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Chairman: Okay. Good afternoon everyone and at this time I call to order the June 21st, 2017 meeting of the Honolulu Planning Commission. [bangs gavel] This time on our agenda is approval minutes for April 12th meeting as previously circulated. Commissioners, are there any changes, revisions or comments regarding the April 12th, 2017 minutes? [no response] Seeing none, any objections to adopting the minutes?

Sodaro: None.

Chairman: No objections. Any abstentions? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, the minutes have been adopted.

[The minutes of the April 12, 2017 meeting, as previously circulated, be approved by the Commission.
Motion was unanimously carried, 5:0.]

Chairman: Moving on to our agenda. Before we do that, Commissioner Lim.

Lim: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Regarding the agenda item for State Special Use Permit for Waipio PV, LLC, formerly Waiawa PV, LLC. I have a disclosure to make that previously when the project originally came through the Commission and then to the Land Use Commission, my wife Jennifer Lim represented the prior developer. And so we no
longer represent—obviously, the prior developer has gone bankrupt. And, so we don't feel that there's any conflict of interest. I will participate in this proceeding but not the next proceeding because I do have a conflict on the next proceeding.

Chairman: All right. Moving on to our next item on the agenda, Central Oahu, State Special Use Permit, 2014/SUP-3, Waipio PV, LLC, formerly Waiawa PV, LLC. At this time Department.

Mr. Young: Good afternoon, Chair--

Chairman: Good afternoon.

Mr. Young: Members of the Planning Commission, good afternoon. My name is Raymond Young. I'm the staff planner assigned to process this two special permit amendments, but we will begin with your first item which is again the formerly Waiawa, now known as Waipio PV, LLC. I think you have a copy of the Director's report before you.

Chairman: The first item on the agenda is the request withdraw.

REQUEST:

CENTRAL OAHU - STATE SPECIAL USE PERMIT -

2014/SUP-3 (RY) WAIPIO PV, LLC (FORMERLY WAIAWA PV, LLC)

Applicant: Waipio PV, LLC (formerly Waiawa PV, LLC)

Owner: NRG Energy LLC
Location: East of H-2 Interstate Highway and approximately 1,000 feet north of Mililani Cemetery

Tax Map Key: 9-5-003: Portion of Parcel 004

Existing Use: Agriculture (pasture)

Existing Zoning: AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District

Land Area: Approximately 313 acres

Request: To withdraw its approval of the extension of time from consideration by the Land Use Commission.

[Request approved on February 15, 2017]

Mr. Young: Oh, okay. So, both those items, the amendment and the withdraw is covered in our planning Director's report. So, essentially in order to act on the amendment, the Planning Director is recommending that the Planning Commission withdraw its previous approval granted back earlier part of this year after the Land Use Commission notified the Planning Department that the process that was used to grant that original amendment was incorrect. So, that is why we are back before you going through the whole full blown process to amend the SUP as if it was an original SUP filing, which is what the Planning Commission rules call for. So, of course, we are in agreement with the petitioner
and the LUC that the process is as if to amend, I mean to
process a new SUP and we have to, we of course agree with
the withdraw and recommend that be done first.

Chairman: Okay. So, we're withdrawing both?

Mr. Young: Withdrawing the approval you granted,
the Waipio SUP extension.

Chairman: Oh, okay.

Mr. Young: Yes.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any questions
regarding just the withdrawal at this time?

Sodaro: Just point of clarification, Chair. So,
the action would be separate, though, from taking action on
the application?

Mr. Young: Yes, correct. That's why, I think
it's a separate agenda item.

Chairman: Okay. Any other questions,
Commissioners? [no response] Okay. So, do we have a motion
regarding the request to withdraw regarding the Waipio
project.

Sodaro: Motion to follow the Department's
recommendation to withdraw our prior approval dated February
17th--February 15th, 2017, Chair.

Chairman: Okay. So moved. Do we have a second?

Lim: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any discussions,
Commissioners, at this time?

[Colloquy between Chairman Hazama and Deputy Corp Counsel Don S. Kitaoka].

[It was moved by Sodaro and seconded by Lim that the request to withdraw prior approval of the extension of time dated February 15, 2017 be approved. Motion was unanimously carried, 5:0.]

Chairman: So, for the record and procedural--Is there anyone wishing to testify before the Commission regarding this matter, only regarding the withdrawal of the original petition? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, then we need a motion to close public testimony.

Lim: Move to close public testimony.

Tolentino: Second.


[It was moved by Lim and seconded by Tolentino that the public testimony portion for the above request be closed. Motion was unanimously carried, 5:0.]

Chairman: So, original motion is back on the floor regarding the request to support Department's recommendation for granting of the withdrawal. Any discussions? [no response] Seeing none, Commissioners, all those in favor, say aye.
All Commissioners: Aye.


Mr. Young: All right, thank you, Chair. Thank you, Commissioners. Okay. We're going to proceed with the request to amend the Special Use Permit for the Waipio, formerly known as Waiawa. Essentially the reason why they came in still stands that the project was formerly by SunEdison, which ended up having financial difficulties and subsequently was acquired by the petitioner, NRG which, of course, they acquired the special permit and the lands, but the petitioner's name is still essentially the same. So, we sent this out as if it's a new SUP application as required by the Planning Commission rules. We did get some comments from several agencies, and there was no objections from the Neighborhood Board or any other organizations that we notified. So, the report has the comments by, I believe was Office of Planning and the Department of Agriculture. The Land Use Commission's comments came to you after-the-fact, I believe because it was a little late when we got them. So, essentially due to unforeseen circumstances, the petitioner did not have control over meeting that deadline, the 2-year deadline to establish the projects, so that's why they're back in to request for a 2-year extension, I believe, end of
2019 or two years or 30 months after the Land Use Commission grants the approval of the extension providing the Planning Commission also recommends approval. So, that will be the amendment of Condition 5.

The other request that came in was to--part of this request was to amend the number of panels that the project had originally proposed. I believe the intent why that condition was established in the first place was to prevent panels from continually being replaced and renewed. So, the project never ends. It just continues on by replacing panels. So, that was the reason why we suggested that there be a limit on the number of panels to be replaced, so it doesn't become a renewed project year-after-year. But, unfortunately, we didn't foresee that when there is a new petitioner and they're proposing using a different form of panels that would result in different sizes and, of course, significantly resulting in more panels. So, because that now has an unforeseen circumstance we are okay with amending that condition to just go with the area covered and not necessarily the number of panels specifically.

