

MEETING SUMMARY

Kaka‘ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council
Meeting No. 7
November 14, 2007

Facilitators: Karen Cross, Kem Lowry
Recorder: Anne Smoke

Attachments:

- UH Facilities Development Presentation
- Kamehameha Schools Development Presentation
- Oct 26 Letter to HCDA
- HCDA response letter
- Nov 5 letter to HCDA
- CPAC Interest ratios
- List of stakeholder interview ratios from Townscape Stakeholder Interview Report

I. Preliminary Business

Rotating slide show of waterfront developments provided by Nancy Hedlund

A. Welcome (Kem)

B. Meeting Overview (Kem)

The primary focus of this meeting was to be presentations from UH and Kamehameha Schools regarding their respective development plans for the Kaka‘ako Makai area.

C. Introductions: Individual meeting participants introduced themselves.

D. Approval of October 25, 2007, Meeting Summary

- Lainie Tamashiro asked to defer approval of the October 25 draft Meeting Summary because corrections should be made on bullets from the DOH_HEER presenters
- The draft Meeting Summary will be further refined and recirculated for CPAC approval and adoption at the next meeting.

E. Steering Committee Report and Recommendations (Mark Wong)

- The Steering Committee met November 5 and the meeting highlights were included in packets handed out at this meeting. The full summary of this meeting is posted on the HCDA Web site under “Summary and Attachments for Kaka‘ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council Steering Committee Meeting November 5, 2007.”

- Q: One member asked if the CPAC needs approve and adopt Steering Committee meeting summaries during CPAC meetings.
A: This has not been determined but will be taken up by Steering Committee.

F. Consent Agenda (Karen)

- Ground rules for discussion were acknowledged. The purpose of this discussion was to determine if CPAC is willing to adopt the remaining CPAC survey results. It was noted that the CPAC survey shows over 90% participant support for the survey items.
- Item #1: CPAC support of survey items (see “CPAC Consent Agenda” on back side of Nov. 25 Meeting Agenda for details)
 - a. Membership—CPAC agreed this needed no clarification
 - b. Decision-making—CPAC agreed this needed no clarification
 - c. Standing committees—CPAC agreed this needed no clarification
 - d. Special purpose committees—CPAC agreed this need no clarification
- Karen asked those present if they could support moving forward by adopting all these items.

Discussion:

- One member suggested that the above process is an exclusive process for various reasons including inability for some people to attend meetings regularly. He added that consensus building needs to be inclusive and not include only a few.
- A member asked if attending 4 out of 5 meetings would be the threshold. It was generally determined that this would not be a threshold.
- One member asked how the majority responses were determined from the survey results. The majority of 92% to 98% agreement on the respective questions was calculated by the total of 49 participating members who completed and returned the surveys.
- ...One member asked for clarification on the agreement to regularly attend meetings. It was suggested that regular meeting attendance could be further defined during the consensus-building portion of the agenda under “Voting Membership.”
- Karen requested a show of hands to indicate if CPAC wanted to move forward with adopting the remaining survey results, and adoption was acknowledged.
- Karen reviewed item #2 on the consent agenda regarding operations officers, noting that the Steering Committee recommended a chairperson, two vice-chairpersons and a secretary to assist with various duties on behalf of the CPAC. It was decided that further discussion was needed and this was deferred to the consensus-building portion of the agenda.

- Karen addressed item #3 on the consent agenda, CPAC Approval to Present Regular CPAC Progress Reports to HCDA. The CPAC agreed by consensus that this should be done.

G. Update on Stakeholder Interview Ratio Question: Material on this subject was provided for information only and is posted as a separate attachment.

II. Presentations

A. University of Hawai‘i: Gary Ostrander, Interim Dean, John A. Burns School of Medicine (See PowerPoint presentation in its entirety on HCDA Web site.)

- The intent was to develop Kaka‘ako Makai as a biotech hub for healthcare and a nucleus for the technology industry.
- JABSOM was built with \$150 million in public funding bonds and opened in 2005. One building is primarily for administration and medical student training, and also has a cafeteria. The second building contains the research labs. In addition, there are plans for a health and wellness center and a 120,000 square-foot cancer research facility.
- There are plans to re-emerge a school of public health program, and this business plan has been completed.
- Presently no plans have been developed for JABSOM Phase II, which will include 190,000 square feet of additional research space.
- The research component includes elements that are important to Hawai‘i and as a complimentary return local needs are being addressed.
- The goal is to become the best medical school in the world with an Asia-Pacific focus. There have been great advances in bio-med research and Hawaii deserves to have this access.
- The proposed 20,000-square-foot Pacific Regional Bio-safety Lab for emerging infectious diseases is a state facility and not a JABSOM facility. This proposal is still under development due to significant funding issues, and NIH (National Institute of Health) funding is still being sought.
- Renderings were projected of alternative configurations and heights of proposed buildings compared to the existing buildings. The proposed cancer research center may include a parking garage, either an underground or surface structure, of 750 – 800 stalls.
- Studies have not been completed for either of the two facilities plans and there is more work to do before the plans are finalized.

