

COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING NO. 5

Location: John A. Burns School of Medicine

Date: September 19, 2007; 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.

From: CPAC Steering Committee and Harmonee Williams, Townscape, Inc.

List of Attendees Attached

SEPTEMBER 19, 2007 - MEETING NOTES

1. WELCOME AND OVERVIEW BY JANIS REISCHMANN

- This is the 5th meeting of the Kaka'ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council (CPAC).
- Overview of the Agenda, which includes a presentation on the history of Kaka'ako by Brickwood Galuteria and his guests.
- Introductions consisted of a go-around, whereby each participant provided said their name and any organizational affiliation.

2. MEETING NOTES

- The July 25th Meeting Summary (Meeting #3) was distributed and approved.
- The August 22nd Meeting Summary (Meeting #4) was distributed and approved.

3. PRESENTATION ON THE HISTORY OF KAKA'AKO MAKAI

- Brickwood Galuteria introduced himself and said a few words about growing up in Kaka'ako, which he did until age 10. He lived in a home on the corner of Cooke and Ilalo where a park is now. The home was part of one of the camps in Kaka'ako at the time. He then introduced his guests, Peter Galuteria, "Uncle Peter," and Frederick Holck, "Uncle Fred," and Fred's wife Carol Holck. Brickwood said that his guests are the real "experts" on the history of Kaka'ako, since they lived there earlier and for a longer period of time.
- Uncle Peter and Uncle Fred talked about their memories and feelings about growing up and living in Kaka'ako, beginning in the 1930s.
- In addition to numerous anecdotal stories, some of the major themes that emerged were that:

- a. Uncle Peter was born where the Fisher building is now at Cooke and Pohukaina. He lived in one of 22 detached and attached homes that filled just a quarter of the area of the present park at Ilalo and Cooke Streets. In their home they had 11 people including their parents. They would work in the Coca Cola plant a block away at Ilalo and Keawe Streets.
- b. There were lots of ethnic groups living throughout Kaka'ako at the time on what would now be both sides of Ala Moana Boulevard.
- c. Kaka'ako had a real neighborhood feeling, where everyone knew each other and trusted each other, even the bullies, and no one locked their doors.
- d. There was a real mix of ethnicities and different languages, and every ethnic group was celebrated. Although they lived in different "camps," they all interacted and lived as neighbors.
- e. The camps had tin roofs; there were small shops and restaurants, and a beach promenade for the local people; children hardly ever wore shoes until the seventh grade.
- f. Pohukaina was a sacred place for the native Hawaiians. There is a rendering of the historic Hawaiian era in the Ali'iolani courthouse building.
- g. Growing up there really gave you a solid foundation. Kaka'ako did not limit their dreams, and they would dream big and strive "to be the best you could be".
- h. Kaka'ako is the sea - the ocean was a big part of their daily lives then, from playing in the water on the reef, to fishing and crabbing and picking abundant limu, to just having the constant smell and sound of the ocean nearby.
- i. Mother Waldron Park was a central gathering place with annual reunions.
- j. There was also the Portuguese band, the Sake Brewery, and the New England Bakery always with the smell of fresh baked bread. There would be barbecued meat on a stick at the bon dance.
- k. Mrs. Holck said she liked the "no higher than a palm tree" rule for development and didn't want to see another tall building in Kaka'ako. She reminisced about the old neighborhood with people

living and shopping there, with restaurants and nice sidewalks.

1. They concluded by talking about achieving their dreams, and about appreciating the ocean and ethnicity of old Kaka'ako. They urged the CPAC to plan with these ideas in mind - to bring back the love for Kaka'ako and help Kaka'ako become a place that builds on the area's history and neighborhood feeling, and recognizes Kaka'ako's cultural and social history.

4. CPAC ORGANIZATIONAL PROCESS

- Reischmann began by reviewing the points of consensus from previous meetings, as listed in the August meeting notes:
 - a. Agreement that a framework for conducting business would be helpful.
 - b. Agreement that the advisory working group's name would be the "Kaka'ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council" (CPAC).
 - c. Agreement that the CPAC would be a working group to "meaningfully participate in the development, acceptance, and implementation of any future plans for the development of Kaka'ako Makai," as consistent with the Legislative advisory that formed this working group.
 - d. Agreement that the CPAC will take the next steps to develop a Vision, Guiding Principles, and Action Plan to move the vision and guiding principles forward.
- Deepak Neupane reported on the September 5, 2007, HCDA Board meeting discussion relating to the CPAC, highlighting the following:
 - a. The CPAC recommendation for contracted facilitators was presented to the HCDA Board.
 - b. In general, the HCDA Board is very supportive of the advisory working group process, but stated concern that the CPAC has not yet organized and there is no spokesperson.
 - c. The HCDA Board would like to see the CPAC become organized before they allot more funding to the group for the recommended facilitators.
- Someone asked what, exactly, are the expectations from the HCDA Board.
 - a. Neupane responded that the following 3 things would meet the HCDA Board's expectation for adequate progress:

