

DRAFT II
MEETING SUMMARY WITH CORRECTIONS
KAKA'AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
Meeting #10

Tuesday, February 12, 2008
John A. Burns School of Medicine, Room 301
5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Facilitators: Karen Cross, Kem Lowry
Recorder: Anne Smoke
Edited by Steering Committee

Attachments:

- A. Consent Agenda:
Recommendation on Kamehameha Schools and OHA Steering Committee Positions
- B. Steering Committee Transition Options
- C. People's Plan Presentation
- D. Preliminary Vision Concepts from the January 15 CPAC Meeting

I. Welcome and Overview

Kem reviewed the ground rules, meeting agenda and consent agenda.

II. Approval of the January 15, 2008 CPAC Meeting Summary

The January 15, 2008, Meeting Summary was approved and adopted by CPAC consensus.

III. Introductions

CPAC meeting participants introduced themselves, and Kem introduced Anthony Ching, the newly-appointed HCDA Executive Director, who commented on the following:

- Tony was appointed on January 2, 2008, following his tenure with as the Executive Director of the Land Use Commission. Previous to this he held positions at the state planning and health departments.
- He fully appreciates the need to communicate, coordinate and work with the community, and it is not his intention to develop plans, announce them and then have to defend them.
- He used the UH football team's past season as an example of teamwork achieving success and statewide support throughout their playing season, thus becoming exemplary ambassadors for the state. He emphasized a similar need for the manner in which the HCDA is conducted as being just as important.
- He understands there needs to be a commitment cultivated within the HCDA to be transparent, clear and consistent, and assured the CPAC that he will provide clarity and consistency in communication.

Questions and answers:

Q: What is your vision for this part of Kaka‘ako Makai?

A: Tony replied the vision is not so much his personal vision, but the vision of the public since this is clearly intended to be a public gathering place. He reflected upon his own involvement in a previous Kaka‘ako waterfront planning process, and noted the importance and similarity of stakeholder focus group issues and concerns then to those of today. He added that since that time further guidance has been provided by resolutions and laws adopted by the state. .

Q: Is it foreseen that the OHA land settlement will create a difference of purposes for Kaka‘ako Makai, one being to generate significant revenue for OHA and the other being the creation of a public space?

A: Tony stated that he is interested in a fair and just settlement for an issue that has been pending for a long time. His understanding of the agreement is that OHA has committed to the continuing planning jurisdiction of HCDA, and the only difference with the state statutory guidelines for Kaka‘ako Makai is that OHA will not be bound to the cultural marketplace concept.

Q: What is the HCDA’s vision of the gathering place, and where is parking intended to be located?

A: Parking is needed to accommodate a public gathering place, and provisions for parking were also in the JABSOM plan. If the Cancer Research Center comes to fruition it will need parking as well, as will other developments presently being contemplated. Adequate parking also will be needed for events held in the area. Parking is presently typically at grade level, and communication has yet to take place regarding any future parking structures, which will need to be appropriately placed and avoid disturbance of landfill.

A. A Steering Committee member noted that there is presently a bill moving through the Legislature seeking centralized integrated parking for Kaka‘ako Makai in the vicinity of JABSOM..

Q: What is being done to remedy concerns about the HCDA’s transparency? For example, when recently asked about a traffic survey there was no response from the HCDA, and there has been none to date. This lack of responsiveness is discouraging.

A: Tony responded that Deepak and Tenny are available to assist the CPAC. He does not plan to micromanage, but will ensure that his staff will be accountable for the open policies he is implementing, including communication and responses.

Q: There is momentum within the larger community in recognition of the CPAC’s established planning process for Kaka‘ako Makai. Given the presently proposed OHA settlement now before the Legislature, how will the HCDA support and perpetuate the established community-based planning process and the momentum supporting this? Will HCDA be able to follow through with the established planning process?

A: Tony noted he could not speak for the Legislature, but he assured the CPAC that there will be ongoing HCDA discussion with the community and that communication is a given.

IV. CPAC Election Results

Karen reviewed the results of the election for CPAC operations officers:

- Mark Wong—Chair
- Ron Iwami—1st Vice Chair
- Amy Anderson—2nd Vice Chair
- Michelle Matson—Secretary

Karen provided the returned ballots and tallies to the Steering Committee's Secretary for verification by the Committee, and noted that these will be delivered to the HCDA offices for public access following verification by the Committee.

