

Minutes of a Regular Meeting
of the Members of the
Hawaii Community Development Authority,
State of Hawaii

MEETING NO. 347
Wednesday, November 4, 2009

Members Present: Barbara Annis
C. Scott Bradley
Grady Chun
Joseph Dwight, IV
Paul Kimura
Kay Mukaigawa
Dexter Okada
Russ Saito

Members Absent: Amanda Chang
Christopher Kobayashi
Jonathan Lai
Theodore Liu
Brennon Morioka

Others Present: Anthony Ching, Executive Director
John Wong, Deputy Attorney General
Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Development for Kakaako
Richard Kuitunen, Asset Manager
Patricia Yoshino, Secretary
Loretta Ho, Secretary
Holly Hackett, Court Reporter

I. ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the Members of the Hawaii Community Development Authority (“Authority”), a body corporate and public instrumentality of the State of Hawaii, was called to order by Mr. C. Scott Bradley, Chairperson of the Authority, at 9:10 a.m. on Wednesday, November 4, 2009, at the Authority’s principal executive offices at 677 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 1001, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, pursuant to Article IV, Section 1 of the Authority’s Bylaws.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

1. Report of the Executive Director;
2. Report of the Executive Director Power Point Presentation (distributed at the meeting);

3. Information: Central Kakaako Business Owner, Landowner, and Tenant Survey Results;
4. Information: Central Kakaako Business Owner, Landowner, and Tenant Survey Results - Conclusions, PowerPoint Presentation (distributed at the meeting);
5. Action: Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Commit to Purchase At Least Fifty-One Public Parking Stalls at the Proposed Halekauwila Place Project at a Maximum Cost of \$2 Million;
6. Action: Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Enter into a Contract and Expend Revolving Funds to Contract for Weed Control and Landscape Maintenance Services at Kakaako Waterfront Park, Kakaako Makai Gateway Park, and Kewalo Basin Park (distributed at the meeting);
7. Action: Shall the Authority Rescind Its Previous Approval of the Agreement with Freeman Guards, Inc. and Now Authorize the Executive Director to Execute an Agreement with Honolulu Merchant Patrol and Guard Company and to Expend Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds for Security Services for Kakaako Waterfront, Kakaako Makai Gateway and Kewalo Basin Parks;
8. Action: Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Expend Additional Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds to Complete the Tenant Improvements for the Hawaii Community Development Authority's New Kakaako Office at 461 Cooke Street.

Chairperson Bradley noted that two Members would potentially have to leave the meeting early which would result in a loss of quorum. He proposed to amend the order of the agenda and cover the action items as the first order of business. By a show of hands vote, there was unanimous consent to change the order of the agenda to allow the action items to be considered first.

IV. ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Commit to Purchase At Least Fifty-One Public Parking Stalls at the Proposed Halekauwila Place Project at a Maximum Cost of \$2 Million?

Executive Director Anthony Ching summarized the written report included in the packet distributed to Members.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether Members had any questions for Mr. Ching.

Member Okada inquired whether any existing parking stalls would be lost in the area where the building would be constructed.

Mr. Ching responded that some parking would be lost. However, the at-grade parking facility at the location was not full, and parking needs for the area could be accommodated with the stalls on the Pohukaina Street side of the lot which would not be affected by the project.

Asset Manager Richard Kuitunen stated that there were 290 parking stalls at the Pohukaina Lot, including the Halekauwila Place area. Approximately one-third of the stalls would be lost with the foot print of Halekauwila Place.

Member Kimura asked whether the idea of using shared parking at Kauhale Kakaako or Kamakee Vista had been explored.

Mr. Ching responded that shared parking within parking facilities was part of the strategy that was envisioned for this area.

Member Dwight inquired about the target market as to who would be using the parking.

Mr. Ching responded that the current capacity for on-street parking was limited. The 51 parking stalls were intended to address current and neighborhood parking requirements at Halekauwila Place, but would also contribute to the offsite capacity to service existing businesses and businesses that will be developed in the area. The project is adjacent to the Kamehameha Schools (“KS”) Master Plan area, and it was expected that shared, dedicated parking, public and residential parking would be needed as a result of the KS project.

Member Saito inquired whether Halekauwila Place would have any commercial activity.