And, of course, the Office of Planning had recommended that Condition 11 which pertain to the archaeological assessment since it was already satisfied be deleted.
Now, getting back to the concerns that were raised by the Department of Ag having to do with whether or not these amendments would affect the feasibility of the ag use that is required to be established there. I believe the petitioner has brought in some information to address that, so I'll leave that up to the petitioner to deal with those proposed changes that the Director had. I think if the Commission feels that they have adequately addressed that, then we have no objections to removing that as a proposed condition to Condition No. 1, amendment to Condition No. 1. Other than that, I have no more comments to add on this and recommend that the Planning Commission move ahead and approve this amendment.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, any questions of Department at this time or any questions of the Department?

Sodaro: Thank you. Could you clarify your comment or the understanding about the project being perpetual with the replacement of PV panels. I thought it was all tied to the 35-year validity of the PV.

Mr. Young: That's correct. There was back end 35-year time limit, but we were concerned that if those panels continually be replaced throughout the 35-year period that would justify extending that 35-year period. So, we wanted to make sure that wouldn't happen.
Sodaro: I understand that part, but I don't understand the trigger for it to happen. I understand protecting against that happening, but I don't see how it could happen because it's tied to the date.

Mr. Young: Yes. It just gives the petitioner added argument that we have new panel here, why not extend the 35 years

Sodaro: Okay.

Chairman: Any other questions?

Tolentino: I just want a little clarification.

And, I think there was some comment made the last time they petitioned the approval that panels, as the years go by reduces its sufficiency and that's why the 35 years was put in place. They felt that the energy or the energy that they put out is going to go like this and like this and would cross somewhere along the 35 years, or it wouldn't be, I guess sufficient enough to keep it going. Is that--

Mr. Young: That's my understanding too. The drop off is, I think about 2% every year but after a while it plateaus.

Tolentino: Right.

Mr. Young: Yes, yes.

Tolentino: Okay. So, you're preventing them from replacing it with panels that might be more efficient?

Mr. Young: Well, that would be no longer the case
because now that we are only concerned about the area
covered rather than the number of panels. So, that would be
a non-issue.

Tolentino: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Any other questions?

[no response] I had a question regarding Director's report
in the conclusion section for Condition 3. You guys are not
basically agreeing with them in regards of decommissioning
of their system?

Mr. Young: Yes. I failed to mention that. They
had proposed in their application that the $4M credit or
some kind of a statement showing they have that money to
decommission be modified to become approximately $4M. So,
we're concerned that might substantially be reduced and
still be considered close to $4M, may be $3.5M still be
rounded up to $4M. So, rather than have that confusion
later or may be some argument over that later, we prefer to
have it at the minimum of $4M, which I believe what the
petition had agreed to in getting this SUP approved.

Chairman: Initially?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Chairman: Okay. So, you're basically--The
Department stands by that they want a minimum of $4M for
protection cost?

Mr. Young: That's correct.
Chairman: Okay. Any other questions of Department at this time? [no response] Okay. Thank you, Raymond.

Mr. Young: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Applicant.

Mr. Kudo: Good afternoon, I'm Ben Kudo. I represent NRG Energy, Inc., the Applicant in both of these PV panel projects. Before I start I wanted to introduce the people that are with me. Sarah Simmons from my office. We have Wren Wescoatt, who is a project manager, consultant with NRG. We have Aarty Joshi from San Francisco, NRG's environmental planner and Jeff Overton from Group 70, who is our planner. I wanted to just invite Aarty up just to give you a brief description of the company itself, because I know there's some sensitivity about the changes in ownership and the bankruptcy of SunEdison, and I wanted her to discuss the background and depth of experience that NRG has in a brief way. Ardi.

Ms. Joshi: Good afternoon. My name is Aarty Joshi. I'm the senior manager, environmental permitting for NRG. NRG, in case some of you don't know, we are a very large Fortune 200 company. We're headquartered in Princeton, New Jersey. We own and operate a diverse portfolio of energy projects including coal fire plants, natural gas power plants, hydro, as well as renewable projects including wind and solar. We have a presence in all 50 states in the
mainland, and our renewable projects we own about 150 wind
and solar projects. We are, as mentioned, we are owner and
operator of all of our projects and that is our intent with
these projects as well. We are very excited to be entering
our 51st state.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Kudo: By way of background, and I again I
apologize to all of you in my meetings with the State Land
Use Commission they wanted to make sure that they had a
complete record so they could make their own Findings of
Fact and Conclusions of Law because they have to also issue
a Decision and Order like you on this particular case. So,
I normally don't try to go through some of the minutia, but
I need to cover some of the corrections in the record and in
the application just because of that. So, I ask for
indulgence on that.

By way of background, I know we're talking about
the Waipio SUP right now, but for convenience, this is kind
of a consolidated double application, and I want to go by
way of background to talk about both projects so it's more
efficient and then I'll stop there and then we can go into
Waipio. The Kawaiola project which is Exhibit 7 is provided
to locate the project. It's between Pupukea and Haleiwa on
the North Shore. And, as you recall in 2005 First Wind came
to Hawaii to start up solar and renewable energy projects.
They proposed this project in 2012 when they entered into a
PPA with HECO. And then in 2014, First Wind filed a Special
Use Permit application with the Planning Commission.
Shortly thereafter in the following year First Wind was
acquired by SunEdison and that's how SunEdison came into the
picture. The State Land Use Commission approved the special
use permit that you had also approved in June of 2015.
However, the SUP had a completion deadline of June 29th,
2017, that's eight days from now. SunEdison was unable to
finance this particular project and others and so HECO
cancelled their Purchase Power Agreement in February 2016.
So, in April SunEdison filed for bankruptcy. In October a
few months later, during the bankruptcy proceedings, NRG
Energy purchased five of the projects that SunEdison had.
And these are two of the five projects that were purchased
through the bankruptcy court. By April of this year, we
were able to renegotiate the purchase power agreement with
HECO. And, so in April of this year we finalized a PPA with
HECO. And, in early May of this year we submitted this
application to modify the previous special use permit.

