

Meeting Minutes
 Kekaha Host Community Benefits Fund
Meeting No. 38
 Kekaha Neighborhood Center, Kekaha, Kauai, HI
 March 13, 2013
 Meeting Time: 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

CAC Attendees Present: Bruce Pleas, Jose Bulatao Jr., Robert Jackson, Glenn Molander, Evelyn Olores, Al “Big Boy” Kupo Absent: Myra Elliott, Thomas Nizo Non-Voting Members: Beth Tokioka, Yvonne Hosaka		
Agenda Item	Minutes	Action
I. Call To Order/Roll Call	Meeting Called to order by Chair Bruce Pleas. Chair noted start time is before 7:00 pm therefore, if anyone from the public comes in at 7:00 pm and requests this body to return to the start of the agenda to hear what was already discussed, we will do that and go to the start of the agenda. Six members were present.	Meeting Called to order 6:20 pm
II. Approval of Agenda	Big Boy moved and Robert seconded that the agenda be approved. Open for discussion. Bruce requested change to agenda. Request was to add Future Agenda Items as #7 to agenda. Moved by Glenn and seconded by Big Boy to accept changes to agenda. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.	Moved by Glenn and seconded by Big Boy to accept changes to agenda. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously.
III. Public Testimony	There was no public testimony submitted	
IV. Approval of the Minutes	Jose moved to approve the minutes of meeting dated February 4, 2013, seconded by Robert. No discussions or corrections.	Motion passed unanimously
V. Financial Report	Treasurer Robert Jackson reviewed the financial report. Status of HCB Fund FY 13 – Principal Balance as of: 2/1/13 is: \$936,633.38, accrued interest from 2/1/13 to 2/28/13 was \$657.44, Total of: \$937, 290.82 as of 1/31/13. Pending recommendations are: \$780,000.00 for the Kekaha Photovoltaic Project (through E Ola Mau), leaving a balance of \$157,290.82 for grant funding. The approved Short & Long Form Grants were: Kekaha Elementary School, \$5000.00; Kekaha Pop Warner, \$5,000.00; Boys and Girls Club, \$10,000.00; E Ola Mau (The W), \$5,000.00; St. Theresa School, \$55,000.00; Episcopal Church – West Kauai, \$25,000.00; Storybook Theater of Hawaii, \$15,000.00 for a total of \$120,000.00.	
Question from– Jose	Was the decrease in the interest accrued as of 1/1/13 to 1/31/13 to 2/1/13 through 2/28/13 because there were fewer days in February?	
Response	Beth indicated that it was part of the reason why but also because of the interest rate fluctuation. She suggested that in the future we have Ernie Barreira come to the meetings to answer any financial questions the CAC may have. Bruce also requested that the interest rate information be on our financial report.	Bruce also requested that the interest rate information be on our financial report.
Question from Audience	Patrick Pereira. Is the interest that is being accrued going to be applied to what is earmarked for the Photovoltaic Project?	
Response from Chair	At this point it stays with the HCB. He would like to recommend that to be a future agenda item.	
VI. Business	A. Discussion and possible decision-making on how the CAC would like to handle unspent grant funds.	
Chair	Noted – This is one part of it and the other part of “a” would be the process by which a final report will be provided by the grantee. Bruce would like to split that into two parts and concentrate on how the CAC would like to handle unspent grant funds. Bruce noted. Is the question on unspent funds to grant or are we going to cover the grants that are out right now? He feels we need clarification of what we are going to discuss.	

Glenn	If we awarded a grant and then the grantee did not spend all of their funds, that's what letter "a" is about. That's what we should talk about.	
Jose	Point of the matter is. Each grant has its own variables in terms of timelines pending on what the project proposal was about. Some are time sensitive based on specific dates on a specific activity. Some may be long standing in terms of a series of things and activities or projects that may take place. Some may be dependent on an order that was placed on equipment or supplies, whatever the case may be. But because we have these variables, we have to deal with each one accordingly. So, I think what we should do, is, for grants that have already been released, approved and released, we need to check with the people who made the project proposal and ask them the question, where are you now, are you completed, are you almost complete, whatever the case might be. Then when we make the determination of an evaluation accordingly.	
Bruce	Are now talking about the grants that have already been awarded? Glen and Jose agreed.	
Glenn	Stated that he has mixed emotions on that because I can see two different viewpoints on it. However, he believes that when we made the grants, we were looking at one cycle. One year. So he feels that based on that, we knew and the grantee knew what period we were talking about and if these grant monies were not spent during this cycle, then he believes they should be returned as unspent. Now in the case with one of our grants, the photovoltaic, those grants of that type, I think that, we the committee need to discuss and specify that at the time the grant was recommended and approved, What I am suggesting is that in future grant funding recommendation, that we the committee make sure that the grantee knows the time period and we know that time period we are talking about and we need to agree to a timeframe than one year or a six month period, whatever the grant period is at that time, or, we don't agree with it. Now as far as the grants that were already awarded, I believe that when that cycle for that grant expires, then I believe that we should have the money back in the kitty to redistribute, whether it's for a new grant for that same organization or a different one.	
Jose	Jose strongly concurs with Glenn's observations and concerns as expressed at that same time, thinks that there are lessons learned for us who were not so specifically bound like we should have been, that having gone through the experience of not having exact specifics as we feel that we should have had for good reasons. I strongly recommend that we follow all of Glenn's suggestions because it does make a big difference about the way we release funds and make recommendations of the way it is released and we need to be more definite about our expectations to assure that it doesn't get strangled along and I concur with Glenn.	
Bruce	Stated that he thinks that during their discussions throughout the past that everyone was under the impression that this was under a one year cycle. Now myself, what I am looking at is because we did not have any grants put out this year so far, which I don't think we will by June. I suggest that we let these roll over and ask for a report at the end of June so we can address everything. I do not know how much Kekaha has left so there may be some monies they may still use. Let's have them report back. On another note: We have one problem with video equipment out and we need to get that back (4,000 + dollars).	
Comment from Audience P. Perreira	Stated that he attends Kekaha School Community Council meetings monthly and indicated that they have approximately \$200 left. He shared that they are getting mulch for approximately \$400 a truck load and suggested the school seek assistance from the landfill and see the Ruiz boy who perhaps could get it for them for free. They will also pick up commercial fertilizer. They are looking forward to the next application period to continue the farm.	
Glenn	Stated that he can see both sides of it and feels that the committee has to maintain control of what happens so that there are no assumptions made in the future and if we continue as the KHCBAC, there may be someone in the future that may say, you did it before, why can't you do it for us? So, I think that we should take it on a case by case basis. The initial approval then we the committee can vote for the extensions so that it is always clear that the committee is managing the money and there aren't assumptions that it is going to get rolled over.	
Jose	Strongly agrees with Glenn and stated that the CAC was formed to be responsible to review and evaluate these proposals and we need to stick to the accountability so we know what we are dealing with. We need to be responsible.	

