

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

MEETING NO. 348  
Wednesday, December 2, 2009

Members Present: Barbara Annis  
C. Scott Bradley  
Amanda Chang (9:15 a.m.)  
Grady Chun  
Paul Kimura  
Christopher Kobayashi  
Brennon Morioka  
Kay Mukaigawa (10:24 a.m.)  
Dexter Okada  
Russ Saito

Kalaeloa Members: Stanton Enomoto (9:20 a.m.)  
David Tanoue  
Maeda Timson

Members Absent: Joseph Dwight, IV  
Jonathan Lai  
Theodore Liu  
Kaulana Park  
Evelyn Souza

Others Present: Anthony Ching, Executive Director  
Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Development for Kakaako  
Tessa Malama, Kalaeloa Director of Planning and Development  
Richard Kuitunen, Asset Manager  
Patricia Yoshino, Secretary  
Loretta Ho, Secretary

## 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 9:05 a.m. on Wednesday, December 2, 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. Report of the Executive Director – Kalaeloa Status Report;
4. Summary Minutes of Authority Meeting of October 7, 2009;
5. Summary Minutes of Authority Meeting of November 4, 2009
6. Workshop: Kakaako Makai Master Planning Power Point Presentation (distributed at the meeting).

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 7, 2009

Chairperson Bradley asked whether there were any corrections to the minutes of October 7, 2009. There being none, the minutes were approved as presented.

2. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 4, 2009

Chairperson Bradley asked whether there were any corrections to the minutes of November 4, 2009. There being none, the minutes were approved as presented.

## III. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Executive Director Anthony Ching summarized his report via a PowerPoint presentation (see Exhibit A).

Chairperson Bradley stated that at the November meeting, Mr. Ching had outlined the process for collaboration with the Kakaako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council (“CPAC”) and the public on the development of the Kakaako Makai lands and also explained that a consultant was on board to start the process. Some concern had been communicated that the Ocean Investments, LLC (“OI”) parcel was not included in that process. Chairperson Bradley requested clarification on why that parcel was not part of that process and what rules dictated what could and could not be done.

Mr. Ching responded that the OI parcel was subject to a 65-year lease issued by the Board of Land and Natural Resources (“BLNR”) to the operator who had indicated and State had agreed that the activity would be a restaurant and meeting room. It is now 33 years later and there is still considerable time left on their tenancy and lease. The new purchaser has indicated that they would like to redevelop and undertake a construction project. The Hawaii Community Development Authority (“HCDA”) is now the landowner and holds the lease instead of BLNR. The HCDA is obliged to review any redevelopment and give approval as long as those improvements are consistent with the parameters described in the design guidelines, rules and zoning requirements for that

particular area. The HCDA cannot stop them from pursuing a redevelopment project that conforms to applicable lease terms, administrative rules and law. While the HCDA does not have final control over the selection of color, final design, it can offer comments.

The preliminary reviews that are conducted for all projects are routine and give the applicant an idea of what issues they must address. Issues and comments are solicited from agencies at the City and State historical preservation to ensure that issues of statewide concerns and health safety concerns are addressed, and the redevelopment plans are appropriate and consistent with the design rules. Their tenancy rights allow them to pursue redevelopment. In this particular case, it is hard to deny that John Dominis is a landmark, but the new owner proposes to develop another kind of landmark.

Chairperson Bradley stated that it was unfortunate in the context of planning for the entire area that there was a carve-out that the Authority does not have control over. He asked what would have to be done to get control. He asked, as an example only, about the future of the lease with the Pacific Basin Research Center (“PBRC”) if they should want to redevelop. Given the planning process the HCDA is engaging now with CPAC and the public, he asked if that would result in a change in the rules and whether those rules would apply to parcels that are subject to existing leases including John Dominis.