The Waipio project began similar in a similar
circumstance and Waipio is shown on this particular Exhibit
7 and is close to Pineapple Road and Mililani. I don't know
if any of you know where that is, but it is right on to the
right of the highway. First Wind started this particular
project in 2014. SunEdison acquired this project which was formerly known as Waiawa in January of 2015. The LUC approved the special use permit that had been approved by this Planning Commission on March 2015.

Again, SunEdison was also unable to finance this project and HECO terminated its purchase power agreement in February 2016. SunEdison, thereafter filed bankruptcy, and we purchased it in October of 2016. In December of 2016, we filed an annual report, which first requested an extension of time to complete the construction of the project for Waipio. Because the deadline on Waipio was March of this year. In February another request was made for extension and time and this Planning Commission approved that extension as a minor change. However, by letter dated March 14, 2017, the State Land Use Commission notified Department of Planning and Permitting that the minor change was actually deemed to be a modification of the SUP and the Decision and Order of the State Land Use Commission and, therefore, needed to comply with a 2-stage approval process under the LUC rules. This is a PC approval and also LUC approval.

We met with both DPP, staff and the LUC staff to agree to one process to redo the SUP modification, application for Waipio and include other modifications both in Waipio and Kailua that we are doing involving the use of different types of PV panels from the ones the SunEdison
had originally proposed. Both the Kawaioloa SUP and the
Waipio SUP are being heard by you today in a consolidated
process. However, we will present each respective project
separately since they are agendaded that way.

Essentially the modifications involve three basic
changes. First, a request to extend the time to complete
the construction of these respective projects. Second, a
change in the number of panels used because we will be
selecting a different vendor or manufacturer of the panels
with different dimensions. SunEdison was going to use their
panels. Those are no longer available so we're using other
vendor panels which have different dimensions. And, the
third reason is that in the Waipio PV project, this project
was originally designed to be a static PV that is
stationary. We are going to use an automatic tracking
system so it tracks the sun and is more efficient, which is
a similar system that was permitted and approved for
Kawaioloa. So, both projects now will be similar with
tracking systems on it.

Since this application is for a modification
of an existing SUP which was approved in 2015, I will not
repeat arguments that were already made on whether the
projects are unusual reasonable use of agricultural lands
under Chapter 205, Section 205-6, as nothing has changed in
that regard. For your information Waipio is situated on ag
lands that are rated as B lands under the Land Study Bureau
and Kawaiola is located on ag land, rated B, C and E, a
majority of which are B. We plan on having Tin Roof Ranch
conduct its ranching operations on the Waipio PV project
lands and Kuoloa Ranch will be operating on the Kawaiola PV
project. And, you can see the letters of intent from both
of these ranches attached to our Exhibit 12. We plan on
pasturing sheep on both projects through these ranchers or
other ranchers that may also be added. There are no changes
to the already filed agricultural plan considered by this
Commission in 2015. The PV facilities are permitted use on
these agricultural lands under Section 205-4.5(21) and City
and County, Land Use Ordinance, Chapter 21-3.50-4, provided
that proper permits are obtained. At this time I will
address the Waipio project in particular.

First of all some housekeeping comments. The
Applicant filed a first list of witness and exhibits on June
19th of this year and a first supplemental list of exhibits
on the following day. If I note Exhibit 12 of our exhibit
list, page 3, includes a corrected table that was originally
included in our application. It corrects and makes
consistent the amount of acreage and power, etc. that was
originally approved by you for the SunEdison project. In
the table the word net should be changed to gross and in the
permitted area should be changed from 308.5 to 308.8. These
small discrepancies were an oversight, but the Applicant would like to clarify these items for the record.

In regard to the deadline for the Waipio project, I turn your attention to Condition No. 5 of the Planning Commission's order. It imposes a project deadline of March 25th, 2017, which is already passed. Again, we obviously need more time to comply with this condition since we only acquired these in October of last year. Therefore, Waipio PV, LLC, is requesting that the deadline be extended to December 31st, 2019, consistent with the Kawaiola PV project as well. We have both same deadlines. And although there has been some reference to a 30-month extension, we think for ease it is simpler just to request a specific date. So, we're requesting December 31st, 2019. This date is also consistent with our purchase power agreement that we entered into with HECO recently. We also agree with the Office of Planning and the Department of Planning and Permitting that Condition 7 should be amended rather than triggering its need to modify by the number of panels to actually switch that to area covered by the panels.

Exhibit 8 is a blow up on the large board here. It shows the current proposed configuration which is subject to slight adjustments to grade, topography and sunlight. An overlay of the previous panel configuration and the current preliminary configuration is shown in the next exhibit,
which is Exhibit 9. The dark blue is the preliminary proposed plan that we have now. And, I say preliminary because when you get in the field and you do the actual engineering there may be differences in grade, topography, sunlight patterns, etc. So, there will be slight adjustments as to the placement. But this is our preliminary engineering plan right now is in the dark blue. The shaded gray area was the old SunEdison. And what you see is that the blue has actually shrunk. And the reason for that is, what Commissioner Tolentino says is that these solar cells get more efficient every year so you don't need as many. However, the panels get smaller so you need more panels. So, instead of three panels we have four panels now. So, they're getting smaller in size, but more efficient. And each year it gets better and better in terms of the energy efficiency. And that's why the differential. But we believe that the difference in the gray and the blue is not significant.

The other changes that in Waipio, as I mentioned before, we're changing from a fixed framework to a single axis tracking rack which will track the sun identical to the racks approved for the Kawailoa project by this Commission. This will increase our efficiency and energy gains as it will expose the cell to more sunlight and produce more energy. To support this change, the Applicant had submitted
an update reflectivity study showing no increase in
reflection from various points. This is attached as Exhibit
12 of our exhibits.

Now, the Department of Transportation has not
submitted official comments, but they have submitted
informal comments to us, particularly from the Airports
Division. The Highways Division doesn't seem to have too
much problems at all. And this is only in regard to Waipio.