Bruce	We need to look at scheduling (if this goes through and the CAC approves), meetings with grant awardees. Second is the timeframe. Do we do it before the end of the fiscal year? Or can it wait until after the fiscal year?	
Jose	I really think it should be an ongoing process like any other projects, if they run into any difficulty, if they can come back to us and let us know that they are having difficulty. We need to know so that we are not finding out after the fact. It is the responsibility of the project proposal people to keep us informed as it may be so that we work together to make sure that things move through as smoothly as possible Not to put them under the microscope, but looking for opportunities to support. That's my purpose for this.	
Comment from Audience Perreira	Point is well taken. Jason, the principle of Kekaha School, when he leaves in May, I think the report will be forthcoming. But now as I understand it, he has to write it a certain way? Is that what I'm understanding?	
Bruce & Jose	Stated that is not what we have agreed upon yet. Jose stated also that we have not yet decided that yet.	
P.Perreira	Mr. Perreira asked if he might have to redo his report then? Stated that he is asking the question because he was under the impression that the final report was due to the County of Kauai, the Mayor. Stated that when he attends Kekaha School meeting he can let them know.	
Jose	Stated, that is why he suggests that we have a process with guidelines to work with. That is why the suggestion was made. Not to dictate. We are concerned to make things better for all of the proposals.	
Bruce	Thanked Mr. Perreira. Bruce indicated that his concern will also be discussed in the second part of "a". Asked if there was any more discussion on that. Regarding unspent monies?	
Glenn	Recalls a similar situation with the W who went through a cycle and did not use all of their money and requested an extension to use leftover money for a second clinic.	
Bruce	Indicated that because it was during the same fiscal year and they spent the money on the first round then they came to us, put in writing for the request to use leftover money. Was during the same fiscal year and was courteous to come back and ask and they have since come back a third time again to do this.	
Glenn	Stated that is the reason he suggested this. For example, Kekaha School, if they got \$200.00 leftover and they know that they can use it, it would seem reasonable to me, the committee, then to come back and say, we have \$200 we know we can use it and it may be outside the one year parameter and we then take it by a case by case basis. That is all I am suggesting that we don't make a decision without having them come back.	
Evelyn	Stated that she likes Glenn's point and it is well taken and thinks that we are all going through the process for the first time for all of the projects we have. Feels that if we gave them the 5000 for their projects, would like to see all of these grantees come back and tell us what they did and maybe some would come back and say, now we need more money and they give us an itemized section of all of the things that they spent the money on. I went in and talked to Jason several times. I got the impression that he didn't want to spend all of the money so that he would have funds to continue his project. I told him that we want him to spend the money this fiscal year and to re-apply again next year. But tell us how you will spend this money. Provide an itemized list. I know he needs fertilizer and stuff like that and he could use the \$200 and like you said, maybe they can just go and pick up all the mulch they need. Their garden is great and the kids like the idea of harvesting and the harvesting has been really great and the kids feel really good about this. So I can see that because it is the first time, like the "W", Josh was good enough to come back and ask, I believe for everyone, we need to have them come and tell us where they are and what they have done. I don't think we can tell them, give us back the money. I would like to see them spend the money within the time frame that they have. Now that we have another funding period coming up, we are looking at a new year of project proposals and we are still learning more about this process. We need to form a better process that is clear for everyone. Everybody is coming back for more money and asking for money. Whether they get it or not, we have to ask ourselves, and look out, is this in the best interest for the Kekaha Community. So yes, I think we need the grantees to come back and have them inform us of their status.	

Jose	Reiterated. Everything should be reviewed on a case by case basis. Because every grant proposal has its own variables, and what I am trying to stress here is, a working relationship with those who present proposals to us that we continue to work together to see what will be the best and final things to do, what might be options to add that we didn't think of in the first place. There were many things that when we look back, we wonder, oh, I wonder if we should have approved that, and it's already too late. There was a situation where we had made an approval of paying for an executive chair's salary. And we had discussion about that and we moved forward. Because of different aspects of the project proposal that had such merit, we may need to review that and see if we will continue to do something like that or avoid something like that so it is a learning process for all of us.	
Comment From Audience B. Ayudan	When these proposals first came out, I believe there were guidelines in the proposal for grantees to follow. I believe that in those guidelines, there was criteria that every grantee was supposed to come back to report. The reporting should have somehow come back to the CAC. Did the six proposals all receive all of their funds?	
Bruce	Stated that yes they have all received the portion of their funds, at this point that I know of. And we did have, did we have any reports Beth?	
Beth	Stated that yes, Nalani Brun did provide the CAC with at least three reports to date.	
	Buddy Ayudan asked, was there some timeframe where commitments were made for a response from these grantees? A summary that they completed it? So if it's the end of this year, then they still have time to finish off and come in and report? So if anybody had problems, the CAC could have inquired and find out if they could come and let you know where they were at. I don't think anyone come to a public meeting with problems.	
Bruce	I think what was required was the end of the year.	
Jose	Thanked Mr. Ayudan for his astute observations of the working mechanisms of how we could have operated. And quoted Robert Burns, the best laid plans of mice and men, often go awry. Which means this, we can expect all this in such a way, such as you described it but we don't have control over how one group may interpret this or respond to it. So things can go awry because of that. Secondly, we were in transition when the contract for our 2 nd facilitator was done and there was a long period of null activity and it took some time for the feedback to occur in moving forward. There are things beyond our control because we are all voluntary. But there are things like you said that was pointed out that could have been likely so, but that doesn't mean it happens exactly as it was intended although it would have been nice to have done that. So your point is very well taken. We are dealing with reality here and we're trying to make best with what we have to work with. We are not faltering. It's not a matter of fault. It's a matter of our duty to do what we can do in working with these realities.	
Bruce	Anymore discussions on the unspent grant fund?	
Glenn	Stated. As an example. When the Kekaha Garden Project was in the works of recommendation. As all grantees, they had a budget. They came back to us and asked to move some of the grant money from one budget item to another and we did give that approval. My point in bringing this up is that we should have a budget report from all of our grantees no matter who they are showing those same items no matter what they spent or didn't spend. Not wanting to get the money back but assuring ourselves that the funds have been spent in the manner that it was originally approved for. Trying to account for all funds so we the committee know what was spent.	
Bruce	So from what I've heard, I am looking for a motion to schedule a report from the grantees for the Wed 6/12 meeting and at that point we would make decisions on grantees return or roll-over status. Is that what everyone is saying? The second part of this agenda item, written report should be submitted in advance. We need a committee member to put together a motion for a decision on how we will handle unspent funds.	
Big Boy	When does the fiscal year end?	
Bruce	June 30 th	

Big Boy	So we are saying we want a report from the grantees before the end of June?	
Bruce	Yes. We have to make a decision. It's up to the CAC if we want to have them return the money before the end of the fiscal year, or we can have it rolled over. Not sure. Have to check with COK. From what I've heard, this is where we might want to go. The CAC would have to enter a motion.	
Jose	Indicated that he thinks that we could give all of the projects the grace of time of the fiscal year and if by 6/12 we have a written report upfront before 6/30 about what the expenditures were and if anybody has any leftover money, we want to know they are accountable. We want to see how, when and where upfront.	
Bruce	They should have a proposed spending for the next 30 days. Most business should have that and we would hold them to it and if they didn't do it then that would be held against them for further funding at the next cycle. That's where I think the committee is going but I still need a motion.	Jose moved, seconded by Evelyn
Bruce	Asked facilitator to read back the motion.	Motion to schedule reports by grantees for Wednesday, 6/12 meeting and there would be discussion and decision on monetary status.
Bruce	So we would look at it individually and discuss where they are at and go from there.	
Big Boy	So we are saying that all the grantees would show up at this meeting for their update?	
Bruce	That they would be on the agenda and it's up to them to show up if they care so.	
Big Boy	And if they don't show up? They were already awarded the grant. How will we know if they don't come to this meeting?	
Jose	Stated that I think what Bruce is saying that an accounting of what they've spent and if they have a proposal to spend that unspent amount, it should be there with their intent and we can have our discussions up front to approve or ask for them to return these unspent funds. Isn't that what we are talking about?	
Bruce	Yes. The COK requires a report at the end of the fiscal year. If they don't come they still have to provide one at the end of the fiscal year. 6/30. So they have to supply this report. They also, with what we would require for this motion by 6/1 a preliminary report so we can discuss for a status for next year.	
Glenn	Indicated that he doesn't see a problem if they are there or not, as long as they submit a report by the deadline date and if they feel that an explanation is needed, then they should show up with an explanation. I believe that report should include the same budget items that they initially placed.	
Big Boy	Come the end of our fiscal year, if any unspent money is left, it should go back. They have the whole year that they requested for and if they didn't use it all by the end of the fiscal year, it should be returned.	
Bruce	So the motion would basically make that decision in June when they present their report.	
Big Boy	Before we approve that, if there is a need for an extension, they should let us know at that meeting?	
Comment from Audience	Mr. Ayudan stated. Taking into consideration that we are all in the learning process. All these projects. Having them return to summarize, maybe recommend that everyone returns so that the learning process can move forward for everyone and it is clear to all. Have the grantees come and make it mandatory so we all can hear it and learn and gain from it. Some of the problems could be prevented.	
Bruce	That would be the intent of the motion on 6/12 where they will be required to submit which would be public record and open for public comments.	