V. Consent Agenda—Steering Committee Recommendation

(See Consent Agenda attachment and Steering Committee Recommendations posted on the HCDA web site)

Karen reviewed the Steering Committee recommendation presented on the Consent Agenda as the result of concerns brought up at the January CPAC meeting. This recommendation addressed how the CPAC might handle public perception of conflict of interest and/or undue influence given that two CPAC officer candidates also represented Kaka'ako Makai land development interests on the CPAC:

- There was concern that the land development interests and potential financial gain of certain members' employers may present a conflict of interest or perception of undue influence if these representatives comprised half the officers representing the CPAC, and there would be a question of public perception of the direction, representation and potential undue influence over CPAC decisions because of the obligations of these representatives to their employers.
- It was concluded by consensus of the CPAC Steering Committee that the community-based image CPAC needed to be preserved in the public's view, and that instead of being officers representing the CPAC in its entirety, the property development representatives for Kamehameha Schools (KS) and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) could hold a place at the table by being appointed ex-officio members of the Steering Committee. It was also noted that the KS representative was presently a member of the Committee.
- The outcome of the deliberation was that this recommendation was a fair and reasonable solution for the purpose of being all-inclusive while avoiding the appearance of conflict of interest and/or the perception of undue influence by elected officers.
- Subsequently both the KS and OHA representatives concurred with the Steering Committee's recommendation to be provided a place on the Steering Committee, and voluntarily agreed to withdraw from the election of CPAC officers.

Discussion:

- Deepak clarified that there was presently an OHA employee on the HCDA board, but this position is as a Hawaiian cultural representative for Kalaeloa and not as a representative of OHA.
- A participating member opined that that KS and OHA were selectively discriminated against in this conflict of interest issue, and noted that people who attend CPAC meetings have several interests despite their place of employment. This member asserted that others may have conflicts of interest as well, and stated that OHA and KS were singled out.
- A Steering Committee member corrected this individual assertion by pointing out that the candidacy of the representatives of KS and OHA was discussed by the Steering Committee because of the demonstrated development interest expressed by the KS and OHA representatives at CPAC meetings, and the ex-officio positions on the Steering Committee were determined to be a fair and reasonable way for these major landholder interests to be represented while not representing the community-based CPAC in its entirety and creating a public perception of undue influence.
- The representative of OHA noted that the objective is for those publicly representing the CPAC to put aside their own interests. He added that OHA believes this process should go forward as defined in the legislative resolution, and OHA does not want to create a perception that they are not supporting this process, or want to do away with the CPAC, or are unduly influencing the CPAC. He further noted that OHA would continue to advocate for their beneficiaries whether or not represented on the Steering Committee.

Karen asked for a show of hands by those who supported the Consent Agenda recommendation by the Steering Committee. There was an indication that 19 of those present were in support of the recommendation, and 1 was opposed.

Because there were additional comments, discussion was deferred until after the presentation.

Later in the meeting Karen asked if there were any other concerns before voting on the recommendation.

- Q. A participant asked if the KS and OHA representatives' ex-officio positions on the Committee would be voting positions.
A. A Steering Committee member explained that ex-officio members, i.e., those officially appointed, can be voting members, and the present KS representative's position on the Committee is a voting position. The understanding is that the OHA and KS representatives would be chosen by OHA and KS, respectively, not appointed by the CPAC, and it was expected that they would be voting members.
- It was proposed and agreed to have language designating ex officio voting members in the recommendation to add clarity to their role.
- A participating member opined that the conflict of interest discussion had taken place without input from the full CPAC, and stakeholder representatives were identified as

- land-owners interests by the Steering Committee but no objection to this has been reflected in previous meeting minutes. The member further asserted that CPAC members had not given the Steering Committee decision-making power, and there are other interests in the CPAC membership that should be reflected in the discussions if KS and OHA interests are being discussed.
- A Steering Committee member corrected these individual assertions by pointing out that the Steering Committee meets monthly to discuss issues brought forth, and makes recommendations to the full CPAC based on their deliberations and findings. Thus the recommendation has been presented for the full CPAC to vote on at this meeting given agreement by KS and OHA. It was further noted that no other representatives of development interests were candidates for CPAC office, and the associated concerns were expressed by CPAC members at the January 15 meeting and reflected in the minutes.
 - A participating member clarified that the term ex-officio designates a member who is officially appointed by their employer and is expected to represent their employer, whereas most other CPAC members have no such obligation.
 - Another participating member reiterated their assertions earlier in the meeting and stated that the term ex-officio should be dropped from the recommendation and it should be made clear that those on the Steering Committee are voting members, and the Steering Committee should sunset.
 - A Steering Committee member responded with the reminder that the Steering Committee had been designated as a standing committee by CPAC consensus. The member then suggested that the KS and OHA representatives provide comments.
 - The OHA representative had nothing to add to his earlier comments. The KS representative explained that KS is interested in stewardship and hopes they can help with the process and contribute their ideas. He noted they have no interest in creating a perception of undue influence.
 - A Steering Committee member commented on the following: a) no discrimination exists when all the parties agree to a solution; b) the concern was met with agreement to take a particular course of action given an appearance of undue influence by large powerful entities; and c) this mutual agreement came about from expression of these concerns and the desire to peacefully protect the CPAC's image as a citizens group.

