KAKA'AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING SUMMARY
Meeting #16

Tuesday, July 22, 2008
John A. Burns School of Medicine, Room 301
5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Attachments:
A. July 22 CPAC Meeting Attendance List
B. Prioritized CPAC Survey Voting Results for Guiding Principles Nominations
C. Leading CPAC Guiding Principle Concepts
D. Combined Guiding Principle Priorities Offered by Steering Committee Members with Comments and Questions Submitted by CPAC Participants at the July 22 CPAC Meeting

Facilitators: Karen Cross, Kem Lowry
Assisted by Anne Smoke

I. Welcome and Meeting Overview

A. CPAC Chair Mark Wong welcomed the CPAC meeting participants and provided an overview of the agenda. This was followed by CPAC participant and facilitator self-introductions.
B. Meeting Materials Distributed:
  - July 8, 2008 CPAC Meeting Summary
  - July 15, 2008 Steering Committee Meeting Summary
  - Prioritized CPAC Survey Voting Results for Guiding Principles Nominations
  - Combined Guiding Principle Priorities Offered by Steering Committee Members

II. Adoption of the July 8, 2008 CPAC Meeting Summary

The July 8, 2008, CPAC Meeting Summary was adopted by consensus.

III. Kakaʻako Makai Guiding Principles Nominations Survey Voting Results Review

Chair Wong described the Steering Committee's work in compiling the results of the CPAC's guiding principles nominations survey votes and, the combination of the priority nominations to achieve a shorter list from the priorities determined by the voting results:
  - There was no editing of the original nominations when the results were tabulated by computer through sorting and ranking.
  - Each original nomination was numbered under its original theme identified by a letter (A-Environment, B- Community, C-Culture, D-Education, E-Viability/Sustainability)
  - Immediately following the July 8 CPAC meeting Steering Committee members chose which theme from which they would combine identical or similar nominated guiding principles.

- The Committee's theme groups then presented their findings at the July 15 Steering Committee meeting and developed 32 specific topics from their work.
- During this process it was found that many guiding principle nominations overlapped within the Community and Culture themes, therefore these two themes were combined.
- The 32 new topics were divided between Steering Committee members, and each chose or was assigned some from which to individually develop related new guiding principles
- Thus 32 new guiding principles were offered by the Steering Committee for the CPAC's consideration, reduced from approximately 90 CPAC survey priorities determined from over 270 nominations.
- Each new guiding principle was further defined by computer identification of a) key words from the related guiding principle nomination priorities, b) neutral words used to refine and express the intent of the new guiding principle, and c) new words and/or terms written into to new guiding principle.
  - It was noted that the computer program had not scanned all the survey priorities to identify all the applicable key words and terms used from the priorities, and determining and identifying these for each new guiding principle had been left to the Committee members.
- This was a first pass by individual Steering Committee members to condense the priority guiding principle nominations and move a shorter list forward for discussion.

IV. Evaluation of New Guiding Principles

A facilitator provided the procedure for the CPAC's review and evaluation of the 32 new guiding principles developed by individual Steering Committee members:
- CPAC participants would have 25 minutes to review each new guiding principle and proceed to identify and record issues related to each, including:
  - any questions to be answered or any clarifications needed about meaning or intent;
  - value comments such as observations of not enough or too much specificity;
  - any omissions from the CPAC's priority guiding principle nominations;
  - recommendations to keep or drop; etc.
- Following this review the CPAC participants' comments would be collected and posted relative to each of the 32 new guiding principles.

The facilitator commented that the 32 new guiding principles were then intended to be compiled into reduced list to be recommend to the HCDA, whose staff had recommended a short list of 10 to 12 guiding principles as being most effective for the purposes of the HCDA's planning process for Kaka'ako Makai.

A Steering Committee member commented on the present list:
- Several of the new guiding principles contained repetitive concepts
- Substantive guiding principle submittals constructed from the CPAC's priorities with high vote counts had not been included in this list, and the Steering Committee needs to further review omissions and additions.

Responding to a Steering Committee member's questions about the context of the guiding principles, what might be used for overriding vision concepts, and the implementation of the guiding principles and vision, the facilitator summarized that the guiding principles and vision will guide the consultants, the HCDA and the planning process, including specific land use suggestions for Kaka'ako Makai.

