

Kaka‘ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council

Final Meeting Summary

Meeting No. 8

December 4, 2007

John A. Burns School of Medicine

5:30 – 7:30 p.m., Room 301

Attachments:

- a. CPAC Organizational Issues—Consent Agenda
- b. Officers and Nomination Process PowerPoint
- c. Separate Individual Proposal: “Kaka‘ako Makai Working Group”
- d. Presentation on Historic Review of Planning Studies and RFPs for Kaka‘ako Makai - Amy Anderson
- e. CPAC Organizational Issues—Consensus Building
- f. CPAC Consensus PowerPoint
- g. Kaka‘ako Makai Community Planning Advisory Council Organizational Structure and Operating Procedures as of November 20, 2007
- h. Presentations and Information Gathering as of December 4, 2007
- i. Next Steps PowerPoint

Facilitators: Karen Cross, Kem Lowry

Recorder: Anne Smoke

I. Preliminary Business

- A. Rotating slide show of art in public places provided by Nancy Hedlund
- B. Welcome and Overview (Kem)
 - Ground rules were reviewed
 - The primary focus of this meeting will be the historical review of past planning studies and RFP proposals presented by Amy Anderson
- C. Introductions
 - Members and guests gave their name and affiliation (see attached attendance list).
- D. Approval of Minutes
 1. Oct. 25, 2007 Draft Meeting Notes
 - Lainie Tamashiro asked for the following revisions: page 4, second to last bullet, Unit 8, replace “assessed” with “tested”; and last bullet, delete “sediments.”

- The CPAC moved for approval and adopted the October 25, 2007, draft meeting summary by consensus with the recommended changes.
2. Approval of Nov. 14, 2007 Draft Meeting Notes
- The CPAC moved for approval and adopted the November 14, 2007, draft meeting summary notes.
- E. Housekeeping on meeting notes and final summaries
- Anne requested that any corrections made to draft meeting notes identify the providers and dates of the edits in footnotes. She pointed out that this is important when there are several edited drafts, and identifying the most current draft will help if there are any questions and will also avoid posting an incorrect draft.
 - Anne noted that there are still several people contacting or copying HCDA via phone and e-mail and this is still causing some confusion. It is important to streamline communications with HCDA by limiting the contacts, and for now the facilitators should be the point contact.

II. Consent Agenda

The purpose of this discussion was to determine if CPAC is willing to adopt:

1. the proposed operational officers' roles; 2. the proposed nomination process; and 3. the four standing committees. (See attachments: Steering Committee "CPAC Organizational Issues" recommendations and "Kaka'ako Makai Working Group" alternative proposed by Dr. Nalua'I)

F. Operational Officers and Nomination Process

- Kem presented the operational officers roles and the nomination process, suggesting that the process be complete by January 1, 2008.
- Kem also referred to an additional handout from Dr. Sol Nalua'I, entitled "Kaka'ako Makai Working Group", proposing several alternative suggestions and modifications.
- One member suggested that old alternatives should not be brought up this late in the process. Others from the group said that they were in agreement with this concern.
- Kem proposed two options on how to address the new information. The first option is that the CPAC could either defer the entire discussion to the Consensus Building portion of the meeting, or to New Business, for Dr. Nalua'I to present his alternatives. If the discussion is deferred the group would vote during the next meeting. The second option presented to the group would be for the CPAC to vote on the items from the consent agenda and be open to new ideas that may warrant another vote at the next meeting. With this option Dr. Nalua'I can present his

alternatives during New Business and if there is sufficient interest in the alternative proposals the CPAC can vote again during the next meeting.

- Dr. Nalua'I said that usually there is group discussion on proposals before a vote, and then commented on the role of the Chairperson suggesting that it is their role to conduct meetings. He added that the officers should make up an Executive Committee and if additional voices are needed, they could become sub-committees.
- One member said that the main point is that HCDA is looking for credibility, and the facilitators add this with the way they conduct the meetings and it is not necessary for a Chairperson to oversee these duties.
- Another member reiterated the roles of facilitators and the chairperson and their responsibilities: a) the duties of the chairperson during the meetings simply would be to call the meetings to order and adjourn them, and b) the discussions would be facilitated. This is a more holistic approach favored by the majority.
- One member pointed out the importance of the objectivity of the facilitators.
- **Kem put forth the question on whether to vote now on the Steering Committee's recommendations for the consent agenda, or to defer this until after alternatives are presented.**
- **The question to vote at this time on the consent agenda items recommended by the Steering Committee was moved for approval and adopted by 99% majority. One member voted against the motion.**
- **Kem put forth the question for a vote on the proposed operations officers' roles as recommended by the Steering Committee.**
- **The question to adopt the operations officers' roles as recommended by the Steering Committee was moved for approval and adopted by 99% majority. One member voted against the motion.**

G. Standing Committees Discussion:

- One member stated that a more formal committee process is not needed until the CPAC begins to vote on final procedures.
- Another member pointed out that the Standing Committees recommended to be adopted are simply the existing committees with the addition of a Nominations Committee, which is recommended to be established for the elections of officers at a later date.
- It was pointed out that these Standing Committees can be adopted now by the CPAC under present operational procedures, and they can also be changed in the future.