Mr. Ching responded that parcels subject to an existing lease have rights that cannot be trampled over. As best as possible we would look in our master planning process and envision what we might do. In this particular case, since it is known that John Dominis wants to set back its facility from the ocean’s edge, we should incorporate this fact into our planning process as it presents a possibility of enhancing shoreline access where it was not previously available. Previously, they built to the water’s edge and there was no opportunity for shoreline access. If the PBRC site becomes available, alternative uses for that site should also be considered. Enhanced public access and park use should be considered for such a prime location. However, without the existing tenants giving up their rights of occupancy via their lease, we have very little option other than to plan and try to incorporate the situation as best as possible.

Chairperson Bradley asked with respect to the Piano Lot whether the Department of Health (“DOH”) had issued to a violation or an order that we need to respond to.

Mr. Ching responded that during the course of the Coastal Zone Management (“CZM”) hearing on our application, the DOH representative indicated that while they did not issue a formal notice of violation (“NOV”), their correspondence requesting remediation of the site should be construed to have the force and effect of a NOV. They noted at the CZM hearing that even though it was not named a violation, we were still obliged to respond.

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

Member Timson asked whether the 6 parcels that had been approved for conveyance to the HCDA in Kalaeloa were preservation properties or whether any of the parcels could be considered income properties.

Mr. Ching responded that the parcels were all preservation properties. At Ordy Pond and Southern Trap and Skeet, the resource values were very high and would not be considered for anything other than preservation. The Northern Trap and Skeet parcel has both resource and potential to host non-intrusive income producing activities. There is also the presence of endangered species in the area. There is a lower lot next to the ocean that could be considered for development since it is on the water. However, it is located at the end of the runway so there would be limited commercial value.

Mr. Ching stated that the likely first step would be to install appropriate fencing to safeguard the parcels in the interim and conduct appropriate surveys to identify the resources there. From a budget standpoint, about \$50,000 for appropriate surveys and \$300,000 for fencing has been set aside in the Kalaeloa budget as a rough estimate.

Member Timson stated the HCDA would want to appropriately maintain our holdings in the district.

Member Okada asked whether the Authority would have any influence on how the John Dominis project would look based on the Authority's design guidelines.

Mr. Deepak Neupane responded that the Makai Area rules have design guidelines and the developer would have to change if the plans do not meet the criteria.

Mr. Ching stated that the plan for the mauka side of the building had previously been a blank wall, so the HCDA had asked for some treatment. The CPAC commented that the sole historic building in the Makai area was the pump station, so their comment had been forwarded to OI for their consideration to make their design contemporary to the historic building.

Member Okada stated that the major complaint was that the proposed building design would stick out as compared to the present building.

Mr. Ching stated that it was the same architect utilizing a different style, dictated by the vision of the new owner as to what the facility should look like.

Chairperson Bradley noted for the record that Members Chang and Enomoto were now present.

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

Public Testimony:

*Ms. Michelle Matson* stated that the CPAC sent a letter to the Authority regarding the PBRC Kewalo Marine Laboratory and asked the Chairperson to respond to the letter. At the CZM hearing, a question was asked about the Executive Director's statement to the Authority that the DOH had issued a notice of violation. The DOH responded that they did not have the capacity to issue violations and was working in collaboration with advice to HCDA staff. She believed that the DOH had indicated that there is no threat to the HCDA to do things right away without considering other aspects of the issue. She requested that the Authority receive a presentation on the OI project to see what the CPAC's concerns are. She asked for clarification on whether there would be a 10-foot or 20-foot setback. The CPAC would be providing a letter to the Authority regarding this project. Regarding the HCDA obligation to approve or disapprove the OI project; approval or disapproval would fly in the face of current efforts to Master Plan the area. The OI architect indicated that they would not begin construction until much later next year. She asked the Authority to look closer at the project and see what impact it would have on the area.

IV. WORKSHOP FOR MEMBERS

A. Kalaeloa Master Plan Implementation

Mr. Ching stated that the following persons were present to provide their reports on Kalaeloa infrastructure: Mr. Craig McGinnis from Hunt Development Group/Ford Island Ventures ("FIV"); and Navy Facilities personnel Mr. Mike Fitzgerald, Ms. Lynn Tanaka, Ms. Janice Fukawa; and Captain Bret Muilenburg, commanding officer from Naval Facilities Engineering for Navy Region Hawaii.

