

**KAKA'AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING #24 SUMMARY
Tuesday, March 10, 2009
John A. Burns School of Medicine, Room 301**

Meeting Materials:

- February 17, 2009 CPAC Meeting Summary
- February 24, 2009 Steering Committee Meeting Summary
- CPAC Meaningful Participation Position Statement and Action Plan
- HCDA 2007 “Kaka‘ako Makai Planning Process” Flow Chart
- HCDA March 4 Staff Report and Planning Process Participation Levels Diagram
- HCDA Map of Kaka‘ako Makai Future Land Use Zones
- List of 2009 Legislation Relating to Kaka‘ako Makai

I. Preliminary Business

A. Welcome and Introductions

CPAC Chair Wong welcomed CPAC participants.

B. Adoption of the January 13, 2009 CPAC Meeting Summary.

The January 13, 2009, CPAC Meeting Summary was adopted by consensus.

II. Presentation - Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA)

Land Management Hale Director Jonathan Scheuer and Trustee Oswald Stender

Director Scheuer provided updates on Senate Bill 995 and House Bill 910 relating to the transfer of 18 ½ acres of Kaka‘ako Makai lands to OHA: Both measures were amended in a second draft by the respective money committees, with certain dollar amounts converted to blank spaces along with technical and procedural changes. The Senate bill has also removed the KKFC site parcel by tax map key from the transfer of Kaka‘ako Makai lands to OHA.

Director Scheuer described three projected slides continued from the previous CPAC meeting presentation. The illustrations highlighted OHA’s preliminary concept of development within the area of Kaka ‘ako Makai proposed to be transferred to OHA in the legislation. The Kaka’ako renderings did not include residential as a potential use. Comments, questions and answers followed (see: Attachment A). Responding to questions OHA representatives agreed that OHA would continue to work with CPAC in planning for the area.

Trustee Stender concluded the presentation with a rendering of the Hilo Banyan Drive property that had been removed from the legislation because of tsunami inundation concerns. The Hilo property concept illustrated that residential and resort uses moved back from the shoreline to allow for an expansive shoreline park landscape can be attractive to both residents and visitors.

III. CPAC Meaningful Participation Position Statement and Action Plan Affirmation

Chair Wong explained that the CPAC Meaningful Participation Position Statement, which had been finalized by the Steering Committee as authorized by the CPAC for presentation to the HCDA prior to the March 4 board meeting, includes on the second page a timeframe beginning with plan development and continuing through the plan acceptance and implementation phases, and an example of the types of CPAC participation expected.

Secretary Matson noted that the expected CPAC participation in the development, acceptance and implementation of the master plan phases was described in a narrative now entitled "Action Plan," which matches the action plan task following development of the Vision and Guiding Principles on the HCDA's CPAC "Planning Process" flow chart.

It was noted that the process and efficient channeling of communication will need to be clearly defined in the consultant's scope of work.

The CPAC Meaningful Participation Position Statement and Action Plan was ratified by consensus.

IV. HCDA Planning Process Presentation

HCDA Executive Director Ching reviewed the following distributed materials:

- March 4, 2009, Staff Report to the HCDA board
- CPAC Meaningful Participation Position Statement and Action Plan
- HCDA 2007 "Kaka 'ako Makai Planning Process" flow chart
- HCDA 2009 "Master Planning Process" task and participation diagram
- HCDA Makai Area color-keyed land use area map

Comments, questions and answers followed (see Attachment B).

Executive Director Ching invited the CPAC to submit comments on the four tasks developed for the consultant's scope of work. He added once the scope of work is finalized, the CPAC would be provided with an opportunity for final review prior to it being issued to the consultant candidates.