It was moved and seconded that the Steering Committee's recommendation be adopted by the CPAC, with 18 of those present voting in favor.

A friendly amendment was proposed to include the clarification that the ex-officio members would be voting members, with 18 voting in favor.

Another amendment was proposed to eliminate ex-officio from recommendation entirely, with 3 voting in favor, 10 opposed and 7 abstentions. The amendment failed.

A third amendment was moved and seconded to add "voting" to the recommendation to read "ex-officio voting position." This amendment was adopted by 24 of those present, with none opposed or abstaining.

By majority vote of those present, the CPAC passed the Steering Committee's recommendation that, in addition to the officers elected by the CPAC, both Kamehameha Schools and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs would appoint one representative each to an ex-officio voting position on the Steering Committee, and that these appointed ex-officio voting members would not hold two positions by also being elected officers of the CPAC.

VI. Kaka'ako Makai Shoreline Park Plan ("People's Plan") Presentation

(See Plan Summary and PowerPoint posted on the HCDA web site)

Nancy Hedlund, Ph.D., introduced the coordinators and presenters of the plan, Wayne Takamine and Michelle Matson, and briefly shared some background of the creation of the People's Plan. Nancy was elected to the Ala Moana/Kaka'ako Neighborhood Board in 2005, just before the plan to sell public shoreline land for development of luxury high-rise condominiums was approved by the HCDA. In response to the presentation of this proposal at a Neighborhood Board meeting, the community gathered to seek and determine a better alternative. She emphasized that this grassroots effort produced a plan that evolved through several iterations from the Kewalo Basin Association's initial concept into a multi-faceted plan with economic viability.

Michelle Matson commented on the slide showing a map of the Honolulu shoreline in 1810, and the location of the original significant Kaka'ako fishing village. She credited Michael Klicks, Ph.D., with providing the shoreline history summary included in the Plan Summary attachment, and explained that Save Our Kaka'ako Makai (SOKM), as shown on the next slide, became a coalition formed by Michael Klicks and Ron Iwami when many concerned citizens gathered to discuss Kaka'ako's remaining open shoreline and its importance to Honolulu's growing population and future generations. The coalition grew and provided extensive public testimony during the 2006 Legislative hearings, which resulted in the law prohibiting the sale of state public land in Kaka'ako and prohibiting residential development in Kaka'ako Makai. In addition, by unanimous resolution the 2006 Legislature requested the HCDA to "immediately convene a working group to meaningfully participate in the development, acceptance and implementation of any future plans for the development of Kaka'ako Makai," which the CPAC is today.

David Lizama, representing the Kewalo Basin Park Association, presented the first shoreline plan concept that led to the "People's Plan." David addressed such issues as increased surfing contests, boating at Kewalo Basin, and other water recreation uses that affect the surfers' access to the area. This as well as the proposed development of luxury high-rises on the Kaka'ako shoreline was the impetus for the formation of the Save Our Kaka'ako coalition, and creation of an alternate plan preferred by the surfers, fishermen, park users and concerned citizens who joined together to preserve and protect the Kaka'ako Makai shoreline for public use. The coalition's numbers grew rapidly from 5 to 500 upon hearing of the proposal to develop the shoreline into an exclusive community of luxury condominiums and commercial development, and this support soon became island-

wide and expanded to the neighbor islands and mainland as the 2006 Legislative session progressed. David explained that a collection of ideas from public input resulted in the coalition's "Lei of the Land" principle of greenery within an expanded waterfront zone and gathering place accessible by the public, which would also include:

- connected bike paths and walkways extending from Ala Moana Park, around Kewalo Basin and the waterfront park, to where the OHA headquarters is planned;
- a community center
- a traditional Kaka'ako farmers and fish market

David concluded that this was a preservation plan for public use by the estimated 30,000 future residents of Kaka'ako Mauka who would require a proportionate amount of recreational open space, and the remainder was left open for further discussion and sustainable planning ideas in the public interest.

