

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
STATE OF HAWAII

MEETING NO. 341
Wednesday, May 6, 2009

Members Present: C. Scott Bradley
Amanda Chang
Grady Chun (9:12 a.m.)
Joseph Dwight, IV
Michael Formby (9:10 a.m.)
Paul Kimura
Jonathan Lai
Theodore Liu
Kay Mukaigawa
Dexter Okada
Russ Saito (9:20 a.m.)

Kalaeloa Members: Stanton Enomoto
Evelyn Souza
David Tanoue
Maeda Timson

Members Absent: Micah Kane
Christopher Kobayashi
Robert Piper

Others Present: Anthony Ching, Executive Director
Diane Taira, Supervising Attorney General
Eugene Won, Deputy Attorney General
Kathy Sokugawa, Division Chief for Planning Division, City &
County of Honolulu Department of Planning & Permitting
Chong Gu, Administrative Services Officer
Tessa Malama, Director of Planning and Development for
Kalaeloa
Craig Nakamoto, Director of Communications
Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Development for
Kakaako
Richard Kuitunen, Asset Manager
Patricia Yoshino, Secretary
Loretta Ho, Secretary
Holly Hackett, Court Reporter

I. ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Members of the Hawaii Community Development Authority (“Authority”), a body corporate and public instrumentality of the State of Hawaii, was called to order by Mr. Jonathan Lai, Chairperson of the Authority, at 9:04 a.m. on Wednesday, May 6, 2009, at the Authority’s principal executive offices at 677 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 1001, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, pursuant to article IV, section 1 of the Authority’s Bylaws.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Agenda for May 6, 2009 Meeting;
2. Summary Minutes of Authority Meeting of April 1, 2009;
3. Report of the Executive Director;
4. Report of the Executive Director PowerPoint Presentation (distributed at the meeting);
5. Kalaeloa Status Report;
6. Ford Island Ventures Report;
7. Hawaii Public Housing Authority report (distributed at the meeting);
8. Information: Heeia Meadow Lands PowerPoint Presentation (distributed at the meeting);
9. Executive Session: Performance Evaluation (confidential material distributed at the meeting);
10. Executive Session: Consultation with the Board’s attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board’s powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities (confidential material distributed at the meeting);
11. Action: Shall the Authority Accept a Deed, in the Form Presented to the Authority, to Building 36, TMK: 9-1-013-055, Kalaeloa, Oahu from the United States (Department of the Navy);
12. Action: Instruct the Executive Director to Consent to the Extension of the Sublease Between Ocean Investment LLC and Basin Projects for the John Dominis Restaurant Site;
13. Action: Authorize the Executive Director to Expend Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds for Improvements and Repairs at the Kakaako Waterfront, Gateway, and Kewalo Basin Parks;
14. Action: Defer Its Buy-Back Provision and Shared Appreciation Rights for Apartment Unit #603 at Keola Lai Condominium Project Based upon Hardship Circumstances that Will Not Result in Speculation;
15. Action: Approve the Kewalo Basin Budget and Authorize the Executive Director to Direct ALMAR Management, Inc. to Enter into Vendor Contracts for Services at Prices Not to Exceed the Budgeted Amounts, Including Cumulative Contingency Amounts;
16. Action: Authorize the Executive Director or His Designee to Retain a Hearing Officer for the Kamehameha Schools’ Kaiāulu ‘O Kaka‘ako Master Plan Application Contested Case Hearing.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 1, 2009

Chairperson Lai asked whether there were any corrections to the minutes of April 1, 2009. There being none, the minutes were approved as presented.

Chairperson Lai proposed to move the Executive Director's Report to follow the Executive Session.

IV. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

A. Kalaeloa Status Report

Ms. Tesha Malama, Director of Planning and Development for Kalaeloa, stated that her written report was in the packet distributed to Members and asked whether Members had any questions.

Member Timson inquired about the status of the Kalaeloa shuttle service.

Ms. Malama replied that that Mr. Adam Burson would address the shuttle service in his report.

Member Okada inquired about a tour of the Kalaeloa District.

Ms. Malama responded that a tour would be scheduled during the summer.

B. Navy Report

Chairperson Lai stated that there was no report from the Navy.

