI: Yes.
	17	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Thank you, Chair.
	18	CHAIR NISHIKI: Any other discussion? Seeing none,
all		
	19	those in favor say aye.
	20	COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

	22								
	23								
	24								
	25								
		RA	LPH ROS	ENBERG COURT REPORTERS, INC. (808) 524-2090					
16	PLU	4/14/04							
Kane,	1	VOTE: AYE	S:						
	2	NOE	S:	Mateo, Molina, Pontanilla, Tavares, and Chair Nishiki. None.					
	3	ABS	TAIN: ENT:	None.					
	4	EXC	.:	Councilmember Hokama.					
	5	ACTION: APPROVE AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED CONDITION NO. 38							
	6								
	7	COUNCILME	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: We're back to the main motion.						
	8	CHAIR NIS	CHAIR NISHIKI: Let the record show oh, excuse me.						
	9	Thi	This was an amendment.						
	10	COUNCILME	COUNCILMEMBER KANE: Yes.						
	11	CHAIR NIS	CHAIR NISHIKI: to the main motion as amended. Any						
	12	discussion? All those in favor say aye.							
	13	COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.							
Let	14	CHAIR NIS	CHAIR NISHIKI: All those opposed? Motion carried.						
Hokama	15	the	record	show both votes eight to zero, Mr.					
	16	exc	used.						

21 CHAIR NISHIKI: All those opposed? Motion carried.



7 – King's Road

Submitted by Rey Figueirea



9 - Park



11-Park



16-Shoreline



23 - Shoreline



28 - Shoreline



30 - Shoreline