Comments, questions and answers followed:
Q. What is meant by empowering the Steering Committee to edit for clarity? Does this relate to the new guiding principles developed by the Steering Committee, or to the original guiding principal nominations voted on by the CPAC as priorities?
A/Q. (Facilitator) This would be the present list. Does this relate to substantive changes?
A. The suggestion might be that the CPAC return to the priorities that were voted on, and make sure the priorities of record are in the guiding principles.
A. (Facilitator) In other words, make sure there is nothing missing and that the list reflects the CPAC's previous work on what the guiding principles should be.
A. Further clarification begs that instead of reflections, interpretations, or other vague representations of what the CPAC's guiding principle priorities are, these priorities need to be included and clearly stated, with some as originally stated rather than merged, woven in, or interpreted in a different way as recreations and re-workings. The Steering Committee needs to look at the intent, context, clarity, and importance of these guiding principle priorities.
A/Q. At the July 15 Steering Committee meeting there was a clear question about whether the context and intent of the original guiding principle nominations priorities would be retained. Is this rewriting or refining? There is a difference.
Q. How long should guiding principles be? These are so long they are difficult to remember.
A. This is a compilation of 270 items reduced to the CPAC's priorities, including those with very high scores. The Steering Committee tried to be as neutral as possible interpreting the will of the CPAC, and the Committee can revisit these while maintaining the guiding principle nominations with the highest vote count.
C. There may have been different reasons for low vote counts, e.g., the type of wording, a question of intent, preferring one to another, etc. Consolidation is a means of making these simpler in the ongoing dynamic discussion. .
C. Providing titles to the guiding principles would help make them more memorable, and some do need bullet points.
A. This is simply an interim process.
Q. What is the objective to this?
A. Focusing on the huge list of CPAC guiding principles nominations and reducing it.
C. A significant number of nominated guiding principles were marked on the survey to be for discussion, and following discussion some of these may also become priorities.
Q. HCDA staff comments at the Steering Committee meeting limited the final number of guiding principles to 12. Was this a recommendation or a mandate? The CPAC may find 20 guiding principles as worthy, excellent or significant and substantial. Will the CPAC have to decide to sacrifice quality to reduce quantity?
A. The number is just to achieve a perspective. There will be a comfortable number of guiding principles without duplication.
Q. What is the end product? Is this being produced for HCDA approval?

A. This is for HCDA's guidance, not approval. The CPAC is intended to represent the will of the community and the public interest, but it is unknown if the HCDA will take the CPAC's advice.

C. The final list of guiding principles will be subject to public scrutiny and additional comments. The clearer the CPAC can make these the easier it will be to have them accepted.

A. The present process shows and audit trail from the original nominations. There will be questions on how the CPAC has arrived at the final result, and people will want to know where their nominations are included. For example, a new guiding principle will include the key words taken from several related nominations combined into it. Therefore, the words of the guiding principles must be chosen very carefully.

C. Some of these combinations have lost the clear context of the original nominations.

A. It is true that some don't carry the same weight as the originals, and it is expected that comments will be received on this.

C. The Steering Committee was authorized to combine the guiding principle nominations for clarity. If comments received are illegible there will be future opportunities to correct this.

C. There is a concern that the new guiding principles include mixed topics. For example, a new guiding principle entitled Historic Preservation actually relates to protecting ocean and marine resources. The Steering Committee needs to ensure that guiding principles are consistent with the subject being addressed.

A. The 32 selected topics were searched and some combined new guiding principles did not refer to these, so they could not be placed.

A. Perhaps the 32 selected topics did not cover some of the substantive nominations, and other topics need to be added or merged with the list of 32 selected check-point topics.

A. The work of the Steering Committee is appreciated, but some things were omitted in this process. For example, Historic Preservation was wrapped into other types of resource protection, and it deserves to have its own clear statement of support. Historic and cultural resource protection need to be explicit. Additionally, there could be overarching preservation and protection statements that include the various types of resources.

C. The more specific guiding principles can be placed under a related overriding guiding principle.

C. The overarching concepts will be in the vision.

A Steering Committee member noted that the Steering Committee's charge is not yet clear. The facilitator asked what the Steering Committee's most helpful charge would be. CPAC participants' suggestions followed:

• Consolidate and combine the new guiding principles.
• Determine what is missing.
• Split and add to the various new guiding principles as appropriate. These were submitted by different people and some are short while others are long. The Steering Committee needs authority from the CPAC to backtrack with an audit trail in reworking these to make them memorable.
• Restore the bullets separating related priority concepts to provide clarity. The removal of these bullets may be what is causing some of the confusion.

- A guide is helpful. For example, condense the 32 topics into 18 or 19 guiding principles encompassing the original survey priorities as supported by an audit trail, and these could be generally stated or split to incorporate different perspectives.

The charge of the Steering Committee was summarized:
- Edit for clarity
- Add missing priorities
- Combine similar statements as appropriate
- Make shorter, memorable statements that reflect the sentiments in all the priorities with the appropriate level of detail.