- Dr. Nalua'I read from his handout and reviewed his additional committee proposals and his suggested operational roles. He reiterated that the chair should be conducting meetings and that the funds used to pay the facilitators be used for other purposes during planning. He re-emphasized the roles per his handout and reminded the CPAC that anybody can join a committee.
- One member said that Dr. Nalua'I's proposed communications committee needs clarification.
- **Kem put forth the question for a vote on the proposed Standing Committees as recommended by the Steering Committee.**
- **The question to adopt the Standing Committee structure as recommended by the Steering Committee was moved for approval and adopted by 98% majority. Two members voted against the motion.**

III. Presentation

H. Historical Review of Past Planning Studies and RFP Proposals for the Kaka'ako Makai Area - Amy Anderson, School of Architecture Associate Professor at UH Manoa.

- Amy explained that all images were taken from the HCDA archives and UH Hamilton Library, and nothing was recreated for the presentation. The series presented began with planning concepts dating back to 1961. Amy also pointed out that all but one of the proposals and studies included in the presentation were state sponsored.
- The original *ahupua'a* divisions for the Kona district of Oahu was presented, followed by a series of aerial photographs of the Kaka'ako Makai area from 1948 through 2001.
- The complete presentation will be posted on the HCDA Web site for public reference along with additional text information that is available on the more recent projects. Amy noted that the full texts of the proposals are worth reading and each has something of merit.
- Amy noted that the state planning studies and RFP proposals were products of sequential state administrations which are noted at the bottom of the slides.
- Amy explained the 1961 master plan. The primary focus of the plan was for expansion and improvements to Honolulu's harbor. The cost for improvements was estimated at \$26 million over the 20 year projected period of the plan. Current improvements to all harbors in of Hawai'i are now estimated at \$1 billion. Plan A included a mid rise residential component, while in Plan B the sub-area was developed primarily as a park with cultural facilities.
- Schemes from a 1987 design charette produced during Governor Waihe'e's term had elaborate manmade waterways and a newly added beach park at the ewa end of the Kaka'ako Makai area. The spatial scope of these projects extended from

Kewalo Basin to Pier #21 and included a portion of Sand Island. Kaka'ako Makai was to be a gathering place with multiple focal points, connecting the town and the landscape beyond.

- The State Office of Planning and the HCDA commissioned the Harbors Master Plan in 1989. In the explanatory diagrams for the plan the shoreline parks “lei of green” concept was highlighted. Water taxies at harbor openings were proposed to provide continuous access through the shoreline park. The Kaka'ako Makai subarea contained a “great park” at the ocean edge. A new waterway was cut internally through the makai area as linkage to the city and a visual axis to Aloha Tower. Views to Diamond Head were preserved by a counterpoint visual axis.
- After the two harbor master plans of 1961 and 1989 were made, proposals for smaller portions of the waterfront occurred.
- A master plan of 1993 for the Kaka'ako Makai area extended the work of the 1989 larger scope master plan but proposed a smaller block division on both the *mauka* and *makai* areas of Kaka'ako and also a curvature to the street that separated the park from the built up blocks. Green spaces were expanded across Ala Moana Boulevard including a strong connection to Mother Waldron Park.
- A Waterfront Park Competition was held in 2002 with focus only on the design of the park at the ocean's edge. The winning scheme included a waterway cut into the *makai* area spanned by bridges and included a covered amphitheater. Amy noted that the scheme submitted by Belt Collins articulated spatial ideas tied to Hawaiian culture.
- In response to an RFP of 2002 for properties adjacent to Kewalo Basin three proposals were submitted. [Negotiations with the developer of the selected proposal were terminated over concerns of the scheme's financial viability.]
- In 2003 Kamehameha Schools with Victoria Ward and HCDA commissioned a study from the urban design firm of Cooper Robertson. The study addressed a larger planning area and made alternative proposals for low rise and midrise development spanning Ala Moana Boulevard. In 2002 the University of Hawai'i initiated the development of the Biomedical Sciences complex. The first phase construction of the John A. Burns Medical School was completed in 2005.
- The recent proposals of 2005 seem more detailed and contain greater financial analysis than previous proposed development, perhaps as a result of the specific requests within the Request for Proposal (RFP) document. Substantial projects were proposed underpinned by public-private partnerships providing revenue from \$26 million to \$200 million back to the State over a 30 to 50 year timeframe by splitting proceeds from residential sales. Four development teams submitted proposals. The selected scheme by A&B Properties promised \$70 million to the State, including a \$50 million purchase of state property in Kaka'ako Makai and \$20 million in shared residential sales revenue.