The Applicant had a chance to review some email
comments from the Department of Transportation, Airports
Division. And they had--their basic comment was, did you do
a reflectivity study so that it doesn't cause a hazard to
flying aircraft? And, we did. And our studies attached as
Exhibit 12, and addressed to the fact that there will be no
impact from the panels even if it is tracking to cause any
kind of concern with regard to the FAA or DOT.

They also mentioned that there was concern about
radio frequency interference emanating from the PV farm that
would impact communication from aircraft to the towers and
whatever. RFI or the radio frequency interference was a
problem in older systems, but since then the industry both
IEEE as well as the United Laboratories has issued standards
that we must comply with, that are being complied with at
Waipio where EMF filters are installed at the inverters. And
the inverters are located at strategic locations. And what
those inverters do is they collect the energy from several panels, they filter it and then put it through a transformer to either increase it or decrease the power. The power from the PV panels is DC or direct current. It has to be inverted to AC and that's what the inverter does, but before it does that it's filtering it so there's no RFI, radio frequency interference or blocks that. And the second thing is that it goes through a transformer to step up the voltage or step down the voltage.

In regard to the $4M decommissioning security we're in total agreement with the Office of Planning. We think it should be no less than $4M rather than approximately $4M. This keeps it at a minimum. In regard to some comments by the Department of Ag on the hog wire. Right now we have hog wire fence the surrounds the PV farm. We're going to be replacing that with chain-linked fence. NRG does projects—you heard Ms. Joshi mentioned that we have about 150 renewable energy projects throughout the country. We use chain-linked fence because we believe that it is safer alternative to hog wire. And, particularly because although the hog wire prevents hogs from entering it may be a hazard for sheep who have long noses that stick into them. Because the hog wires, as I understand it, are in squares. So, the chain-link prevents that. And, so we believe that the use of the chain-link fence is not going to pose a
problem. So, Department of Agriculture ask that we have the farmers, the operators send a letter in that they're not going to have any problems. And, we did get those letters, and they are attached as Applicant's Exhibit 10 and 11.

And we also recommend DPP's recommended language suggesting an additional study be deleted. In wrap up, in closing, we hope you will be able to support this particular SUP project. We believe that the changes are insignificant and minor and don't cause any significant difference in impact to the environment or anything else. So, for that reason we would respectfully request that you support this particular request to amend the SUP. Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Before we go on, I guess in fairness, and I don't know what the reason is regarding these two applications, but we have received several late comments. So, in regards to the Department of Transportation, Highways, the Commission is in receipt of their comments and findings. So, in fairness to the Applicant, would you like to take a short recess to review the document?

Mr. Kudo: Sure, sure.

Chairman: Okay. That being said, any objections to taking a 10-minute recess? Commissioners.

Sodaro: None.

Chairman: Okay. Any abstentions? [no response]
Okay. At this time we will take a 10-minute recess. [bangs gavel]

[Commissioner Hazama calls for a recess from 1:50 p.m. and resumes at 1:58 p.m.]

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Call this meeting back to order. [bangs gavel]

Mr. Kudo: Thank you, Chair Hazama. We've had a chance to review both letters for Waipio and Kawaiola sent by the Department of Transportation, State of Hawaii. I have Wren Wescoatt here, and he'll comment on the requirements that they're asking us to comply with.

Mr. Wescoatt: Thank you. Wren Wescoatt, consultant for NRG and long-time project advocate. Good afternoon, Chair, members of the Commission. After reviewing both letters, we believe, in both cases, they ask, NRG or the projects to communicate with to coordinate with the future construction in both of these areas. We anticipate that we will be completed long before either starts construction, but we we're happy to coordinate in both cases.

Chairman: You have no objections with that?

Mr. Wescoatt: No.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. So, any questions, Commissioners, regarding Waipio?

Sodaro: Could you clarify the fencing plan. Are
you going to pen the panels and put a perimeter property
fence or you're just doing one fence and the sheep are
behind that?

Mr. Wescoatt: So, in general there will be one
fence. There's a few different areas you can see. So,
probably for the Waipio project, there will be fence along
both sides of the main road. We'll have fencing along both
sides of the main roadway and then each of these large areas
will be surrounded by a chain-linked fence. Within that
area after the PV project is constructed the ranchers
typically will move sheep from one area to other using a
short electric fence. It's a low voltage electric fence.
It's real easy to move. You just pick it up and move it.
So, by moving that area they're able to keep the right
number of sheep in an area temporary to eat the grass down
to 6 inches or lower, not too much lower and then they move
them to another area. So, that's how they keep to manage
the grass and NRG has several other solar projects that have
sheeps. So, they're familiar with this practice. And that's
what the ranchers will be doing. So, there will be a large
chain-linked fence around the exterior and then temporary
fence to move them within.

Sodaro: One additional question. Last time
through there were ancillary support buildings needed. Is
there any change to that with this plan, no additional
buildings?

Mr. Wescoatt: No, no buildings; no.

McMurdo: I had a question with regard to your tracking of solar panels. Is there noise related to that?

Mr. Wescoatt: There's a small motor attached to each. If you imagine it's sort of like a long table top and it sort of tracks very slowly. So, there's a small motor that turns it, but it's very low level, not something you would hear, a hundred feet away you wouldn't hear anything.

Tolentino: I have a few questions. My question is also in regards to the rack system. I think the original was a pig system, and we a certain time to allow the animals to free roam the property and not restrict them to certain areas. Is that still the case with this?

Mr. Wescoatt: It is still the case. If we can, just to use this as a demonstration. Typically in a fixed-tilt system a panel will mounted on racks above the ground where the lower edge of the panel. This is sort of facing south slightly like that. The lower edge of the panel may be two or three feet off the ground, and the upper edge may be seven or eight feet. In a tracking system what they do is they orient a bunch of panels on a pivot rod, like this, and what the panels will do, is they will turn throughout the day, so they'll face, you know, slightly tilting to the east and then slightly tilting to the west
throughout the day. Essentially, though, the dimensions
bottom to top are the same, but it's just going to change
whichever end is higher throughout the day. And it moves
really slowly.

Tolentino: Okay. I have may be one or two
additional questions. You said you did a glare study, was
it on the fixed system or did you do a glare system on the
moving system?