Comments arose later in the meeting concerning the CPAC's position in the planning process reflected on the HCDA's "Kaka'ako Makai Master Planning Process" diagram:

- C. There is a question of what has been presented on the participation and task diagram, and the role of the CPAC as representative of the larger community. It appears that the CPAC has been segmented from the stakeholders and larger community, and segmentation of the CPAC, the larger community, stakeholders and landowners could compromise what the CPAC has accomplished.
 - A. To ensure an open process, members of the public and stakeholders participating in the planning tasks could be invited to CPAC meetings.
 - A. It remains important that the CPAC's Meaningful Participation Position Statement serves to define what the CPAC is and represents.
 - A. The CPAC is behind in publicizing the Vision and Guiding Principles for Kaka'ako Makai, and the Steering Committee needs to work on this.

V. 2009 Legislation Relating to Kaka‘ako Makai

Chair Wong reported that the Steering Committee will be providing regular updates on active legislation affecting Kaka‘ako Makai, and noted the short timeframe in which to develop CPAC consensus. Comments followed:

- It was suggested that the CPAC consider forming a consensus on the first three bills, which are less complex, including the measure addressing the CPAC’s future and a museum for Hawaiian music and dance.
- It was noted that some CPAC participants had been testifying as individuals on the legislation, and if the CPAC does not have the time needed to form positions on the bills, the individual testimonies could continue to carry the message.
- It was advised that the CPAC’s presence, as an entity, had been absent at the Legislature, and if the CPAC remains silent the legislation most important to the CPAC may languish.
- It was pointed out that the CPAC represents the larger community, and without a consensus or majority support testimony cannot be presented on behalf of the CPAC.

Following brief discussion on the bills in general, it was agreed that the CPAC should focus on Senate Bill 1069, which would statutorily recognize the CPAC’s advisory capacity for the development, acceptance and implementation of any future plans for Kaka‘ako Makai.

- It was agreed that given other proposed Legislation to abolish the HCDA or transfer the HCDA’s functions to DLNR or zoning authority to the city, or a large portion of Kaka‘ako Makai to OHA, an amendment would be needed to ensure that with any such transfer the recognized advisory capacity of the CPAC would be made part of that transfer.
- It was recommended that the measure be amended to ensure that the CPAC remains advisory to any agency with control over the planning and development of Kaka‘ako Makai.
- It was noted that the measure would not change the present functions of the CPAC, but would provide the CPAC with the standing and protection needed to continue its mission under any successive conditions or reorganization of agency functions.
- It was recommended that the CPAC authorize a letter addressing Senate Bill 1069 with the recommendation for an amendment that the CPAC shall be advisory to whatever entity has jurisdiction over Kaka‘ako Makai.
- It was suggested that the Steering Committee draft and approve the statement based on the CPAC’s authorized recommendation.

Two-thirds of those present voted on favor of a letter being drafted by the Steering Committee to recommend that Senate Bill 1069 be amended to ensure that the CPAC remain advisory to whatever entity has jurisdiction over the planning and development of Kaka‘ako Makai.

It was agreed that the remainder of the legislation would be discussed by the Steering Committee and considered for presentation at the April 14 CPAC meeting.

VI. EPA Community Grant Opportunity

Chair Wong reported that discussion had been opened with the EPA relating to the 2009 CARE grant process. He noted that given the time constraints in preparing the grant application by the March 16 deadline it was decided by the Steering Committee that a grant

application could be better developed over the next year and submitted for the EPA's 2010 CARE grant opportunity, and the need for a 501c3 receiving structure has been mentioned.

Secretary Matson added that the record of discussion to date on the CARE grant opportunity could be found in recent Steering Committee meeting summaries. She also reported on email correspondence with the national EPA grant coordinator, who had advised that the CPAC's candidacy, application area and general questions could be more fully addressed following closure of the present grant application period. She pointed out that once the EPA response is received it can be shared with the CPAC and there will be more to discuss. Information on the EPA CARE grant, including application information and a web stream seminar, is posted on the EPA CARE grant web site at <http://www.epa.gov/CARE/>

VII. Announcements

Chair Wong announced the CPAC's next meeting dates:

Steering Committee Meeting	Tuesday, March 17, 2009
CPAC Meeting	Tuesday, April 14, 2009

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

March 10, 2009, CPAC Meeting Attendance (and Meetings Attended)

Anderson, Amy	(20)	Nalua'I, Sol	(16)
Crone, Bob	(19)	Oda, Bob	(7)
Dunn, Scott	(1)	Okada, Dexter	(19)
Feltz, Bill	(19)	Parkinson, John	(15)
Furushima, Scott	(16)	Sakaguchi, Bill	(4)
Hagedom, Joe	(4)	Scheuer, Jonathan	(16)
Iwami, Ron	(19)	Smimokawa, Brian	(3)
Loy, Bob	(13)	Stender, Oz	(4)
Matson, Michelle	(24)	Takamine, Wayne	(21)
Miasnik, Geoff	(15)	White, Reg	(8)
		Wong, Mark	(17)

HCDA Staff
Ching, Anthony
Neupane, Deepak
Nakamoto, Craig

Draft CPAC Meeting Summary transmitted by the CPAC Secretary to Steering Committee Members for review on March 17, 2009. Draft CPAC Meeting Summary approved for posting by the CPAC Steering Committee on March 31, 2009.

ATTACHMENT A

Office of Hawaiian Affairs Presentation Summary

OHA Land Hale Director Scheuer described the projected slides continued from the previous CPAC meeting presentation:

- The three illustrations show a conceptual plan for the 18 ½ acres of Kaka‘ako Makai proposed to be transferred to OHA.
- These preliminary renderings resulted from a meeting of the OHA negotiating team, comprised of four OHA Trustees including Trustee Stender, and some consultants, where the OHA values were discussed as related to real estate and the Kaka‘ako Makai area. This meeting was immediately followed by architects developing a conceptual plan in time for community meetings on each island.
- The aerial view shows a colored delineation of the parcels of lands that would be transferred to OHA.
- OHA values also include shoreline access, and the conceptual renderings show commercial development along Kewalo Basin from Fisherman’s Wharf restaurant through the John Dominis site with the buildings set back to allow pedestrian access along the harbor waterfront to Point Panic and Kaka‘ako Waterfront Park.
- Conceptually, the development area would be divided into thirds:
 - the most mauka third would be commercial retail tied into the Ward developments across Ala Wai Boulevard.
 - the center third would be civic and entertainment space,
 - the makai third would be cultural space.
- There are connections between and indoor and outdoor environments, and between the marine and land environments.
- The retail focus would be on local small businesses with authentic local food or local services, and not designer stores.
- The cultural public market in the vicinity of the Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy site would include a permanent indoor-outdoor farmers market to provide a venue supporting native Hawaiian and other local farmers struggling to get their products to market in a profitable way on a permanent basis.
- The scale at the top shows the scale of the proposed Ward development heights up to 400 feet relative to the makai area development of 2 to 3 stories in height.
- The Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy is not depicted, but OHA would welcome this use either incorporated in OHA’s plans or as a neighbor.
- The John Dominis site changes are also not incorporated in the conceptual renderings.
- The long-term view for the Honolulu Marine dry dock site, which has a lease for many more years, is that they will either move or become part of this concept.

Questions, answers and comments followed:

- Q. What was the community reaction to the conceptual plans?
 - A. The reaction to the compensatory plan was very positive on all islands except Hilo, where much more concern was generated related to the Hilo Banyan Drive transfer and the tsunami inundation zone, and this is why the House dropped this segment of the transfer. The value of generating revenue to support Hawaiian programs was strongly received. One beneficiary asked how OHA could execute all this, and clearly OHA would need partners.