- A decision-making process
 - Spokesperson(s) for the CPAC at the HCDA Board meetings
 - Agreement on membership/participation
- Michelle Matson reported on the results of the survey (*attached at the end of this document*) sent out by the Bylaws Committee. She highlighted the following:
 - a. The survey was born out of the immediate need to organize the CPAC and to demonstrate to the HCDA Board that the CPAC has made progress.
 - b. The response rate for the survey was an admirable 60%.
 - c. The results are listed on the hand-out, as attached.
 - d. The objective of the survey is to use this as the basis for decision-making at this meeting, beginning with the priority questions.
- Questions from CPAC participants:
 - a. What are the boxes shown on the attachment?
 - Each box shows the actual results from each of the surveys.
 - b. Whose survey is this? What is the significance?
 - It was created by the Bylaws Committee as a working guideline. It is a product of the Committee and the results have not been formally adopted yet by the CPAC.
 - c. You may want to close the survey now that people have seen these results, since they may be influenced by it.
 - The Committee informed CPAC members they could also provide responses if present at this meeting, and the survey should be closed as of tonight.
- Reischmann explained that this survey was meant to gauge the individual CPAC participants' interpretation of the CPAC structure and is not a final decision.
- Matson noted that the survey reflects the will of the vast majority of the CPAC membership.
- People were also asked to look at Dr. Nalau'I's comments in response to the survey, which were passed out at the beginning of the meeting because he was unable to stay.
- Appreciation was expressed to the Bylaws Committee and its individual members for their continued hard work and efforts to move the group forward.

- Reischmann asked the group if they thought they could now agree on how they will make decisions. She pointed out that what has been put forth is the idea of working toward consensus on each decision, meaning that everyone can live with what is being put forward, and if consensus cannot be reached then some form of majority vote would be needed. Participants were asked if there was anyone who could not support this.
 - a. No one did not support this and it was approved by consensus.
- The next question was about what percentage would be appropriate for the majority vote, and options were as follows:
 - a. 50% + 1 of those present
 - b. 50% + 1 of the total membership, not only those present.
 - c. If (b), then there would need to be quorum and a limit set on absences, to account for participants who stop coming to meetings and no longer participate as working group members.
 - It was noted that it might be too difficult to get the group to agree on membership at this time, so would there be a way to go forward with counting only those present, at least for the short-term.
 - d. It was recommended that this be a super majority of 2/3 or 3/4 of those present, followed by affirmation of the decision for final approval at the following meeting.
 - A discussion followed on needing a quorum, the use of absentee votes and proxy votes, and the need for making informed decisions. Agreement was deferred on these issues.
 - It was agreed that any decision items should be posted on the agenda well ahead of the meeting so people would know and could attend if they wanted to vote.
- Final agreement on voting procedures for the short-term.
 - o Agendas will be posted with notification of decision items well ahead of meeting dates;
 - o The CPAC will strive to reach consensus;
 - o In the absence of consensus, a 2/3 majority vote by those present would be needed for decision-making.

Participants were asked if there was anyone who could not support this.

- o No one did not support this and it was approved by consensus.
- Moving on to the topic of spokesperson(s), Reischmann explained that this member or group of members would represent the CPAC to the HCDA Board. Participants determined that the CPAC would be best served if the representative(s) would:
 - o Report to the HCDA Board on the progress of the CPAC
 - o Have an unbiased viewpoint by representing the entire group, not any individual position
 - o Not advocate anything that the group has not discussed and agreed upon
 - o Not be afraid to speak before the HCDA Board and gather information from them, and report this information to the CPAC
 - o Be available to attend HCDA Board meetings, which are the first Wednesday of the month from 9 am until approximately 12 pm
 - o Serve in this capacity for 6 months
- There was a discussion on the idea of choosing CPAC representatives to the HCDA from various sector interests or issues. It was generally agreed that doing so would divide the CPAC when it would be best to have the CPAC united in representation and working together.
- It was noted that a question on the survey regarding the commitment of the CPAC "working together in the public interest for the good of the whole" received a near unanimous 98% vote of support, and that spokespersons should represent the interests of the whole, not special interests.
- The CPAC decided there should be a group of individuals representing the CPAC, but not representing different interests.
- Participants interested in being representatives and spokespersons for the CPAC were identified by being nominated or volunteering, and stood to be counted. Through this process it was decided that all 10 people would serve as the CPAC representatives for an initial 6-month interim term, as follows:
 - o Bob Crone
 - o Mike Dang
 - o Nancy Hedlund
 - o Ron Iwami
 - o Michelle Matson