Mr. Ching provided a presentation on the Kalaeloa infrastructure and master plan implementation via a Power Point presentation (Exhibit B).

Capt. Muilenburg stated that Mr. Fitzgerald has been assigned to work full time on Kalaeloa, particularly on utilities, to navigate through to the solution that all parties wanted. The Navy is recommitting to the process of divesting the land and utilities that Navy still retains ownership for and wants to work with the HCDA and other partners more closely together to move this ahead. The Navy intends to retain 2 parcels: the bio salvage facility, and the golf course and beach cottages for the morale of the armed service members. The horse stables will not be retained, since they have their own NAVFAC Hawaii compound to consolidate. In addition, the Navy signed a lease with the FIV for 495 acres called "downtown". Hopefully, it will provide an avenue for development and flow of capital that will allow some of the utility providers for the community to decide it is in their interest to come forward and help with the process. The utility systems continue to age, but the Navy is not putting in a lot of capital reinvestment. They

have been doing only maintenance and breakdown maintenance for a long time but it is not a long term successful strategy. What is needed is to map a route to transition the systems into the hands of someone who can provide the service on a long term basis, recapitalize and do it right.

Capt. Muilenburg stated that the Navy has hired the General Services Administration (“GSA”) to be the third party facilitator to coordinate efforts between the Navy, the HCDA, the FIV, Hawaiian Electric Company (“HECO”), Board of Water Supply (“BWS”), City and County of Honolulu (“City”) and others to make this happen. The Navy has been very involved in the utility master plan that has been funded by the FIV and has been talking to all the groups to refresh commitment and intentions. With respect to land, this area is handled for the Navy by BRAC PMO under Secretary of Navy. He emphasized that the intent is not to abandon the utilities. The Navy runs electricity, water, waste water and communications, and had no intention to walk away. They are trying to reassure some of the 27 customers out there now, but there must be an end date as to how long the Navy can provide the service. The Navy does not have the ability for recapitalization or to expand the right services, so that is the reason it needs to get into someone else’s hands. They can provide service at the existing capacity, but it would be the restrictor on further development and has already been the restrictor in some instances. They understand that and want to work with everyone to get past that.

With respect to the waste water system, the plan in the works was a public benefit conveyance to the City. The Navy engaged the City, and while they are interested, recapitalization money is always a problem for everyone.

They plan to reengage with the BWS. The change that the Navy can offer BWS is they are now offering the water sources - their well and distribution system coming down to the property. The Navy has determined that it does not need that allotment or source, and that is likely the most valuable piece of the whole system. By adding the water source to the pot, it will help move the discussions forward.

On the electrical system, the Navy had previous discussions several years ago with HECO, but discussions broke down. A major reason that the discussion broke down was the issue of co-location of communication cables with the electrical distribution system. The utility provider really did not like that arrangement since it was not common for them. The Navy now intends to abandon that portion of the communications system, so that it could become electrical distribution. They think that HECO will be much more willing to talk about it now.

The Navy is encouraging customers to talk with private providers to find solutions since they most likely will be abandoning their aging system out there. They are hopeful the engagements are productive and will continue to work on options and

keep the Authority informed if they are making progress. If not, they will then come back to the table and look over options, e.g. public sale or some way to get it into the hands of someone who can provide the capital to reinvest and help new development.

In summary, Capt. Muilenburg stated that Navy Region Hawaii is renewing its efforts to transition the systems and commits to work with HCDA in a cooperative fashion and in concert with the vision of the property and make progress.

Mr. Ching stated the Navy was extending great cooperation to HCDA. They have been looking to make those types of accommodations to allow us to move forward. Redevelopment was not going to take place until there is an answer to the question of how do we build out the infrastructure. The HCDA is also working with the City Departments of Planning and Permitting, and Transportation Services to understand what infrastructure standards we need if we move forward.

Member Timson stated that Capt. Muilenburg's comments were a breath of fresh air because the Navy had never partnered with the HCDA before. She understands that the process will be a long one and the project is a massive one. The Navy said it would maintain what it currently had, but on the other hand we are asking FIV to redevelop and revitalize the area. She was concerned that FIV may not be able to move forward if they cannot get the service they need.