Mr. Wescoatt: We did--Initially, we did a glare
study on both to determine what's the impacts. Then since
we changed the system at Waipio, we redid it and said now
this is a tracking system, redid it with the same
consultant, same parameters but now shifting to a tracking
system. So, we did it both ways. And actually the glare is
less with the tracking system. Because it's just not--You
don't get that. One time during the morning when there was
some glare that could be experienced kind of on the freeway
side, but now it's almost (inaudible).

Tolentino: I'm just kind of guessing that if you
have a fixed system and the sun moves you'll probably get
the glare for half an hour of the day.

Mr. Wescoatt: Exactly.

Tolentino: But as it tracks the sun there's an
area that may be exposed a little bit longer, you know to
the glare. And the other thing is, you know, there's
development that's already started happening, and it's very close in proximity to where your project is going to be. At this time there's no neighborhood board that represents that project. And it looks like it's going to be really--It's just that it's going to be close. Has there been studies on being that close to a subdivision?

Mr. Wescoatt: Yes. So, the Koa Ridge. You're talking about Koa Ridge, yeah?

Tolentino: Yes.

Mr. Wescoatt: It's going to be right across the freeway from Waipio. We did in our initial application, we did visual simulations, looking from the Koa Ridge side where the homes will be, the closest ones. And that's why we made the decision to--Because the property is a little higher in elevation, there's not a really good view of the project, but we thought they may be able to see the edge. So, we developed a landscaping plan to put up a sort of visual screening with plants, naupaka and other plants along the edge of the fence, outside the fence. If there is some--people may be don't want to look at the edge if they're living right nearby, so we did some visual screening based on the landscaping.

Tolentino: I see that you're going to planting trees along that west bound.

Mr. Wescoatt: Yes.
Tolentino: Good job. Thank you.

McMurdo: Another follow-up question. You mentioned that the level of the noise for the tracking is low, are you talking about say just one panel, but if you multiply it over---How many panels were you planning to put in, a hundred thousand of these?

Mr. Wescoatt: Yes. There will be a few hundred thousand.

McMurdo: So, in total will they be all moving together and will this combined sound---what is the combined sound?

Mr. Wescoatt: Yes. In each case. The noise that's created on a solar project comes from three places. One, is the tracking motor that you identified it, which is very, very quiet. I'd say a hundred feet. I'm sure you couldn't hear anything by that distance. Each long rack of about may be 150 feet or so has one motor that turns the whole thing. So, it's not like every panel is making noise. And those are very quiet. The inverters that stand, there are several inverters throughout the project. I don't recall the number, but may be 20, 25 inverters. There is some hum associated with those, but again not something anyone---There's nobody nearby. Even when Koa Ridge is built, they won't hear---They'll be too far away to hear anything from the project.
McMurdo: How far away is Koa Ridge?

Mr. Wescoatt: It will be across the freeway here. So, here would be the closest houses, and they will also be too far to hear anything. And the last source I said the substation. That has the larger transformers. That's the HECO substation. Some of you have driven by. There's substations. There's one by Costco fence substation which has HECO equipment. That has a hum to it also. The substation here is way mauka so that's really far away as well. We've done EMF studies which, I think included audio in the initial report. Looking specifically at the substation, because that's really where more of the noise comes from. There isn't anyone close enough to hear noticeable sound.

McMurdo: But no noise study on the new panels?

Mr. Wescoatt: No, no.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any other questions? So, you had to renegotiate a new PPA, right? So, the length of the PPA is still the same, 35 years?

Mr. Wescoatt: The PPA we did. So, for each of the projects we went back to HECO, negotiated a new PPA and that's now before the public utilities Commission for review and approval. The length of time, initial duration of the PPA is 22 years for the initial term, then there is a time where what's called a bank curtailment term, where any
curtailed energy we deliver to HECO at a lower reduced rate, and then we're allowed to operate by mutual agreement sort of year-to-year. So, we are hoping that project operates--We're hoping that the PPA will be sort of year-to-year extended throughout the useful life of the equipment. It's a long way from now, but typically the useful life of a solar farm is 35 years. That's where that came from.

Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Wescoatt: After that, as Commissioner mentioned they degrade a little bit over time about 1/2 percent a year, though not all the same. So, around the 35 year timeframe, it's just not worth continuing to operate the project. It's just not producing enough for all the maintenance if you have to do. So, the typical useful life of a solar project is 35 years. The PPA--We hope that it will continue for that long. But no guarantees, but it's at least 22 years.

Chairman: And the inverters require electrical power, correct? So, you have battery back ups in case. Say you lose power to that area, will the inverters still be able to function or will it shut down?

Mr. Wescoatt: The inverters are driven off of the power from the PV panels, but they do draw in energy when they start up, so that's why our connection is to the HECO
transmission line. So, if that main HECO transmission line goes down the whole project is down. However, there is battery back up for some critical systems, the communication system. So, there's small batteries like 24-volt type batteries that support that equipment. There won't be utility scale batteries.

Sodaro: On the battery, if you were to add a battery storage component, that would be considered modification to the SUP. May be for your counsel. I'm asking because just to be clear there is no battery storage component.

Mr. Kudo: Yes. I would think that would constitute some type of modification to the SUP because it's different from the original proposal.

Sodaro: Okay. Thanks.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any other questions at this time? [no response] Okay. Thank you very much. At this time, is there anyone wishing to testify in front of the Commission regarding the Waipio project? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, Commissioners, can I get a motion to close public testimony.

Tolentino: Motion approved.

Chairman: So moved.

Sodaro: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections?

[It was moved by Tolentino and seconded by Sodaro to close public testimony for Central Oahu - Amendment of State Special Use Permit - 2014/SUP-3 (RY) Waipio PV, LLC. Motion was unanimously carried, 5:0.]

Chairman: Commissioners, are there any motion or further questions of anybody?

Sodaro: I just got a point of clarity for you, Chair. So, in the Director's report the only Applicant modification I heard would be to change the 30 months to 36 months? Because our Director's report has 30 months. Is that correct?

Mr. Kudo: What we have suggested is that we rather than use months we just pick a date, which is that of December. I think for both projects it makes it simpler.

Sodaro: Thank you.

Chairman: Department, can you come up.

Do you have any objections to the establishment of a date versus a time period that you stated in the report?