- Q. What is the conceptual use for the piano-shaped lot?
 - A. Possibly neighborhood retail on the ground floor and office space on the second and third floors over a parking garage core important for regional parking, i.e., a multi-story parking garage behind a multi-story façade, similar to the Ward plan where the shops are wrapped around the parking.
- Q. Is there residential development?
 - A. There is no residential development in this concept.
 - A. OHA's effort is to try to create revenue-generating facilities in Kaka'ako Makai while being attentive to community needs. OHA's negotiating committee has talked a lot about lower density residential use, and there is a trend to have residential units over shops such as in Chinatown. There is also a great need for affordable rentals and OHA wants to explore all options and this idea as part of the mix. But this is not cast in concrete. OHA understands that residential development in Kaka'ako Makai is prohibited by statute, but believes the legislation should not stand in the way of meeting people's needs.
- C. Legislation prohibiting residential development in Kaka'ako Maki was enacted to serve a broader purpose and protect the wishes of the community.
- C. The concept since the 1987 charette, even before the A&B controversy, was that residential should be mauka of Ala Moana Boulevard, The idea was that there would be a certain synergy with 24/7 nighttime activities which would disturb residential use and conflict with residential parking.
- C. Trustee Stender is to be commended for conveying what OHA has been exploring in concept, and for placing this out for open discussion. Open communication, dialog, understanding, compromises and consensus comprise a sound and beneficial approach in seeking successful solutions, and this is an example for other organizations and agencies.
- Q. Where would the Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy and marine conservation activities be located in the plan?
 - A. The flying saucer-type building.
 - A. That would be the location, but it is not physically shown.
 - A. OHA would want their architects to get together with the KKFC architect to integrate the KKFC plan, which is quite good and meets one of OHA's goals.
 - A. The KKFC program will be in Kaka'ako Maki, whether leasing from the HCDA or OHA.

Trustee Stender commented that before things got too far along he had wanted to let the CPAC to know that OHA appreciates all the work the CPAC has done and convey the concept contemplated by OHA, and that OHA will return to work with the CPAC on seeing how to make it work.

- Q. What will the relationship be between the harbor area and the OHA headquarters site?
 - A. There would be visual connections, e.g. architectural design, as well as mobility connections between the two. It is very important for OHA to have their own building with a sense of identity and government presence instead of being housed in a standard high-rise, and OHA has been working with HCDA to secure the headquarters site. Planning has not begun yet, but the architects have stressed that one of the most powerful things would be to tie the two sites together, and OHA recognizes this is a very important issue.

- A. The difference would be that the harbor side would be a truly commercial public activity area, while the OHA headquarters would be more culturally correct than the harbor side. Hawaiians are ocean-oriented and the building would be set back from the ocean, there would be a canoe launching area, lo‘i, hula halau. Parking will be a problem, and OHA has been talking with the other stakeholders about a shared parking facility for the headquarters, set back from the ocean and shared with the seawater air-conditioning operation to serve both needs.
- Q. Balancing values real estate goals is quite a task, and it seems that this would be a different process and planning approach than business-as-usual. If OHA chooses to interface with the CPAC, would OHA go about the process and planning in a different way?
 - A. Yes. The Trustees’ real estate decisions are driven by a “Vision, Mission and Strategy” policy document adopted following an OHA self-study on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis as OHA moves into land ownership. The importance of lands to Hawaiians and also the relationship with the larger community is deeply imbedded in this policy, and planning will be done with community input. Recent KS North Shore planning has been an exemplary as a long-term community-based planning effort, and OHA would strive to emulate this and not the process used for the A&B development in Kaka‘ako Makai. The renderings are a preliminary attempt to show what OHA’s values might look like as interpreted by one architect under time constraints to get it to the community, and the final design should be formed by community input.
 - A. First, what will drive this is an economic engine to support OHA’s programs. Second, the community element will be key in making this a local place. The vision is to have all the cultural foods not found in large centers, authentic Hawaiian merchandise and local activities including a venue for Hawaiian concerts instead of the Waikiki Shell to meet that goal. A pure Hawaiian cultural venue will be at the OHA headquarters to preserve the culture and tradition, not to generate revenue.
 - A. It will be private at the headquarters and public around the harbor.
- Q. Because the surrounding area is already filled with commercial retail use, would the traditional Hawaiian goods and services market niche make this development sustainable for OHA?
 - A. The renderings are not based on detailed financial analysis, but on the values of that OHA would like to see. The detailed financial analysis must still be conducted, and it is hoped the economy will be better in a few years.
- Q. If the Makai lands are transferred to OHA, will OHA work with the CPAC and the CPAC’s Vision and Guiding Principles for Kaka‘ako Makai?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. Will the HCDA continue to have any control over the land transferred to OHA?
 - A. The versions of the active bills exempt OHA from HCDA zoning and statutory control, and OHA would work with the HCDA on the headquarters site.
 - A. OHA is a government agency and projects don’t move when inter-agency consultations are required and time is spent talking about rules, and when the Legislature passes a bill it is difficult to change if it is wrong. OHA does not want to be mired in the HCDA’s 20-year-old policies that may not be workable today.
 - A. The bills were drafted following 45 community meetings with nearly 1500 people, where questions arose about OHA being controlled by the HCDA or DLNR or the city. OHA has always been autonomous, and the active bills continue this intention.