Capt. Muilenburg stated the Navy has the obligation to provide services to FIV for four years, and are working closely with them on their plans and for infrastructure to support their development. They are engaging together with them on the utility master plan that will define the densities and the usage that is appropriate in the utility system. They hope that they can lay it on top of the existing system and those parts that are salvageable can contribute to that master plan until it can get into someone else's hands, HECO in particular. Much of the old system will be abandoned as they assume parts of it and accommodate the 27 existing customers and the growing customers that FIV is going to bring.

Member Timson stated she liked the comment about the water well since that had been an issue with the BWS for a long time. She thanked Capt. Muilenburg for coming to the meeting.

Member Saito stated that he wanted to hear comments from the City and FIV on mass transit and what it was going to do relevant to bringing infrastructure in. The whole area mauka of the mass transit area is developable. Infrastructure would have to be pulled in to serve those areas. The rest of the areas are mostly park usage, so if you can serve those areas that are earmarked for development, you would have much of the problem solved.

Mr. McGinnis stated there are ongoing partnerships being created with the Navy and the HCDA to facilitate development. The Navy has lease term obligations and was working through all those very closely with some of the development. They are trying to solve what are basically technical problems, and those areas are going very well and those projects will move forward. As part of master planning process, one of the largest question marks about the redevelopment of the area is alignment of certain infrastructure, roads and the alignment of the mass transit as it is developed through the district. The alignment was laid out in the City's EIS and its mass transit presentations. At this point, he was not sure how some issues would get resolved, but those are preliminary plans so they can make sure that anyone's interests are aligned and get development moving and not have to wait for years and years for these issues to be resolved before development can take place.

Member Tanoue stated that Kalaeloa would be the second or third phase of the rail project. Right now, the first phase is the 20 mile phase from east Kapolei to the Kroc Center all the way to Ala Moana Shopping Center. The next phase is either from Ala Moana to the University of Hawaii or the phase out to West Kapolei.

Member Saito stated that in reality because the City not started to look at it, he wondered how FIV can go ahead with their development plan without a sense for what the City was going to do to support the mass transit line.

Member Tanoue stated the City has been working with FIV. In a lot of situations, the developer will install some of the infrastructure needed for the project or otherwise have to wait for the City to program it in their CIP. This might not be done for another 10 years because of competing priorities. However, the City tries to work with developers as much as it can and understand their timetable. Infrastructure is a big hurdle at this point.

Mr. Ching stated the infrastructure master plan would answer many questions because it will determine what strategy might be taken for particular utilities. The infrastructure master plan would need to go through review by City and State agencies for their comments. The HCDA was working with the Navy, FIV and all stakeholders in trying to understand the potential need for service in the district. FIV was also trying to work out what the possibilities are there beyond the FBI project. In terms of energy, the Enterprise Road project is a step that is considered crucial for us to start to engage because it will bring HECO presence and it will service the downtown area. He had a recent discussion with a developer interested in seeing how they might appropriately get into this particular area and produce renewable energy such as solar. They would have to figure out how to do the interconnection and bring the power that is generated to the grid.

Mr. McGinnis stated he has received an update on the schedule from consultant on the infrastructure master plan and the first rough draft would be ready in the January or February timeframe.

Member Saito asked whether it was a master plan for the entire area.

Mr. McGinnis stated that after the land was conveyed to FIV by the Navy, they started redevelopment and coordination with City services, which showed they cannot be concerned with bringing energy to just one area but need to understand what is going on in the entire Kalaeloa locations. That was when they coordinated with the HCDA to offer the services of their consultant to do the utility master plan for the entire district.

Mr. Ching noted that the consultant is Belt Collins who has done previous work with the Authority in planning for the area.