Michelle presented the plan's evolution into the next generation that was part of the effort during 2006 Legislative hearings. She presented a "Walk Through the Park," highlighting the plan's public recreational uses and cultural facilities throughout the conceptual schematic site plan,* including:

- an expanded landscaped shoreline park
- connected "Lei-of-the-Land" bicycle and pedestrian pathways
- an *ahupua'a* farmer's and fish market
- a Kaka'ako community center
- a significant performing arts center and Hawaiian music hall of fame
- a water sports exhibition hall and surfing hall of fame
- restoration of the sheltered Kewalo Basin cove area for marine conservation education and activities
- additional public uses within the larger area from Kewalo Basin to Cooke Street.

Wayne Takamine presented a sustainable Traditional Hawaiian Fishing Village concept* within the plan, and highlighted the emphasis on native Hawaiian cultural values and features within the village reflecting cultural practices within the *ahupua'a*, including:

- a stream configuration with a fishpond and lo'i
- native Hawaiian coastal plants and trees
- an interactive canoe-building halau
- a makahiki area with Hawaiian games and martial arts demonstrations
- a hula platform and story-telling huts

Wayne further explained that this concept would provide sustainability through certain revenue-producing features.

(*see full description in the Plan Summary attachment posted on the HCDA web site)

Michelle concluded with examples of successful sustainable public interest projects which addressed public/private partnerships, and the successful non-profit Central Park Conservancy model.

Questions, Answers and Comments

Q: A participating member suggested that the fishing village concept was not necessarily traditional in accordance with Hawaiian cultural history and practices, and questioned whether the initial planning had appropriate cultural consultation. The member discussed placement of the fishing village and provided a series of specific examples of traditional features, and suggested that before further work is done there should be consultation with OHA, Kamehameha Schools and Hawaiian cultural practitioners.

A: Michelle thanked the member for providing an excellent opportunity for detailed guidance on the Hawaiian features of the plan, and fully agreed that consultation on Hawaiian cultural elements is essential. She noted that it had not been the objective to define the details of cultural features in the schematic concept, primarily because of the time constraints of the Legislative process at the time. She agreed that as the CPAC moves forward in this process the cultural details would be for the cultural practitioners, *kupuna*, Hawaiian civic clubs, OHA, KS and others with Hawaiian cultural expertise to come to the table to discuss and to provide guidance for the placement and details of the cultural elements for a culturally appropriate plan, and to make the plan the best it can be.

Q: Another participating member suggested that it is recognized cultural experts and Hawaiians lineally descended from the area who should be consulted for reliable cultural guidance. The member then asked how the plan came to be called the "People's Plan."

A: Michelle explained that when a corporate redevelopment plan was first proposed and accepted by HCDA, the people who actively used the area proposed a contrasting alternate plan that began with the priority of the shoreline park, and later more discussion both with the people who actively used the area and wider public interests brought forth additional ideas. She added that the plan for this shoreline area also needs to be right from the Hawaiian cultural perspective, and noted an appropriate and complete plan can be achieved with constructive input.

A. Wayne added that the ocean and park users were most actively involved in the early discussions on this plan, and during the evolution of the plan more people came together with an array of ideas and compromises, but some of the input they needed remained lacking and the CPAC is now enabling better opportunities for discussion on the cultural aspects.

Q. A participating member commented on the work reflected in the plan, and asked whether consideration had been given to interfacing the vision in this plan with what the new process might be going forward, i.e., the dynamics of the previous visioning and a new plan emerging, or if it is the intention to modify this plan.

A. Wayne pointed out that because the plan is conceptual it can be stimulated. He noted that there are clear differences between the vision of a park with public uses and the vision of economic development to generate revenue, and added that a successful plan will find a balance by incorporating supported concepts, with some concepts staying and others changing according to community input.

A Steering Committee member commented that when this plan was called the People's Plan it was created by the people who cared about the water and the shoreline and others

who cared about open space and parkland, and who stepped forward and fought to prevent inappropriate development in Kaka‘ako Makai and had something to say about a better plan. The member emphasized that the strategy then was that the plan was a means to achieve a message to the Legislature but not an end to the planning. This member suggested that despite a few members questioning details of concepts, working group participants as a whole could benefit from the vast array of opportunities presented to perpetuate a vision.