Comments, Questions and Answers

- Q: Will parking be shared with the public and available for public use during weekends?
- A: This is a reasonable request and should be considered.
- Q: Clarification on the entire ten acres belonging to UH was requested
- A: Four acres on the Ewa side of medical facility are proposed to be used for the cancer research center.

- Q: Will parking require additional land area?
A: No. There will be 1,200 parking spaces built under three levels of research facilities totaling 240,000 square feet, and the cancer research center will have 2 levels of parking under 5 stories of technical facilities – all within the HCDA height requirements.
- Q: Which will be the largest building and what is the height?
A: The height may be increased from 4 stories to 6 stories, and this is within present HCDA height limits.
- Q: Concerns were expressed regarding the construction of six stories that will impact the view planes from the shoreline to the mountains..
A: This would then be a question of building wider than higher. UH is willing to discuss this, but they want to address the needs of the state.
- Q: What do the people who work here want to see in the area for food options? What do they want to see?
A: UH has received some comments and is considering additional facilities to serve the workforce, with the exception of child care facilities due to liabilities. Keeping the cafeteria open longer hours is also being considered.
- Q: Parking space clarification was requested.
A: See PowerPoint for details on parking.
- Q: How many people will be coming and going to use facilities on a daily basis?
A: Double the current number – another 300 people or so can be expected, but this is somewhat unpredictable. The tally of workers currently is 1000 and additions will add 300, possibly 500 more, including grad students and part-time researchers who work there around the clock.
- Q: What is time period for growth?
A: 10 – 20 years is estimated timeline for fulfilling growth, but variables may change that.
- Q: Concerns were raised regarding natural hazard risks of the proposed bio-safety lab.
A: Many types of contaminants cannot live in salt water, such as bacteria, and triple redundancy systems for natural disasters are planned or already in place to ensure safety.
- It was noted that Waikiki attracts 71/2 million tourists, and Kaka‘ako Makai would be a flyway entry point for these communicable diseases.
A. Security will be provided from within facility and will not be obvious to the public.
- Q: What if there is a natural disaster? Are we at a high risk?
A: No. Requirements include consideration of safety and appropriate restraints and redundancies.

B. Kamehameha Schools: Mike Dang, Director, Planning and Development Division (See PowerPoint presentation in its entirety on HCDA Web site. Slide 65 has a map showing the Kamehameha Schools properties along Ala Moana Boulevard. Slide 66 shows schematic drawings of two proposed development concepts, one before legislation was passed in 2006 prohibiting residential development in Kaka‘ako Makai, and the other in compliance with the new law.).

- The KS development adjacent to the Gold Bond building is a life-science-based project to help expand a new economic base for Hawaii. In addition, it hopes to provide more people with good job opportunities to enable them remain or return to Hawaii. It was originally designed as a smart growth project to provide jobs as part of a life sciences campus. Its design included some housing which could enable people to live, work, shop and play in the area. One of the benefits of this approach would be that it could help reduce traditional traffic impacts while adding jobs. The project potentially offers 1000 new jobs.
- KS uses a five values view approach to developing its lands. The values, as listed on the slide, are economic development, education, environment, community and culture.
- Mike focused on several other slides and then asked if there were other things the CPAC would like to cover.

Comments, Questions and Answers

- Q: One member requested disclosure of the KS mixed-use plans in the Makai area.
A: The plan revised to be consistent with the new law contemplates no housing.
- Q: Is KS proposing that the residential portion be in Kaka‘ako Mauka?
A: KS is studying smart growth practices on the Mauka side, which critically includes residential and other uses. This mix of uses facilitates people living, working, shopping, and playing in close proximity of each other, thereby reducing traffic, and other negative lifestyle impacts.
A. (From a KS representative in the audience) Workforce housing is not residential development.
- Q: Prior to law change did you have entitlements for housing?
A: No entitlements, but housing was consistent with HCDA zoning. Consequently, homes were assumed for the Kaka‘ako Makai area.
Q: Do the plans take into account long-term planning for global climate change and peak oil shortages?
A: Yes. In fact, one of the reasons Smart Growth has become a favored approach to developing today is because it allows for more people but with far less impact than traditional development methods. The approach by design tries to reduce urban sprawl and related issues.
- Q: What are the demographics of the workers? Will the life science companies be permanent?
A. The plan is for 1000 jobs. Workers in the life sciences field tend to have more educational credentials than general population averages. They also tend to earn more than the average. One hope is that by developing this economic base it can help diversify Hawaii’s economy. Another hope is that this type of field can help provide jobs to reduce Hawaii’s “brain drain.”
- Q: Are LEEDS standards being considered? Carbon outputs, etc?
A: KS continues to explore and study sustainability values, methods and standards including the LEEDS certifications model. A full holistic, sustainability approach