Mr. Ching stated that in terms of sustainability, the HCDA had some orientation from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (“NREL”), and it is not just energy and power generation. Sustainability means that it is a new ethic and basis for the community. NREL has suggested there should be 5 topics of emphasis:

1. Carbon dioxide emission/fossil fuel consumption
2. Energy conservation and renewable energy
3. Water conservation
4. Remove barriers to food production
5. Solid waste management

It was interesting that a mainland consultant said that you should build in a way to remove barriers to food production which is a big part of sustainability. From an urban design standpoint, you need to have smaller blocks which allow people to circulate within the district, a huge superblock that takes a long time to get around and through streets that allow people detour to get someplace, ultimately looking to reduce automobile use. The alignment of the proposed transit line is not to make it dense along the whole line. You would promote the living areas around the stations so you are not just sprawling along the line, but focusing development at the station and encourage people to concentrate in the area with services developed in that area. When clarity comes for transit and where the stations are going to be, we would overlay at that point on our rules and zoning rules. For energy, the standard that we would push is the LEED silver, because that is the State standard. NREL consultants are going to try to give us very specific engineering and building construction code support.

Regarding reserved housing, the master plan does not specify the target percentage; however, as much as 30% might be envisioned. The direction at this point is to establish a number that is consistent with our current statute and rules which 20%.

Member Timson asked who the mainland consulting group was.

Mr. Ching stated that NREL is providing support, but they had subcontracted to Clarion Associates.

Member Chun asked, in terms of rules, where the Navy and City are involved, where does the HCDA fit in.

Mr. Ching stated that the HCDA will administer the rules.

Member Chun asked what the role of the Navy would be if they were still resident in the district.

Mr. Ching stated the Navy would transition from being the provider to being a consumer and would like to figure out how they would step back. For instance, the U. S. Coast Guard is located at the southern point at the axis of the runway, which is very inconvenient from a power generation standpoint. As Capt. Muilenburg stated, instead of running power and telecommunications in underground conduits to serve the Coast Guard in the near term, you can stop the telecommunications and just do power because that is the cheapest solution to continue to provide power. That is an example of an individual solution to bring power in that would allow longer term solutions to be envisioned that will be produced by our collaboration.

Member Saito asked who has jurisdiction over approval of all permits and have to establish district rules. Someone will have to approve the utility plan, sewer plan and drainage plan. Right now there are specific things approved by the City and the State and all of those approval requirements are going to be integrated. It will be difficult to plan unless you know who is going to approve those plans.

Mr. Ching responded that in the short term view, with ID projects, they will get comments from the City in terms of the standards and get an understanding of how we are going to move forward, then initiate the projects and move forward. Ultimately we want to dedicate facilities to the City. If not, we would have to determine how to move forward, with possibly community associations or other situations to manage the facility over time.

Member Tanoue stated if a facility is built to City standards, the City will take it. If you deviate, then there are problems because the City is concerned with potential liability. If want to do it differently, the option is to take on responsibility yourself and establish a community association that will manage it.

Member Timson stated she would like any community association to come to the HCDA first for approval. The Villages of Kapolei were not built to City standards.

Member Okada stated that Capt. Muilenburg's discussion on infrastructure shows that HECO is very important and wanted to know whether HECO was motivated to participate.

Capt. Muilenburg stated that HECO had initiated the request to meet with the Navy and seemed motivated. The Navy offered them whatever part of the system was useful.

Mr. McGinnis stated that for FIV, development is planned for HECO power. The service request for the FBI project was sent to HECO and they plan on submitting more. Their fallback plan is coordination with the Navy to tap into their system if HECO will not provide power in a timely fashion. They are trying to give HECO economic incentive by providing rate payers.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether the solar farm on Department of Hawaiian Home Lands ("DHHL") is part of the discussion on the HECO grid.

Mr. Ching stated that the DHHL had recently held 2 hearings and indicated it had agreements in principle to set aside 34 acres to Sopogy to use concentrated solar. The target was 5 megawatts which is the limit for an independent, private producer to provide in this area. The time frame is still unknown, because there is still action to be taken by the Public Utilities Commission as well as interconnection agreements to be negotiated.

Member Enomoto asked whether the DHHL was involved in the infrastructure master plan process. He also asked whether completion of the infrastructure master plan was dependent on rules, what was the timing for getting the rules out for public review of the master plan, and would a public hearing be required.