- Q. Has OHA communicated the CPAC’s Vision and Guiding Principles to their architectural team, and were these embodied in the conceptual plan?
 - A. OHA’s architects were given the Vision and Guiding Principles document and directed to the CPAC section of the HCDA web site. Not everything wanted from the values was embodied, and this may be the first of many plans. This effort was to put visualizations forward to get away from the legal aspects and transfers issues and show people at the meetings how something positive can be done, and this was helpful to people in the community.
- Q. If something like this concept is developed, OHA will become the major stakeholder along the harbor. What does OHA envision for the remainder of the harbor and how would this tie in with OHA’s selected commercial flavor?
 - A. One vision was to take the entire harbor to Ala Moana Park, but this is not going to happen so OHA hopes to work with the HCDA and the work done by the CPAC to help meet mutual goals for the remainder of the area, including a park that should be open to the shoreline, should be accessible, should have view planes, and should not be commercialized.
- C. As mentioned at the last meeting, the Ala Moana Park side of the harbor, with the exception of a small parcel adjacent to Ala Moana Park, is ceded land, and, given the present agreement with the State, OHA would receive 20% of the lease revenue from whatever might be developed there. Some CPAC concepts discussed variously either at length or briefly include the following for the harbor perimeter:
 - Local services and small local shops to support and supply the fishing and excursion boat businesses in the harbor;
 - A harbor promenade and connecting greenbelts leading to the Park;
 - Possible relocation of the Kewalo Marine Lab to the nearly vacated NOAA facility.
- C. As shown on the rendering, the Look Lab parcels would become part of the Waterfront Park area.
- Q. Has OHA considered retaining Fisherman’s Wharf as a historic building, or adaptively reusing the unique interior?
 - A. No, because the building is so old that it would be costly to restore with the outside support that this would require. But there may be portions that could be reused in new construction.
- C. A positive aspect about this concept would be the experience people would have with the flow from the Park and harbor front into the complex form one end to the other, and the kinds of commercial use that would attract the local pedestrian traffic instead of high-end shoppers or personal storage facility users.
 - A. Yes this would be a Local People Place.
 - A. People have talked fondly about the sights and sounds in Kaka‘ako, where people were engaged with the place and where politicians liked to campaign.
 - C. Another positive aspect would be an open area near the Fisherman’s Wharf restaurant site and the street.
- Q. Would OHA have an interest in working with the HCDA to remediate the park or remove the mounds?
 - A. As a landowner in Kaka‘ako Makai OHA would contribute to the improvement district and pay fees for the maintenance of the Park, and it would be in OHA’s interest to make the Park more successful.