Jose	Commented. It says here on our calendar. The notes read: Previous awarded grantees to share their projects with the community. It's already there.	
Bruce	Yes that is for the workshop and we could also schedule it for that meeting. We need to have their report by 4/26 circulated to us to read before the meeting and if the CAC feels that we will require a report before 4/20 then it's up to you. I have no problem with that.	
Jose	So we have a month and week or so to ask these grantees to prepare something in writing. I don't want to stipple the project people, proposed projects. I don't want to be that cold hearted finance person that says, "you either do what I say or your out of the parade". We are in this together. But I do want to see that we are fiscally responsible and we give ourselves the deadlines to work things out as best as possible. To see how well we were able to benefit the community. To kokua each other.	
Question from Audience Mel Rapozo	Are you guys on the main agenda of the 7:00 meeting?	
Bruce	Yes. Business, Section 6a. Discussion and possible decision-making on how the CAC would like to handle unspent funds. We are doing the first part of that.	
Mel	You guys started before 7?	
Bruce	Yes we did. . We had a little discussion and we decided to start at 6:40. I believe when you came in we were just starting on the business. If there was any of the public that decided and came in late, we would go back and revisit that agenda item.	
Mel	I didn't come late, I came in at 7.	
Bruce	We started early, if there was a topic concern from the public, please tell us which agenda item you would like to go over and we will come back and revisit that.	
Mel	Well I guess I'm just tossing you the sunshine law. You have to start when the agenda starts.	
Bruce	Yes. We didn't want to sit around and wait for 40 minutes. We took the gamble and we got caught. Thank you. I understand.	
Mel	I just would like to ask for that courtesy for the community, and the sunshine law. If you said seven, please start at seven.	
Bruce	Like I said, if there is an agenda item that you would like to go back and revisit that we will.	
Mel	Well I do have some comments that you are talking about right now if you don't mind. May I?	
Bruce	Yes and we are discussing how to handle the unspent grant funds. The final report will be a second part	
Mel	I think there is one component, as far as the funding of HCB. I guess from what I am hearing, it doesn't seem like these applications or when these people get awarded the grants, there is no policy as to when the report is due? There is no policy to do a quarterly report or a financial report after the completion of the project? That's not in there right now? What's their requirement?	
Bruce	The requirement is, the end of the fiscal year, the cycle report was to be provided to the county as a normal grant process and that was going to be provided to the CAC. We did have reports once during the year, at 6 months. We visited quarterly's and I think we decided that there was a yearly one guaranteed that they had to present to the County and that would be the final one that we would get.	
Mel	Ok. I'll just toss this out to the CAC as one of the questions that I'll be asking and I'm sure that some of the other council members would be asking as we are re-doing the funding for next year. Keeping in mind that the lateral and tipping fees will go up again so I anticipate there will be an increase in the Host Community Benefit for Kekaha and I'll be supporting that. Now whether or not it passes, I don't know. But we on the council also have a fiscal responsibility to the people that we cannot continue to fund monies and have these monies out in the community with no	

	accountability. I guess I know Mr. B doesn't want to be the dictator on that, but whether it's the CAC or the County, somebody has to be accountable for these funds because what I don't want to see is x amount of dollars floating in the community and nothings being done. I'm assuming when these projects are being approved that it's a specific project, there is a budget attached and they shouldn't have extra money and if they do for whatever reason, then that has to be addressed at that time. There has to be some sort of report, and going forward, that report from all the grantees awarded are available to the council. Because that's the first question I'm going to ask. I'm going to point out. What's the status of these grants.	
Bruce	So basically, what we will have is a written report for the council, it's due to the county. When will it be due to the county Beth, do you know?	
Beth	I am not certain of that absolute date and would have to check. Grants were awarded in May. Before your October meeting, Nalani asked for a report from the grantees and presented that to you with an update and I think at the December meeting, the same thing. So she's happy to provide them for whatever meeting you have and want a status on grants for that meeting, Nalani will do that and has done that twice so far. In terms of a final grant report cycle, what was spent and unspent, that would be at the end of the fiscal year that you are talking about now. They would have to account for it.	Check on Deadline date for final report
Bruce	But there is a report that the county grant office is requiring from the grantees? And the date for the final report?	
Beth	Yes. There is definitely a final report and the interim reports. I can't tell you off hand what the date of the final report is.	
Bruce	Ok. But there is one and there was one when we passed all these we wanted one report and we were assured to be at the end and we are looking now to get an update in either May or June of the status that would also be public record that would be available for the council that would give us a preliminary report before the final. We've asked them to come forward with any changes. And I believe that we have been on these.	
Robert	Bruce isn't the county, their required to report to the county in the process so that's the watch dog so they should be able to go the next office and get the information and forwarded to the council.	
Bruce	So can we get back to our motions so we can get at least half of our agenda item done? Can you read it back. We may need to change the date.	Motion to schedule update reports from the grantees on Wednesday, 6/12 meeting discussion and decision on monetary status with a written report prior to the 6/12 meeting.
Bruce	So do we want to change the date from 6/12 to 5/6? Looking for a consensus?	
Jose	We are moving which to 5/6?	
Bruce	We are just looking at two dates because you mentioned that you would, you're thinking that during the community meeting of 5/6 that there would be the reports and discussion and decision making on the grants?	
Jose	So it gives us working time to review.	
Bruce	Right. So I am interested in the motion to move it up to 5/6 or keep it at 6/12?	
Jose	What are we voting on right now?	
Bruce	We are not voting on anything. We are just reviewing the motion before put out on the floor. We are still in discussion. So the discussion is 6/12 or 5/6?	
Robert	I say 5/6 that would give them time to make adjustments before the final report.	

Big Boy	Yes but Jose has a meeting that day.	
Jose	May 6 th is a Monday? I will tell my church to go without me.	
Bruce	But we may change that date too. Yvonne is going to try to change the date. So we are looking at May 6 th then?	
Big Boy	Well we cannot say May 6 th if Yvonne is going to change the date.	
Bruce	What it would be is. Go ahead.	
Yvonne	Suggested that it be on the "next scheduled CAC meeting that they provide a written budget report"	
Bruce	That would be April 1 st ?	
Yvonne	Well, how about, at the "next scheduled CAC meeting in May"	
Bruce	And were going to work on the report on the next segment.	
Evelyn	How about, Wednesday, 5/22 instead of the Monday 5/6? Unless you can change the date to 5/8?	
Yvonne	If I am hearing correctly, it sounds like there won't be any grants awarded this fiscal year? So you could actually use the 5/22 date for this reporting meeting as the workshop for grant proposals will be rescheduled.	
Bruce	We could do it on the 22 nd then. It gives grantees some time to put their report together.	
Glenn	So this motion that's on the floor. Is somewhat general and I understood from you just now that the next meeting we have we will come up with a format for the grantee to get back to us?	
Bruce	We'll be coming up with that as soon as we finish with this one.	
Glenn	Ok. Then, as I said before, I'd like to see the format standardized so that the budget comes up in the same form as it was originally proposed.	
Bruce	Ok. And with the final report, we can also bring that up on April 1 st if we run into problems with this segment. If we can't get it tonight. So we are looking at May 22 nd as the date? A Motion? Could you read the motion back?	Motion to schedule update reports from the awarded grantees at the 5/22 meeting for discussion and decision on monetary status with a written report prior to the 5/22 meeting. Moved by Big Boy, seconded by Robert.
Bruce	Discussion? So that means that Yvonne would need to also inform the grantees as to what date you will need the report so you can put it on the agenda and available to the public and we can review prior to the meeting.	Yvonne to contact Nalani Brun.
Glenn	We need to be specific as to where the reports should go?	
Bruce	The reports should go to the facilitator and she distributes to us with the agenda. So do we need to make a change to who the report should go to? Should that be included into the motion?	
Jose	Moves to include that to the motion.	Included to motion, that the report go to the facilitator, Yvonne Hosaka by such a date

