

**LĀNA'I PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 15, 2025**

[\(HYPERLINK TO THE TEAMS VIDEO RECORDING\)](#)

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Lanai Planning Commission (Commission) was called to order by Mr. Reynold Gima, Chair, at approximately 5:01 p.m., Wednesday, October 15, 2025, online via the Microsoft Teams videoconferencing platform, **Meeting ID: 261 558 012 799 8 and Password: sj9yG3Ee**; and at the Current Planning Conference Room, One Main Plaza, 2200 Main Street, Wailuku, Hawaii, 96793; and a courtesy testimony site at the Maui County Council, Lanai District Office, 814 Fraser Avenue (entrance on Gay Street), Lanai City, Hawaii 96763.

A quorum of the Commission was present. (See Record of Attendance)

Mr. Gima: Okay. So again, I want to welcome all of you to the October 15, 2025 meeting of the Lanai Planning Commission. Let the record show that we have quorum. Let the record show that we have quorum. We have Commissioners, our Commissioners Alboro, Atacador, Grove, Rabaca, Kaaumo, and Gima present. Everybody alone, or does any of the Commissioners have someone in the room with them? Okay, all Commissioners are alone in their room.

Just some housekeeping. For those wishing to testify, please go in the chat, provide your name and the agenda item you wish to testify on. You'll have three minutes to testify, and you'll be testifying to the Planning Commission. Until such time that you do testify, please mute your audio and video. We will be taking testimony also from the Lanai District Office, and the Planning Department's conference room office.

A. PUBLIC HEARING (Action to be taken after public hearing.)

1. A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 19.36B AND 19.500 MAUI COUNTY CODE RELATING TO OFF-STREET PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENTS FOR HOUSING

Ms. Kate L.K. Blystone, Planning Director, referring to the Maui, Moloka'i and Lāna'i Planning Commission, a proposed bill to amend Chapter 19.36B and Chapter 19.500 of the Maui County Code. The proposed bill initiated by the County Council through Resolution No. 25-152 would amend the residential parking requirements currently based upon size of structure to a requirement based upon number of bedrooms. An additional proposed

amendment would address nonconforming parking and loading related to nonconforming structures that add bedrooms. The Commission will consider these amendments and potential alternatives presented by the Department. (G. Pfost)

**The entire text of the proposed bill for ordinance is available at:
Aia ma lalo iho nei ka 'ōlelo piha o ka pila i ho'olale 'ia no ke kānāwai:
<https://www.mauicounty.gov/DocumentCenter/View/154512>**

Mr. Gima: All right, that being said, we have the first item on our agenda is a public hearing. A bill for an ordinance amending Chapter 19.3 B and 19.500, Maui County Code relating to off-street parking space requirements for housing. Ms. Kate Blystone, Planning Director, referring to the Maui, Molokai, and Lanai Commissions, a proposed bill -- excuse me -- Molokai and Lanai Planning Commission, a proposed bill to amend Chapter 19.36B and Chapter 19.500 of the Maui County Code. The proposed bill, initiated by the County Council through Resolution No. 25-152, would amend the residential parking requirements currently based upon size of structure to a requirement based on number of bedrooms. An additional proposed amendment would address non-conforming parking and loading related to non-conforming structures that add bedrooms. Commission, the Commission will consider these amendments and potential alternatives presented by the Department. So this time I'll take turn this over to you, Greg.

Mr. Gregory J. Pfost: Yes, thank you, Chair, members of the Commission. I have a usual, have a brief power point presentation here to go over if you can bear with me and let me share my screen. Hopefully y'all can see that. Yeah, the item before you is an ordinance that was initiated by County Council through Resolution 25-152, which is attached to your packet. This was heard by the Maui Planning Commission yesterday, we're before the Lanai Planning Commission today, and Molokai Planning Commission next week. After we go to all the planning commissions, then I will provide your report back to the Council with the Commissions' recommendations and or comments related to this bill.

The purpose of the bill is really to change the existing parking requirements for housing within from a structure size requirement to a number of bedroom size requirement, a number of bedrooms requirement. The Council felt that this is a more precise measure to address parking and specifically gets at larger residential structures that are being constructed that is being felt that they're not really supplying their necessary, necessary amount of onsite parking. So that's really what this bill gets at.

Start with a little bit of background. The existing code right now today for apartments, duplex dwellings, farm labor dwellings, multifamily dwellings and single-family dwellings require each of those dwellings to provide the number of parking spaces on property based upon the size of the dwelling. So for example, as shown in the table, this is what the existing code requires. As for a structure under 3,000 square feet, they have to provide two onsite parking spaces. As a structure between 3,000 to 4,000 square feet must provide three onsite parking spaces and so on. Additionally, the code requires any accessory dwelling units (ADU) on the property to provide for an additional parking space per accessory dwelling unit. And if there are any kitchenettes on the property within the main dwelling unit, also an additional parking space must be provided.

So the proposed revision is proposing to change that from a size requirement on the structure to the number of bedrooms. So you can see here this is what is being proposed that for a studio or one bedroom structure would require one parking space, a two bedroom or three bedroom structure would require two parking spaces, and for four or more bedrooms the structure would require three spaces plus one additional parking space for each additional bedroom over four. This, the code amendment also addresses the existing non-conforming parking and loading section, so it is consistent with the bedroom count by simply inserting the word or bedroom. So a non-conforming structure then would be looked at for the number of bedrooms to see whether or not they're meeting their onsite parking requirements. And if they're not, then we'd have to provide additional parking for any additional bedroom that is being added.

So when the Department received this and, and looked at it in a little bit more detail and realizing that this is really to kind of address larger structures and, and, and really the bigger picture is really addressing parking impacts to neighborhoods as a result of these some of these larger structures and, and, how, how, if they're not meeting their, their usable, how many parking spaces that they really need then those parking spaces or those vehicles end up being impacting the neighborhood through either parked on the public right of way or other areas. And so the Department felt this is really a, a, a really kind of a bigger issue and more nuance related to more policies within the County as well as some existing issues we have with our development code. So we just raised as, as within the report goes into a little bit more extensive dialogue. But let me just summarize these really quick if I can some of the factors that go into some of the parking impacts that we're experiencing in neighborhoods. And, and I might say, I don't know if this is really as much affecting Lanai as it is really more Maui Island specifically and some of our denser urban areas, such as in Kahului, Wailuku, Lahaina, Kihei and so forth.

But some of the factors are, for example, inadequate alternative means of transportation. So the way that at least, especially Maui islands been developed is the pattern of development really dictates where you have housing that is kind of far away from jobs or far away from schools or shopping, and so it necessitates the need for vehicles. And so I gave an example and some more information within the report that 64 percent of our occupied housing units actually have two or more vehicles. And if we were to have better transportation alternatives, either through better biking or, or better bus system or what have you, that would help reduce the number of vehicles and therefore reduce the number of vehicle impacts to neighborhoods.