C. Hawaii Public Housing Authority Report ("HPHA")

Mr. Adam Burson, HPHA Homeless Programs Specialist, summarized the written report in the packet distributed to Members.

Mr. Burson stated that the Kalaeloa shuttle service had been stopped due to lack of funding. He inquired whether the funding that had been approved at the Authority meeting in April was still available.

Executive Director Anthony Ching stated that the funding was still available. Staff was working to complete the procurement in 2 weeks and make an award.

Mr. Craig Nakamoto, Director of Communications, stated that risk management at the Department of Accounting and General Services would be

providing insurance and permitting requirements in order to place the bid on the Hawaii Electronic Procurement System (“HePS”) and have the service properly procured.

Member Souza asked whether the Authority was still obligated to provide the \$20,000 funding in the event H-5 was dissolved.

Mr. Ching stated the Authority’s action resolution provided \$20,000 for partial funding of the shuttle service and was made flexible so it could be used to cover personnel, fuel or other costs.

Member Souza asked how much H-5 needed to be self sufficient and to operate the shuttle.

Mr. Burson replied that H-5 needed \$175,000 immediately to remain open, and \$17,000 per month was needed for the shuttle. There had been unexpected items added to its operating expenses, such as the request from the Governor to increase the number of shelter residents by 100 people, and the need to hire security guards when the State guards were reassigned to Iolani Palace. He stated that Ms. Jessica Nichols of H-5 was working on grants but in the meantime, there were no funds to continue the shuttle.

Member Timson stated her concern that when the homeless were brought into the community, the State was expected to provide appropriate support for the program. She stated her belief that the State should try to find emergency funding to take care of the homeless.

Mr. Burson stated there was a meeting last week for a fund raiser for the shuttle. Workers at the shelter are trained to handle violence, but fights break out and posed a danger to staff.

Mr. Ching stated that Mr. Utu Langi of H-5 had indicated that they were actively seeking the donation of a bus. Funds would be needed to cover operational costs.

Mr. Burson stated the bus would service over 120 people. Expenses would include the cost of fuel and people to run it.

Member Souza stated for the record that she was 100 percent in support of the shuttle service in Kalaeloa.

Chairperson Lai noted for the record that Members Chun, Formby and Saito were now present.

D. Ford Island Ventures Report (“FIV”)

Ms. Malama stated that the written report from FIV was in the packet distributed to Members. She announced that the Child Development Center (“CDC”) was operating.

Member Timson expressed her thanks to FIV for getting the CDC up and running. She inquired about the status of the bowling alley.

Ms. Malama replied that negotiations were still underway.

Member Souza asked about the status of the FIV meeting with the City & County of Honolulu (“City”) Parks and Recreation Department.

Ms. Malama responded that the City would be operating the parks as usual until an actual agreement is put into place.

E. Heeia Meadow Lands (“Heeia”) Preservation Report

Mr. Ching provided a report on the Heeia Meadow Lands preservation project.

Chairperson Lai asked whether Members had any questions on the report.

Member Bradley asked what was the original intent for the parcel when it was accepted from Kamehameha Schools (“KS”).

Mr. Ching stated it was a complicated exchange, but the State’s intention was to head off development and promote preservation of the area.

Member Bradley stated that the objective and values articulated in the community standpoint are correct. However, the legislative intent in the founding of HCDA was limited to Kakaako and Kalaeloa. Member Bradley indicated that it might be more appropriate at this time to convey Heeia to another State agency with the appropriate expertise and resources, instead of using HCDA resources outside its districts.

Mr. Ching stated that there had been discussions with the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (“OHA”), KS and the Department of Land and Natural Resources (“DLNR”) relating to a sale or exchange of lands. The HCDA’s statute tasks the agency to manage assets under its control, and HCDA has title to this asset. Although outside the boundary of its development districts, the HCDA has the stewardship responsibility and statutory jurisdiction for Heeia. Given its consistency with the original purpose of the acquisition, the support for the Heeia project was reasonable and prudent. It was also important to note that the community group intended to pursue other funding through grant applications.

Member Bradley stated there was a difference between stewardship of the asset and providing security and maintenance as opposed to going into community planning, which could be a large investment in time and money.