- Amy said there are questions about what happened to some of the proposals, as it appears schemes were selected for development but there is not clear evidence from the archival material of what happened to the plans.
- Amy concluded with her own schematic diagrams as a summary of urban design concepts within the forty year period of the planning proposals. The concepts reflect evolving ideas internationally in urban design theory. She said that diagrams can be a visual tool for analyzing human dynamics in the space of the city and even more the human to nature relationship. Urban design can proceed by trying to understand on a deeply psychological level the means for people to belong to a place.

Comments, Questions and Answers

- Q: Someone asked if a bridge was included in General Growth's plan.
A: Amy said that two of the proposals had bridges but General Growth's plan did not.
- Q: Amy was asked what she hopes to add to the presentation.
A: Bibliographies need to be added. Drawings won't be changed, but text will be added.
- All documents are available at HCDA for public review.
- Q: Will the planning concepts be available soon?
A: They will be available on Monday.
- Q: Where is Mother Waldron Park today?
A: It is located at Halekauwila and Cooke Streets
- Q: What is an RFP?
A: RFP is an acronym for Request for Proposals.
- Q: What is an iconic structure? A:
A building that is a symbol.
- Q: What is the long range plan for the shipping container area and the Foreign Trade Zone?
A: A harbor facilities master plan is being broadly implemented for the harbor.
- Q: Is this area being shifted away from the Kaka'ako Makai planning district?
A: The State Legislature returned Piers 1 & 2 to Harbors Division last year.
- Q. Did the RFPs call for specific design elements?
- A. There were suggestions for design features in the RFPs, such as neighborhood links and axis to connect with a large park; there was a large plaza near an Ala Moana circular in the early 1990's plan.
- Q: Were the last designs shown following waterfront design 'best practices' or design elements that were specific to Kaka'ako?
A: It is unclear if such practices were actually requested or included as part of the plans, but the plans can be interpreted as having them. There were charettes in

the 1980's, then studies, plans and guidelines from the HCDA. There is a distinction between the early period with the harbor planning studies and the later mixed use proposals by developers.

- It was pointed out that it would be important for the CPAC to have a follow-up presentation on the financial aspects and economics of some of these plans because the CPAC cannot recommend a plan for Kaka`ako Makai in an economic vacuum.
- The presentation was commended and a formal request was made for a presentation(s) on the financial and economic aspects of these plans, including the projected costs and financing. It would be helpful if the plan consultants could talk with the CPAC.
- Q: Was there a plan with a plaza near Ala Moana Blvd? This was not shown today but such a plan is recalled.
A: Amy said she wasn't certain, but if anyone knows of specific proposals and would like to see them, she could try to retrieve them for the CPAC. Amy requested that if anyone would like her to investigate specific plans they could send an e-mail to the facilitators to pass on to her.
- Q: Are there proposals for the design of the existing park? What influenced the present design?
A: Yes, there are proposed concepts, and the park design was part of a competition.
- Q: A member noted that the current design incorporated the former dump area.
A: Amy said that she will add the current park design piece to the presentation before posting the presentation.
- Q: What can be done with the berms? Can the berms be leveled?
A: A CPAC member suggested berms cannot be leveled because the removal of the berms with the added capping is much more costly.
- Q. How thick is the capping?
A. One member confirmed that the mounds are repositories for contaminated incinerator wastes that need to be disposed of or capped, and a 20- year-old study indicated that the cost of removal at that time was \$2.5 billion. Today the only remedy is to remove, ship and treat the contaminated soil elsewhere.
A. Another member commented that technology is available to melt down the waste and remove it.
- Q: One member noted that there has been 40 years of planning and no action; so what happened to the plans and why weren't they implemented?
A: Amy will investigate this matter and include any new information in the presentation that is posted. She also said perhaps better ideas were perceived as needed.
A: A CPAC member who researched plans on her own for a separate project suggested that changes in each State administration was reason for some plans not going through, as each wanted something different.