		she determines.
Bruce	Does anyone need the motion re-read? All in favor for the motion as stated please raise your hand. Looks like the workshop date has changed. We now have part of our agenda for that meeting. Now we will go to the next part of this business is the process by which a final report be provided by the grantee. Jose had some ideas and this is for the process for final report and if we want to standardize. We will open up for discussion and please note that we can defer this and finalize at the next meeting. So I will open up for discussion.	Motion carried unanimously
Jose	The reason if I may reiterate that, was to try to give the grantees an indication of the kind of expectations we may have as a CAC in guiding them to provide the information that should be forthcoming. Of course it should include the fiscal report, the timelines or the benchmarks or the highlights of what they did, what went well, the degree of contacts that they've made in the community so that we have a sense of the way in which the projects interfaced well with the community so we have that kind of report. So those are some of the things I wanted some detail on. The nuts and bolts to what they did that was successful or struggled with in terms of things that we can help them should they want to apply for a grant again. Look at ways to which we can help them with their efforts in asking for more funding to either expand, let's say, the Kekaha School garden project. Do they want to consider the possibility of doing a greenhouse as a garden project which may not have been incorporated in their original plan. That's just an example. Doesn't have to be as specific as that. I'm looking at ways that we can build things together and empower the community to do things. That's the reason I am asking for these types of questions or parameters.	
Comment from Audience – Pat Perreira	I think those points are very well taken by the community members but the first thing you have to ask. Beth, does the county have a standard by which the report needs to be written to them? If the county has a standard that they expect the grantee to write the report in, then that's it. It should suffice the county as well as our CAC.	
Beth	I can check with Nalani to see if she has a template for report. It certainly could be added. I will check to see if she has a sample.	Check for template from COK on grant reporting requirements
	Thank you	
Jose	And that might meet our needs just as is because then we have something definitive to look at and or to begin with.	
Bruce	So it seems like we should be getting some information from Nalani for the type of report the county requires. We have notes from Jose, his questions and suggestions. So what I would look at is, we will defer this with any other format or questions, please send to Yvonne to compile them and at the next meeting we would be looking at information from the county with their template and whatever else that the CAC members may have and send to the facilitator and she will compile that. And then we will discuss and have a possible decision making on our final report. The discussion I have is on the process on the final report will be provided by the grantee. The process as I understand it right now from the grantee required to the county. That final request will be forwarded to the CAC when that is received by the county and I would also like to know what the dates that the county requires the grantees to submit those reports by.	CAC Members to send Yvonne questions with regards to reporting process.
Glenn	Also when we're speaking about grantees, I am assuming that we are speaking about the fiscal sponsors and not the actual project?	
Bruce	I would assume both.	
Glenn	Well because the fiscal sponsor is the responsible party really. All I am trying to say is that we need to make sure that we know who is responsible for the fiscal report. For example, the episcopal church doesn't say that they thought the garden was going to do it and vice-versa. And not passing the buck and say, we didn't know.	
Jose	I think that's a point well taken. Where they are fiscal sponsors that umbrella the project proposals, it requires the people who submitted the grants to consult with their fiscal sponsors to make sure that there is accountability of all parties involved in the process and that is part of that final report being made. No one should be kept out of the loop. I really think that's very	

	important to maintain that clarity, transparency and accountability. That people who are involved or made a commitment to be a part of this to take on responsibilities. Everyone should be involved.	
Bruce	That was a good point. Would the facilitator be able to notify both. The fiscal and grantees? Make sure there is an understanding that somebody has to get a report to us.	
Yvonne	I will set up a meeting with Nalani Brun and get all of that information from her to go over the policies and procedures for grantees. I would also like to read what was dated 2/15/11 regarding Process of Grants which is a part of the past documents on file. "Grant Monitoring and Evaluation. All approved and funded grant proposals shall be monitored by a designated County officer or employee in accordance with the requirements set forth: 1. Overall compliance with the grant agreement terms, 2. An assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of program design and administration; 3. The degree to which payment milestones are being met and services and activities described in the proposal are being provided. If there are deficiencies in any of the areas above, the County will communicate these issues with the Grantee and request corrective measures. If deficiencies persist, the County may withhold payment for services or cancel the grant. So it sounds like you already have something in place and further discussions to provide better structure can be made in the grant applications so that all that is required can be placed in the application and they have it up front.	
Bruce	Can you cut out that part you just read to us and make sure it's in the minutes so we have a reference to that? Is there any more discussion? There was a motion to defer to the next meeting and be an agenda item. Moved and seconded. All in favor please raise your hand. So we now have this deferred at this point Monday 4/1 which may change.	Motion to defer to the next meeting and be an agenda item. Motion carried unanimously. Add onto agenda for next meeting. Grant Management and Process.
	We are now going on to the second part of our business. This is an update to the Kekaha PV solarized project and possible discussion. We will turn the floor over to Dennis Eguchi.	
Dennis Eguchi	You all have a copy of an email circulated by Mr. Bulatao through facilitator. Mr. B, Garrett, Patrick, Wayne and myself would like to thank you for taking the time to write something like this and we actually appreciate this and that's because you are exactly right. There should be transparency, clarity and accountability so I think Mr. B as a CAC member was the only one that actually took the time to do something like this and it keeps us in check. As far as the PV Project, we presented a timeline at the last meeting for you guys and unfortunately, at that meeting, we found out that the proposed 80% of the funding for the up and coming years were no longer ours, well Bruce, we even found out tonight that even the interest for the 780,000 that was also proposed might not also be ours. So until we actually know how much money we literally have in the pot, we really can't go forward right now. One of our proposals to the community was, we were going to try to see if we could put a PV system on every owner occupied home within the seven year timeline while we receive funds from the landfill. And we looked at about 80% of 150,000 per year and we do not know where we are now because we lost that 80%.	
Bruce	It is on the agenda for discussion. The interest is still in our bank and may be allocated in the future.	
Dennis	Well going forward, we need to know whether it's in our pot and not in the general pot.	
Jose	It's very interesting if I may respond to that. I don't think we have any idea ourselves about any interest specifically designated to the 780,000. The interest was on what is the entire account for the HCB allocation received and nothing was earmarked for only the 780,000 ever as far as I know.	
Dennis	I actually said it was proposed and Bruce is the one who actually proposed it. Both the 80% and the interest on the 780,000 and that's why as far as where we are at right now, we have to wait to see what you decide how much is allocated to the PV project so we know what to present to the community as the options which was already presented to the CAC. One of the biggest one was if we could do every home, we could just borrow the money off of the proposal for funding	