Of course also another factor is lack of affordable housing that's throughout the County. What that leads to is we have a lot of multi-generational housing, which is sometimes called doubled up or crowded housing, which means too many people in a bedroom. And with that and you can actually see in the statistic that a little over 20 percent of households in the County are crowded and or doubled up. And so more adults within a dwelling unit equals more vehicles and subsequently more impacts to neighboring and neighbor, neighborhoods.

Limited available of on-street parking maybe due to subdivision design of roadway widths being too narrow to park on the street, or indoor driveways being too close together, and so you, not enough parking on the street. Reduce parking requirements from the past. Interestingly, the County Code up until 1982 only required one parking space for residential unit. And a little over 36 percent of our occupied housing units were built prior to 1979, meaning that many of our housing units probably only have one parking space that was provided when they were first developed. Thus leading to when you, when you add these other factors into, into the equation, leading to more vehicles that are probably impacting the neighborhood.

Insufficient driveway length, meaning that our current code for residential requires a 15-foot front yard setback so it's somewhat, but yet a parking space is 18-feet long. And so subsequently if you have a garage or carport that is 15-feet from the property line, you don't really have enough to park a vehicle on the driveway without it overhanging into the right of way. And so if that was changed, that might help.

Multifamily housing being developed with single, single-family parking standards. What we're seeing and, and I, I mentioned more of this in the report that for example, we're seeing some structures being developed within Lahaina as part of the rebuild. For example, we issued a permit for a ten-bedroom single-family residence with a two-bedroom attached ADU, and when you consider the wet bars that they were allowed to have per code and external access

requirements, it really makes this single-family dwelling actually appear more as a four-plex actually. And that entire structure only required three parking spaces per our code. If this, if this code was to be implemented and approved by the Council, they would have required to be ten parking spaces, so it changes the whole dynamic of when you're talking about large structures. That's a really good example of how large structures are not really necessarily providing for the amount of parking.

Tandem parking spaces currently in our code are not explicitly allowed for ADUs or kitchenettes, and if that were to change, perhaps then additional ADUs or kitchenettes might be developed, providing additional housing opportunities for the County.

And then another factor is lack of on-street parking regulations and enforcement. There actually in Title 10 actually identifies various roadways within the County that, that do not, do not allow for on street parking. And so a greater enforcement in those areas would probably help in, in regulating vehicle impacts to the neighborhood.

So with that and the Department does support this ordinance with some modifications as identified within the report. And these modifications are really to address some of the factors that I talked about. The Department believes this is a good interim effort to really address the, the need for the number of parking spaces that should be on a property based upon the size of the dwelling unit or the number of bedrooms, which is often relates to the number of adults driving. And so we think it's a good interim effort. But one thing that and it's noted in the report is, you know, we have these, we have a housing issue in, in the County and one some of the efforts that we're looking at right now is to potentially increase density. And as we increase density, we're gonna probably have to need to revisit parking requirements and how that allows or effects density. So while we believe this is a good interim effort to try and address some of these larger developments, especially being built right now in the Lahaina area, at some time in the future, we'll probably have to address parking again in regards to density allowances.

With that, as I mentioned, the Department's supporting the ordinance, but however, has recommended some additional modifications. The first one is to add a new definition of bedroom, because now we're going to require these two parking to be required per bedroom, and we don't have a definition of bedroom right now in our code and so what does that mean? And so you'll see in the, in the report a recommended definition of bedroom.

We're also proposing to decrease the requirement for four bedrooms. Excuse me. Currently, as, as I mentioned earlier, the, a 3,000 square foot dwelling unit only requires two spaces and

you can easily get four bedrooms into a, into a 3,000 square foot dwelling unit. So as to avoid future non-conformities we thought it would be best that four bedrooms also only require two spaces. So it would be two, three and four bedrooms would require two spaces. And then five bedrooms and anything above would be three spaces plus anything above one parking space for each bedroom above five.

We are recommending to make it explicitly clear that you can have tandem parking spaces of ADUs and kitchenettes, meaning that they can park their vehicles behind the main dwelling units, requirement vehicles, required vehicles.

Requiring additional parking space for wet bars, and this really goes to the example that I mentioned identifying the report of large developments. Single family residence is being built in Lahaina right now where they're using the wet bar as almost a quasi-kitchen or kitchenette and kind of defining a separate unit. So we felt that maybe adding additional parking space for a wet bar would be beneficial.

And then changing the definition of dwelling unit to require rooms to be internally connected. Right now, there, we do have no requirement for them to be internally connected. So in that example that I mentioned, it was a two-story house and the, the stairways are external going up to the second floor. And those stairways actually go into separate rooms that with the wet bar almost act as a separate dwelling units, but they're not classified as that. So having an internally connection between all spaces within a dwelling unit would then help to create more of a single-family residence, which is what's required.

And then finally, we are recommending to increase the front yard setback for garages and carports to 18-feet. As I mentioned, the current code requirement for front yard setback is 15 feet. By making the setback for garages and carports, carports only, it would allow for parking on a driveway, sufficiently parked on a driveway while the main dwelling unit could still be remaining at 50-foot setback.

So those are the recommended modifications the Department's putting forward with this bill. The Planning Commission today has basically four different options. One is to recommend approval the bill as proposed. Recommend approval of the bill with amendments or and or comments to the Maui County Council, which may or may not include our Department recommended modifications. Three, recommended denial of the proposed bill the Council. Or four, vote to defer the action until you gather more specific additional information. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

Mr. Gima: All right. Thank you, Greg. Before we go to questions and comments from the Commissioners, I will now open it up for public testimony. Leilani, anybody in the conference room or in the chat?

Ms. Ramoran-Quemado: Thank you, Chair. I don't see anyone in the conference room. No one signed up in the chat, but I see a person turned on his camera so I'm sure if he wants to testify. Paul Taylor.

Mr. Gima: Hi, Paul. Did you, did you want to testify on, on this item? Paul, can you hear me? Okay, while we're waiting for Paul, let me check with Roxanne. Roxanne, anybody in Gabe's office wishing to testify?

Ms. Roxanne K. Morita: Aloha everybody. No, there's no testifiers here.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Let's get back to Paul. Looks like your camera's frozen. Can you hear us? Okay if Paul comes back on while Commissioners are discussing and I'll, I'll give him an opportunity to, to testify. So I'm not closing public testimony yet until we get a yes or no from, from Paul. Then in the meantime, let's go back to Commissioners. Any questions or comments for Greg? Go ahead Lisa, and then Nikki.

Ms. Grove: Nikki can go first.

Mr. Gima: Lisa, are you yielding to Nikki?

Ms. Grove: I was just saying that maybe she could go before me. I feel like sometimes I go first a lot. I don't want to be that person tonight.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Go ahead, Nikki.

Ms. Alboro: I guess I just had a question. Like if you're you know the main, the main focus or the main goal of this is to minimize on street parking and then you're changing it to a parking stall per bedroom. Why is it less? You know, like, why is your graph showing like a three bedroom would only need two stalls, a four bedroom would only need two stalls, but anything five or more would be three plus one. Like why is it not three bedrooms need three parking, four bedrooms need for parking?