Mr. Deepak Neupane, Kakaako Director of Planning and Development, responded that there would be 3,000 square feet for commercial activity. There would also be an area for the Sector 3 Kakaako Trailer police office which is separate from the commercial area.

There were no comments offered by the public on this agenda item.

Chairperson Bradley entertained a motion for the Authority to authorize the Executive Director to commit to purchase at least fifty-one public parking stalls at the proposed Halekauwila Place project at a maximum cost of \$2 million.

A motion was made by Member Kimura and seconded by Member Mukaigawa.

There was no discussion on the motion by Members.

A roll call vote was conducted.

Ayes: Members Annis, Bradley, Chun, Dwight, Kimura, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion passed 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Chang, Kobayashi, Lai, Liu and Morioka).

2. Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Enter into a Contract and Expend Revolving Funds to Contract for Weed Control and Landscape Maintenance Services at Kakaako Waterfront Park, Kakaako Makai Gateway Park, and Kewalo Basin Park?

Mr. Ching summarized the written report included in the packet distributed to Members.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether Members had any questions for Mr. Ching.

Member Saito noted that the existing contract expired on November 30 and asked whether there was an option on the contract.

Mr. Ching responded that, in the event there was no compliant bidder, there was an option that the existing vendor for landscape and maintenance service could complete the supplemental year.

Member Saito asked if the vendor contract was with the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Mr. Ching responded that the contract was with the Hawaii Community Development Authority (“HCDA”).

Member Okada inquired as to whether the vendor would repair the irrigation system.

Mr. Ching responded that scope of the project included maintenance of the irrigation systems and effecting necessary repairs.

There were no comments offered by the public on this agenda item.

Chairperson Bradley entertained a motion for the Authority to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract and expend revolving funds to contract for weed control and landscape maintenance services at Kakaako Waterfront Park, Kakaako Makai Gateway Park, and Kewalo Basin Park.

A motion was made by Member Saito and seconded by Member Chun.

There was no discussion on the motion by Members.

A roll call vote was conducted.

Ayes: Members Annis, Bradley, Chun, Dwight, Kimura, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion passed 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Chang, Kobayashi, Lai, Liu and Morioka).

3. Shall the Authority Rescind Its Previous Approval of the Agreement with Freeman Guards, Inc. and Now Authorize the Executive Director to Execute an Agreement with Honolulu Merchant Patrol and Guard Company and to Expend Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds for Security Services for Kakaako Waterfront, Kakaako Makai Gateway and Kewalo Basin Parks?

Mr. Ching summarized the written report included in the packet distributed to Members.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether Members had any questions for Mr. Ching.

Member Okada stated that the \$62,000 bid seemed low and asked for the extent of the services to be provided.

Mr. Ching replied that the service would cover an 8-hour period between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. The parks had monitoring stations that the security patrol had to pass over to create a record that security had been there. Information was also provided in the Executive Director's report on the number of people who were asked to vacate the parks. He noted that the security personnel did not carry guns and the plan to transition to the Sheriff's Department would be more effective.

Member Saito noted that the Authority was being asked to approve the contract. However, from a procedural and procurement perspective, the contractor was performing work without a contract since performance of the service had already started on October 8.

Mr. Ching responded that staff checked with the procurement office and had been advised that it was not a violation since the bidder withdrew during the procurement process.

Member Saito stated that awarding the contract was part of the procurement process. However, the vendor was actually executing and performing work without a signed contract.

Mr. Ching responded that it had not been possible to get Authority approval for the next bidder because the bidder who initially had been awarded the contract withdrew exactly after the October Authority meeting. The vendor performing the service had been advised that the award was pending final approval from the Authority.

Member Saito asked whether the first invoice for services had been received.

Mr. Ching replied that an invoice had not yet been received.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether any members of the public wished to comment.

Ms. Michelle Matson, secretary of the Kakaako Makai Community Planning and Advisory Council (“CPAC”), stated that the CPAC steering committee supported the contract for security services and the contract in the previous agenda item for the provision of landscape services.

Chairperson Bradley entertained a motion for the Authority to rescind its previous approval of the agreement with Freeman Guards, Inc. and now authorize the Executive Director to execute an agreement with Honolulu Merchant Patrol and Guard Company and to expend Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds for security services for Kakaako Waterfront, Kakaako Makai Gateway and Kewalo Basin Parks.