- o Wayne Takamine
- o Erik Takeshita
- o Jennifer Thompson
- o John Thorpe
- o Mark Wong
- The 10 CPAC representatives were tasked with the following responsibilities:
 - o Representing the CPAC at the HCDA Board meetings
 - o Helping the facilitators set the CPAC agendas
 - o Reviewing CPAC meeting summaries before posting on the HCDA website as final drafts pending approval at the next CPAC meeting.
- The CPAC then asked HCDA staff members Deepak Neupane and Teney Takahashi if what had been agreed upon by consensus would be acceptable to the HCDA.
 - o Both Neupane and Takahashi concurred that the CPAC's decisions should be acceptable to the HCDA Board.
- It was pointed out that some stakeholders who cannot attend the HCDA Board meetings are usually the regular folks, blue-collar workers.
- The last issue on the agenda was membership. Given that only 10 minutes remained in the meeting, the CPAC asked Neupane and Takahashi if what had been agreed upon so far is sufficient progress for the Board.
 - o Both responded that they thought it would be.
- The suggestion was made to contact the registered participants who did not respond to the survey to determine if they were still interested in being members.
- Email proxy votes were offered as a viable option for those members who could not be present at every meeting.
- It was decided that for the time being the CPAC will continue to define the membership as those people who attend meetings and sign in.

5. NEXT STEPS

- The next meeting will be October 25th at 5:30 at the same location (JABSOM).
- The agenda will include a presentation on environmental conditions of Kaka'ako Makai (DOH is available on that date).
- The new facilitators should be on board at that meeting.

- Tentative meeting dates were discussed for the remainder of the year:
 - November 14th
 - December 4th

List of Attendees

Anderson, Amy
Bannick, Nancy
Ching, Randy
Cristofori, Marilyn
Crone, Bob
Cross, Karen
Dang, Mike
Downing, George
Farrell, Joseph
Feltz, William
Foster, Norman
Furushima, Scott
Haas, Frank
Hedlund, Nancy
Hoomanawanui, Carol
Iwami, Ron
Kadowaki, Jay
Killeen, Kevin
King-Lanzilotti, Louise
Kliks, Michael
Lowry, Kem
Lum, Lori
Matson, Michelle
Mattson, Keith
Mento, Frank
Morisato, Neal
Musick, Marla
Nalua'i, Dr. Solomon
Oda, Bob
Okada, Dexter
Parrish, Jonathan
Ribeiro, Alex
Shimokawa, Brian
Smoke, Ann
Sohn, Kristen
Takamine, Wayne
Takeshita, Erik
Tameshiro, Elaine
Thompson, Jennifer
Thorpe, John
Valera, John
White, Reg and Connie
Wong, Mark
Wong, Michael
Yajima, Loretta

CPAC SURVEY RESULTS as of SEPTEMBER 19, 2007
45 Participants as of the Beginning of the CPAC Meeting

Organization and Operating Procedure

Priority Questions

Decision Making

1. **98%** CPAC members develop informed recommendations based on evaluation of comprehensive information and in consideration of public input.
(1 No)
2. **91%** CPAC members will strive to reach consensus on Kaka‘ako Makai planning issues, and if consensus is unattainable decisions will be made by majority vote.
(4 No).

Membership

3. **93%** CPAC members may include any member of the general public who wishes to meaningfully participate as a working group member.
(3 No)
4. **98%** CPAC members share a commitment to work together in the public interest for the good of the whole.
(1 No)

Leadership

5. A leadership group, or steering committee, of up to five people including 3 officers has been suggested to represent the CPAC. What term would be appropriate for the interim Steering Committee to manage the operations of the CPAC?

49% 6 months
(21 and two non-votes)

51% 12months
(22 and two non-votes)

6. Would you be willing and have the time to serve on the Steering Committee?

44% Yes
(18 and 3 non-votes)

56% No
(23 and 3 non-votes)

Maybe
(1 and 3 non-votes)

Secondary Questions

Decision Making

7. 73% Majority vote will carry with fifty percent (50%) plus one of the CPAC membership.
(12 No)

Membership

8. 91% CPAC members regularly attend meetings to become informed on Kaka 'ako Makai planning issues.
(4 No)

Standing Committees

9. 98% Standing committees may be needed over time to facilitate the organization and operations of the CPAC.
(1 No)