- Q: The word *ahupua'a* was used initially; is it possible to incorporate the *ahupua'a* concept into the plan for the area?

A: No plan will be identical to the *ahupua'a*, but the concept and principles can be included effectively through design. Various design considerations can be used to re-establish the tradition of the *ahupua'a*, such as the role of the water with the landscape, opening up the landscape, responding in an environmentally responsible manner, and carefully considering social relationships in space. It was noted that Ray Soefuji mapped the waters of the *ahupua'a*.
- A formal request was made for a presentation regarding the *ahupua'a* concept, and cultural practitioner Ramsay Taum and UH Professor Davianna McGregor were noted as possible presenters.
- Q: What happened to idea of creating a beach?

A: The beach designs may have been in conflict with harbor operations.
- Q: How do you take four decades of un-implementable planning ideas that are not driven by community-based input and translate them to a community-based process that the CPAC can use? The visions and ideas from the CPAC need to be translated into a master plan. What is the process that will allow this to happen?

A: The community-based planning process is not new and requires patience for planning. Today, given a more egalitarian planning process, spacial ideas in urban design are emerging to match this approach
- One member noted that the “People’s Plan” concept was not shown as current from the HCDA, and this should be updated. A final version was offered, and Amy agreed to include the update on the HCDA web site.
- Q: What is the impact on Kaka’ako Makai of the proposed elevated mass transit plan?

A: Amy did not see this in the plans she reviewed except for broad reference to transit systems articulated in the Coopers Robertson study of 2003.

A: One member noted that the fixed guide-way route is planned to be elevated along Halekauwila Street.
- It was noted that the proposed elevated transit line will block the mauka-makai view planes to the mountains from Kaka`ako Makai, and the elevated structure is planned to rise up to 80-90 feet to serve an Ala Moana shopping center transit station
- Q: Concern was expressed about global warming, and one member asked how the projected rise in sea level is being considered in present planning practices.

A: Amy noted that sea level rise was only one aspect within a range of environmental concerns. Community based design process can incline in the direction of correcting mistakes, however the complexity of the issues will need expertise skilled in extensive data evaluation and economic projections for alternatives to determine remedies
- Amy was thanked for her comprehensive presentation, and for providing her research for posting on the HCDA web site CPAC link for future reference.

IV. **Consensus Building on Organizational Issues** (See attachment)

I. Consensus Presentation

- Karen provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding consensus measuring procedures, and noted this would also be available online. She explained a “fists of five” voting process for signaling the degree of support for group polling questions. There were no objections to this consensus building technique.

J. Consensus Discussion

- It was requested that Karen go over the next consensus building questions with the CPAC. Karen reviewed the CPAC’s points of consensus for “meaningful participation” of the voting membership and the summary of meeting attendance percentages (see attached handouts) and noted the attachments will be included on the CPAC’s HCDA web site posting for this meeting.
- One member noted that “regular attendance” had not yet been clarified.
- Karen reviewed the attendance numbers on the handout: to date, 38 registered members had attended at least three out of eight CPAC meetings. Six of the eight meetings (75 percent) had been attended by 20 participating members, or 53 percent of the registered participating members.
- Many of those present expressed concerns regarding future stacked or skewed votes, and stated that a fair and balanced voting structure must be defined.
- It was again pointed out that it will be important to determine what is meant by “regular” attendance.
- Karen asked those present for their ideas on the definition of “meaningful participation” for voting purposes, and presented a starter list that included some suggestions, e.g., anyone can attend the CPAC’s open meetings; the percentage of meetings attended over a certain period of time, such as half or more; and interest group voting.
- One member pointed out that there are interest groups and stakeholders that invested their time and attention in the entire legislative process relating to plans for Kaka`ako Makai, and these groups should be considered for their investment of time and energy. It was suggested that one way to acknowledge meaningful participation among these stakeholders is interest groups is based on a caucus concept, and assigning an equal number of votes for each interest group to prevent skewing of votes. For example, anybody can be a member of an interest group, and every interest group would have 5 votes; if or when there is no consensus achieved within the interest group, votes would be put forth to determine the proportionate position of the participants in the interest group, e.g., 3 votes in favor , 1 abstaining and 1 opposed.
- Kem reminded the CPAC that the quality of deliberation on CPAC recommendations and the coalescing around ideas on planning issues will be important, because this quality will result in more persuasive and powerful

recommendations to the HCDA. He encouraged the CPAC to continue with consensus as the goal.