Mr. Young: Raymond Young, Department of Planning.

No, not if the petitioner is okay with that clarification to December 31st, 2019. We're fine with that.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any other
questions of anybody, anyone? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, can we have a motion.

Sodaro: Yes, Chair, I'd like to offer the--on Central Oahu Amendment of State Special Use Permit 2014/SUP-3, Waipio PV LLC to approve the Director's report with the modification of the date expiration being December 31st 2019.

Chairman: Okay. So moved.

McMurdo: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Commissioners, any further discussions regarding the motion on the floor? [no response] Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.


[It was moved by Sodaro and seconded by McMurdo that Central Oahu - Amendment of State Special Use Permit - 2014/SUP-3 (RY), Waipio PV, LLC be approved. Motion was unanimously carried, 5:0.]_

Mr. Young [from the audience]: Chair, I have a question--

Chairman: You got to come up.

Mr. Young: I might have miss heard it, was Condition 1 being modified or is that modification being
proposed not part of the motion?

Chairman: Condition 1?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Chairman: No. The only condition was changed was the 30 months to the actual statement of a date.

Mr. Young: Okay. So, the Commission's motion was to accept the proposed condition by the Planning Department for Condition 1?

Sodaro: Yes.

Chairman: Yes. Okay. Commissioner Lim, you want to be recused.

[At 2:30 p.m., Commissioner Lim departs. Recused from Kawailoa Solar, LLC. Prior notice was given and disclosed on the record at the beginning of the meeting. See pages 3-4 for prior dialog.]

Mr. Kudo: Excuse me. There's one condition that is in the original order that talks about a study by the--DOA wanted us to do a study, but since--To determine whether there's going to be any adverse impact from tilting of the panels and such and that's why we had to get the letters. I think the Department is okay with the letters, and we don't need to do an actual study about whether it causes impact to the sheep. You know the tilting of the--So, if we could eliminate that from the requirement that would be--

McMurdo: Where it says other competent means.
Mr. Kudo: Yes. So--

Mr. Young: If the Planning Commission felt that those two letters, one from the ranch and one from the petitioner met those concerns, would be okay, we're not requiring that as part of Condition 1.

Chairman: Was that in the original SUP, though, the requirement?

Mr. Young: Yes. The Director--No, no, not in the original approval. It was added in response to the DOA's comments in the amendment. But now that the petitioner has provided those two letters, we're okay with not including that part of--I'm not amending Condition 1 at all.

McMurdo: So, you want us to amend--

Chairman: But it's not referenced in your report, so--

McMurdo: It is, it's--

Mr. Young: Yes, it is.

McMurdo: Page 8. That's what you're talking about, right, page 8?

Mr. Young: Yes.

McMurdo: So, you're saying you don't need that?

Mr. Young: We don't need it anymore.

Sodaro: But they satisfy it we don't need to open the action.

Chairman: Yeah.
Sodaro: It's moot.

Mr. young: True too.

Chairman: Yeah. So, it's not--

Mr. Young: My only concern was if later there was another change to the ranch and, you know, perhaps another modification to the design of the project, that condition might require them to come back again. And, they didn't want that to be another impediment to this project moving forward.

Chairman: Well, I mean there's no modification to the agricultural plan part of it. So--Well, the original plan--doesn't the original plan state that--But any change the way it's written, any change by the Applicant the Director has discretion to review, right?

Mr. Young: Except the Director doesn't have the authority to make a change without the Planning Commission and further the Land Use Commission's consent. I'm trying to prevent that from causing further processing in the future if, in fact, there is some proposed changes to the ranch or further changes to the project design that might again invoke this part of the condition.

Chairman: I don't think we make a ruling that covers everything. At this point I don't think--I mean, we cannot make a ruling today that's going to cover every possible situation that can happen in the future. I would
leave it up to the Director to determine whether that particular change in condition would be considered a minor modification or something that which he or she would consider major that would have to again come before the Commission. But for us to issue a ruling to say that we blanketly will cover any possible future change with the project. I don't think we're in a position to do that.

In regards to your specific, Applicant's specific question before the Commission we've already accepted it, so that point is moot. We've already covered it.

Mr. Young: Okay. That's fine.

Mr. Kudo: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Moving on to our next item on the agenda, North Shore, amendment of Special Use Permit, 2014/SUP-6, Kailoa Solar, LLC. Department.

NORTH SHORE - AMENDMENT OF STATE SPECIAL USE PERMIT - 2014/SUP-6 (RY), KAWAILOA SOLAR, LLC

Applicant: Kawailoa Solar, LLC

Landowner: Trustees of the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, dba Kamehameha Schools

Location: Kailoa, North Shore, Oahu

Tax Map Key: 6-1-005: Portion of 1 and 6-1-006: Portion of 1

Existing Zoning: AG-1Restricted Agricultural District
Land Area: Approximately 382.2 acres

Request: To amend the Special Use Permit which allows the establishment of a 50-megawatt photovoltaic (PV) energy generation facility and accessory uses and structures by modifying Condition of Approval Number 6 to extend the deadline to establish the proposed solar energy facility and by modifying Condition of Approval Number 8 to redefine what constitutes a major modification.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, Planning Commission members, my name is Raymond Young for the record. I'm the staff planner assigned to process this proposal for a modification to the Land Use Commission's Decision and Order for the Kawaiola PV project.

Similar to the last project that was before you, again, as was explained by the Applicant's counsel, this project was also acquired by NRG because of the bankruptcy of the previous project owner. So, we don't have any problems with recommending the extension because, of course, it was an unforeseen circumstance and they need the additional time to construct and establish the project. So, in this report it is similar in terms of the time extension
to December 19th. I mean, sorry, December 31st, 2019 and, of course, the amendment of the number of panels to area covered and then the change to the $4M be actually no less, and there is no deletion of the condition of archeological compliance since that wasn't an issue with this particular project.

And, of course, we had no objections from the Neighborhood Board, and we did receive comments from DOA, the Land Use Commission, the Office of Planning, and we believe they're being addressed in the report and the Applicant's submittals today. So, we're open to questions.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any questions of Department at this time? [no response] The only difference between this project and the Waipio one is that this one is the lands designate IAL, right?

