

**KAKA‘AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
June 16, 2009**

Committee Members Present	Mark Wong, Nancy Hedlund, Ron Iwami, Bob Oda, Wayne Takamine, Michelle Matson, Amy Anderson
CPAC Members Present	Bob Crone, Reg White, Fumiko Wellington, Dexter Okada, Scott Furushima, Christian O’Connor

**CPAC Meeting Summaries**

There has been no indication when the presentation attachment for the May 12, CPAC meeting summary might be provided by the presenter.

Approval for posting the June 9 meeting summary was deferred pending review by Committee members present at the June 9 CPAC meeting. It was noted that the HCDA could post a substitute link to the CPAC web site presently under construction if they continue to be shorthanded for posting CPAC documents on the HCDA web site.

**Presentation Requests**

There were no presentation requests for the July 14 CPAC meeting.

**Master Plan Process**

Chair Wong announced that he had posted two National Charrette Institute documents and a video related to charrettes and community planning on [www.oahu.net/cpac](http://www.oahu.net/cpac). He advised viewing these given their appropriateness to the process.

The HCDA process was discussed relating to the basic selection of a consultant from a prepared list, and negotiation of the scope of work with the consultant following the selection. It was pointed out that the described process was incomplete for the allocated \$600,000. Comments followed:

- HCDA stated that upon selection of the consultant the scope of work will be negotiated, and since there is very little information provided in the scope of work narrative apparently being used, the negotiated scope of work will be very loose.
- Professionals want a definitive master plan but military IDIQ contracts are open-ended so the top brass can make changes they want later.
- A strategic plan could build in flexibility for known changes.
- Strategic alternatives for redevelopment could allow flexibility to move with the market.
- The master plan is what the community believes should be the environment of this area for future generations, and is not intended to morph into other things dictated by economic cycles
- The Vision and Guiding Principles codify the community’s desires for the master plan.
- The scope of work should be more detailed and complete to justify spending \$600,000.
- One question would be how HCDA would strengthen the planning consultant RFQ with a different approach to the process, i.e., to clarify the solicitation process by outlining HCDA expectations for the planning process in terms of deliverables, resulting in consistent responses from the various qualifying planning firms. Specifically outlining the project, expectations, deliverables, vision, etc. will help determine if the consultant candidates understand the objectives and can carry them out.
- Usually together with the lead planning firm there is a team of sub-consultants with disciplines such as engineering, architecture, archaeology, demographics, traffic management, etc.

- The question to the consultant candidates should be what can be delivered for \$600,000.
- The charrette event will produce a lot of information and will consolidate valuable time.
- The \$600,000 allocation is already high, and fees are decreasing because work is needed.
- Discounts are running 20% to 30% across the board.
- Based on the June 9 CPAC presentation, the phases in the condensed charrette cycle for the conceptual plan reflect the phases of the overall process, where deliverables are revisited as they are refined over four progressive phases.
- The question is what can be done over this amount of time for this amount of money, and what can be consolidated if it will take too much time or too much money.
- Negotiation should occur during evaluation of the candidates, not after the contract award.
- Consultant candidates must have the qualifications to meet the recommended scope of work, and negotiations prior to awarding the contract will determine which candidate will be able to perform best at the least cost to finish the plan.
- If \$600,000 is high then scope of work details need to justify the cost, or find ways to spend less and get further for a completed plan.
- One way to spend less and get further is to have the charrette up front to save time with the energy focused at one time in one place followed by research on remaining questions.
- This will give people a sense of accomplishment toward a final product. HCDA cannot deny the community a final product from this process.
- The HCDA board directs the staff.
- Being an HCDA board member means acting in the public interest to 1) understand and agree to the statement of work sent out to the respective consultants and 2) is there sufficient criteria to make a reasonable judgment on the selection for use of public funds. If the statement of work is sketchy, why would the HCDA board approve funds?
- The HCDA board only receives information from the staff and assumes they are knowledgeable about the process, and that what is left of the \$600,000 in each phase will be carried to the next. There is also concern about how money is spent in this economy.

It was agreed that clear answers were needed from HCDA, and it was suggested that a letter be written to the HCDA board to request information. Recommendations for the letter included:

- Questions:
  - Will HCDA refine their scope of work to include the CPAC's recommendations?
  - Does the \$600,000 carry the master planning process past phase 2?
- State the concerns about the procurement process and the absence of:
  - Defined criteria for the selection process
  - Clarified steps for the planning process
  - Negotiation before awarding the contract
- Confirm that the adopted Vision and Guiding Principles guide the master plan
- Recommend specific things to be produced by staff
- Recommend a charrette up front and request a final plan
- Attach the scope of work summary, outline and process phasing diagram

It was agreed that the letter and attachments would be submitted to the HCDA for the July 1 board meeting because time was of the essence.

Chair Wong provided a draft Project Team communications circular diagram modified from a Stanford sustainable design diagram. He requested that the Committee review it for refinement.

Two examples of the draft Vision and Guiding Principles brochure were presented for Committee review by Second Vice Chair Anderson. She explained that the ocean is represented on the front backdrop and the mountains on the back of the fold-out brochure, which also could be changed to booklet form. Comments followed:

- A Point Panic surfing photographer has agreed to provide some photos for the brochure.
- The larger text is good for the guiding principle statements and the smaller print is good for the defining bullets to show they relate to each other.