A motion was made by Member Dwight and seconded by Member Mukaigawa.

There was no discussion on the motion by Members.

A roll call vote was conducted.

Ayes: Members Annis, Bradley, Chun, Dwight, Kimura, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion passed 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Chang, Kobayashi, Lai, Liu and Morioka).

4. Shall the Authority Authorize the Executive Director to Expend Additional Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds to Complete the Tenant Improvements for the Hawaii Community Development Authority’s New Kakaako Office at 461 Cooke Street?

Mr. Ching summarized the written report included in the packet distributed to Members.

There were no questions from Members or the public on this agenda item.

Chairperson Bradley entertained a motion for the Authority to authorize the Executive Director to expend additional Hawaii Community Development Revolving Funds to complete the tenant improvements for the Hawaii Community Development Authority’s new Kakaako office at 461 Cooke Street.

A motion was made by Member Dwight and seconded by Member Kimura.

There was no discussion on the motion by Members.

A roll call vote was conducted.

Ayes: Members Annis, Bradley, Chun, Dwight, Kimura, Mukaigawa, Okada and Saito.

Nays: None.

The motion passed 8 to 0 with 5 excused (Members Chang, Kobayashi, Lai, Liu and Morioka).

II. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Mr. Ching summarized his report via a PowerPoint presentation (see Exhibit A).

Member Chun exited the meeting at 10:49 a.m.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether Members had any questions for Mr. Ching.

Member Okada asked to see a design plan for the Kamakee and Queen Street intersection. He commented that the makai street corner flooded when it rained.

Mr. Ching responded that plans were available and could be viewed after the meeting. The plans involved a tapering of Queen Street ewa of Kamakee Street to align more precisely with the Diamond Head side of Queen Street. Kamakee Street would be continued so the alignment would be straighter. A little island on the ewa makai side of Kamakee Street was part of the design requirement and would have crosswalks on all four sides. The design was consistent with the City & County of Honolulu ("City") requirements, and staff had worked with the City Department of Transportation Services, Department of Planning and Permitting and other groups. Conveyance of property was secured from General Growth Properties ("GGP") on the makai side of Queen Street in order to effect the tapering.

Member Okada inquired whether drainage problems would be addressed.

Mr. Ching responded that drainage improvements were being made on all four corners to be consistent with the City standards.

Member Okada asked when final approval from the Special Management Area ("SMA") hearing on the Piano Lot was expected.

Mr. Ching responded that the SMA had its own process to review a project from a Coastal Zone Management ("CZM") Act standpoint. If the project is approved from

the CZM side, design of the site can proceed. The total remediation project involved the GRG Lot, fish auction site, cannery site, Piano Lot and Forrest Avenue Lot. The next step involved securing the contractor and subsequently construct the improvements. Assuming that asphalt would be used to remediate the Piano Lot, a farmer's market was reasonable as an interim use for that particular area. It would have to be determined what other services would need to be provided in order to ensure that the farmer's market would work. There would be ongoing discussions with the CPAC on suggestions for other events, activities or uses for the Piano Lot. The CPAC proposal for one-third parking and two-thirds landscaping had been priced, and the pricing and cost disparities were quite clear.

Member Okada asked whether the Piano Lot would be all blacktop or have some green areas.

Mr. Ching responded that the existing landscaping on the perimeter would be maintained. The CPAC plan showed established greenscapes as aisles for the parking and envisioned the planting of trees. The consultant had shown that the costs would be prohibitive and exceed the budget for the area. Establishing curbs and landscape medians within the parking area would make it become a more permanent parking lot and was not consistent with an interim remediation project. Instead, the blacktop was envisioned to be just painted, and no curbs or physical facilities would be developed. Perimeter fencing would be installed if appropriate as well as water to take care of the perimeter landscaping. If CZM approval is received, the project would proceed as designed. HCDA staff would work with the CPAC to determine what long term and permanent uses might be appropriate on that lot as part of the planning process.

Member Okada asked whether the major obstacle was the cost.