A participant agreed, adding that those from different cultures would benefit by working together to conceptually build authenticity into the plan, but noted that from the outset the first two organizations contacted for guidance, OHA and KS, did not respond to the invitation.

Q: A participant asked about the surfing spots used regularly along the shoreline area, commenting that the Island of Oahu serves an estimated 300,000 surfers.

A: David identified the major surf spots, and reiterated that there has been a notable increase in other water activity over the past ten years. He explained that on a summer day thousands of people use the water and shoreline park for surfing, diving, swimming, paddling, kayaking, jogging, bicycling and walking, and as the population in Kaka‘ako increases with development this area will become more popular.

A. A participating member added that Ala Moana Beach Park serves 3.5 million people annually.

Q: A participant noted that the State and UH previously made vision decisions for Kaka‘ako Makai by building the medical school and planning research centers around it. The participant then interpreted the People’s Plan as having a basic premise of no residential or high-rise use, and posed a question whether there was any proposal within Kamehameha Schools’, OHA’s, HCDA’s, or the People’s plans for rental and other residential support for people working at the medical and research center campus.

A. Michelle reiterated the community’s effort to preserve the shoreline during the 2006 Legislative session, and that there was extensive testimony in the public interest that focused on the importance of this remaining shoreline area to today’s population and future generations. She explained that as the result of this effort and the voice of the people, a law was enacted in 2006 precluding the sale of state public land in Kaka‘ako and prohibiting residential development in Kaka‘ako Makai, and this law has been added to existing statutory guidelines for Kaka‘ako Makai that also include a public cultural market.

A participating member expressed support for the central park conservancy model, and felt the revenue-generating Hawaiiana concept could clutter the area and risk being exploitive. The participating member also expressed support for OHA taking over the Kewalo waterfront, noting that conditions in the marina could create financial pressure on the remaining Kaka‘ako Makai lands if carrying the harbor users as well.

Another participating member responded that the Kewalo Basin harbor users generate income to support the harbor, and none of the plans would be supplementing the commercial harbor users.

A participating member acknowledged that the central park conservancy model highlighted in the presentation was one of the best examples of this type that could have been presented.

VII. New Business

- A. The Steering Committee Transition Options listed in the handout were deferred to the next meeting.
- B. Preliminary Visioning comments submitted by CPAC participating members at the end of the January 15 meeting were provided in the meeting handout. (See attachment posted on the HCDA web site.)
- C. An additional proposal was presented to Karen with a request for presentation at a future meeting.

VIII. Next Meeting Steps

A. Next Meeting Dates:

February Steering Committee Meeting: February 20, 2008; location and time to be posted.

March CPAC Meeting: March 11, 2008; JABSOM Room 301

B. Forthcoming Presentations and Discussions:

- OHA Presentation
- KKFC Presentation
- Vision Statement

Q: A participant asked if HCDA will be giving a presentation showing their vision.

A: Deepak replied that HCDA presently does not have a vision and is awaiting input from the community.

The CPAC meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Meeting notes prepared by Anne M. Smoke and received by Steering Committee on 2-18-08
Draft Meeting notes edited and reformatted as Meeting Summary by CPAC Secretary on 2-28-08
Steering Committee review and approval of Draft Meeting Summary completed on 3-3-08
Draft Meeting Summary correct by Anne Marie Smoke 3-19-08

Attendance List: on following page

CPAC Attendance

Anderson, Amy
Bidari, Keshar
Bolduc, Sara
Browning, Chad
Burgess, Kawika
Chang, Dawn
Chartrand, Grant
Chillingworth, Mele
Ching, Randy
Chun-Oakland, Senator Suzanne
Crone, Bob
Cross, Karen
Cunningham, Corrin
Dang, Mike
DeMent, Gwen
Feltz, William
Furushima, Scott
Hagedorn, Joe
Hedlund, Nancy
Hetrick, Willow
Howe, Jim
Hubbard, Klouldil
Killeen, Kevin
Lee, Kaimana
Lizama, David
Lowry, Kem
Loy, Bob
Matson, Michelle
Miasnik, Geoff
Nalua'i, Dr. Solomon
Okada, Dexter
Paluch, William
Parkinson, John
Pearson, Chuck
Phlegar, Chelsea
Plottier, Maria
Reilly, Elizabeth
Scheuer, Jonathan
Smoke, Anne
Sohn, Kristen

Takeshita, Erik
Takeuchi, Gregg
Tamashiro, Elaine
Thorpe, John W. Jr.
Wellington, Fumiko
Yajima, Loretta
Zupic, Danica