Mr. Young: That's correct, it is.

Chairman: Okay.

Mr. Young: And, of course, it's in the process of being acquired. I think it's still owned by Bishop Estate. One thing I wanted to pointed out, the Land Use Commission and mentioned that there's acreage clarification that they wanted to specify exactly what the acreage was approved. But we felt that the Land Use Commission in their Order had specifically put down an acreage that was approved and as part of the requirement that they submit a metes-and-bounds
to kind of refine the area that's actually going to be used.
We don't see a problem there because they can always come
back again and submit another metes-and-bounds map to refine
the area, set aside for PV usage and also the area intended
for the sheep cultivation. So, as long as they don't go
above the total amount that was approved, we don't have any
problem making adjustments as necessary, underground
engineering. Actually areas that are developable versus may
be gullies. As long as they don't go over total acreage
specified in the Land Use Commission's Decision and Order,
we have no problem.

Chairman: Okay. Any other questions for the
Department at this time?

Tolentino: I have a relevant question in regards
to the other project also. So, you have the PV panels, and
you're saying there's radioactive or energy waves that are
hovering and you have a device that extracts that.

Now, and I'm assuming that the sheep are sold for
consumption. Does that have any effect on the wildlife that
they're raising there?

Mr. Young: I'll defer to the Applicant who may
know those answers better than I.

Mr. Wescoatt: Wren Wescoatt consultant for NRG.
No. The electricity, anything electric, hair dryer, this,
degenerates some electromagnetic, you know, it's just part
of the features of anything that's electric. So, it's too
low enough level that it's not going to have any negative
effect on the livestock or the people that are working the
system or anything.

Tolentino: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman: Are we done with Department? Okay.

Thank you, Raymond.

Mr. Young: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Applicant.

Mr. Kudo: Thank you. The Kawaiioloa SUP is
different from the Waipio SUP in that it only has two
amendments, not three. First, the extension of the deadline
which is the December 2019 date, and the second is the
number of panels because we are using a different vendor.
It's already a tilting, and it was approved as a tilting
type of project. For the record, I wanted to address some
of the corrections to our application. We filed a first list
of witness and exhibits and a supplemental list recently and
on Exhibit 12, page 3, there is a corrected table that was
originally included in the application to modify the SUP.
So, what we've submitted in our exhibit list, Exhibit 12,
page 3, should be substituted for the original table that
was in our application. Exhibit 12 also includes a
correctly labeled Exhibit C to the Applicant's letter. In
the table, the word net should be changed to gross and the
49-megawatt should be changed to 50-megawatts. And this is again to bring it consistent with the original SUP. The permitted area should be changed from 384 to 382.2 to be precise. So that it's again consistent with the previous SUP. The discrepancies in the description of the project capacity, the ability to generate power are due to the differences between what we call gross and net capacity. When solar power is sent through a substation about 1-megawatt of energy is lost. And that figure is called a net figure. The gross is what is actually coming off the panels. The permitted area was a rounding error and the Applicant is making no changes to the permitted area 382.2, so it stays as was previously approved. And the Applicant's letter entitled Exhibit C, that was incorrectly Waipio instead of Kawaiola. I won't go through the changes again, but just to summerize. The deadline has been changed to December 31st, 2019 for the completion of the project. The second again is Condition No. 8 is to change the phrase "significant increases in the number of PV panels to "significant increases in the area covered by the PV panels." Again, to address the change in technology and the use of different manufactured panels.

Again, let me show you the Applicant's Exhibit 9, which is a similar exhibit to what we showed for Kawaiola [sic]. This shows a preliminary configuration overlay in
comparison to the previous configuration. The dark blue is 
the present configuration of the panels, and it's a 
preliminary engineering design, and the gray areas are where 
the original one is. And, as you can see, it's very minimal 
as far as the number of coverage or difference between the 
dark blues and the gray areas. As far as the $4M 
decommissioning security, again we reiterate our support of 
OP's comment to say that it is no less than $4M rather than 
approximately. In regards to the fencing, again we've 
explained why we're using chain-linked fence.

I want to respond a comment received by the Land 
Use Commission which points out a discrepancy between the 
permitted area of 382.2 and the exhibit map labeled Exhibit 
B in Applicant's letter dated May 5th, 2017, which I will 
call the overall sight plan, which is Exhibit 8 on our 
board. And the reason I address it is because I need to 
explain this to the LUC that we're addressing their 
particular issue when it reaches them. The overall sight 
plan lists a figure of 299.809 acres as the SUP area. 
However, this is actually not correct. The fenced project 
area. It's not the SUP area. The SUP area is larger, the 
actual project area is narrower, but we want the SUP area to 
be larger because we might have to move because of the 
topography and other things. The configuration of the 
project itself within it. And it also gives flexibility to
the sheep ranchers to work with us to see where the
pasturing should occur within the particular sight. So,
we're requesting that the permitted area 382.2 acres remain
the same and unchanged.

In closing, the changes proposed for, actually
both SUPs and its conditions are relatively minor and do not
change the impacts of the project. We would respectfully
ask for your support of the Kawaiola modifications which are
similar to the Waipio modifications. For your information,
the Land Use Commission has tentatively scheduled August 9th
and 10th as hearing dates on this matter assuming you
approve both SUPs. But they must receive your complete
records including your adopted minutes no later than July
24th for us to make the August 9th and 10th hearing. So, we
would ask for your indulgence. If you approve this permit
to have your adopted minutes ready to be sent to the State
Land Use Commission no later than July 24th, otherwise we're
off schedule and will be postponed by the LUC to the next
available hearing date. With date, I thank you very much
for your attention and for the approval of Waipio, and I ask
for your support on this particular application. Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any questions of
Applicant at this time?

Tolentino: I have a question that just kind of
popped into my head. You also have the same amount for
decommissioning at the end. Could you explain how you
properly dispose of a single panel? I'm not thinking you
could just throw it away in the rubbish can.