Mr. Ching responded that rule implementation was targeted for the first quarter of 2010 and there would be a public hearing. Some steps had already been taken. Ms. Tesha Malama, Kalaeloa Director of Planning and Development, had established the Kalaeloa Advisory Team specifically to comment on the rules. The HCDA recently received approval to purchase a web hosted solution to broaden public comment and collaboration possibilities. The DHHL is their own entity, but they have received the suggestion that they should be developing their service requests and identifying what their potential future uses would be.

Member Enomoto asked whether completion of the infrastructure master plan was necessary to finish the rules or whether they were running on parallel track.

Mr. Ching responded that they were on a parallel track.

Member Mukaigawa noted that the DHHL had made a presentation to the Authority one year ago. She asked if there was anything current from them and noted that the DHHL had meetings every 6 weeks with its lessees.

Mr. Ching stated he would be meeting with DHHL Chairman Kaulana Park in a few days.

Member Timson suggested scheduling an Authority meeting in the Kalaeloa area.

Member Enomoto asked whether the DHHL had the right of first refusal on the 6 parcels to be conveyed in the special legislation.

Mr. Ching stated that the DHHL right of first refusal applied only to 3 parcels in the Downtown area. They made a commitment that they would exercise that option, but it requires the City to first refuse the parcels. To push that along, the National Park Service set a deadline for the City to respond.

Member Enomoto asked whether the DHHL had specific uses planned for the parcels.

Mr. Ching responded that the 3 parcels would likely be used for something that would be revenue producing for the DHHL.

Member Okada stated that there is always discussion about the DHHL and FIV. He asked whether there was any control over airports.

Mr. Ching stated he had been in discussion with the Department of Transportation-Airports and they were part of the collaboration. The Enterprise Road project terminates at the airport.

Member Saito suggested that it was a good idea to have the DHHL present at the meeting, but FIV should also be included.

Mr. McGinnis stated that FIV was open to discussion.

Chairperson Bradley asked whether there were any other members of the public who wished to comment. There were none.

A recess was taken at 10:56 a.m.

Members Enomoto, Kimura, Tanoue and Timson exited the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

The meeting reconvened at 11:05 a.m.

Chairperson Bradley noted for the record that Member Mukaigawa was present and Member Kimura had departed the meeting.

B. Kakaako Makai Area Master Planning

Mr. Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Development for Kakaako, introduced Mr. Geoff Miasnik, the consultant from MVE Pacific; and members of the CPAC, Ms. Amy Anderson, Mr. Ronald Iwami, Ms. Matson, and Mr. Reg White who would be participating in the workshop discussion.

Mr. Neupane described the Kakaako Makai master planning process via a PowerPoint presentation (Exhibit C).

Mr. Neupane stated about 100-300 people were expected to participate at the community workshops/charrettes in January that would probably be at the John A. Burns School of Medicine cafeteria.

Mr. Miasnik stated that 3 months would be spent on development of alternatives which would then be taken back to the community to talk about what was heard. The second charrettes would be held then.

Mr. Neupane stated that one alternative could arise and become the preferred one, or there might be a hybrid. The final outcome would be the preferred master plan which the community wanted.

Chairperson Bradley acknowledged and thanked the members of the CPAC for the time they had given to the process.

Member Okada asked whether involving the community would include legislators and the Governor's office in case any bills came up. He stated he did not want to go through the process and later have the legislators act against the master plan.

Mr. Neupane stated that legislators and the Governor's office would be kept informed. He noted that several elected officials had attended the CPAC meetings.

Chairperson Bradley asked how the charrettes would be promoted and whether there would be a live cam so people who were unable to attend could still participate.

Mr. Neupane stated that the charrettes would be publicized in the news media and by word of mouth. He noted that at the first meeting, 100 people were in attendance, and then interest slowly dropped off. He would look into the possibility of a live broadcast, possibly on the HCDA website.

Mr. Iwami stated he was the acting chair of the CPAC and Ms. Anderson was the vice-chair who leads the master plan subcommittee that the CPAC just formed. Subcommittee meetings were held on the first Tuesday of every month. Almost 3 years had been dedicated to the master plan and they were excited to start the process and work with the HCDA and MVE Pacific. They wanted to convey the

message to the Authority that they want to work in that spirit to come up with a master plan.