Mr. Pfofost: It's a good question. Thank you. I think it's really because the current code requires only two parking spaces for 3,000 square foot dwelling. So I think it's acknowledging that a

two-bedroom, a three bedroom and as recommended by the Department that a four bedroom could easily fit into a 3,000 square foot structure so it's trying to basically keep it equal, right? So a two-bedroom, three-bedroom, four bedroom will still continue to only require two spaces as it is today. It's when you get to these larger structures. So a five bedroom is what Department's recommending. You get to a five bedroom and then you, then you really need three spaces. You're getting to a larger structure and then you're adding more bedrooms. And a six bedroom would require six spaces. A seven bedroom require seven spaces and so forth. Well, actually a five bedroom would require three spaces. A six bedroom would require four spaces. Seven bedroom require five spaces and so on. So I think it's acknowledging and, and I think that's the acknowledgement when it was provided by the Council was that, you know, a two-bedroom and a three bedroom would, would maintain a two, two car parking space.

Mr. Paul Taylor: Now how do I turn it off?

Ms. Alboro: So the bill, still using the square footage plus bedroom? Or are you eliminating square footage and add, and going only by bedroom?

Mr. Pfost: That is correct. We're eliminating the square footage requirement and now only going by bedroom. So that way what it really does is it gets at the larger single --. What we're experiencing is the larger single-family residences is they're doing, as I mentioned the example, a ten-bedroom house, right. A ten-bedroom house and, and so right now a ten-bedroom house, if you're under 3,000 square feet, which we've issued permits for, only requires two parking spaces. And a ten-bedroom house we know, especially with the location of, of addition of wet bars that ten-bedroom house, at least we believe, is going to be probably more accommodating more adults than what a typical single-family residence would be. And so you can end up with more vehicles and those vehicles because you're only providing two parking spaces on the lot are gonna end up on the street. So you end up with neighborhoods with many vehicles parked on the street. And that's -- this is not just also for proposed new development. I mean, we're experiencing that already with the existing developments when folks add illegal or use illegal bedrooms and so forth. You end up with too many adults on the property and too many vehicles then they cannot be parked on the property and so you'll end up with neighborhoods that are severely constrained in regards to parking, illegal parking, constraints of people double parking, and things like that.

Mr. Gima: Nikki, any more questions? Okay, Lisa.

Ms. Alboro: No, thank you.

Ms. Grove: Hi. thank you. I want to start by saying I thought that your analysis of the other problems was incredibly thoughtful and thank you for taking the time to do that. So I think you answered one of my questions. I have a few. But the retro act -- it is going to apply to all neighborhoods, right? Is that accurate saying?

Mr. Pfost: Yes, yes.

Ms. Grove: You're going to have to find parking spaces where you lived on your property to deal with this situation.

Mr. Pfost: It is retroactive, but it's not applied until you do something with your property. So for example, if you're, if you had a structure and you know our, our code --. If you're had a structure that was non-compliant, so you had, you had five bedrooms that you're only providing two spaces, right? So that means you're nonconforming. So only when your structure is, for example, are nonconforming ordinance says that when your structure is damaged or destroyed by more than 50 percent, you need to bring everything into conformance. So that's when we would require per bedroom, when you rebuild your structure, that you're gonna have to require parking spaces per bedroom, so that's when it would change. Or if you, or if you add a bedroom and you're in noncompliance, any additional bedroom that you add will have to comply with the codes. So you have to add an additional parking space for that bedroom if you're noncompliant. That's when it applies.

Ms. Grove: And so if a person was to sell their house, would it look like it's, and they only have two parking spaces and four bedrooms or five bedrooms or whatever, would it look like they're quote noncompliant?

Mr. Pfost: They are nonconforming, not noncompliant. But it's called nonconforming and that's okay.

Ms. Grove: Yeah.

Mr. Pfost: You know you can continue to be nonconforming forever right? Until one of those two things happens. You know your structure is damaged or destroyed by more than 50 percent and or you're, you add an additional bedroom. That's when you then have to bring things into full compliance if your entire structure is destroyed, but or more than 50 percent. Or if you're just adding a bedroom, you have to add a parking space for that, just that one bedroom. You have to bring everything in compliance.

Ms. Grove: Okay. Thank you. That's super helpful. You mentioned that Lahaina example a couple of times. Can you tell me like how many houses like that are you guys seeing? Can just be a, is it three or four? Is it a dozen? Is it way more than that?

Mr. Pfof: I, I know of, I know of a few. I don't --

Ms. Grove: Okay.

Mr. Pfof: -- know if it's quite to a dozen. I mean, we're seeing, you know, structures being rebuilt. Obviously building a, a ten bedroom --

Ms. Grove: Yeah. And more to come.

Mr. Pfof: -- a ten-bedroom structure is fairly expensive to do. And, and not to say that, you know, Lahaina as it's in rebuilding, I mean more units, great. You know more, more housing great. But the problem is not being able to have parking spaces to support that housing creates a problem for the neighborhood. Both the safety problem and, and just a, a problem just having too many vehicles in your neighborhood.

Ms. Grove: Got it. So you, you also mentioned that you know sort of crowded up households which we all know and multi generation or you know multi family, same family and same one dwelling. Um, is the implication is that they're all adults in terms of how you guys are talking about this? And wouldn't there be a, a number of children or nondriving kupuna as part of that equation?

Mr. Pfof: Yeah.

Ms. Grove: So that not -- and for families, I just think about families that have either religious or cultural reasons that have a lot of children. Is this gonna be, have some negative effect on them? Because their kids who are not drivers are being measured as a parking space.

Mr. Pfof: I, I don't think so. I mean, I, I think because, you're right. You're right that, you know, this doesn't necessarily mean that they're all adults. But I think what, what this code amendment gets at is actually the much larger structures that are being built. I think, I think most of our, kind of our, our crowding and, and I think I put a statistic in there that our crowding and doubling up -- if I can find it here again. Bear with me for just a minute -- is 20.6 percent. But most of our households are currently two to three bedrooms. And that

there's another statistic in there. So you're finding the more the crowding and doubling up are happening in our two to three bedrooms and that's not going to change the parking require at all. It's really what this really is, I think really in my opinion, is focused in is on when you start to get into the four or five bedrooms, larger developments. And, and you're right that could accommodate multi-generational housing and it could accommodate more with kids. But I think you're getting even with multi-generational housing in a, in a five or overcrowded you're, you're starting to get in more adults probably and more vehicles than, than what would account for. But I think it really just gets up to larger development projects, not necessarily everything else would be maintained the same, I think.

Ms. Grove: Right. The other issue is sort of people who, who work virtually right, like need a home office or more than one person in the household needs a home office.

Mr. Pfost: Sure.

Ms. Grove: That's not uncommon in our world. My last question goes to your, oh, I have two more questions. One is just so we're all clear, can you define a wet bar, and can you confirm that it is defined in County, the County Codes? If we don't have bedrooms, I'm still going to get a little worried that we don't have wet bars.

Mr. Pfost: I can confirm that it is in County Code. If and you can bear with me I can actually give you the definition of it.

Ms. Grove: Great.