	and it would be returned to the CAC at the end of the project and we could do a system to every home and literally you would get your money back but we need to know how much we have in the pot. So the sooner you can decide, we can let the community know what their options are.	
Bruce	That's the next agenda item and as soon as you are done, we can move on to that.	
Jose	My concern after we had the presentation at the last meeting of the several options that was presented to those of you who worked with the County representatives is that we were seeing those options for the first time, we here at the CAC. My concern is I think we need to be very definitive about any financial arrangement with public funding that's coming through this committee and whether or not we can get into the so called business of going through loans, collecting things, what financial responsibilities we have to do that, who's going to do it and under what arrangements, what contracts are being drawn and it's hard for us to make a decision when all of these things are not clear in our minds after the one brief presentation of this possible proposal of an option. So it make take us more time to review the exactitudes if any of these options may be taken up because we just can't say yes to an option that is not detailed in terms to what we are dealing with. So that's my caution to any of these options.	
Dennis	Noted and well taken. That option actually came up because there was a major concern by the CAC that we would specifically give only X number of people in the community and that's why we pursued that option and you are right. You need to get more information. Unfortunately, we had someone at the last meeting who was going to do the presentation of this option but you did not have time and we got tabled instead. So we can go ahead and set up another meeting and unfortunately the next meeting would not be until 5/22. If we can do a presentation at all. We were thinking about, just knowing exactly how much was in the pot first and then actually doing a presentation to the community and letting them know what the options were so that they could be updated also and at that time we could come back to the CAC to let you know what the community is really looking at what option with the specifics to see what the CAC thinks. If they decide that they even like that option then we'd be spending more time with you guys trying to explain what we are trying to accomplish before the community actually says, this is what we want.	
Glenn	The PV Project is a commendable project and I support it 100% but my feeling is that we know how much money we are talking about and we never agreed to or specified that there will be interest and I commend our chair for sticking to the agenda and I want to do that and that's another agenda item. I don't think there should be any assumptions that we don't know. We also don't know how long the current council is going to be in, or what changes are going to be there, the Mayor and so we cannot project into the future so all that we can do is make our decision at a particular meeting with a specific amount of dollars and I don't think that it can be assumed that there is an open check book at all.	
Jose	There is also the concern Dennis that when the project proposal came for us to review at that given point in time in May or so, we sent the proposals up to the County level for review. It's been since that time, May, June, July, August, September, October November, nine months later and we have the specificity of what was originally proposed, to what it morphed into. So we had given the grace of approval to what we understood would be a means at which PV could be possibly installed in whatever matter and style. Since then, the question about liabilities on private property, the particulars of the situation in each home, weather they had gas or electricity, weather they qualified one way or another, all of these details were coming in validly because people were asking questions, do I qualify, what about my house, so forth and so on, we even talked about and it's in the minutes, as to whether or not the photovoltaic concept could possibly be placed on this roof or on schools, on churches, or any other public buildings so that we could do what the photovoltaic could do for the community which was originally intended in any manner and style because that's where the merit of the proposal met the highest amount of money that we awarded because we liked the idea. But because it's morphed into a different approach of how this may be accomplished. It really needs to be carefully reviewed so that we are all on the same page understanding how this may move forward with the approval, consent and the knowledge of everybody involved. That's what I am concerned about	
Dennis	Mr. B. unfortunately, what happened was, we spent too much time listening to your concerns apparently and the options that we came up with was because we felt that you guys were critical about putting it on personal homes, etc. and as far as on structures that couldn't accommodate a	

	<p>system, we already know that and it was presented at the last meeting. Basically think there has been a miscommunication between us and the CAC because we have not spent enough time with you guys and we spent too much time listening to you guys instead and tried to accommodate basically your concerns but if you guys want us to go ahead with the initial proposal then we'll just go ahead with the initial proposal, we don't have a problem with that but you guys concern was that we would be giving only specific people and we stopped and said you guys have a point, we have been working hard to see if we can come up with a solution. If it comes down to we have to stick to the original proposal then we will just go ahead with that. That's fine.</p>	
<p>Evelyn</p>	<p>My concern is the different options. It's been so many months and the proposal has changed. When I look at revolving loan fund, 780,000 and if I put hypothetically speaking, something on my roof, how much of this 780,000 is going to pay or am I going to have to pay on the revolving loan. Am I going to have another bill to pay? KIUC stated in the paper, "Thinking about PV", talk to KIUC first and a lot of the things KIUC says, it's not in this proposal. If I put a system on my home, whatever watt it is and if KIUC doesn't have the ability to connect me to that transformer is not big enough, I may have to wait, even if I am paying for that system and I am not getting any feedback from KIUC because KIUC doesn't have enough power to power my system at my house and so in looking at what KIUC has in this paper and it's in black and white. I don't see any of that in this proposal. All I see is the different options on how I could do bulk purchases option 5 and you have 5 different options to look at and all of these things up until this briefing for the solar program to me it's a shocking thing at this point. I went ahead and looked at our local bank here in Kekaha and I asked them, how does this revolving thing work? It's a good thing but I still have to take out money from pocket to put into the revolving fund so that it will work and grow as it goes. I am looking at myself and saying, am I going to have enough money to put back for this solar system and I know, I asked Ben Sullivan what is the county doing for this and he stated that he was leaving it up to this proposal. I'm thinking, go back to Kekaha and see how many people want PV systems in their homes. And we go back to KIUC and say we want to do the PV project and can we put it on the Kekaha Neighborhood Center roof, which going back to the county again. They're not going to an individual house where it's personal property where the home owner, I would have to make sure that I go to planning according to what you guys said, the contractor will do that, but the contractor will not tell us that they can actually hook up the line to the KIUC post if they don't have the transformer there. I'd like to see other options come back to the table and I think we can go back to KIUC and tell them that we are part of KIUC, we are members of KIUC and this is what we want. Why can't we build our own garden of PV voltage whether it be on a county facility, church building, then no one pays anything, we would just pay for the PV system that goes up there and everyone would benefit without going to a personal property then if the system don't work, it's the person that owns the property that holds the bag.</p>	
<p>Dennis</p>	<p>KIUC is aware of this project because we have already met with them. They know about the project. They actually told us that the grid in Kekaha is broken down into 4 different grids so we would be able to do so many homes per grid as we progress so that that way they can get their infrastructure ready for us so they already know about all this. As far as the revolving loan, the intent of the loan was, if you were to put up a system, what it is is the money would come from the pot and whatever your electric bill was for the month is what you will be paying back until you have paid up for the system. The reason why the loan was good was because we could go then after federal and state tax credits so then system would come down to only half the price or 45% of the price cause we would be able to get the 25 & 35% if they don't change the percentages. That's why that option was thought of also. As far as a different type of proposal, we would like your input you tell us what you would like to see and we are willing to take a look and work with whoever has any ideas about what we can do. I am kind of getting mixed information here because one says that maybe we have to look at a different proposal, another one says this was the original proposal, now you guys are trying to change it. You guys have to clue us in to what you want also. We feel that the bottom line is still the community. We need to present whatever we have out there to the community and let them make the decision after all, we represent the community and if they say this is what we want, fine and if they say, your project is taking too long we are tired of it, whatever it is, we need to go back to them first and your decision about how much money goes into the project makes a big difference because then we'll know how much more we can accommodate.</p>	

Bruce	So what Evelyn is saying will a resident have another bill? You're saying that the revolving fund payback for a resident will be tagged on their electric bill.	
Dennis	Bruce, If I'm not mistaken, and I don't want to quote you but at one of the meetings I think you kind of mentioned that you put in a system you borrowed the money and the system literally pays for the note or whatever you paid for.	
Bruce	I paid my note is the same as my electric bill basically	
Dennis	So basically, you pay that until the note is over then you're Scott free after that right?	
Bruce	Yes. What I'm asking is basically what are the proposals you have at this point. What you're looking at. I'm just looking for answers for that because I understand that everything changes every month. I have no problem with that. You can drop that on me. To clarify, to me, what Evelyn was saying, if a resident at this point the revolving fund, you are just looking at getting from the resident what they paid for electricity.	
Dennis	Right for example, if Buddy pays 400 a month and I pay 200 a month, I don't want to put aside a 400 a month system that means I have to take out of pocket 200 more. So it would be only practical that I put in a system that pays for my electric bill.	
Bruce	But the bottom line what I'm asking, is under that revolving loan fund, there is no intention at this point for the resident to have to put out any money except for what they are currently paying for their electric bill.	
Dennis	Right. Basically what the resident will be doing is coming to the board and putting in another grant and the grant is for their system. Basically, that's how the loan will be transacted.	
Bruce	That's something new again.	
Dennis	Well we are just trying to basically say. If we spend all this effort and we go to the community and they say, this is not what we want, then we don't want to go there, so what we want to do is go ahead and present it to the community and say, this is what we think we can do, and then they say, ok this is what we think we want, then ok, let's get to the specifics and then we come back to you guys go through the entire specifics and then go back to the community and say ok now, this is what we came up with is this alright with you guys and if they say no, they say no.	
Jose	In what manner and style does the money replenish that fund like you said, if you put money out that we gave you, some money will come back to replenish that amount. Is that correct?	
Dennis	Yes because if you were to put in a system and your electric bill is 200 a month now so we put in a system for you, every month you pay back 200.	
Jose	But the 200 I'm paying to KIUC for providing me electricity?	
Dennis	No, KIUC provides you electricity. The system that you are supposedly borrowing on, you're going to pay us back or pay the CAC back basically that what it is, or the communities' money. Whatever power you don't use is your money.	
Buddy Auydan	Can I explain? PV System basically supplies energy to the household. If your bill is 200 your system will perform the 200 worth of electricity.	
Jose	And that's a guarantee? That total, whatever you pay that fluctuates month to month the photovoltaic will cover that entire system no matter what?	