Special Purpose Committees

10. 96% Special Purpose Committees may be needed to assist the CPAC with research, expert consultations and presentations on specific areas of interest as may be determined to be appropriate by the CPAC membership
(2 No)

Bylaws Survey Questions

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
(This table records each survey response on each question, i.e., Y – yes, agree; N - no, disagree; C - comments)									

Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Voting by consensus or unanimous.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	<u>N</u>
C - Increase majority to 65-70%; Committee tasks and member time?									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	M	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y
C - Members can be informed without going to meetings									
Y	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	6	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - Balance membership - concern is stacked voting. Increase majority to 75%.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - 50%+1 vote of total is unattainable									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	0	0	0
Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	6	Y	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	Y	Y
C- Alternate plan scenarios for HCDA; raw votes or %; officers duties? removal?; members + voting members.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Member commitment; 50% + 1 to 2/3 voting majority; focus committees; annual elections.									
Y	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Qualified, vested leadership - not the most vocal; listen to ideas and build consensus									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Decision-making by majority vote									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Question 4 ("CPAC members share a commitment to work together in the public interest fro the good of the whole") is of utmost importance and should be affirmed. 50% + 1 should be of all members; 2/3 majority votes also needed.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Majority vote or more appropriate method.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Committees may be redundant depending on CPAC size and meeting attendance.									
Y	Y	0	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	0	<u>N</u>	Y	0	0
C - Too difficult to attain 50% + 1; define "regular" attendance; too early for committees									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Get CPAC moving. Give Kaka`ako Makai to a major public facility, not small projects, in a park setting that continues the lei of green.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Provide opportunities for meaningful presentations and feedback from the public outside regular CPAC meetings									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y
N	N	N	N	0	0	N	N	N	N
C - Objects to By Laws - only simple guidelines for consensus are needed. Supports community-based voluntary public planning process, with all views and proposals important. Proposes three officers representing Land interests, Ocean/Harbor interests, Business/Government interests.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Membership and committees should include a variety of public opinions, not just pro- or anti-development.									

Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - Majority vote should be 60%									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C- Members: Should attend meetings to be informed, be accountable for studies and reports, be honest and positive, participate meaningfully or relinquish membership. Create stakeholder interest groups and hold public opinion forums. Internal matters - lesser vote; larger matters - wider vote. Have a means for tie-breaking. Interim officers for 6 months to evaluate their effectiveness; selection process needs to be defined.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Quorum requirement? Voting should be based on a quorum and majority present.									
Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	12	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - A few strong business interests who were not coalition stakeholders are trying to move in and have things their way for their interests and profits. HB 2555 states otherwise.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	6	N	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - Leadership to represent all views of membership, to be inclusive of all views while prioritizing the community's desires. CPAC to advise HCDA on views, priorities and interests of the community.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	6	Y	<u>N</u>	Y	Y	Y
C - Meeting attendance varies - recommend minimum of 60% to carry majority vote.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Have not attended meetings but are keeping up with proceedings and issues, and are seeking a representative member									

Y	Y	Y	Y	6	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - Senior citizens interested in preserving the use of the park land for the people.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y
C - "Public Participant" and "Regular Meeting Member" inclusive enough for all concerned. Majority rule ok for vote-related actions.									
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Y	Y	Y	Y	12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y

Survey Respondents

1. Reg White
2. Paul Barrett
3. Kristen Sohn
4. Richard Quinn
5. Nancy Hedlund, PhD
6. John Thorpe Jr.
7. Janet Mandrell
8. Cheryl Kaneshige
9. Dexter Okada
10. Karen Tiller (n/a)
11. Tim Bostock
12. Mike Dang
13. Jonathan Scheuer
14. David Lizama
15. Michelle Matson
16. Jennifer Thompson
17. Elaine Tamashiro
18. Ronald Iwami
19. Bob Crone
20. Neal Morisato
21. Unknown
22. Amy Anderson
23. Loretta Yajima
24. Erik Takeshita
25. Nancy Bannick
26. Kiersten Faulkner
27. Robert Oda
28. Solomon DK Nalua`I MD
29. Tom Laidlaw
30. Jan Yakota
31. Randy Ching
32. Jonathan Parrish
33. Linda West
34. John Parkinson
35. Wayne Takamine
36. Michael Kliks, PhD
37. Brian Shimokawa
38. Christine Kaneshiro
39. Stanton Enomoto
40. Scott Higa
41. Matt Dunlap
42. Edith Iwami
43. Scott Furushima
44. Frank Mento
45. Bob Loy
46. Bill Feltz

Surveys Submitted At or After the Meeting
(these will be logged with the next meeting notes)

47. Mark Wong

48. Jay Kadowaki

49. John Valera