Additional suggestions followed:
- Consolidation or synthesis of specific guiding principle priorities can be within an overarching community trust guiding principle that can also specify certain guiding principles, such those for as historic preservation and coastal resources.
- Historic preservation is a technical resource not commonly understood. For example rehabilitation is a historic preservation option along with protection and restoration. The Steering Committee must look carefully at the context and intent of the original guiding principle priorities so they are perpetuated in the final product.
- Vague, sweeping and all-inclusive statements would not be definitive enough to guide the present planning process or the review of future proposals in order to meet the intent of a plan developed for good guidance, and these proposals may be presented in various ways, in any form, and at any time.

V. Review of Guiding Principles Marked for Discussion

Questions, answers and comments were provided for the guiding principle nominations prioritized on the CPAC surveys as needing further discussion:
- B16. Q. This appears too defined. What is 10%? A. This was a place-holder until more information on needed parking is available.
- B21. C. Open space versus parking structures. It is important that these structures are not in the green space. A. HCDA could work with DOT on Piers 1 and 2, but this may be too detailed. A. Piers 1 and 2 are not within HCDA jurisdiction.
  A. This may be a zoning statement; instead of B16 and B21, use: Parking should be shared for maximum efficiency. Parking should be sensitively placed in relationship to open space.
- B16 and B21. There should be convenient access to green open space without having to have a car or parking.
- C18 and new guiding principle #18. Please define Hawaiian rights. Is this intended to be rights to high-density development in Kaka'ako Makai to serve OHA beneficiaries, or is this more for cultural practitioners, gathering rights and access? In addition, there is a question whether this is a priority guiding principle with 3 votes in agreement, 8 to discuss and 7 to drop. A. This applies to a range of recognized native Hawaiian rights incorporated in federal laws, the Hawaii State Constitution and a number of State statutes applying to individuals, practitioners, ohana, and organized groups and entities representing and comprised of the native Hawaiian people.

- C 36 and C37; D6, D7 and D8. The intent of these is to be neighborly with stakeholders and those who occupy the Kakaʻako Makai area, and to encourage Kamehameha Schools, JABSOM and OHA to have community events.

VI. Announcements and New Business

Chair Wong announced and commented on the following:
- He reminded CPAC participants to check their posted comments for legibility before leaving the meeting, and to also verify their correct email and other contact information on the HCDA registration list.
- In response to a Steering Committee member's question, he informed CPAC participants that any guiding principal submittals not included with the new guiding principles reviewed at this meeting will be included in the Steering Committee's review at the next Steering Committee meeting. He noted that some consolidated guiding principles had more than one submission, and those assigned were used while others were set aside for forthcoming discussion.
- He explained that that a previous survey not filled out in accordance with the survey format could not be processed. The next CPAC meeting will include multi-voting on a new list of synthesized guiding principles, and the survey will require that the participant fill in the space provided without comments on the survey sheets, because there is no time to review these comments.

Chair Wong asked all CPAC participants to be sure to review all meeting materials for the August 12 CPAC meeting at least one week prior to the meeting. This material will be posted on the HCDA web site at www.hcdaweb.org.

VI. Next Meetings

Steering Committee Meeting –Tuesday, July 29

All are welcome to attend the Steering Committee meetings.

CPAC Meeting – Tuesday, August 12

The CPAC meeting adjourned at 7:36 PM.

Draft CPAC Meeting Summary developed and transmitted by CPAC Secretary to Steering Committee Members for review on July 25, 2008.
Draft CPAC Meeting Summary approved by Steering Committee for posting on July 31, 2008.

July 22, 2008, CPAC Meeting Attendance List
(and Meetings Attended)

1. Anderson, Amy   (15)
2. Sara Bolduc   (6)
3. Tim Bostock   (1)
4. Chartrand, Grant   (7)
5. Cristofori, Marilyn (8)
6. Dang, Mike   (12)
7. DeRego, Mike   (1)
8. Faulkner, Kiersten   (9)
9. Feltz, William   (12)
10. Furushima, Scott   (10)
11. Gulick, Tom   (2)
12. Hedlund, Nancy   (15)
13. Ishikawa, Scott   (1)
14. Iwami, Ron   (13)
15. Killeen, Kevin   (11)

16. Lizama, David   (9)
17. Loy, Bob   (11)
18. Matson, Michelle   (16)
19. Nalau'I, Solomon   (13)
20. Okada, Dexter   (15)
21. Parkinson, John   (8)
22. Quinn, Richard   (7)
23. Tamashiro, Lainie   (15)
24. Thorpe, John   (15)
25. Wellington, Fumiko   (6)
26. Wong, Mark   (12)

Cross, Karen (Facilitator)
Lowry, Kem (Facilitator)
Anne Smoke (Facilitator Assistant)