Mr. Ching replied that it was cost and the nature of the facilities. The planting of trees with deep roots would be inconsistent with a plan for interim use. Trees are an investment over time where the roots develop so it becomes permanent. The perimeter trees already planted would be fostered. The landscaping proposed by the HCDA would use coconut trees which can be moved. Further investment should be subject to the results of master planning for permanent uses in the area for those particular lots.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether any members of the audience wished to comment on the Executive Director's report.

Mr. Wayne Takamine from the CPAC stated that the alternative plan for the Piano Lot submitted by the CPAC was a leap of faith. It was something they would like to see but did not have an idea of the cost. The costs could be lowered by using gravel, eliminating the curbs and just having a cut out. Trees could be grown because the hazardous soil was only in the makai area, and most of the areas on Ilalo and Ohe Streets were clean on the mauka side. Revenue was projected at \$91,000 a year for a farmer's market one day a week. By dedicating an area for a farmer's market 7 days a week, the revenue could be increased to \$637,000. Amenities, such as a sheltered area and landscaping, could be added to make it superior to other farmer's markets.

Vendors who already exist and have a following would be a way to bring people in. The CPAC had not had a chance to fully explore all the options of a farmer's market and wanted to work on it further.

Ms. Matson asked if the Authority had received the letter dated October 12 from the Executive Director to Senator Brickwood Galuteria. She asked to have it on the agenda for the next meeting. She stated she agreed that the primary purpose of the Piano Lot project was remediation with the Department of Health ("DOH") options of either gravel, asphalt or soil anchored with grass and landscaping. Public uses such as a farmer's market would not be possible without comfortable areas that were shaded and grass for people to have some place to gather. It could be a superior application to any of the other farmer's markets and would generate more interest and activity in Kakaako Makai. The CPAC advocated a mix of public use areas for public benefits and auxiliary parking to support the uses. HCDA staff did not mention the approximately 130 parking spaces along the outside of the perimeter of the Piano Lot. Less than half the site was contaminated soil. This was an opportunity to create a lei of green in the area. Reserving recreational areas was one of the purposes of the CZM area regulations. From an economic perspective, a mix of uses would attract people to the area and could include revenue generation and sustainability. A precedent project in Florida with elements similar to the CPAC mixed public use example showed a final cost of only \$1,091,000. However, the HCDA was going to move forward with asphalt at a cost of \$2 million. The CPAC was informed by HCDA staff at the October meeting that if there was an agreement on any changes that meet both the CPAC criteria and the HCDA criteria, the HCDA could ask the Office of Planning ("OP") to revise the permit. There were organizations and individuals who had standing and were seriously considering a request for a contested case hearing from the OP. She requested that collaboration begin on the interim phase and design of the Piano Lot prior to any further actions on the parcel.

Mr. Kevin Killeen from the audience commented that new development should be pedestrian and bicycle friendly. There should be green spaces between sidewalks and streets. Automobile sales should not be allowed on the Piano Lot and only agricultural products should be sold at the farmer's market so as not to have a swap meet.

Member Okada asked whether the whole Piano Lot needed remediation.

Mr. Ching responded that the whole lot was subject to remediation, but there were concentration points of contamination.

Ms. Matson stated that the DOH map showed the areas of contamination were in the makai area only.

III. ITEM FOR INFORMATION

A. Central Kakaako Business Owner, Landowner and Tenant Survey Results

Mr. Ching reviewed the written report included in the packet distributed to Members. He summarized the conclusions via a PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit B).

Mr. Neupane gave examples of innovative financing strategies such as tax incremental financing and property taxes that could be given to development districts. The survey indicated that the community was interested in limited Improvement District (“ID”) projects which do not meet City standards. However, the community would need to be aware that the City would not be responsible for long term maintenance of roads and other improvements.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether Members had any questions for Mr. Ching.

Member Saito stated that the Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for the City rail transit project was being wrapped up and getting final approvals. He asked how far would the rail line go and where the alignment would be according to the current EIS.

Mr. Ching responded that the HCDA comments on the rail EIS had been limited to where it directly impacted the district, e.g., the Queen Street extension.

Member Saito stated that before planning the infrastructure, the Authority needed to know where the rail was going to be. Infrastructure should not be developed if the rail was going to come through.

Mr. Neupane stated that the EIS was based on the preferred alternative in which the rail would come in at Halekauwila Street, go all the way to Ward Avenue where it would go into private GGP property, and then come out at the intersection of Kamakee and Queen Street. It would traverse the whole length of what was designed as the Queen Street extension before going into Ala Moana.