- One member suggested that to meaningfully participate the CPAC working group should be in joint partnership with HCDA.
- It was noted that the State Legislature defined the types of participants for this working group: 1) interested stakeholders, meaning anybody with a stake in Kaka‘ako Makai; and 2) the 12 community groups including surfers and others advocating public uses for Kaka‘ako Makai, who rallied to meet with legislators and testify for the appropriate uses.
- It was pointed out by several CPAC members that it is important to make a distinction between special interest factions and public interest groups. This process is intended to be a holistic approach and the recommended interest groups are defined as people who are interested in cultural, environmental and other aspects of public use planning and design. It was noted that referral to factions would be dangerous to this all-inclusive planning process.
- One member said that they cannot always attend meetings and but can review the items from each meeting posted on Web site.
- Karen noted the time and deferred the remaining discussion to the next meeting. She reminded CPAC participating members about the two questions remaining on the agenda: a) how many meetings might be reasonable to expect participating members to attend in a period of six months, eight months or a year in order to have sufficient background to vote on key planning questions; and b) how many consecutive absences would hinder this ability. She also noted that the Steering Committee would be meeting to discuss ideas to be presented at the next CPAC meeting.
- A member noted that before addressing the Vision or Guiding Principles, it will be important to define the voting membership.
- It was requested by a member that the CPAC soon have a full discussion on planning values and principles, because once the visioning begins the areas of planning consensus and disagreement will become better understood along with what decision-making process will be necessary.
- Another member suggested that before the CPAC enters into discussion on interest groups and how they will be counted in the voting process, a mission statement or list of goals is needed to show broad strokes of intent for this planning effort, and how each interest group can benefit the process.
- It was noted that some of this information is on the CPAC link on the HCDA Web site.

V. HCDA Communications (See attachments)

- The Organizational Structure and Operating Procedures to date and an education component page listing the presentations to the CPAC for information gathering will

be presented to HCDA at their next meeting, and CPAC reports will be regularly provided to keep the HCDA apprised of the CPAC's progress.

- Karen and Anne reminded the CPAC that materials being distributed at meetings or posted on the HCDA Web site must be provided to facilitators five days in advance of the meeting.

VI. Next Steps (See attachment)

The next steps and topics for upcoming discussion were provided with a PowerPoint presentation. This included developing the January 15, 2008, agenda and determining topics for the February 12 and March 11, 2008, agendas with the additional topics requested at this meeting:

- Economic and financial information added to Amy's presentation per a member's request and CPAC agreement;
- The Hawaiian ahupua'a tradition, with suggested presenters being Ramsay Taum or Professor Davianna McGregor.

NEXT MEETING: January 15, 2008; JABSOM, room to be determined

Meeting notes drafted by Anne Smoke 12/8/07

Revisions added to Presentation summary by Amy Anderson 12/14/07

Reviewed, corrected and approved for posting by CPAC Steering Committee 12/20/07

Attendance List:

Anderson, Amy	Gulick, Tom
Bates, Cheryl	Gum, Charles
Bright Spangler, Susan	Harada, Ernest
Cheever, David	Hathaway, Nancy
Conover, Don	Hedlund, Nancy
Cristofori, Marilyn	Howe, Jim
Crone, Bob	Hudson, Gail
Cross, Karen	Iwami, Ronald T.
Dang, Mike	Jaffe, Michelle
Eckard, Andrew	Johnson, Lynne
Feltz, William	Kamin, Hester
Foster, Norman	Killeen, Kevin
Furushima, Scott	Kunisaki, Susan
Gordon, Lee David	Lareanx, Juliana
Griffin, Jaye	Lowry, Kem
Griffin, Keith	Loy, Bob
Gulick, Margaret	Lum, Ryan

Maluafiti, Alicia
Matson, Michelle
Matsumoto, Lisa
Miasnik, Geoff
Michael, Donald
Moffitt, James
Murakami, Jane
Musick, Marla
Nalua'i, Dr. Solomon
Neale, Judy
Okada, Dexter
Olsen, Phil
Paluch, William
Park, Soo-Joun
Parkinson, John
Parrish, Jonathan
Pearson, Chuck
Petty, Bill
Pickens, Alex L.

Prescott, Meredith
Quinn, Richard
Schnell, Tom
Schweitzer, Marsha
Shintani, Terry
Smoke, Anne
Stone, Geoff
Swift, David
Takamine, Wayne
Takeshita, Erik
Tamashiro, Elaine
Thorpe, John W. Jr.
Tiller, Karen
Titterton, Michael
Tsuchida, Bruce
Wellington, Fumiko
Wong, Mark
Yajima, Loretta