Mr. Wescoatt: I haven't been through the process
myself and so the decommissioning--we receive an estimate
from the construction company for decommissioning of the
project before they even start. That estimate may be higher
than $4M which is why we were looking for this change. As
for the PV panels, I don't know exactly where they are
processed, recycled, disposed of, except that I know it
cannot be in a local landfill. So, I think, I believe these
panels--And now we have like 350-megawatts of just on
residential, right. So, eventually we're going to have to
come up with this situation. I don't know whether a
processing facility might be set up here at some point, so
they can properly recycle the materials but, you know, right
now we're required to decommission them not--cannot be on an
island landfill.

Tolentino: And approximately $4M the amount of
panels that you have today, is that a number that you're
comfortable with?

Mr. Wescoatt: That's the estimate that we came up
when we did this process previously. The estimate may come
out lower or higher, but I think the $4M we're comfortable
that if anything the estimate would probably be lower. So,
we're hoping that with the $4M we want to make sure we're
covered so whatever happens in the future that amount is
posted as security for decommissioning.

Tolentino: Thank you.

Chairman: Any other questions?

Sodaro: Actually on that note, I saw the spec
sheets for the panels and like a mock installation, but are
these concrete block ballasted? Are you having to excavate?
What is the anchoring foundation system for the racks?

Mr. Wescoatt: Good question. These panels are
ground mounted with driven posts. So, there's a machine
that drives in like a steel post. The ones we had before
was sort of an I-beam shape. I've seem them in sort of
C-shape channels. Basically the steel post is driven into
the dirt, about 4 to 5 feet in, with about 5 feet sticking
up. And that's the anchoring of the post. That's how the
post are anchored, and they're tension tested and the racks
are mounted on that.

Sodaro: Where's the wind farm relative to where
the panels insulations--

Mr. Wescoatt: The turbines are here. There's four
turbines in row here. We have about a 600-foot buffer from
the turbines and the closest panels to avoid shading. So,
there's four turbines here. There's another one here.
There's some more on this side and then there's none on this
ridge here and they are along this ridge here. This is the
Waimea Valley ridge. [referring to map] The rest are here,
and there is some over on this side.

In white, the turbines are along this ridge, and
then along here. There's a road here. [referring to map]

Sodaro: Thank you.

Chairman: Any other questions, Commissioners.

Chairman: What is your length of lease agreement
with Kamehameha Schools?

Mr. Wescoatt: It's 34 years.

Chairman: Okay. And the PPA is the same, is
identical to the Waipio project?

Mr. Wescoatt: That's correct.

Chairman: Okay. All right. Any other questions?

Seeing none, thank you.

Mr. Wescoatt: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. At this time, is there anyone
wishing to testify regarding the Kawaiola Solar, LLC,
project in front of the Commission? [no response] Seeing no
one, Commissioners do you have a motion to close public
testimony?

Tolentino: So moved.

McMurdo: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections?

testimony has been closed.

[It was moved by Tolentino and seconded by McMuro that public testimony be closed for North Shore - Amendment of State Special use Permit - 2014/SUP-6 (RY), Kawaiola Solar, LLC. Motion was carried, 4:0:1; Commissioner Lim recuse.]

Chairman: Commissioners, do we have any further questions of anyone or discussion? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, do we have a motion?

Sodaro: Chair, may I offer a motion to approve the amendment of State Special Use Permit 2014/SUP-6, Kawaiola Solar, LLC, with one modification to the Director's report placing a construction completion date of December 31st, 2019.

Chairman: Okay. So moved.

McMuro: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any further discussion, Commissioners? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

All Commissioners: Aye.


[It was moved by Sodaro and seconded by McMuro that the North Shore - Amendment of State Special Use Permit
- 2014/SUP-6 (RY), Kawaiola Solar, LLC, be approved. Motion was carried, 4:0:1; Commissioner Lim recuse.

Mr. Kudo: Thank you very much.
Mr. Wescoatt: Thank you.
Sodaro: Thank you.
Tolentino: Congratulations.
Chairman: Okay. At this time, Director of DPP you want to come up?

Director Sokugawa: Hi, Kathy Sokugawa. I just want to give a small little update. We do have a Congress of Planning Officials Conference coming up later this year. This is the save-the-date notice. Trying to let you get a little input on the program. We have not a set program, although we have a draft program set up. We are going to have the usual format. Wednesday will be mobile workshops, September 20th, Wednesday, followed by a full day of conference on Thursday, and a half day on a Friday. It will have a preliminary session on Thursday morning followed by afternoon breakout sessions. If there's a particular topic you want to cover or you want to volunteer for a panel, let us know. We are planning, again, everything is tentative, but it is at the so-called former Pacific Beach Hotel. We assume it is, but--So, we're thinking of having an interesting participation by boards and commissions like yourself, and maybe with a board/commission from other
neighbor islands. I think for commissioners that might be interesting. So, we haven't really formulated what that format would be, but certainly it would some kind of panel discussion perhaps. So, if you have some ideas and want to volunteer for that. Again, this is in September.

Unfortunately, you have to sort of decide whether you're too Revolution in Denver or HCPO in Honolulu because there is a 1-day overlap. Revolution ends that Wednesday. So, unfortunately, it normally is in October, but this year is in September. So, again, some of the topics that we're going to cover--Again, these are not solidified. Historic Hawaiian land use, something about climate change, something about affordable housing, form based codes, military planning, the ahupua'a land use model, and the theme is partnerships. We're trying to make a different spin on it, but that's what the meaning of "my neighbors in paradise" is. So, its about emphasizing public partnership, public, private partnerships. So, that's the highlight. If you have any questions, please let us know, call us, you know where to find us.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you, Director.

Director Sokugawa: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any other announcements?

Sodaro: I just had a question about hitting the
July 24th adopted minutes?

Chairman: So, our next scheduled meeting is on the 19th of July. So, if we adopt the minutes there.

Sodaro: Oh, Central Oahu.

Chairman: I think we should make that deadline

Sodaro: Okay.

Chairman: Okay. If any other questions? [no response] Okay. If not, we have no further items on our agenda. Can I have a motion to adjourn.

Tolentino: So moved.

McMurdo: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections?

[no response] Any abstentions?

Sodaro: None.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you very much everyone.

This meeting is adjourned. [bangs gavel]

[It was moved by Tolentino and seconded by McMurdo that the meeting of June 21, 2017 be adjourned. Motion was carried, 4:0:1. Commissioner Lim recuse.]

[meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.]
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