Mr. Pfost: It's, it's basically, it, it's, it's basically -- if you want I could read it to you -- but it's basically for the serving of hot or cold beverages only. You're not supposed to be able to cook anything in regards to a wet bar. It also identifies a specific size sink. It's a smaller sink, right? And so and it and I believe it identifies smaller refrigerator too. But that's basically it. So if you may, you may recall that we had a code amendment that added kitchenettes right. So that was an, that was a thing that we, we added so that you have the opportunity to have a kitchenette and actually be able to cook in one of these, to provide more housing opportunity. But we were also required additional parking space for that. And, and because we knew that that would be serving an adult, that would probably have a vehicle. So that's why kitchenette definitions a little bit more broader, allows you to cook. But theoretically a wet bar should only be for the, the distribution of hot and cold beverages, and that's it. But we know that folks do more than that. They illegally turn them into, you know, you throw, throw a microwave there or a hot plate and all of a sudden you have a kitchen, right? And,

and people do that, or they convert them to even more than that so. If you like, I can read the definition of, of . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Grove: No, that's okay. That was super helpful. Yeah. And then my last question just goes to your definition of bedroom. You add, the last sentence says, in addition an unfinished basement shall be counted as at least one additional bedroom? Can you explain your thinking around that? Because you're, you're saying it is unfinished. And I'm just wondering how it, what the thinking was to allow for a bedroom because it feels hard to imagine that a lot of people are using unfinished basements as bedrooms but --.

Mr. Pfost: Yeah, I, I have a feeling and I'll be honest with you, I, I stole this from another jurisdiction and, and it was a, a jurisdiction actually on the mainland that probably has more basements than what we experience here --

Ms. Grove: Yeah.

Mr. Pfost: -- and, and so I, I just don't -- I, and I haven't really thought about that. I, I think probably their rationale is that it, an unfinished basement could be converted into an additional bedroom at some time in point. And, and so subsequently they were accounting for that to be used as a bed, to be used as a bedroom, a bedroom at some time and point. So that's, that's the only thing I can --

Ms. Grove: But it's not a bedroom now. It would be like at some point --

Mr. Pfost: That, that is correct.

Ms. Grove: -- potentially in the future, someone could turn it not into a man cave, but into a bedroom.

Mr. Pfost: Yeah, right. Sure. Yeah. But you have the, you have the space --

Ms. Grove: Okay.

Mr. Pfost: -- so I think it it's acknowledging, okay, it's unfinished. Yeah, it's unfinished right now, but perhaps you just need to pull a permit to, to do some minor electrical work, and then all of a sudden you have a bedroom. So I think that's why they were doing it, but I hadn't really thought about that honestly.

Ms. Grove: Okay. That's all I had. Thank you very much. I really appreciate your thoughtful answers.

Mr. Pfost: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Thanks, Lisa. Michelle?

Ms. Fujie-Kaaumo: Hi, thank you. So my question was regarding parking space. I noticed that on, I think, item number three you mentioned allowing for tandem spaces, so that's parking behind each other. What does that parking actually look like? Like does it have to be paved? Is it like because there's all different ways that they could define it? And does it actually have to be on property? I mean, like, you know, there's, I mean, like, I'm thinking about houses here on Lanai, like, they usually have, like, a long drive or some have, like, long driveways where you could ideally fit like, I don't know, four cars down inside of your area, but that's kind of, yeah. So my -- and then does it have to, I mean, obviously in Hawaii, they don't always have to have, um, roofing structures or that kind of stuff.

But I was just really curious about the definition of parking and, and what that means because I know you said it's trying to reduce on street parking? But we know of many houses here in Lanai that parking spaces are sort of on property, but it's also, yeah, if you could just define that a little bit for me.

Mr. Pfost: Sure. So a parking space for a residential dwelling unit actually does not have to be on concrete or on surface driveway. It could be actually on dirt gravel, any pervious surface. A parking space does not have to be located in a garage or under a carport, so it can be an open carport. So when we talk about tandem, so imagine for example just a, maybe a standard dwelling unit with a driveway in front of the garage and two spaces within the garage. So tandem would mean being able to park one space behind the garage. So, so dwelling unit would meet, could meet their two parking spaces by providing them in the dwelling unit. I mean in the garage, right, two spaces. And if they were doing an accessory dwelling unit, well, how do they, how do they park that accessory dwelling unit if they can't park it in tandem? Meaning they can't park it behind one of the two? I guess you could, you could make the argument well, you could park the dwelling unit in tandem because dwelling units are allowed to be parked in tandem. But accessory dwelling units or kitchenettes in the code, it does not explicitly say that you can park behind the main dwelling units' cars. And so what we're making that, we're making the point is, if we were able to allow accessory dwelling units and kitchenettes to be parked behind the main dwelling unit because it's typically there's only two

or three people living on the property, two or two or three units, then it makes sense that they could work out that issue with themselves. It's, it's a low amount of tenants. And so that's, we're just making it, we just wanna make it clear in the code that for accessory dwelling units and kitchenettes you can park behind the main dwelling units required spaces. That's what we're trying to do.

This doesn't work for larger multi-family projects, for example, because you wouldn't want one unit's dwelling units to part behind another dwelling units, right? You can't, you can't manage that with large number of tenants, but on a small single family, I think you can manage that. So and that's only accessory dwelling units and kitchenettes are only allowed in single-family dwellings. So they're not allowed in multi-family so that's why I think it kind of addresses that point.

Ms. Fujie-Kaauamo: And then my second question was the size of the parking space. I know you mentioned the 18 feet, but that was just more the distance that it needs to be. Is there a specific size that a parking space needs to be?

Mr. Pfof: Yeah. Yes, the width is 8 1/2 feet.

Ms. Fujie-Kaauamo: Thank you.

Mr. Gima: Okay, before I ask Erin or Sandi, if they wanted to provide any input, let me go back to Paul Taylor. Paul, did, you were on camera earlier, did you want to testify?

Mr. Paul Taylor: That was a technical glitch from an old man trying to sign on.

Mr. Gima: Okay. All right. Thank you. Okay, that being said, I will close public testimony. And then Erin or Sandi, any comments or questions for Greg?

Ms. Rabaca: No from Sandi.

Mr. Gima: Say again?

Ms. Rabaca: No, I don't have any questions. It's Sandi.

Mr. Gima: Okay, thanks. Erin?

Ms. Atacador: Same. I don't have any other questions or comments that weren't already discussed by the other Commissioners.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Greg, I got several like I do on, on every bill that comes before us. What was the presenting problem?

Mr. Pfost: I, I believe that presenting problem, it, it actually, it's interestingly enough when we were having the discussion at Council level with Bills 103 and 104, and 103 was the one that would, you, you guys had seen it, is about increasing density in residential neighborhoods and Bill 104 was about adding kitchenettes. So as that made it through all the planning commissions and it was being discussed at Council, it was actually the Office of Recovery actually at one of the hearings, made a presentation about initiating this discussion of changing code to number of parking, parking spaces per bedroom instead of square foot. And that was presented to the Council at one of those meetings where we were discussing density and I think some Council Members liked that idea because I think Office of Recovery as well as Council has been hearing about large development, large single-family residences that have been being built in Lahaina, that basically are not meeting their parking need. So we have these ten bedrooms structures that are being built that aren't really providing enough parking spaces and therefore impacting the neighborhood. And I think that was really the genesis of this and, and trying to address that need of, of large single-family residences.