- is being considered. KS is committed to sustainability, including sustainable agriculture.
- Q. What are the plans for the KS properties where the Ala Moana car dealerships are located?
 - A. Current price points, generally speaking, are not high enough to overcome current redevelopment costs, and the existing uses generate good income. This could have been different on the makai side, where a mixed use urban village with 24/7 activities was contemplated.
 - Q: Would there be a visual and usage linkage between KS land ownership of parcels on the mauka side of Kaka‘ako and Kaka‘ako Makai? What plans are there for what was requested?
 - A. Yes, ideally there would and that would be a goal where development is possible. Smart growth applied to the mauka side, like anywhere, would have to pencil out, and the makai side would be a place where people could commute to for work. A mixed-use village makes sense adjacent to Downtown. Residential is a possibility but construction costs are an issue because they are high. Income generating structures are desirable, also, but to the extent you can create energy filled, needs sustainable communities, that is the ideal.
 - Q: Would it make sense to link Mauka and Makai with public uses and facilities on the Makai side to compliment residential development on the Mauka side?
 - A: Income generating facilities are beneficial. Apartments do not appear to pencil out in Hawaii, generally speaking, which may explain why there are no typical large national apartment developers providing apartments here.
 - Q: Clarify ‘apartments pencil out’
 - A: This means that if a developer were to build an apartment building that he could cover his cost and earn some income, also. Typically, the developer will plan and study the costs and revenues to see if the revenues cover the costs and provide income to him, i.e., “pencil out.”
 - Q: How do you define this method vs. the community in the context of the planning KS is doing? Would there be communication between KS and the CPAC?
 - A: KS intends to serve the broad community. KS hopes that by participating in the CPAC process that the community feels it can talk w/KS on an ongoing basis. In fact, KS hopes to work w/the community to help redevelop the area to best contribute to Hawaii and its people.
 - Q: Shouldn’t the land in Kaka‘ako Makai be reserved as open space and recreational, cultural and educational public uses for the 30,000 residents projected for in Kaka‘ako Mauka? These families will need open space and recreational space.
 - A: Clearly, a part should be—in particular, the waterfront. As to the rest, it depends. KS will likely continue to provide public use areas that will serve the larger community as well, just as KS has done where it has had land.

III. Consensus Building on Outstanding Organizational Issues

A. Karen reiterated the remaining actions to be addressed on the CPAC Consent Agenda under #2, Adoption of CPAC Operations Leadership Roles

Discussion and comments:

- Meetings are fine the way they are run now.
- A Chairman should be conducting meetings. This will save taxpayer money by eliminating the facilitators' role.
- Facilitators are needed to guide the consensus-building process.
- The expertise of many CPAC members was acknowledged, and it was noted that the experience of the facilitators will promote teamwork and bring out the abilities of CPAC members.
- Organizations with officers usually do not hire facilitators.
- Facilitators can help move diverse groups forward.
- The objectivity of facilitators hired by the HCDA was questioned.
- The funding for the facilitators is being well spent.
- Facilitators may help bring various members and levels of expertise together.
- It was suggested that the operations officers' roles listed on the consent agenda were different than suggested on the survey, and there appeared to be a shift in what was originally presented and what was now being discussed.
- A Steering Committee member explained that this was consistent with the survey because the three officers were mentioned in the survey as also being members of a Steering Committee, and the newly-formed Steering Committee was now recommending a second vice- chairperson to assist the CPAC along with the chairperson, vice chairperson and secretary.
- HCDA would like a chair to communicate with them and we have not moved forward with this decision.
- Karen asked if it would be important to have a few leadership roles.
- One member said they would prefer to keep things as they are.
- Another participant referred to two other projects, where one is using facilitators and the other is using an 11-member steering committee, and both are working well. Would HCDA be willing to consider using alternate forms of structure?
- Teney Takahashi, the acting HCDA executive director, agreed that facilitators can serve a useful role, and it is helpful to have officers because both facilitators and officers need to function together to move things forward. Facilitators may expedite the project while slate of officers may take on some of the facilitator workload. The HCDA board would be concerned if facilitators were not part of the organization
- It was pointed out that the Steering Committee was not suggesting otherwise.
- Will HCDA board work with facilitators if there are no officers? Currently nothing is being transmitted to HCDA.
- It was agreed that the Steering Committee is the CPAC communications link, and HCDA recommended that the CPAC Steering Committee communicate directly with the HCDA.