Mr. Ching stated that the EIS did not have an extensive discussion of the Kakaako neighborhood. It discussed how the elevated rail would straddle the Queen Street extension and how the footing of the poles would perhaps have an impact on cultural and historical properties.

Member Saito asked how many rail stations would be in Kakaako.

Mr. Ching responded there were two rail stations planned; one by Sports Authority, and one by South and Halekauwila Streets.

Member Saito stated that there would be a lot of future commercial development clustered around the rail stations. Before talking about financing or giving direction,

the Authority needed to know what it would be doing. The areas that do not have infrastructure and the areas where rail would be going needed to be superimposed on a map so the Authority would be able to see the whole picture of what would or would not be affected, rather than individual projects or parcels.

Mr. Ching stated that certain individual infrastructure improvements were needed whether rail was there or not. Staff would need to follow up by working with the community and stakeholders to understand what individual projects might still be necessary and could be done, notwithstanding rail. The discussion on the survey gave the Authority context when presented with individual projects and costs of how it might be financed, whether it related to Transit Oriented Development (“TOD”), or contributed to the issues raised by stakeholders, such as parking, right of way and the need for certain improvements. The survey provided useful information on the issues that people felt strongly about, and indicated that they are there to stay and should not be ignored. The notion of organization and education of the community was important, because it was clear from the survey that more needed to be done in that area. The overwhelming majority of stakeholders wanted a limited ID, but the HCDA should not proceed until the questions that would come up with a limited ID project could be answered.

Member Okada inquired as to how the HCDA can take a more proactive step in central Kakaako. The rail’s physical plan right now would destroy parts of central Kakaako, and a lot of land by Kona Street would be condemned. If plans are not made for what we want central Kakaako to look like and we wait for the City to decide, TOD would be the last step and central Kakaako would be gone. He felt the Authority would have to be more firm about what was wanted in Kakaako.

Mr. Neupane stated that the HCDA had commented on the EIS, but had not commented on the alignment in central Kakaako. If the Authority felt it needed to object to the alignment, then that would be another strategy.

Mr. Ching stated that TOD and our vision for it in central Kakaako was clearly in the HCDA’s province. He agreed with Member Okada that the Authority had not addressed that issue and it has been a wait and see. If the Authority were to articulate its vision for central Kakaako that would or would not include or accommodate rail, then that would demonstrate the direction to go in that particular area. The HCDA as the zoning authority would have an interesting relationship to develop with the City. The City might also say they had a whole solution that they were bringing to the whole area, not just the Kakaako area, and we would have to work with them to find the middle ground.

Member Okada stated that his biggest gripe in the past about the HCDA was that too much was done to further development as opposed to preserving Kakaako. As an example, instead of saying parking is needed at Lot 40, the HCDA should look at how building a parking structure with mixed use would affect the rest of the community. There would be both positive and negative effects on the community. Instead of looking for spot solutions here or there, the HCDA should see how a

project fits into the whole picture. There is an effort to create a coalition in Kakaako to bridge that gap and get the community involved. The survey showed that the level of knowledge in central Kakaako was very limited. People may understand when their property floods that they need drainage, but they don't understand ID projects. As an example, for Queen Street, the landowners were supposed to pay 23%, but they did not realize that there was no cap on the actual cost. If construction is done during booming times, the cost is very high. There is a Kakaako coalition that is trying to get the community together to provide that knowledge and help make some of the changes. The coalition can go to the City Council and Legislature and bridge the gap.

Mr. Neupane stated he believed there was a cap on the assessment for IDs. Even if the construction cost went up and the bid came out higher than the initial estimate of the ID, the HCDA would have to find legislative funding for the additional amount.

Member Kimura stated that the ID concept needed to be tweaked. In the beginning, the landowners wanted IDs to develop the area, but now it is a different story in central Kakaako. A lot of the properties in central Kakaako were residential before, which is the reason that the streets are narrower and the drainage is not as good. The transition from residential to business has been difficult, and to have an ID with City standards is going to be impossible. Legislative help may be needed to force the City to accept lower standards.

