

Central Kakaako Initiative  
March 12, 2009 Meeting

Infrastructure Improvements

A common theme of the four preferred visions for Central Kakaako is that infrastructure improvements are needed to address drainage, utilities, parking, and the like.

Attendees at the March 12<sup>th</sup> meeting were asked to review (i) the scope, and (ii) the strengths, problems, opportunities, and threats (SPOT analysis) of each of the following infrastructure improvement scenarios, and add to each scenario as appropriate:

- No improvements
- Limited improvements
- Full improvement district (ID) projects
- Limited ID projects

Attendees were then given four (4) votes and asked to vote for their preferred infrastructure improvement scenario(s). The results of the voting are as follows.

Votes Received	Infrastructure Improvement Scenario
31	<p>LIMITED ID PROJECTS</p> <p>A limited ID project would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements that <b>do not meet</b> city and county standards for dedication</li> <li>• Concrete sidewalks</li> <li>• Underground utilities</li> <li>• Drainage improvements</li> <li>• No right-of-way acquisition</li> <li>• Sewer and water upgrades</li> </ul> <p>The SPOT analysis for this scenario is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strengths:</b> better environment, will enable FAR to increase to 3.5</li> <li>• <b>Problems:</b> does not meet city and county dedication standards, disruption during construction, loss of parking during construction</li> <li>• <b>Opportunities:</b> development potential</li> <li>• <b>Threats:</b> assessment, loss of business during construction</li> </ul>
15	<p>FULL ID PROJECT</p> <p>A full ID project would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements that <b>meet</b> city and county standards for dedication</li> <li>• Concrete sidewalks</li> <li>• Underground utilities</li> <li>• Drainage improvements</li> </ul>

Votes Received	Infrastructure Improvement Scenario
	<p>The SPOT analysis for this scenario is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strengths:</b> full improvements, eligible for city and county acceptance of dedication,</li> <li>• <b>Problems:</b> disruption during construction, loss of parking during construction</li> <li>• <b>Opportunities:</b> full development potential</li> <li>• <b>Threats:</b> assessment, loss of business during construction, right-of-way acquisition</li> </ul>
12	<p>LIMITED IMPROVEMENTS</p> <p>A limited improvements project would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asphalt sidewalks and roads</li> <li>• Overhead utilities</li> <li>• Drainage improvements</li> <li>• Perpendicular parking</li> <li>• No right-of-way acquisition</li> </ul> <p>The SPOT analysis for this scenario is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strengths:</b> minimum disruption during construction, minimum cost</li> <li>• <b>Problems:</b> some disruption during construction, loss of parking during construction, maintenance cost, not pedestrian friendly, limited value to landowners</li> <li>• <b>Opportunities:</b> continuity</li> <li>• <b>Threats:</b> no change, limited/less development potential</li> </ul>
0	<p>NO IMPROVEMENTS</p> <p>No improvements/maintenance would be done under this scenario.</p> <p>The SPOT analysis for this scenario is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strengths:</b> no disruption, status quo</li> <li>• <b>Problems:</b> drainage, parking</li> <li>• <b>Opportunities:</b> limited development potential, city and county accepts streets</li> <li>• <b>Threats:</b> blight</li> </ul>