Mr. Gima: And would the Office of Recovery's presentation be helpful for us tonight? I was curious; you make reference to the presentation, but we never saw it.

Mr. Pfost: I don't think so. It's basically the code that you see. Basically the code amendment that you that is being proposed by the Council, Council Member, is, is pretty much what they presented at their presentation. It was very brief. They did provide a letter that is attached to your packet that is recommending support of this bill, and basically, for the reasons that I've identified. And so I don't think it's necessary for them to be here. I don't think he would offer anything more than what, what I've already explained within the report itself. And the discussion at the Council level was fairly brief. They just kind of presented it to council as an idea and probably less than a minute's discussion. And then, and that was it, so I think the letter that you have attached to your packet probably provides enough information from Office of Recovery.

Mr. Gima: Okay, number three, is this proposed bill Lahaina specific?

Mr. Pfof: No, it's not. It's County wide. It applies to all three islands, but I have to admit it, it's probably more specific to Maui Island than Lanai and Molokai just given the size of these structures and, and within the, the dense populated areas that they're being proposed. I, I, I don't know how many of these kind of structures, these large type ten-bedroom structures you have in Lanai. I, I, I don't have that, but I don't see that as affecting Lanai and Molokai as much as Maui.

Mr. Gima: So if this is not Lahaina specific and this is a County wide, why is this coming to us now as opposed to two years ago, five years ago, ten years ago?

Mr. Pfof: I, I don't know. I this is I think what -- it's, it's not Lahaina, Lahaina specific, but probably as a result of Lahaina rebuild has generated the issue at hand, right? Because we're seeing rebuild of you know we have basically vacant lots and you're seeing folks rebuilding, not all that there are some instances where folks are building significantly large single-family dwellings that do not really meet their parking requirements. So, I think this is when it's come to light. I do know of other instances within, within the County of there being single-family structures that have been converted by adding new bedrooms or converting bedrooms and, and there is subsequently parking issues in dense areas within, within our County, especially those cities that I, those, those areas or those towns that I mentioned. So I can't tell you why it wasn't done earlier, but it's probably because of the Lahaina rebuild has more come to light now as, as to the issue, and we've heard complaints as well.

Mr. Gima: Okay, number four or five. I'm still having a hard time understanding the change from square, square feet to bedrooms. So, so is, is the Office of Recovery or the Planning Department, their, their assumption is the number of bedrooms correlates better to, to the number of vehicles rather than square footage? Is, is that the assumption?

Mr. Pfof: Yes.

Mr. Gima: And so, and so what, what contribute to the change in the assumption?

Mr. Pfof: Well, I think I answered that one. It's a good question. I think what, I think the change in the assumption is that I think by, by the, the building permits that we recently issued, and seeing these structures actually be ten bedrooms as opposed to a three-bedroom structure would just perhaps a, a very giant large living room or a larger, a larger community spaces, we're actually seeing smaller living rooms or smaller kitchens and, and, but with large number of bedrooms. So I think it was the, the changes as seen that are anticipating that a

structure with ten bedrooms, under 3,000 square feet is most likely, I assume the assumption is that that's being constructed to house many adults. When you look at also the bedrooms and in proximity to wet bars that seemed to be segregated from the rest of the house, to act as separate units. So I think it's trying to get at that that issue and these larger, these larger projects with multiple bedrooms.

Mr. Gima: So does this bill give preference or permission for more monster homes?

Mr. Pfost: No, I think, I think it actually is quite the opposite. I think if you do larger homes such as the one that we're talking about with ten bedrooms, you're gonna have to, for example, in this example with the ten-bedroom house, you would actually require, I think, it was ten, ten parking spaces. That's actually going to limit, if you wanted to do a ten-bedroom, you're gonna have to find ten parking spaces on your property so you're actually gonna be have to reduce the size of your structure in order to do that and or you know you have to compensate in that way. So I don't think it necessarily contributes to more monster homes. The, the development standards, for example of these structures, they're still meeting all the required development standards -- setbacks, building heights -- so they're building within their developable area. It's just that they're cramming more bedrooms in than what you would normally think as a single-family dwelling on that property. A relatively small lot of 7,000 square feet accommodating basically 12 bedrooms is something unique that you don't typically see. Usually your 7,000 square foot lots have two, three, four bedrooms; typical single-family residence that you can imagine. But we're seeing a 12-bedroom house on a 7,000 square foot lot with three parking spaces, all per Code, all allowed in the Code that we currently have. And so unless you alter the Code to address, perhaps at least the bedroom count because you assume that there's more adults that are gonna reside in this with ten-bedrooms to provide more parking spaces on site to account for that to reduce the impact of the neighborhood.

Mr. Gima: So this bill will affect basically housing units that are built once this bill is approved.

Mr. Pfost: Yes. And then also any of those housing units that are non-conforming after the bill is approved, as I mentioned earlier. So, if you had a five- or six-bedroom house and you only require, only had two parking spaces when it was developed, if that five-or six-bedroom house gets damaged or destroyed by more than 50 percent, then the rebuild of that structure would have to build the number of parking spaces according to the new Code. So that's when it would become effect for existing structures.

Also, any existing structure that's currently nonconforming, so for example, a five- or six-

bedroom house that only has two parking spaces when it was developed. If they add another bedroom, they're going to have to provide one additional parking space for that additional bedroom. Which may not be difficult because typically you already have two parking spaces in your garage. The driveway parking space may count as your additional parking space, so it may not be difficult for non-conforming structures to come into compliance.

Mr. Gima: So what was the thinking in terms of enforcement of this proposal given that it's a complaint driven process?

Mr. Pfost: Well, I think it's a, it, I think the complaint generated process was, I mean, it's interesting. It's, it's a, it's a, a complaint that was generated, I think, saying that, hey, we should really look at this because we're getting these giant structures and we're gonna have these parking impacts, which may be unsafe with this, in our rebuild. So I think that's it's kind of a different than a complaint that you might have on a code enforcement complaint. It might be a little bit different, but it's actually kind of a complaint that's looking how, how this rebuild is occurring. So I, I think it's it, I think, I think in my, my personal opinion is that it's a valid, it's a valid issue, it's a valid complaint. On, on and, and having us relook at this in a little bit more detail than what current code is because current code is basically if, if a lot of these were constructed on one block, you're gonna have a parking related issue. And I think by dealing with the bedroom count, you're gonna be able to then provide parking spaces on your property. It will help alleviate that, that parking impact to a neighborhood.

Mr. Gima: Okay. And then my last question is, is there anything that came about in the Maui Planning Commission's deliberation that may be of help for us?