Mr. Ching stated \$50,000 would be needed to install proper security gates to prevent unauthorized access. To minimize costs, instead of engaging consultants, HCDA would be using its own staff to assist with community planning. This expenditure was considered necessary to secure the property regardless of whether the community based project was pursued or not.

Chairperson Lai stated that he concurred with Member Bradley's concerns. He inquired as to why Heeia was still within HCDA and why a conveyance had not been made to DLNR.

Mr. Ching responded that another agency would look at whether it had the time and resources. There had been no action in spite of previous discussions with DLNR regarding the conveyance.

Member Dwight stated there was no issue with the merits of the community plan. His main concern was that Heeia might be better placed with another agency.

Member Liu asked when the last discussion was held with DLNR.

Mr. Ching stated it had been before his tenure at HCDA.

Member Liu felt DLNR should be encouraged to take the land. He offered to open discussions with DLNR, and requested that staff draft a letter of proposal.

Member Bradley requested updates to be included in future Executive Director reports on the expenses incurred for Heeia.

Member Enomoto stated he was curious as to the expense to date to manage the property. In its proposal, Kako'o 'Oiwī was bringing forth responsible stewardship. He felt that management costs could be reduced by having a responsible steward. In Kalaeloa, there is a lot of cultural stewardship which has been very valuable in planning efforts. He did not want to discount the value of this group, which could be a direct translation to work being done in Kalaeloa.

Mr. Ching stated that previous revenue was only \$1,000 per month, so a significant revenue stream was not being lost. As requested, he would initiate a discussion with DLNR and would provide reports on expenditures to the Authority.

Member Souza hoped that having a community group involved would make it more attractive to another State agency.

Ms. Michelle Matson from the audience provided testimony. She felt it would benefit the image of HCDA to support Heeia and its involvement with Hawaiian culture and community needs.

Member Souza stated that although it might improve the image of HCDA, she wondered whether it would be detrimental to Kakaako and Kalaeloa to stretch its resources to Heeia.

Ms. Mahealani Cypher, of the Koolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club, provided testimony. She stated that all the things their community group would be doing would support the HCDA mission. She felt that if Heeia was transferred to DLNR, it would not be able to manage it. She stated her appreciation for the help and support from HCDA.

F. City & County of Honolulu Rail Transit Project and Transit-Oriented Development Presentation

Mr. Mark Scheibe provided an update on the Honolulu Rail Transit Project.

Member Souza asked if the rail project would take 30,000 cars off the road, where would they park.

Mr. Scheibe stated that passengers could walk or take a shuttle bus to the rail station.

Member Souza stated that the Park and Ride facilities seem to be inadequate and would need to be enlarged.

Mr. Scheibe stated the plan was for 4,000 cars. The current Park and Ride facilities for TheBus are lightly utilized, so the City does not want to overbuild for the rail.

Member Timson stated that in other cities, such as Melbourne, the key is more than just parking lots, but how bus and rail link one to another.

Member Saito asked whether the City had quantified the cost to expend bus service to become feeders to the rail.

Mr. Scheibe stated that the operating costs for the bus system would not be going up since costs were expected to be reallocated amongst the various routes.

Member Souza stated there would be impact on the roads which needed to be built prior to and not after as a reaction to rail.

Mr. Scheibe stated that the cost projections included the need to construct certain street improvements.

Member Okada stated that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) showed rail in Ala Moana at the 40 foot level. He asked why the DEIS did not address future extensions.

Mr. Scheibe stated that the DEIS looked at what was proposed currently by the rail project. Future extensions were not funded nor proposed. The route to the University of Hawaii was identified as long term, was not funded and was not a subject of the DEIS.

Member Okada asked if there were any plans for a parking lot in Kakaako.

Mr. Scheibe replied in the negative.

Member Kimura stated that the biggest traffic problem was in Ewa and asked if there was a plan to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Scheibe described several approaches that would be available in Ewa, including a substantial rework of the bus system to provide access by bus.

City Councilmember Duke Bainum provided testimony and stated he was in favor of rail. However, the EIS did not address all the issues and consider the entire route. He encouraged HCDA to get additional input from the AIA, Outdoor Circle and other groups.