Buddy	<p>Whatever the system that you put on the home. The quantity of the system per say. If your bill is 200, the system that goes on the house will make up that 200. You won't have an electric bill. The bill that you normally pay, replenishes the fund. All the questions about KIUC when we originally made this proposal, we had to make sure that every household can acquire a system. The question you had about KIUC facilities not being able to power up your house because they don't have a transformer. We had done that before we even made the proposal. If we didn't do all of our homework and due diligence, on something like this, we couldn't even put a proposal in because KIUC would literally tell us that we cannot handle this and cannot do it. So before we even came to the CAC board with the proposal, we made sure we did our homework on the whole system, all of Kekaha. We sat down with the County, permitting process, and did everything that initially has to get done to have PV put on a premise. Bruce Pleas and Big Boy knows more about this than anybody else on the board because they have systems on their homes. They can literally explain to you how much they are benefiting from it. The loan term process time, that you pay back to the system ends in a matter of six years give or take. The other 20 years roughly, the life expectancy of that, It practically eliminates the bill Evelyn is talking about. She literally will not have an electric bill except for the surcharges that KIUC charges for that. Now on the other side of the coin, the insurance factor from anything that you buy can crap out tomorrow. But, the equipment that is put on the home has an insurance coverage for the material. The workmanship that the contractor supplies, he has to also give you insurance. Now, what is Extra earned for each PV System. We are not on net metering net metering was only given to maybe 10%, I'm not sure. Only a few hand-full on this island is net metering. Because we are a co-op, we own it. We are not like all the other islands. Maui is going crazy putting PV Systems. Stepping back a little. A lot of the people that are not aware, why don't we build a PV Farm for Kekaha and farm it out to all of the homes. There are no new permits for any PV Farms being issued anymore on Kauai. They closed that out a long time ago. Any project you here is going to be done have already been permitted. We know a lot about it because we had to do the proposal, we had to do the project. We asked a lot of people in the community for help. I think we assumed a little too much but the concerns were, we wanted to move this forward so we did our due diligence, we hope we've kept you informed, we have nothing to hide. If there are any questions that need to be answered, I'm almost positive that we can answer them right now.</p>	
Bruce	<p>I would like to move forward at this point, I am looking for a motion for a deferral on this with a return of a solarized Kauai for a question and answer period so that the CAC members can get more acquainted with that and it would be at the next meeting and I would also appreciate it if the CAC members would send questions directly to solarized Kekaha so they can come prepared with questions already asked with answers so we wouldn't load stuff on them so I would be looking for a deferral and a scheduling for the next agenda if that's alright with you guys. Or we can sit here and answer questions tonight but I don't think we are going to cover much</p>	<p>CAC Members to send questions about PV Project directly to Solarized Kekaha.</p>
Dennis	<p>Well, the thing is, we can answer all your questions for the different type of proposals but it's the community still needs to know what's available and let us know what they are interested in so until we get their input, there is no sense in us trying to pick an option then if that's not what the community wants, we would have to come back to you guys and say, this is what the community says they wants.</p>	
Glenn	<p>From my perspective as a member of the CAC, I've spent a lot of time on each of the proposals from all of the grantees, including the solarize project. I feel I can't be an expert on all fields. I can't even be an expert on the community garden project or the elementary school project so from my perspective I need to have one proposal that says, this is what we propose and this is how much It will cost. I understand photovoltaic in general and I read a lot about it including your fine proposals but we really need to get something accomplished here. This has going on for a long time now and like I said, we need to boil this down to a proposal that we can get our teeth into and then go forward from there. It's a situation that, well one more point that I wanted to make is, I talk to some community members but I keep busy so all of these proposals should be based on your interaction with the committee we've had meetings such as tonight, and solarized Kauai needs to come up with a proposal based on their understanding of what the community needs and then we can move forward.</p>	

Dennis	Yes. Thank you.	
Jose	In sending our questions to Solarized Kekaha that would be: Dennis Buddy, Glenn and Patrick?	
Dennis	Yes	Jose moves to defer, seconded by Evelyn.
Bruce	Any discussion? So we are in a catch 22 her that I can see. We're looking at one CAC member wants one proposal from everybody from the community. Maybe in this timeframe before you come back you should hold your meeting with the community and see what they have to say and come back with solid information for us. We will have you on the next agenda for discussion with presentation and community decision.	
Dennis	When we hold this community meeting, is there anything in the sunshine law that prohibits you from attending this meeting to listen to what the community has to say?	
Bruce	No. We can attend this meeting and we hope you send us an invitation to us so we can attend.	
Dennis	Thank you.	
Audience – Phoebe Eng	May I speak?	
Bruce	Public Testimony can be accepted at any time if you raise your hand and as long as it's on the agenda item.	
Phoebe	Ok just for the record, my name is Phoebe Eng and I am a resident of Waimea. I just have a few short comments about the project that was just described as well as the process. Much interested more in the process so that it is fair and that everything is above-forward. I think that it's interesting that the solarized Kekaha project is asking the CAC to give information that other grantees did not have about available funds and then working with that information to then change or amend their proposal as needed. I think that I am not going to make a comment about that particular request but that it is not equitable in terms of other grantees that would or have been part of this process. It's not a negotiation. I think that's one of the issues. That we cannot turn the tables on this grant making process. I've been involved in many many foundations and many grants. The way it works is as everyone knows is that a grant maker with grant funds puts out a request for proposals the proposals are met with various written plans and then the grant maker decides or asks for more information. I've never been in a situation in any professional setting where the grantee then says tell me how much money you got and then we'll make a plan to fit that. That's completely beyond me I don't understand that and maybe that's for Kekaha and that's fine but it's something, from grant making process is inappropriate in my experience. Thank you very much Mr. Molander for saying that the community check in process is something from a due diligent stand point is the responsibility of the grant proposer. I do caution the solution that was just made by this committee about having the solarized Kekaha project then put out a community meeting announcement that is/could have the effect of showing an approval of this project without it really saying so. So I just caution that. I also would like to make sure that it is the actual proponents of this project, the four gentlemen that are proposing this project that are the presenters and not somebody from outside of Kekaha. I think that it's important just for the spirit of this grant because it is about the people by for and about Kekaha and about supporting the leaders of this community and then just shortly in looking at the Solarized Kekaha project in terms of the power point presentation that was given to us last meeting, that the loan and revolving fund process that is recommended doesn't in my eyes as a	