- A. It is certain that the government will not care for the Park as it should be taken care of, and this can only be done with private money. So it would be helpful if the State and OHA and other Kaka‘ako Makai stakeholders could establish a cumulative fund for this purpose.
- C. Two CPAC representatives once met with Hawaiian cultural practitioner Kaiwi Yoon, and asked him how he would treat the mounds in Waterfront Park. He envisioned that, because they were already there, a use would have to be found for them and from a Hawaiian cultural perspective they could be used for celestial navigation education.
- C. There has been dialog about how to integrate the Waterfront Park with the OHA headquarters to bring this culture into the Park and achieve this flow, and bridging the irrigation canal has been mentioned.

Trustee Stender concluded the presentation with a rendering of the Hilo Banyan Drive property that had been removed from the legislation because of tsunami inundation concerns.

ATTACHMENT B

HCDA Planning Process Presentation

HCDA Executive Director Ching reviewed the March 4, 2009, Staff Report to the HCDA board and commented on the following:

- Following the receipt of the CPAC's Vision and Guiding Principles for Kaka'ako Makai, HCDA staff developed a report and at the March 4 HCDA meeting requested \$600,000 for planning consultant services for the master planning process.
- The Staff Report is adapted from the report presented at the March 4 HCDA meeting with the addition of the four specific tasks.
- The flow chart illustrates the levels of participation and tasks involved during the master planning process for landowners and stakeholders, CPAC representatives as an interested party consulted on the Vision and Guiding Principles, the HCDA consultant, HCDA staff, and decision-making by the HCDA board to update the plan in a particular way. Thus the CPAC has a role under the different tasks.
- In addition, individual projects may come up. For individual projects there is no CPAC position on the flow chart, and the CPAC can always participate as stakeholders or as the general public.
- The HCDA 2007 "Planning Process" flow chart was reviewed along with the CPAC's "Meaningful Participation Position Statement and Action Plan."
 - There are no questions on the Position Statement.
 - The first paragraph of the Action Plan appears to describe a scope of work or expectations for the CPAC representatives and there will be certain commitments, and they will provide context by expert references in terms of any questions that come up on the Vision and Guiding Principles and in discussion. This is fine.
 - For the second paragraph, first sentence, the HCDA is obliged to make the decisions about and procure the qualified planning consultants, but the CPAC can review and comment on the scope of services prior to the RFP. The four tasks in Exhibit A attached to the Staff Report describe this scope of work, and the CPAC's comments are welcome on this.
 - The procurement process precludes disclosing consultants chosen for a short list.
 - The next two sentences are fine.
 - The third paragraph appears to be the CPAC representatives' scope of commitment, and the HCDA would not need to comment on this.
 - The first sentence on the fourth paragraph describes the CPAC's seat at the table, and the second sentence provides examples of participation. Having that voice is no problem.
 - The last sentence parallels HCR 30 in terms of acceptance and implementation of the plan. The CPAC will have a seat at the table to continually have a voice in providing the context of the Vision and Guiding Principles and providing advice.
 - The HCDA board has the final authority.

Comments, questions and answers followed:

- C. The CPAC is looking for direct link with the consultant through a liaison committee. While the tasks are listed on the diagram and the players are present, the vertical link between the CPAC representatives and consultant appears to be absent for the purpose of managing information between the CPAC and the consultant, and reporting to and from the CPAC.