Member Saito asked whether calling the consultants back to address questions raised by the EIS would place the project in jeopardy.

Mr. Scheibe replied that it would not. The EPA comment was that more information was needed to describe how decisions were made in advance of the publication of the DEIS, particularly those from the alternatives analysis process. The alternatives analysis process was a legitimate decision making process and those decisions can be carried forward into an EIS.

Member Timson asked how many meetings with the community had there been within the last 3 years.

Mr. Scheibe replied there had been over 200 meetings.

Member Timson asked what kind of experts were working on this project.

Mr. Scheibe replied that City has professional staff with considerable experience with rail projects and had hired support consultants to supplement its staff. The

consultants have experience with elevated and light rail. His own firm, Parsons Brinkerhoff, has experience in all forms of rail transit.

Member Timson asked when the next workshop was scheduled.

Mr. Scheibe replied that there would be a station design workshop for Kapolei on May 12.

Member Formby noted that the DEIS was out, comments were closed and would be reviewed, incorporated and ready to go to the accepting authority. He inquired as to who would be the accepting authority.

Mr. Scheibe replied in terms of the NEPA process, the Federal Transit Administration would be the accepting authority.

Member Formby stated he appreciated the comments of the Councilmember. However, at this point unless the City were willing to pull it back and redo it with another document, a proposed FEIS would go to the accepting authority and unless it gets challenged, it was pretty much set.

Mr. Scheibe stated that in terms of the environmental process, Member Formby's comments were true. He stated it was the City's intent to continue working closely with all the communities along the route and remain in communication for the next 10 years.

Member Timson noted that in December 2006, the previous Executive Director Dan Dinnell had testified in favor of rail, so the Authority has taken a position on this project.

Ms. Matson from the audience provided testimony. She stated there was new information now that wasn't available when the DEIS came out. Steel on steel would operate 4 am to midnight, leaving only 4 hours of peace and quiet in Kakaako. Historic sites would be affected by elevated rail. She stated that there were lots of reasons to reroute.

Ms. Kathy Sokugawa provided a presentation on Transit-Oriented Development ("TOD") and the City's strategy.

Member Okada asked whether TOD would increase property values in Kakaako.

Ms. Sokugawa replied it could possibly be reflected in the market values for properties along the route.

Member Kimura inquired whether there would be wholesale condemnation of land.

Ms. Sokugawa responded that there is a difference between condemnation and market-negotiated acquisition of land. The latter was the preferred route.

Member Timson commented that the Waipahu community was excited about TOD projects and the possibility of revitalizing the community. In Kapolei, the activities would be university- oriented projects. In Waipahu, the activities would focus on little stores, where there is an old community that just wanted to continue to survive.

Member Okada commented that he had attended many rail meetings and was disappointed that when questions were asked, they got shot down by the Mayor. He hoped that future meetings would be kept more open so as to get a better feel for what the community wanted.

In closing, Ms. Sokugawa stated that information was available on the City's website with a special page for TOD.

V. ITEMS FOR ACTION - KALAELOA

2. Shall the Authority Accept a Deed, in the Form Presented to the Authority, to Building 36, TMK: 9-1-013-055, Kalaeloa, Oahu from the United States (Department of the Navy)?

Mr. Ching summarized the written report in the packet distributed to Members.

Member Timson asked why the land could only be used for homeless and what would happen to the land if we did not continue with a homeless shelter.

Mr. Ching stated that it was a condition of the deed from the Navy.

Ms. Malama explained further that the parcel had originally been targeted to go to the University of Hawaii ("UH") for use as dormitory housing, but the UH rejected it. When conveyance was not accepted, BRAC took it back. Although there had been discussions for conveyance of the parcel to go directly to HPHA, BRAC did not allow it.

Member Timson asked how it could be ensured that the parcel would be maintained for the designated use even when HCDA is not around.

Mr. Ching stated that as a condition of the lease, HCDA would look for the responsibility to be transferred or be assumed by HPHA.

Member Timson expressed her concern about the availability of funding, given the current situation with the Kalaeloa shuttle.

Member Kimura asked why the UH rejected the parcel.