	<p>public citizen honor the spirit of what the landfill HCB money is about. It benefits a few and only those only who can monetarily pursue that kind of pay load. A very similar project was put out several years ago by the same group to Native Hawaiian Homelands beneficiaries and homesteaders and that project was a loan program and that project was not taken up with much enthusiasm by its residents and we do have the numbers on that and the reason was because the payback was simply unaffordable to a lot of the folks who receive public assistance and for whom additional loan payments were absolutely unmanageable. So regardless of whether this is a program of revolving fund that could be made available to low income residents, it is still a cash flow situation that does not benefit the residents of Kekaha in an equitable manner and I think that Mr. B was very clear in saying that this should be something that everybody benefits from and this committee that can safe-guard with that high vision. The other thing is that payback schedule that was described previously, I feel that the projections have to be a lot more specific. I cannot figure out how that math works. Unless you were off grid, that's simply impossible that you would never have to pay more than your energy bill and that would be a guarantee. I would like to see the projections and I hope you ask for those projections. From a business plan perspective, you would actually do a couple of scenarios for that so that you could see how the math worked. If a family of 4 has an energy bill of 400 plus I would like to see what their payback schedule is and what happens if they run up a bill of 1000. I don't see that hypothetical in there so it's only through the math where see what this project is. Similarly, in terms of revolving funds, you have to ask all these questions. You really only need an energy financial account to look at this. What happens in the case of default? When you trigger a default on a PV system that costs tens, thousands of dollars, does it comes out of the revolving fund? What is the liability on that revolver? Where does the revolver go in terms of creating collateral base for the CDFI that actually houses that fund. For instance, if I am the bank that's going to manage that \$750 to \$850, 000, I can then use that as money that's not necessarily under my control but that I can use as my net asset base in order to leverage as my own CDFI for other projects. So it is a benefit that goes to whatever CDFI gets awarded this. Those benefits should be disclosed in any review that you do of this project. I also caution using this idea of getting your money back as an asset to this project. Getting your money back means you're getting the money back from who? From the Kekaha residents. When you say getting your money back, it's very much from an investment banker's point of view. From a point of view of a party who doesn't care how the hell you get the money back. We don't want the money back from the people of Kekaha. This money was for the people of Kekaha. So let's make sure that this is money that you leverage wisely but that we don't do so at the expense of the vision of what a landfill benefits payout is supposed to be. The payout is because our children and our families suffer because of the landfill and its repercussions for generations Thanks, that's all I have to say. Thank you.</p>	
Bruce	Any discussion, comments. You may come forward	
Dennis	<p>In regards to the funds that we asked about earlier. It wasn't funds that we were asking because we are asking for it now. We were under the assumption that it was proposed and that it was already ours and we did not do the proposal. CAC did. So we apparently had a misunderstanding. We thought that 80% of the pot going forward was going directly to the project. Only to find out it wasn't. We are not asking for the money. It was you guys that actually came up with the proposal to offer us the money. What Phoebe has come up with has a lot of merit and she is exactly right that the money from the landfill was supposed to be for the residents of Kekaha and maybe in that sense we have to go back to the original proposal and give it only to the people of Kekaha. But the problem was it would only be for a number of people and so that's why we looked at options to see if we could accommodate more. You are right and there are merits to what you said and maybe we should just address the original proposal. Thank you</p>	
Jose	<p>In the process I think because of the original concept that was given to us to review and in the process of looking at what we had to deal with again, not realizing for instance, and I'll speak for myself, the extent to which we may have had to consider the possibility of litigation concerns if we're using public funds on private property. That has now clearly been addressed to me. But those are the kinds of concerns that need to be clarified up front. The other one was the extent to which any of us in what manner and style a financial company will handle the income of that</p>	

	<p>money and the redistribution of that money because at no point in time did we ever think about creating such an entity that we're replenishing 780,000 plus for us to use again and as Phoebe pointed out we're the ones putting the money in now and not getting it from the County. Because the County had decided that Kekaha was given the allocation because of the fact that we're hosting the landfill. So this money is coming in part from us because we pay taxes and so on, but it's coming from the entire County of Kauai in terms of revenue that's been put aside and how money's are coming to this particular funding. So there is so many financial aspects that weren't clear and I think that's part of the reason why it's taken so long at the county level to iron out these kinds of concerns and problems that we had no privy to until these options were presented to us at the last meeting. That's why I moved to defer because there are so many things left unanswered because of the intricacies of problems that face all of us and again we need to be responsible for what we're doing.</p>	
Dennis	<p>Unfortunately, Mr. Molander came up and said that we need to watch what we do as we progress something we did prior might haunt us and basically, it has already and putting up personal PV system on a private property. You guys already went and did that when you put a system on a catholic school and that was an issue, it was private property and you guys kind of let that one go by and so you guys have to be more consistent in what you say and decide to do in going forward. So if you feel that the project we are doing shouldn't be on personal property then so be it. But you have already crossed that threshold and already did that so....</p>	
Bruce	<p>I understood that at that time and I also said we were setting a precedent and I'll stand by it. I look at what this is. We have the financial aspects. We have a lot of effort and understanding but as a citizen who has a PV system, you put one up big enough there that covers your electricity you're making money. Bottom line. It's not that hard and it's well within reason. I make \$1000 a year. I don't even pay a penny. It's all covered. If these guys (solarized) can get the people of Kekaha the same deal, have it written in writing and supply the information to the CAC after the community has voted on it, I'm comfortable with what's going on because it does work. If there is any more discussion, please speak up so we can move on with our agenda.</p>	
Phoebe	<p>I did speak to Ben Sullivan, he did tell me that in terms of the payback that comes to photovoltaic owners that it's not going to be as it was because Kauai has topped out until they can create some new transmission lines and so people won't be getting the kind of windfalls that they are getting so far. So those kinds of things get mapped out in the projections as well just based on what KIUC or somebody might see as payout into year 3 or 5 would be more realistic in terms of what people can expect. Another thing is in terms to St. Theresa School, the big distinguishing factor was that St Theresa School wasn't financed with a revolving credit line. It was just pay for the Photovoltaic, Put the PV on the roof, deal done, grant done. I am not sure. I am not familiar with the St. Theresa program. But I think that the finance aspect is the big distinguishing factor of this particular project as well as the breath, and extent of it. It's a much more expensive project. You're putting a bigger chunk of your cash in it.</p>	
Jose	<p>And Dennis point is well taken if I may answer to that too. One of the considerations for the St. Theresa's proposal was that the savings would be used to offer scholarships and to create programs for the children in the school and that made a little bit of difference in terms of specificity of the savings they would get putting photovoltaic on the school property which is private property not personal property and the way in which they were thinking of diverting whatever savings they would get for the benefit of the children who attend the school and I think that was the reason we approved that one.</p>	
Dennis	<p>There probably might not be a savings because there is going to be AC units In the whole school now so I don't know if that was looked into prior to awarding the money for the PV System but the school will be equipped with A/C for every room which is great because my grandson goes there. I asked my daughter did you get a discount on tuition? No, Do expect one? Not sure.</p>	
Bruce	<p>With that, we'll close business "b" and move on to business "c". Discussion and possible decision-making on proposal to earmark a percentage of HCB interest to Kekaha PV Solarized project. Now note, the agenda item is a percentage of the HCB interest. All we are speaking on is the interest part whether you want to earmark a percentage of the interest to the solarized project. I am going to apologize to Dennis them because the agenda item should have included a percentage of the take. But I can't fudge it at this point. We might be able to in about 10 minutes. So what I proposed that the interest from the 780,000 would go into the PV fund. That's all I proposed. Discussion for CAC members now open.</p>	

Glenn	I prefer not to do that. I would like to see a clean proposal concerning the Solarized project without any variables. We know from the financial report earlier that the interest rate can vary therefore, the percentage of the amount that represents the percentage would vary, it's an unknown amount. We are not doing this for any other grantees, we're not giving them this privilege. I would like to see each year's funding be a separate item. If solarized comes up next year and says we would like 50% of the funds that are available to Kekaha for HCB, fine. So I think we need to stick to a proposal with a set amount of funds with a set budget and go from there.	
Jose	In my thinking, because there is an anticipation of funding that should be coming in to the community of Kekaha up until the year 2021 and as councilman Mel Rapozo pointed out, they still don't know how much of it of an increase if any that the community might receive from year to year. I think this is where it behooves us as a community, if we really think we deserve more because of extenuating circumstances of more income coming in to solid waste department. Then we should be fighting for a larger amount or bidding to the table why we think we deserve more. With that being the case, if that PV project moves forward, in the next 3 or 4 years what's to stop us from having a new proposal coming in with the same amount if not more because if they have a proven track record and things are working as well as they had anticipated in any shape or form, we can reconsider funding them another 780,000 if the money off the bat is there and if we choose to do so and not merely just a percentage of the interest at this point and time. So I really think we are not closing the door on the merit of this project, but we are considering a range of possibilities it can keep on going if it merits that kind of financial support. That's the way I see it.	
Glenn	One other comment about our funding in the future which we believe we will be getting in the future, we believe that we will be getting interest in the future but none of those are certainties. We went through a lot of pain and time early on with this committee in trying to get community input. (Item e, survey results) We actually got quite a bit and I think all of us worked through some extent to try to contact community members to try to get some ideas and we got a lot of ideas probably more than we wanted. Eventually, we sort of shifted gears and got to where we are now. The point is, there is still a lot of things out there that would benefit the community and I think we need to look at all of these things before we spend future funds and future funds off of interest. We need to look at everything that's out on the table.	
Bruce	Ok. Anymore discussion?	
Big Boy	My feeling on this is the interest should go to the general fund and not to the PV Project. Another grantee might say, how come we don't get the interest also. Regarding St. Theresa, we don't want to make another mistake by doing this. So, I think the interest should go back to the general fund.	
Evelyn	I think, I'm for what Glenn had said and all the other proposals. We gave them the exact amount. I think we should do that with this proposal. Going back to St. Theresa whether the tuition came down or not I think it's going to take time before the PV kicks in before St. Theresa can see whether they are making adjustments to their electric bill. I don't think it's going to be in the near future that their tuition is going to come down. I think it will take time. I think we should give the amount that the project was proposed for and look at new proposals and see how best we can spend the interest that is generated. Since it's going to be different every month, it's going to be hard to determine what the interest should be. As time goes by, we can look into other options as to how best we can spend the interest that will be received.	
Bruce	So from what I hear. I am looking for a motion. We have a general consensus that at this point the interest money should stay in the general fund and that it may also be available at a later day at the HCB decision for the solar project. Also, from what I heard from two of the members is that the solarized should be coming back next year and be getting ready to present a long form – request for money. Is that what I hear? So in a nutshell, I am looking for a motion to receive this item for the record.	
Dennis	Is this a calendar year or the county's fiscal budget year?	