Mr. Pfost: Sure. Yeah, I can summarize that. The Maui Planning Commission supported all of the recommendations except for the fifth recommendation by the Department, which in the fifth recommendation was to change the definition of dwelling unit to require internal access only. And the Commission raised the issue of, hey, look, what if I, what if I wanted an office which now under the new definition of bedroom would be a bedroom? What if I wanted an office on the side of my house? It is externally, because I do some work out of home or what have you. And, and, I want that to be separate from my house or I want that to be, you know, maybe separated by a, a, a breezeway or something. So they felt that that was a, that was maybe a need. Although you can count it as a bedroom and require the parking space. They didn't -- they wanted the ability for property owners to be able to not have internally accessed all the time. And that's currently code doesn't require that. So the Maui Planning Commission was not recommending number five. Beyond that, the Maui Planning Commission provided a number of comments that they would like to be sent off to the Council.

Comments such as they recommended the Council review roadway width, roadways that do not have sufficient width, and whether, and, and whether there should be parking on roadways or not. Based upon that an enforcement mechanism should be done in order to ensure safety because they did hear a testifier that was from Lahaina and was concerned about safety as a result of what happened in the wildfire and experiencing some of those things that happened there as a result of too many cars on a block.

The Maui Planning Commission also recommended to the Council as a comment to address the transportation needs and, and, and improvements necessary to have more multimodal transportation within the County. More bus surface, more bicycle paths and things like that. All of that is if you actually look at one of the, one of the items attached to your package is general plan policies related to some of these issues. And there's a lot of policies to talk about improving our transportation system. So The Maui Planning Commission's recommending that as a comment to the Council.

And then a couple other things. They're not as much related. They're recommending looking at increasing permeable, the permeable surface requirement. We talked a little bit about that during the meeting about what impervious, impervious and where you could park your vehicle. Some Commissioners feeling that more pervious --. Right now we have a requirement that 65 percent of your lot, no more than 65 percent of your lot can be impervious. And so they wanted, suggesting the Council look at that issue. So those kind of things. So just some comments like that. But as far as the recommendation from the Department, they're recommending approval of the, of the bill, but with the Department's recommendations, except for number five.

Mr. Gima: Okay, thanks Greg. One, one last comment. So Maui Planning Commission and Department of Fire and Public Safety had no specific concerns or comments about this adding to the increased density, and, and in terms of, you know fire lane access when they have to -
-

Mr. Pfost: The bill doesn't actually increase density at all. The, the, the bill just is requiring more parking spaces. So the Fire Department, as shown in the last page of the report was, is basically supportive of the bill. I think, I think that it makes sense for the Fire Department because it ends up getting more vehicles off the street and in, into a property, so it doesn't clog up the street so they can get their vehicles through, right?

They were concerned, the Fire Department wanted to make sure that parking spaces are in

designated spaces and do not obstruct required apparatus access. So they have the opportunity to -- but they will be reviewing that during building permit process. So when an application comes in for say a ten-bedroom house and they have to provide ten parking spaces, the Fire Department's gonna review that permit and see where those ten parking spaces are being allotted to and then they can make comment at that time. So the Fire Department's just acknowledging that they have the opportunity to review, continue to review through the building permit process and, and make adjustments at that time so.

Mr. Gima: All right. Thanks, Greg. Appreciate it. Commissioners, any comments or questions about this bill as it relates specifically to Lanai? Okay, any, any thoughts about the Maui Planning Commission's approval of the bill with amendments, except for number five? Or are you guys feeling --? I mean how are you guys feeling about the bill by itself or the bill with the Planning Department's amendments? Any preference?

Ms. Grove: I would go with amendments, and I'm fine with the Maui County's exclusion of the number five. But I think they're useful. I don't have a real issue with number five, although I do see the point.

Mr. Gima: Anyone have any objections to taking out number five? Okay, if not, I will, I will entertain a motion to recommend approval of the proposed bill with amendments by the Planning Department, with the exception of number five, to the Maui County Council. Yeah, I'll leave it at that.

Ms. Grove: So moved.

Ms. Atacador: Second.

Mr. Gima: Who seconded?

Ms. Atacador: Atacador.

Mr. Gima: Oh, okay. Alright, it's been moved by Commissioner Grove, seconded by Commissioner Atacador that we recommend approval of the proposed bill with the Planning Departments except for number five. All right, any further discussion on the motion? Okay, hearing none, all in favor, please raise your hands. All right, motion passes unanimously. Thank you.

It was moved by Ms. Lisa Grove seconded by Ms. Erin Atacador, then unanimously

(The vote for Agenda Item A.1. was made at 00:53:24 of the Recording.)

VOTED: To recommend approval of the proposed bill to the Maui County Council with the Planning Department's amendments except for number five.

(Assenting: N. Alboro, E. Atacador, M. Fujie-Kaauamo, E. Grove, S. Rabaca)
(Excused: Negus Manna)

(Motion carries.)

B. COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. Temporary Investigative Group (TIG) Members Reynold Gima, Nikki Alboro and Lisa Grove presenting their report and findings on redefining "all proposed action" on Section 12-402-14 Special Management Area Minor Permit Procedures.**

The Commission will hear the TIG members' report/presentation and receive public testimony. Commission members may ask clarifying questions, however, discussion and action will occur at a subsequent regularly scheduled public meeting.

Mr. Gima: All right. Moving on, under Communications, the temporary investigative group, TIG members Nikki Alboro, Lisa Grove and myself presenting the report and findings on redefining all proposed action on Section 12-402-14 -- excuse me -- Special Management Area Minor Permit procedures. The Commission will hear the TIG member's report. presentation and receive public testimony. Commission Members may ask clarifying questions, however, discussion and action will occur at a subsequent regularly scheduled public meeting. I will turn this over to the lead TIG member, Lisa.

Ms. Grove: Thank you. I can give you a progress report. We have and happy to report that us TIGsters have been meeting by Zoom and communicating by e-mail and text quite a bit. We created a document that explains the situation for public conversations. We were waiting to hear from some feedback from the County, which happened at 4:30 this afternoon and so we haven't, weren't able to incorporate it into this conversation or the document. We have met with a local, members of our team met with a local land use and legal expert to brainstorm solutions. And as I just referenced, we did send the County some wording options to see if they pass muster. We understand that we're, we're investigating and coming up with, you

know, potential ideas. But we also felt strongly that they passed muster, that we're not having conversations with the public about things that aren't possible. We also asked for a Planning Department ruling on some language that may already create some exceptions and just wanted to see if in fact the read of that is remotely accurate. We and as I mentioned, we just got that this afternoon, so we'll incorporate that into what we're up to.

Then the next step is to have a commute, with this sort of explanation and the document that I was referencing up top is about like sort of how we got to here, and what this, what the current situation looks like and how it impacts the community. And then open up the conversation for input and ideas and hopefully reactions to at least an option or two. And that's happening next. I want to thank the folks in the community who have reached out to me and others on our committee asking for input. You will have your opportunity. We're still working through that, but we're being very mindful about the impacts on the groups in the community that, and the, the users of the community that need some certainty, and including those that have programs in place within the SMA.

Once the --. And then we're also asked to be on the agenda for the November 20th Hulopoe Beach Council meeting to discuss proposed changes and gather input from that body. So that's where things stand. Any questions?