Ms. Malama stated that UH intended to put students in the facility but their direction subsequently changed.

Member Saito stated that the UH wanted to use it for a dormitory. Since they did not utilize it, they were actually in default. DAGS was looking for a homeless shelter and initiated the transfer to HCDA, which gave UH a way out.

Member Liu asked who put in the covenant for perpetuity in the deed. He felt the Authority could commit to a reasonable period, but to prevent future uses or transfers was not reasonable.

Mr. Ching replied that the BRAC process was not flexible. When land is transferred through public benefit conveyance, BRAC gets a sponsoring agency who determines the use which does not change. BRAC will not proceed on any other basis. If land is acquired through sale, public auction or special legislation, then some flexibility in use could be established.

Ms. Malama stated that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) was the sponsoring agency and dictated the particular usage of the parcel.

Supervising Attorney General Diane Taira reiterated Mr. Ching’s comments that BRAC regulations are very inflexible. Public benefit conveyance is only allowed for certain specified purposes, and homeless shelter is one of them. There is no escape clause. When the purpose was dormitory rooms for the UH, the sponsoring agency was the U.S. Department of Education.

Member Liu asked what would happen if conveyance was not accepted.

Member Saito replied that the State would have to give up the parcel.

Member Timson stated that in 1995, Kalaeloa went through the BRAC process. The Navy took what it wanted, then went to the City and the State. However, conveyance was allowed only for certain reasons and use cannot be changed. Since housing was an issue, HUD got involved.

Member Chang asked whether there would be any possibility that the use could be changed after the conveyance of the land.

Ms. Taira responded it was not possible under the current state of the law.

Member Saito commented that if the parcel was no longer needed, the State could give it back. HCDA or another agency could then go to the proper

federal agency and apply for the land.

Member Enomoto stated that prior to getting the deed, the Authority had taken action and made a determination to support the use of Building 36 for the homeless shelter and go through the process for HCDA to receive title to the land. The truth of federal conveyance process is that as a public benefit conveyance, all lands given are required to be used for that specific purpose. Member Saito was correct and UH was the classic precedent. The UH could not use the property for the purpose with which it was conveyed and therefore gave it back. If HCDA takes control, but at some point no longer needs it for a homeless shelter and notifies the Navy or proper federal agency, it would revert back to the federal government. If it is then put up for auction, at that point there would be no restriction on the deed since they are selling it. The restriction would be in conformance with the zoning authority for the district. So conceivably, HCDA could put a place holder for mixed use or other use at some point. He suggested that option was available to HCDA, or for another authority to decide.

Member Souza inquired about the conveyance for the Onemalu and Onelauena shelters in Kalaeloa.

Ms. Taira stated they were conveyed to the HPHA, who had also originally applied also for the Building 36 parcel. However, the Department of Education and the UH dormitory project eventually won out.

Member Okada inquired whether the deed was for the land and the building, and whether HCDA would be responsible for the upkeep.

Mr. Ching replied that under the lease, the HPHA would operate and maintain it.

Ms. Taira noted that they were currently doing so under a sublease.

Mr. Won added that HCDA would be responsible for periodic monitoring for environmental compliance. Environmental hazards had been remediated but not removed and would need to be monitored.

Member Okada inquired as to how solid was the building.

Member Saito replied that the building had been refurbished to last 20 years. While it was intended as transitional housing for people to move on to affordable or other housing, the reality is there will always be homeless people needing help with housing.

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Lai entertained a motion for the Authority to accept a deed, in the form presented to the Authority, to

Building 36, TMK: 9-1-013-055, Kalaeloa, Oahu from the United States (Department of the Navy). A motion was made by Member Timson and seconded by Member Souza.

Chairperson Lai asked whether Members had any discussion on the motion.

Member Tanoue stated he would be voting against the motion. He felt the action would be taking on a responsibility, like Heeia, that was a deviation from the agency's overall plan. Even at this point, it would be very hard to give back something people have established some connection to. He stated that if the parcel were purchased at auction, encumbered by this homeless shelter, it might be cheaper and provide the agency with more opportunity that the use may be changed. He was concerned that the Authority would be getting into a situation that could become a liability, whether it was maintenance or something else going on, and still be responsible for it.