- Kem pointed out that a single point of contact such as the chairperson will serve everybody, and the facilitators should not be placed in the role of communicating to HCDA on behalf of the CPAC because their job is to facilitate meetings.
- One member suggested that the CPAC retain the facilitators and do away with officers.
- The Steering Committee recommends one chairperson, two vice chairs and a secretary. CPAC should start with Steering Committee recommendation rather than countering with other proposals. The recommendation being put forth is to form leadership roles and representatives to communicate with HCDA.
- The leadership tasks being proposed are not for controlling decisions but to help facilitate the CPAC operations process.
- The Steering Committee is to set agendas and communicate with HCDA, and this organizational structure is needed in the Steering Committee.
- A move to vote was requested by Nancy, who asked if the four roles are named would the CPAC agree to have this leadership for the CPAC, or with the roles being proposed for CPAC not necessarily exactly as described?
- There was no consensus.
- Karen asked if an alternate proposal should be brought forward.
- It was suggested that the Steering Committee elect their own officers.
- It was suggested that new proposals need more thought and time prior to putting them to a vote, and this matter should go back to the Steering Committee for further recommendation.
- Nancy moved that the proposal for operational leadership roles go to the Steering Committee for further consideration and recommendation.
- Consensus was achieved with this suggestion.
- One participant asked to become a member of the Steering Committee and be notified of upcoming committee meetings. It was noted that the CPAC had appointed the committee members, and anyone who wished to could be notified by the HCDA about the committee meetings and would be welcome to attend them.

IV. New Business

A. HCDA Communications and Agenda Requests

It was proposed that the group approve regular CPAC progress reports being presented to HCDA. The reports will summarize the CPAC's accomplishments to date, including decisions and actions taken.

The proposal was moved and seconded. Consensus was achieved for this action.

B. Next Steps

- Discussion on the ceded lands presentation:
 - Jonathan recommended that the OHA presentation on ceded lands be deferred because he will be unable to be present. He recommended that the CPAC first have a discussion on what ceded land is prior to the OHA presentation.

- As requested by the Steering Committee, Michelle had already extended the presentation invitation to Trustee Stender, who had accepted pending the date to be determined. She noted that Trustee Stender mentioned that Jonathan and Stanton might accompany him.
- Jonathan stated that the CPAC can invite Trustees to provide their opinion, but if the CPAC wants OHA's position then they should have the administration's point of view.
- Kem requested that for the time being the facilitators be the point of contact to HCDA in order to save confusion and unnecessary e-mail. We also must be considerate of their deadlines when submitting material a minimum of five working days ahead of the date needed.

V. Next Meeting Date(s)

Steering Committee Meeting: November 20

CPAC Meeting: December 4, 2007, JABSOM Room 301

Attendance List:

Anderson, Amy
 Ching, Randy
 Crone, Bob
 Cross, Karen (facilitator)
 Dang, Mike, (KS)
 Feltz, William
 Furushima, Scott
 Hamada, Jack
 Hedlund, Nancy
 Howe, Jim (C&C Lifeguards)
 Imada, Neal (HCDA)
 Iwami, Ronald T.
 Jaffe, Michelle
 Kadowaki, Jay
 Kamoto, Kip (KS/KUD)
 Lowry, Kem (facilitator)
 Loy, Bob
 Maluafiti, Alicia (Lo'ihl Com.)
 Matson, Michelle
 Mattson, Keith (UH)
 Miasnik, Geoff
 Morisato, Neal
 Nalua'I, Dr. Solomon
 Oda, Robert (KS)
 Okada, Dexter
 Ostrander, Gary K. (UH)

Quinn, Richard
Scheuer, Jonathan (OHA)
Smoke, Anne (facilitator)
Strom, John (EH)
Takamine, Wayne
Takeshita, Erik
Tamashiro, Elaine
Temali, Mihailo (NDC)
Thompson, Jennifer
Thorpe, John W. Jr.
Tsuchida, Bruce (ULI)
Wong, Mark
Yajima, Loretta