Member Okada asked where PPS fit in.

Mr. Miasnik responded that the Project for Public Space (“PPS”) is a nonprofit organization that consults on waterfront redevelopment and inner city driven gathering places. Their specialty was finding ways to go about energizing a community. They hold public workshops and focus on elements and key ideas such as community outreach and urban planners.

Member Okada stated he had attended their presentation. They were impressive, young and energetic. He noted that Members could look at their website at [www.pps.org](http://www.pps.org) to see the kind of work they had done and the practical solutions they offered.

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

Public Testimony:

*Mr. Jack Hamada* stated that the Authority was going too fast in discussing the master plan since they had not resolved the redevelopment of the John Dominis Restaurant. He asked whether it would be a single or multi-level structure.

*Ms. Matson* stated that the structure was going to be 51 feet high and did not seem to be appropriate for the location. It was a piecemeal development and not master planned. She wondered why it was being done when the developer knew the Makai area was going through a master planning process.

*Mr. Hamada* stated that the John Dominis Restaurant development, sale of Fishermen’s Wharf, and the Piano Lot needed to be worked on first, or the master plan would mean nothing.

*Ms. Anderson* stated she echoed Mr. Iwami’s comment on a positive spirit. She encouraged the Authority to attend the community workshops. The Kalaeloa workshop presentation on sustainability was remarkable and she hoped it would come to Kakaako.

Chairperson Bradley stated that the current rules in effect obligate the HCDA to respond to the OI request within 100 days. HCDA staff was trying to influence the developer as best as possible.

*Ms. Matson* asked for a clarification on the 100-day requirement since the requirement for General Growth Properties was 200 days.

Mr. Ching stated there was a difference between a master plan versus a development permit application.

Chairperson Bradley complimented HCDA staff for having the developer make a presentation to the CPAC.

*Ms. Matson* asked whether it was the responsibility for the Authority or HCDA staff to respond to the developer.

Chairperson Bradley stated that HCDA staff responds because it was an administrative action. If the floor area was under 1.5 FAR and the applicant was not seeking a modification, then it would be an administrative approval at the executive director level. He further noted that if the developer followed the rules, then the application cannot be disapproved if they were following rules that had gone through a public hearing process.

*Ms. Matson* asked whether public opinion counted.

Member Morioka stated that it was an administrative action and not discretionary. If the applicant follows all rules, then the executive director is obligated to approve the application.

*Mr. Iwami* stated he understood that obligation. The CPAC would make a statement to the developer and ask for postponement and participation in the master plan process.

*Mr. Miasnik* asked Chairperson Bradley to clarify his comment about a webcam. He asked whether a live or recorded broadcast was envisioned.

Chairperson Bradley stated that some people might find it difficult to attend the meeting, so if there was a way to see the process live, it would be better than recorded.

Member Okada asked whether the Sunshine Law limit of no more than 2 Members would apply to attendance at the charrettes.

Mr. Neupane stated that if it were an Authority meeting, there would have to be a quorum in attendance.

Mr. Ching stated that according to the Attorney General, just the presence of more than 2 Members could be construed to be a meeting. A subcommittee could be formed so a quorum would not be required.

Member Saito stated that a subcommittee would also be subject to the Sunshine Law. However, an investigative committee would not be subject to the Sunshine

Law. The Chairperson would need to appoint members of the committee at a regular meeting. The committee would need a stated purpose, start date and end date.

*Ms. Matson* stated that for the Neighborhood Board, it was called a task committee.

There were no further comments offered by the public.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by Member Mukaigawa and seconded by Member Morioka to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried 9 to 0 with 4 excused (Members Dwight, Kimura, Lai and Liu).

The meeting adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

C. Scott Bradley  
Chairperson

Attachments: Exhibit A - Report of the Executive Director  
Exhibit B – Kalaeloa Master Plan Implementation  
Exhibit C – Kakaako Makai Master Planning