A roll call vote was conducted by the Executive Director.

Ayes: Members Bradley, Chang, Chun, Dwight, Enomoto, Formby, Kimura, Lai, Liu, Mukaigawa, Okada, Saito, Souza and Timson.

Nays: Member Tanoue.

The motion carried 14 to 1 with 3 excused (Members Kane, Kobayashi and Piper).

Chairperson Lai stated that a recess would be taken after which time the Authority would convene in Executive Session.

A recess was taken at 11:38 a.m.

VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION

.....

The Hawaii Community Development Authority convened in Executive Session at 11:49 a.m. pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(2), (3) and (4) Hawaii Revised Statutes, to consider the performance evaluation of an employee where consideration of matters affecting privacy will be involved; to deliberate concerning the authority of persons designated by the board to negotiate the acquisition of public property; and to consult with the board's attorney on questions and issues pertaining to the board's powers, duties, privileges, immunities, and liabilities.

.....

Lunch was served as an integral part of the meeting during the Executive Session.

Member Dwight exited the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Member Bradley exited the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Members Chang, Enomoto, Souza, Tanoue and Timson exited the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

The regular meeting was reconvened at 2:27 p.m.

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION - KAKAAKO

4. Shall the Authority Instruct the Executive Director to Consent to the Extension of the Sublease Between Ocean Investment LLC and Basin Projects for the John Dominis Restaurant Site?
5. Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Expend Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds for Improvements and Repairs at the Kakaako Waterfront, Gateway, and Kewalo Basin Parks?
7. Shall the Authority Approve the Kewalo Basin Budget and Authorize the Executive Director to Direct ALMAR Management, Inc. to Enter into Vendor Contracts for Services at Prices Not to Exceed the Budgeted Amounts, Including Cumulative Contingency Amounts?

Chairperson Lai stated that Action Items #4, 5 and 7 would be deferred to the next Authority meeting.

8. Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director or His Designee to Retain a Hearing Officer for the Kamehameha Schools' Kaiāulu 'O Kaka'ako Master Plan Application Contested Case Hearing?

Chairperson Lai noted for the record that Executive Director Ching had recused himself from the subject.

Mr. Deepak Neupane, Kakaako Director of Planning and Development, summarized the written report in the packet distributed to Members.

Member Okada asked whether KS would be affected by S.B. 1350.

Mr. Neupane responded that KS would have to follow S.B. 1350.

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Lai entertained a motion to authorize the Executive Director or His Designee to retain a Hearing Officer for the Kamehameha Schools' Kaiāulu 'O Kaka'ako Master Plan Application Contested Case Hearing. A motion was made by Member Liu and seconded by Member Kimura.

A roll call vote was conducted by Mr. Craig Nakamoto, Director of Communications.

Ayes: Members Chun, Formby, Kimura, Lai, Liu, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion carried 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Bradley, Chang, Dwight, Kobayashi and Piper).

6. Shall the Authority Defer Its Buy-Back Provision and Shared Appreciation Rights for Apartment Unit #603 at Keola Lai Condominium Project Based upon Hardship Circumstances that Will Not Result in Speculation?

Mr. Richard Kuitunen, Asset Manager, summarized the written report in the packet distributed to Members.

Member Saito inquired as to the difference between a deferral or waiver of the provision.

Mr. Kuitunen responded that with a waiver, it's gone and there would be no shared appreciation. With a deferral, the shared appreciation program would be maintained until the Authority exercises its right under the program to share in any positive change in value of the unit.

Member Liu asked whether a true hardship case been confirmed.

Mr. Kuitunen responded in the affirmative per letters and instructions from the bank in escrow.

A roll call vote was conducted by the Executive Director.

Ayes: Members Chun, Formby, Kimura, Lai, Liu, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion carried 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Bradley, Chang, Dwight, Kobayashi and Piper).

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by Member Mukaigawa and seconded by Member Liu to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Bradley, Chang, Dwight, Kobayashi and Piper).

The meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jonathan Lai', written in a cursive style.

Jonathan Lai
Chairperson

Note: The transcript of this meeting contains a verbatim record and should be consulted if additional detail is desired.