- C. The Steering Committee will need to review and comment on the diagram with recommendations for further refinement.
- A. That would be acceptable.
- C. Communications should be open in both directions – from the CPAC to the consultant and the HCDA, and from the HCDA to the consultant and the CPAC.
- C. The diagram shows three levels of input to the consultant, and the output is in the form of an action or actual document.
- A. There is interaction under each task, and the consultant produces documents and schematic diagrams, etc. This is meant to be a stratified process to for the tasks to be accomplished with involvement at each level, and a decision at the end.
- C. The involvement must be integrated and must filter through.
- C. A clarification is needed on the scope of services. The HCDA will be hiring a consultant or team to review the entire map of the Makai area, but some of the stakeholders' plans have been fairly well determined and defined, such as those of OHA, KS, and JABSOM.
- A. The scope of the planners work is defined in the narrative of the four specific tasks attached to the Staff Report, with the first task being handled by HCDA staff.
- Q. What is the timeline for the tasks to be completed?
- A. Roughly 18 months, including refining the scope of work with consideration of the CPAC's comments, select the consultant, and complete the tasks in an iterative process.
- Q. How did the HCDA arrive at the amount of \$600,000 for consultant services? For example, community-based master plans cost about \$250,000 and the Diamond Head State Monument Master Plan with a full EIS process was \$1M.
- A. This is the HCDA's estimate from other contracting consultants' estimates.
- Q. What will happen if the OHA legislation is successful?
- A. The planning will stop and the scope of work will be rewritten for the remainder.
- C. The need will remain for the overall coordination of stakeholders' projects into a master plan for the entire Makai area, which has never changed.
- Q. Who would lead this coordination?
- A. All stakeholders could come to the table. The plan is supposed to address the preferred community alternative.

The February 2009 Mauka Area land use map was reviewed:

- Piers 1 and 2 (grey) – harbor and industrial use controlled by DOT
- Makai Parks (green) – park planning and improvements for Gateway, Waterfront and Kewalo Basin parks comprising the lei of green.
- Historic Pump Station (white) – adjacent to the municipal pump station on Keawe Street.
- Medical Education/Research (yellow) – UH medical facilities and KS life sciences complex with respective plans completed or underway.
- Waterfront Commercial (blue) – Kewalo Harbor perimeter, piano-shaped lot and future OHA headquarters site.
- Ala Moana Commercial Blocks (red) – Acura car dealership and water works block (KS), AAFES/DOH block, Forrest Avenue lot, and Gold Bond building block (KS). These are submitted to the CPAC as being commercial blocks.

Comments, questions and answers followed:

Q. Does KS own the block between Forrest Avenue and the AAFES/DOH block?

A. No, these are state-controlled (ceded) land. KS has its own development initiatives.

The attention of the consultant will be directed to develop, as in the four tasks, out to the four tasks, schematic diagrams that address the particular blue area, because this area is unplanned as yet, keeping in mind the context of the whole, but the focus will be largely in this area, and the park planning will continue as needed to be incorporated into the plan.

C. The master plan will be for the entire area so everything will flow together cohesively, but in addition, either existing or applied given conditions will be designated for some of these areas, and some of these conditions differ from the CPAC's vision.

A. The map is an attempt to graphically show the major areas.

C. One important thing is to have a green connection between Ala Moan Park and Kewalo Basin Park.

A. One given in the context of this map is the assumption that if UH gives up the Kewalo Marine Lab the value of the site will be park. Also accepted as givens are the KKFC and the cultural market place at the cove site because of the legislation enacted.

C. There is an opportunity with the different stakeholders for a planning group to potentially coordinate this. There are also more pressing issues of planning energy and water usage, with new data collection to show the necessity of a coordinated plan for the entire area. The scope of work would not only be about the program, a financial analysis or aligning existing studies, but infrastructure issues that transect the entire site, which is a different way of casting the scope of work..

A. The plan should look at how to be environmentally sensitive, and LEED silver certification is becoming a State standard.

Q. Presently the height limit along the 'ewa side of Kewalo Basin is 65 feet, and the piano-shaped lot building height limit is 200 feet. Will this change if the land is transferred to OHA, which is contemplating residential use?

A. This is question for the Legislature.

The draft of specific tasks for the planning consultant's scope of work exhibit attached to the HCDA Staff Report was summarized:

- The possibilities, alternatives and range of ideas come from brainstorming at the design workshops and charettes.
- The conceptual master plan alternatives and development strategies go into details such as infrastructure needs and engineering issues that have to be incorporated.
- Schematic designs show the basic placement and form in site plans and renderings based on discussion on what it might or should look like.

Executive Director Ching invited the CPAC to submit comments on the four tasks, and the scope of work would be finalized for final review by the CPAC.