- The alignment of the guiding principle statements with the definitive bullet points should be adjusted.
- There would be concern about any editing of the text of the Vision and Guiding Principles for appearance purposes.
- The subtitle should be closer to the title above the vision, which needs separation and a space between the first two sentences to be consistent.
- The dark wave and light lettering is disconcerting and difficult to read.
- The guiding principle titles should be in bold text.
- The CPAC web site could be added when it is ready for public comments.
- A map of the area could be placed in one of the large spaces.

First Vice Chair Iwami commented on the Friends of Kewalo Basin Park clean-up on June 20, which would provide an opportunity for outreach on the Vision and Guiding Principles. It was agreed that the draft brochure of the complete Vision and Guiding Principles could be provided for the event, and more time could be taken to complete the final brochure.

The master plan context was discussed in terms of the relationships between the Makai Area's public and private lands. The KS representative explained that the private lands may subscribe to the guiding principles but would not necessarily be part of the exercise for the master plan.

Comments followed:

- Because these lands relate to each other it is valuable to have the discussion of what is planned on the private lands and how the public lands relate.
- The master plan is an integrated plan, and private lands are addressed further as individual projects under the HCDA review process.
- This will need to be clarified at the charrette early in the scope of work.
- The integrated plan would have a reflection of what will be planned for the private lands.

Secretary Matson explained that the relationship of private lands adjacent to public lands was addressed under footnote #15 of the Guiding Principles. For example, if an office building is adjacent to a park or heavily landscaped area, there would be some visual and physical flow through an open ground level of the building. She noted that the intent is not to dictate the use of the building but to ensure there is a compatible context and relationship between spaces. The KS representative agreed that this made sense and would not be a problem.

## **Communications**

Chair Wong asked about the CPAC press release, and several Committee members indicated they had not received the draft. It was agreed that the timing of the press release would be coordinated with the posting of the Vision and Guiding Principles on the web site for public comments.

Comments followed:

- It will be difficult to rely on HCDA to manage the public comments because email sent to the comment block proposed to be posted on their web site will have to be transferred, manually reviewed, and recorded.
- A way for the CPAC to keep track of the comments also remains undefined.
- The CPAC believes the Vision and Guiding Principles should be made public but there have been many delays with the HCDA software, and the HCDA executive director is willing to meet with those interested to discuss alternatives.
- First a plan to handle the public feedback is needed, and right now Plan A, with the HCDA web site software, is not going to do this. Plan B would be using the CPAC web site when it has the capability, if the HCDA will agree.
- A free blog could be established on Google Moderator.

It was agreed that the public comments process should be worked out by the Communications Committee, and this would be followed by a meeting with the HCDA executive director.

Secretary Matson reported that the Governor's invitation for comments on Senate Bill 1069 had a deadline of June 5, many individual comments in support of Senate Bill 1069 had been sent to the Governor's policy office, and to date there was no indication of a veto. She noted that the Governor's list of bills intended to be vetoed would be published on June 30, with the veto deadline on July 15. Comments followed:

- At the June 9 meeting the CPAC approved writing a letter of support, and the letter could be prepared from the list of points submitted for the purpose of drafting the letter if needed.
- The letter could include the brochure to show what the CPAC has accomplished.

Chair Wong agreed to work with Committee Chair Miasnik in drafting the letter and cc'ing the Committee for review, and it was agreed that the brochure should be included with the letter.

Chair Wong commented that there was no update yet on the web site and content submittals, but HCDA staff had agreed to the CPAC's use of the logo if it is identified with the HCDA. Comments followed:

- Using the HCDA logo would send a message of close alignment with the HCDA.
- The logo generally represents the Makai Area.
- Something could be added to the logo to identify it with the CPAC.

Formal and informal email communications were discussed as they relate to the CPAC and the Steering Committee. Chair Wong determined that informal communications between Steering Committee members are not necessary to distribute to the entire Committee, but if communications are sent to the Steering Committee as a whole, they should be open to anyone. A question was asked about the scope of work meeting with HCDA staff. Secretary Matson explained that HCDA staff indicated on May 21 that any recommendations would have to be received within the next week, and five Steering Committee members contributing to the detailed work reviewed by the Committee were asked to attend the meeting to clarify the recommendations as necessary. Chair Wong noted that those attending the meeting represented the Steering Committee and CPAC in general, and advised that any critical information should be emailed to the entire Committee.

### **Proposed Agenda for the July 14 CPAC Meeting**

- 1) Adoption of the June 9 Meeting Summary\*
- 2) Community Concerns and Announcements
- 3) Presentation – no presentation was scheduled at this time
- 4) HCDA Staff Updates
  - a) Planning Process Scope of Work Update and Consultant Status
  - b) Pending Project Updates
  - c) Kewalo Basin Slips/Tenants – Harbor/Assets Management
  - d) Point Panic Maintenance
  - e) Mother Marianne Cope Memorial Update
- 5) Committee Reports
  - a) Steering Committee
    - 1) Planning Process Recommendations Update\*
    - 2) Charrette Process \*
  - b) Communications Committee
    - 1) CPAC Web Site
    - 2) Correspondence with HCDA, Governor
- 6) Kewalo Basin Report
- 7) Other Business
- 8) Next Meeting Dates
  - a) Steering Committee Meeting – July 21
  - b) CPAC Meeting – August 11

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.