Bruce	Everything is based on the County's fiscal – July to June.	
Dennis	Ok so what you're telling us is that if we don't get the project off the ground by June that we have to reapply for the grant again?	
Bruce	No the 780,00 is intact. We may have to make a decision on that at the end of the year again. You brought up a new item. What I was saying for next year's allocation, you should already be thinking of applying for next year. But it's discussion so we have different aspects so we'll let the discussion go forward.	
Dennis	My question is, is the 780 still for the original proposal?	
Jose	The proposal is intact in terms of what we approved in May. However, because of the concerns that we have been discussing and because of the timeline. We are stuck with the fiscal year that we didn't create. It's a matter of reality. My suggestion is to have Beth check with the County Attorney's office about the legality of whatever types of extension may be possible for us to consider. We need that information. We cannot make that assumption that we know what we can do if there are legal requirements to be met. I only want to be within what the charter says we can do. If we say we can and we didn't know, because the meeting that we went to about Boards and Commissions, that Evelyn, Yvonne and I went to voluntary. The thing was brought up about did we have to fill out those forms two years after we were appointed. Mauna Kea clearly explained that the board of ethics ruled in our favor that we didn't have to do that. But we had to have that clarification from the board of ethics. We couldn't say that just because we think so, it is. So I want to be sure we meet those levels of understandings that come officially from the attorney's office.	
Bruce	We will need information on legally whether we can extend the 780 to next year or does it go back to the general fund. I assumed we can just go ahead and assumed from the beginning the 780 was set aside. But we need verification on that from the County Attorney.	Can we extend that 780,00 proposal for next fiscal year? Beth to check with County Attorney.
Jose	For the record. I would personally lean towards keeping that 780,000 intact based on what we are legally required to do	
Bruce	I believe that was the intent that we had because we understood it wouldn't be spent this year. We are just going to check up on that now. I agree with some of the other CAC members, for your next year allocation that you were hoping to get information on.	
Dennis	As is, if the project gets going by the end of the fiscal year than the 780 is intact for the project?	
Bruce	No because we have not sent the recommendation to the Mayor?	
Beth	You sent the recommendation to the Mayor but he has not yet approved it yet to release the funds. But I think what you're asking, they would like to have that money to be continued to be held as long as you are still working on the project and trying to make it happen. Until we get verification from the County Attorney that it doesn't have to last that current fiscal year. I think and agree with what you said, that you can continue to hold it for that project and until such time in moving forward and you say you aren't going to do it.	
Jose	And at an earlier discussion pointed out from the discussion we had among the CAC members, we deferred another portion because we wanted further clarification on some of the things that were not forthcoming and also according to our minutes of our last meeting, we had anticipated the possibility of a community meeting at the call of the project proposal people and I think that you will be moving in that direction which will help all of us in moving forward. Those are the things that are pending and whether the Mayor is waiting for the kind of information also so that all of these wonderings can be clarified up front. Clarity, accountability and transparency of all	Clarify matter on whether Attorney should be present to validate CAC meetings?

	parties. I would also suggest further that in order to not make assumption that KIUC be invited to one of our meetings so that they can answer us directly. One of the other things that I need to point out is that the workshop we attended Paula Murakami made the statement that there was this thing on whether this committee was at the same level as boards and commission. The answer was “probably”. However, the point of the matter is that, she made the statement that all boards and commission and probably us, never have a meeting without the presence of the attorney assigned to that board, commission or committee. So I asked the question. We have our meetings without the presence of an attorney, so does that render all of our meetings illegal?	
Bruce	Motion to receive business C. So moved, by Jose seconded by Robert	Motion passed unanimously.
	Next item is “d” on the agenda. This is a budget request to finance community facilitator. So this is our budget request to go in for this year’s item, but by our agenda item, it just covers the community facilitator which is the money we receive from the Mayor’s office. We make a request to budget for a line item for \$80,000 to budget for a facilitator. Do we want to do the same thing this year? This is the initial budget request from this CAC that we will send to the Mayor, the Mayor will put it in as a line item in the budget that then goes in this Friday to the council and then that’s when we go.	
	Based on the contract that we had right now with the facilitator, there will be money included in the budget that will be presented this Friday to provide you with a facilitator through next year.	
Jose	What about the annual allocation?	
Bruce	Right now this is to finance the CAC Facilitator? For the Fiscal year 2013 – 2014. July through June. We are looking for a motion.	Moved by Evelyn, seconded by Glenn. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed unanimously
Bruce	I am looking for a deferral for e,f, and g on the agenda	Moved Big Boy, seconded Evelyn, No further discussion, all in favor, motion passed unanimously.
Bruce	Open discussion for the amount of money for Kekaha on the Budget for the HCB Funds.	
Jose	Based on the fact that I don’t know why there is going to be another increase, but there’s also the residential increase or addition to what solid waste is getting. Is that correct? Where does the money that charging residents go to?	
Beth	You mean the \$6.00 a month. That goes to the County General – Solid Waste funds.	
	Ok, because Solid waste is receiving more money, than I think the money that we request should go up also.	
	Ok. Well we requested 1 million last year. We are not going to vote on this and we are just discussing it. I would put out, 1.5 million. We asked for 1 million last year and we got 600,000 last year and because of the increase of the height and tipping fees, plus in general purposes, I think 1.5 is reasonable.	
Beth	I think at some point you should make a formal request to the Mayor. Have it put on your agenda to discuss and send in as a group.	Write a letter to the Mayor requesting funds for facilitator.

Bruce	You may come forward	
Anthony Aguiar	We all know how our county council and we vote for 7 of them and we have 7 clowns in there that running around there in their little clown circus there. On the 25 th of this month, the charter commission will be entertaining single member districts and after I come back from that I was wondering If I could come back and bring it back to you folks, since you are the only ones here. That would be fine with me and I just want to be put on the agenda so we can have a little time. The meeting is the 25 th of this month and I have to get back to you on the time.	Single Member District requested to be put on the next agenda.
Bruce	I will think about it. I don't know that that's an agenda item for HCB but thank you for the public information.	
Jose	I recommend you contact Mary Jean Buza-Sims who is the President of E Ola Mau to get on the agenda for their next meeting.	
Anthony	Thank you	
Evelyn	Final roll call, six members present. Evelyn moved to adjourn, seconded by Jose. All in favor, so moved.	Meeting adjourned 9:08 pm

Drafted by: _____
Yvonne Hosaka, CAC Facilitator

Submitted by: _____
Evelyn Olores, Secretary

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Bruce Pleas, Chair

() Approved as is
() Approved with amendments
See minutes of _____ meeting.