Mr. Gima: Thanks Lisa. Nikki, you got anything to add?

Ms. Alboro: No, just getting the information back from the e-mail. I guess we just gotta digest and kinda go from there.

Mr. Gima: Lisa, you want to summarize maybe what we sent over to, to the County without going into, you know, just detail?

Ms. Grove: Yeah, we were looking at the idea of some sort of exceptions for community use and with some definition around that proposed solutions, or I'm sorry, all proposed actions. And then there was some definition of the term development in a different part of the Code that seemed to create some exceptions, including specifically fishpond restoration and some other things that cultural practices that may already be in place, and we're just trying to understand that.

I also, we thought it'd be useful for the community to understand how much the fees are. We talk about this process being kind of onerous for community members and, and local grassroots organizations, and also just wanted to understand what the impact was on their

bottom line. So also Danny responded a few minutes before this to tell us how much those were going to cost.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Thanks Lisa. Before I open it up to Commissioner's comments and questions, I will now open it up for public testimony. Leilani, anybody in the conference room or in the chat?

Ms. Ramoran-Quemado: Thank you, Chair. There's no one in the conference room and no one signed up on the chat. Thank you.

Mr. Gima: All right. Thank, thank you. How's about you, Roxanne, anybody in Gabe's office?

Ms. Morita: No Chair, there's no one here to testify.

Mr. Gima: Okay, so at this time, I will close public testimony. So, Erin or Sandi, do you guys have any question for any of us regarding what we've been discussing? Michelle?

Ms. Atacador: No questions at this time. I just wanted to thank you all and really acknowledge the additional work that you guys are doing. We really appreciate it, so thank you.

Mr. Gima: Alright, let's see. Adrian, Adrian, could you summarize for us what our next steps are or could be regarding the, the TIG?

Mr. Adrian Pierce Reifsnnyder: Yeah. So, if you feel the investigation thus far is sufficient, you could terminate the TIG and then next meeting could open it up to deliberation, discussion, and voting and action. If you feel like you want to conduct more investigation and research, you could just continue the TIG, in which case next meeting they could present their findings and provide an update again, but no discussion, no deliberation, no action. You could, I guess you could also if you wanted to redefine the scope, you could do that if you wanted to focus on a different area, um, moving forward. That's another option. Yeah, I'd say those are, those are kind of the main options.

Mr. Gima: So before this goes to a public hearing for a proposed change in the Planning Commission's SMA Rules, we have to take it back to the full Planning Commission first for deliberation and then set, set it on the next month's agenda? Is that accurate?

Mr. Reifsnnyder: Sorry, by Planning Commission which, which Planning Commission do you mean? The Lanai Planning Commission?

Mr. Gima: Our --

Mr. Reifsnyder: Yeah.

Mr. Gima: Yeah.

Mr. Reifsnyder: Yeah. So it would just be -- you would essentially just close the TIG today and then next meeting would be on the agenda for deliberation and action, discussion and action.

Mr. Gima: Okay so since we have not been able to review the Planning Department's response to our, our questions, um, I, I, I would think then next month's meeting, we will report back to the Lanai Planning Commission members the outcome of our discussions or review of the Planning Department's review. Does that make sense, Lisa and Nikki?

Ms. Grove: The one problem with that is that, the, the Beach Park Council is the day after our scheduled meeting so that we would not have the feedback from the Commissioners before we're reporting in this body, because I think it's on the, or it's on the 20th of November. We got a confirmation from John Sprague on that, and that happens after our meeting.

Mr. Gima: Umm. Hold on a second here. Okay, but in, but in terms, in terms of for, for the TIG, I mean we can't, we can't propose, we can't make a proposal to the Planning Commission until we, we review the Planning Department's response. Right?

Ms. Grove: Yes.

Mr. Gima: Okay. So I would think that the earliest we could go to public hearing on a Lanai Planning Commission, SMA Rule change would be December.

Ms. Grove: Yes.

Mr. Gima: Does that make sense, Adrian?

Mr. Reifsnyder: Yeah, yeah, so, I mean, it sounds like you folks want to keep the TIG open so that you can take in more testimony from the Beach Park folks and then bring it to -- and then close the TIG after next meeting or during at the end of next meeting and then reopen it up for discussion and public testimony the December meeting, yeah.

Ms. Grove: Okay, just so I'm clear. If we close the TIG before the 20th of November, which is when we're on the agenda at the Beach Park Council, wouldn't we be -- like what would be the point if in fact, we're gonna be talking to those Commissioners about and seeking their input and recommendations? Which makes me think it's January, not December.

Mr. Reifsnyder: Well, okay, so the TIG, the TIG is minimum three meetings. So we, we set up the TIG last month. Now we're in the discussion or presentation. So if you wanted to, you could close it now and then deliberate in, in November. Or you could keep it open and deliberate in December or farther than that. But it's really I guess today it's just a matter of do you need, do you wanna collect more, more information as a TIG? Do you want that flexibility as a TIG to collect more information? And if that's the case, then I would, I would recommend keeping it open.

Ms. Grove: Yeah. We do.

Mr. Gima: Okay. So we're keeping it open. I, I, I misunderstood, Lisa. I thought, I thought the TIG was gonna be at tomorrow's Hulopoe Beach Park Council meeting. But you said we're on, we're on the agenda for November's meeting.

Ms. Grove: Correct.

Mr. Gima: Okay. Okay, so we're all in agreement that we're gonna keep it open, especially since this will allow Hulopoe Beach Park Council to weigh in at their November meeting. Is it accurate, Nikki and Lisa? Okay. All right, last call on the TIG agenda item. Sandi, Michelle, Erin? All right, moving on. I will turn the Director's report over to Danny.

C. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Completed Lāna'i Applications Report (Permits issued from the period of 09/05/25 to 10/07/25.)

Mr. Dias: Thank you, Chair. Good evening Lanai Planning Commission members. For the Director's Report, you folks got a list of the completed Lanai applications report. I know there's a list of projects, but essentially it's three projects. The, the SMX permit numbers, essentially, when people apply for permits, they get assigned an SMX number, and then when we actually approve it, then they're issued, you know, an SM permit with the actual number behind it. So anyway, not to be too confusing, but essentially it's three projects.

So I'll start off with the 16th annual paddle for life event that occurred at the Hulopoe Beach at -- and it's already occurred so that's on October 4th so you folks probably know more about this than I do. So that's the first project that we issued a minor permit for. The second project is the Nanahoa trail restoration and signage project. I know I mentioned this at your last meeting. I'm going to attempt to share my screen, so hold on here. Here we go. Is that working or no?

Mr. Gima: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Dias: It is. Okay, cool. So this is a, a site plan of the project. You folks can see the trail and of course there's a few signs that were put up. You know, the, the yellow thumbtack are the danger signs and then the kind of blueish ones are wayfinding signs and those signs --. Here's an example of the wayfinding signs and then the danger signs. So let me kind of expand that a little. So some simple signage and then of course the areas that they're gonna be placed on so. And that's about it for this project. If you folks have any questions, I can attempt to answer them. Oh, and there's also an EAE, Environmental Assessment Exemption attached to this project. And the reason for that is because this project is in the State Conservation District, which requires an environmental assessment.