Mr. Neupane commented that it was certainly another option. There may be certain areas in a community where it does not make sense to be required to meet the right of way; certainly Queen Street was one of those. The revised Mauka Area Plan was based on those concepts. The enabling statute, HRS 206E does not say that it is required to dedicate improvements to the City. It just says that if the intent is to dedicate improvements to the City, then it must be built to their standards.

A recess break was taken at 11:23 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:26 a.m.

Member Dwight commented that the survey indicated 93% of respondents wanted improved drainage, flood control, or positive results from an ID project. He felt that flood control in the central district of Kakaako was probably more important than parking, since it adversely affected not only businesses but anyone driving in the area. He wondered whether that could be addressed or if it needed to be placed on hold while waiting for some sort of rail determination.

Mr. Ching stated that a limited ID project would attend to drainage facilities in the scope of the road because that affected the flooding situation. A limited ID could include catch basins or graded inlets for drainage.

Mr. Neupane stated there was a catchment at Kamakee Street, so a limited ID would just go to that catchment instead of building another catchment under the streets. There are also other options that would work for drainage, such as laying asphalt.

Mr. Ching stated that a limited ID might be preferable from a total cost standpoint in the interim to address the drainage and flooding. The cost can be more modest when not dealing with right of way, condemnation and other issues. The question that needed to be acknowledged was that the long term maintenance of such facilities would still need to be addressed. If there was no share or cost in assessment from the community toward construction, the direction might be that long term responsibility must be taken by the community to maintain it. The City would not be responsive because it was not built to their standards.

Member Dwight commented that for central streets like Kawaiahao and Waimanu to meet City standards for right of way, it would essentially require having to condemn portions of the properties or, in some instances, entire properties in order to achieve that.

Mr. Ching stated that if the objective was not to dedicate to City, but to make drainage and facility improvements, the costs could be brought back for review by the Authority. However, the first step would be to get back to community and hopefully they can become educated and organized on the long term responsibility for maintenance, and then move forward together with the HCDA.

Member Dwight inquired whether there had ever been any planning or consideration in the central area about potentially eliminating some of the streets in favor of widening other streets. Although there would have to be more condemnation, the end result would be improved flow and lot design for the whole area as opposed to trying to make it fit within the existing tiny lots and streets.

Mr. Ching stated that it would be an overall urban design concept. If we wanted to maintain Central Kakaako or a particular neighborhood, there could be perimeter roadways and then interior roadways made up as promenades closed to traffic.

Mr. Neupane stated that when the original Mauka Area Plan was developed, the idea was superblocks and large developments, which was the cutting edge planning philosophy at that time. However, it has gone 180 degrees and the concept now is smaller blocks, narrower streets and a more pedestrian friendly environment.

Member Kimura stated that Kakaako was one of only a few industrial areas in East Oahu. If Kakaako was eliminated as an industrial area, you would have to go far away to find the same kind of business.

Member Dwight stated he was not suggesting eliminating it, but was just wondering if there may be a way to increase some of the lot sizes available for industrial uses and still improve drainage and traffic flow.

Member Okada stated that hopefully the Kakaako coalition can start looking at alternatives. The major part was education on what things are available, and then try to develop a community plan for all parties. The coalition was not just central Kakaako, but included Sheridan, Kamehameha Schools and GGP. The HCDA also lends support to the group.

Member Saito stated that regardless of how the coalition gets support, the plans would have to come before the Authority for approval. His concern was if the Authority waited until everything was completed, it was not going to do anything. It may never get to point where everyone agrees, but the Authority still had to approve projects and development and be able to move forward. He did not want to look back 10 years later and see that nothing was done. Maybe the way to start in central Kakaako would be to look at the drainage situation and determine what needed to be done relative to incorporating the master plan. Even if that problem were to be solved, it was still only one small part of Kakaako. If that was the way to produce the kind of environment and neighborhood that the charter envisioned, then the Authority had to be willing to address it.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by Member Dwight and seconded by Member Mukaigawa to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried 7 to 0 with 6 excused (Members Chang, Chun, Kobayashi, Lai, Liu and Morioka).

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

C. Scott Bradley
Chairperson

Attachments: Exhibit A - Report of the Executive Director
Exhibit B - Conclusions: Central Kakaako Survey

Note: The transcript of this meeting contains a verbatim record and should be consulted if additional detail is desired.