With that being said, the final project that we have is the Manele Desilting Basin Restoration Project. Let me see here. The summary of the project is basically the removal of 8,000 cubic yards of built-up sediment from the existing silt basin. And you know, yet you folks know that this is located behind Manele Harbor. Let me pull up. It is a little confusing. It's a site plan. I mean it, it, it kind of you know shows the desalting basin. But I think what's more relevant is you know the photograph of, of that basin. And just some maps showing you know where the flood zone is not too relevant. But essentially, yeah, the project involves removal of sediment in this basin, so. Any questions on that? If not, I'll stop sharing my screen.

Ms. Alboro: Do you know when that starts, that project?

Mr. Dias: That's a good question. I, I, I don't know, honestly.

Ms. Alboro: Okay.

Mr. Gima: And does the, does that project application state where they gonna, um, take all the silt?

Mr. Dias: Give me a second here.

Mr. Gima: The 8,000 cubic yards is a lot.

Mr. Dias: It, it, it states here -- I'm just gonna read off what was in the application. So the removal of 8,000 cubic yards of built-up sediment from the existing silt basin and the sediment removal will require dredging to a depth of 10 to 125 feet using equipment such as excavators. The sediment will be collected in roll off containers, which will be loaded into truck and transported to the existing quarry, to an existing quarry. And that's, that's what's in the . . . (inaudible) . . .

Ms. Alboro: What about like traffic control etcetera for like the trucks and Expedition users and etcetera, is that an issue or --? And then they're gonna take over the construction parking area on the gravel so I'm just wondering like what impacts or how are we gonna get all those vehicles moved? Some are broken down, some can't move.

Mr. Dias: Yeah. Unfortunately, Keiki-Pua is not available tonight. She said she would be available next month. So sorry, I, I don't, you know, like the logistics and those details, I don't know. Oh, I see Mr. Kurt Matsumoto has his hand up.

Mr. Gima: Great, Kurt.

Mr. Kurt Matsumoto: Yeah, so some of the questions that you asked like where the soils are gonna go. Some of the soils gonna be used on some of the projects that we have going on right now. And then we're also gonna move some the remaining soil to the take area where the County uses to use for the landfill.

As far as the traffic concerns at the harbor, yeah, we'd be working with the Harbor Master to create a plan so that we don't disrupt the flow of activities there. So for example, not start too early in the morning to disrupt the early morning ferry. And then we would have traffic personnel at the intersections to help navigate traffic.

And then as far as clearing out the area, that'll be our responsibility to make sure that the vehicles in that area are going to be moved.

Mr. Gima: Okay, thanks Kurt. Nikki, any, any further questions for Kurt? Or, or suggestions? All right. So Danny, like we had asked last month the Minor Permit approval currently by the

Planning Director, this is our official notification as opposed to a letter to the Planning Commission?

Mr. Dias: That is correct, although we can provide you folks with the approval letters.

Mr. Gima: Yeah, because I think someone, one of the Commissioners mentioned that you don't have enough room to, to fully explain the description.

Mr. Dias: Okay, I, I will send the approval letters to Leilani and then she can forward it to you folks.

2. Status of LPC vacancies and potential nominees

Mr. Dias: Thank you. Next item is the status of LPC vacancies and potential nominees. I was out of the office. I did see some emails from you, Butch, but I don't think you got a response, right? Okay, so we didn't get any updates either.

Mr. Gima: Yeah., right. I, I – we had our pre-LPC meeting a couple of weeks ago and we learned that Independent Nominations Board (INB) is prioritizing filling other County boards and commissions. In addition to that, it seems that the two nominees for the Lanai Planning Commission are being asked to consider filling other boards and commission vacancies which pissed me off to no end. So I wrote, I wrote a letter to Jody Yoshida, and I forget who their, who their staff attorney is. I invited them to tonight's meeting. Um, I felt it was, you know, if in fact that's accurate that they're using, asking our two nominees to fill other positions, I felt that was one, very disrespectful, and two, it was disrespectful because they did not let us know. And three, if in fact this is accurate, we needed to know so that we can look for more potential nominees. But like you're, you're correct, Danny, they have yet to respond. And then I asked Jody and their Counsel to share the communication with their Chair. I told, and I told Jody and the attorney that, you know, I'm, I'm concerned his has been dragging on, and I haven't talked to David Leon or Lisa Galloway, but I, I worry that, you know, they just may give up and withdraw their nomination because INB is dragging their feet on this issue.

Okay, I'm through with my sermon, Danny, you can move on.

3. Agenda items for the November 19, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Dias: All right. Thank you. And then last item is agenda items for your next meeting, which will occur on November 19th. So in the previous discussion, my understanding is we will not

bring the TIG discussion back up in November. We'll do that in December. And it, it's gonna basically be another Greg meeting. There's two ordinances that he's bringing before you.

One is to clarify the duration and or extension requirements for certain permits. Basically the County Code has like a limit on how much time you have to apply for a time extension. Usually it's 90 days, but it doesn't have a limit on like how early you can apply. So some people have tried to apply like years in advance so this is to clarify and give a window when you can apply for a time extensions.

And then the second ordinance is to revise the newspaper publishing requirements that we currently have in our Code. Basically, the Code requires that notice be in a newspaper that is printed at least twice a week. And the problem right now is that, for example, *The Maui News* only gets printed once so technically that requirement cannot be met and so to meet this requirement we actually post meetings in *The Honolulu Advertiser* because that's what the Code requires. But it obviously doesn't really make much sense, right? So this is to kind of, you know, clean up that language so that we can post in newspapers in Maui County. And, and I believe that's it for now. Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Gima: Um, Danny, I think we may want to keep the TIG on the agenda because once Nikki, Lisa and I review what the Planning Department sent us, we may want to -- we're probably going to meet again and then we can share that with the rest of the Planning Commission in November's meeting.

Mr. Dias: Okay, okay, gotcha. Gotcha. Okay, we'll, we'll put that on the agenda also. Thanks.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: November 19, 2025

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gima: Okay. All right, Commissioners, anything you guys want to place on the November agenda? Okay, hearing, seeing none, I think, we're set. All right. Thank you everyone. If there are no objection, meeting is adjourned. See you guys next month.

There being no further discussion brought forward to the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,

LEILANI A. RAMORAN-QUEMADO
Secretary to Boards and Commissions II

RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Nicole Alboro, Vice-Chair
Erin Atacador
Michelle Fujie-Kaauamo
Reynold Gima, Chair
Elisabeth Grove
Sandi Rabaca

EXCUSED:

Negus Manna

OTHERS:

Danny Dias, Planning Program Administrator
Greg Pfof, Administrative Planning Officer
Adrian Pierce Reifsnyder, Deputy Corporation Counsel
Roxanne Morita, Executive Assistant, Maui County Council, Lanai District Office
Leilani Ramoran-Quemado, Secretary to Boards and Commissions II