MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

Minutes
Wednesday, July 19, 2017

The Planning Commission held a meeting on
Wednesday, July 19, 2017, at 1:34 p.m. at the Hawaii Okinawa Center, Legacy Ballroom, 94-587 Ukee Street, Waipahu, Hawaii. Chairman Dean Hazama presided.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Dean I. Hazama, Chair
Theresa C. McMurdo, Vice-Chair
Cord D. Anderson
Kauiulani K. Sodaro
Arthur B. Tolentino
Ken K. Hayashida
Wildred A. Chang, Jr.
Gifford K. F. Chang

COMMISSIONER EXCUSED: Steven S. C. Lim
[prior notice given]

COMMISSION STAFF: Gloria Takara,
Secretary-Hearings Reporter

DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL: Don S. Kitaoaka
(Advisory to the Commission)

DPP REPRESENTATIVE: Bob Stanfield, Branch Chief
Development Plan & Zone Change Branch

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman: Good afternoon, everyone. And at this 4 time I'll call to order the meeting of the Honolulu Planning Commission for Wednesday, July 19, 2017, and welcome to all our guests at the Hawaii Okinawa Center. I want to thank staff right now for coordinating this so that we can actually bring out this meeting to the area rather than holding it down at Honolulu Hale.

So, at this time I call the meeting to order. [bangs gavel] First order of business on our agenda is approval of our minutes from our June 21st meeting. I know there were some changes submitted by Commissioner Sodaro.

So, Commissioners, any other changes or comments other than those that have already been submitted? [no response]


Any abstentions? [no response] Okay. The minutes as corrected have been adopted.

Next order of business is public hearing. A Bill 21 to Adopt the Revised Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan for the City and County of Honolulu. At this time can I ask the Department to please come up.

Mr. Stanfield: Good afternoon, Chair Hazama and Commissioners. I'm Bob Stanfield with the Department of Planning and Permitting. I'm the project manager for the review and revision of the Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan. Earlier you were transmitted a copy of the Plan and a review report that came in two volumes. And today we submitted testimony that includes a document that I have on other table. A briefing handbook that we've been using for our community outreach that looks like this with the public copies of all these materials were available over there at the sign-in sheet table. We also submitted testimony with regard to the Waikolo Storage Area proposal that you recently received.

First, I'd like to briefly go through the handout and point out some key points in that. Most of it, rest of it is useful as a reference. First one I'd like to call your attention to is page 5, which summarizes the evaluation that we did during our review report. We looked at six major elements of division for Central Oahu and essentially our assessment is that they're mostly successful in protecting ag lands, open space, revitalizing Waipahu and Wahiawa, protecting natural historic and cultural resources, a building master plan community that support walking, biking and transit use, designing communities to produce automobile use and providing adequate infrastructure, mostly successful, but there definitely have been challenges. For example, protection of ag lands have been challenged by the
1. Developments in Kunia Ridge. And although we have saved the
2. land for an open space network we really haven’t developed
3. an open space network. Redevelopment revitalization of
4. Wahia. They are definitely facing challenges. The future
5. of the hospitals that question, and it’s the most important
6. job center in Wahia, and there’s a number of new ventures
7. proposed but there’s a long way to go for realization of
8. them.

And, finally probably our most challenging vision
9. element is providing adequate infrastructure particularly
10. the transportation and school adequacy and the future of the
11. rail system is obviously a factor in that.

Next, I’d like to call your attention to page 6,
12. which is a discussion, basically a summary of the
13. improvements that we’re proposing to the Plan. In general,
14. there’s not a change in direction being proposed. We’re
15. still pursuing the same vision elements. This is more like
16. proposed tune-up and update to include issues, problems that
17. in 2002 weren’t apparent to us including incorporating the
18. complete streets, policy, the City’s affordable housing
19. policies, making Central Oahu H-friendly as part of the
20. city’s friendly Honolulu initiative and responding to the need to
21. adapt the climate change and to be resilient. We’re also
22. incorporating the TGD, the Transit–Oriented Development
23. policies as it effects the Waipahu area and also

1. Incorporating new projects for Wahia. And at the back of
2. the handout there’s copies of the four maps that are
3. proposed for the Plan and the thing I’d like to say about
4. that is that there is no expansion in development capacity
5. being proposed from what was adopted in 2002. And there are
6. some changes to the Growth Boundary to illustrate the policy
7. recommendations and interpretations. One is the addition of
8. the Kunia state ag park in this area, the explicit extension
9. of the boundary on Kipapa Gulch and Waikiki Gulch to show
10. that it’s to be preserved as open space. There’s inclusion
11. of the Waikiki bluffs area indicating that it should be
12. viewed as being inside the Growth Boundary and available for
13. Urban Development. The exclusion of the east range military
14. training area as should be part of the open space and
15. expansion of the boundary for Schofield to recognize
16. military usage in this area. That concludes my testimony on
17. the Central Oahu Plan.

Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any questions of
18. the Department at this time? [no response] Okay. Seeing
19. none, thank you, Bob.

Mr. Stanfield: We also had testimony on the
21. Waikiki. Do you want to take it up at this time or not?
22. Chairman: Why don’t we do that after, if that’s
23. possible. Okay. So, we have a list of registered speakers.
25. At this time first speaker is Peter Savio. Can you please

Come up to the table, please.

Mr. Savio: Good afternoon. I’m Peter Savio. I’m
3. the landowner of the land on Waikiki Storage Park, and I’m
4. here with my team Scott and Ron to ask for the inclusion of
5. our project within the boundaries and to clean up some of
6. the confusion that results that were left out. Scott, do you
7. want to explain the (inaudible)?

Mr. Ezera: Okay. Sure. Chair Kazama, members of
9. the Commission. My name is Scott Ezera. I’m a principal in
10. the land use planning firm of HNF Planners, and I’m working
11. with and representing Mr. Savio in his request to propose an
12. amendment to the sustainable communities plan. We have
13. submitted, and I think you have in your possession a pretty
14. lengthy request that describes in detail what we’re asking
15. for, why we’re asking for it. I’ll just give you some
16. highlights of the reasons we’re here today.

First, I want to apologize because I do recognize
17. that we’re here rather late in the game. We did not
18. participate in any of the process leading up to the
19. preparation of the sustainable communities plan update. And,
20. I’ll like to explain why that happened. Basically, it
21. happened for four reasons. The Applicant, Mr. Savio, only
22. achieved ownership of this property in 2015. At the time
23. they came into ownership of the property, they believed that
24. some nonconforming status granted to the uses and buildings

On the property previously by the Department of Planning and
2. Permitting, and I’ll describe that in a little bit as well,
3. would allow them to take possession of the property,
4. continue the industrial uses and make modest improvements to
5. the land and to the buildings that are part of the overall
6. project. The Department—And, we’ve been in conversation
7. with DPP for many, many months on this issue, and our
8. appearance here today is an end game resolution of that
9. conversation. DPP only recently advised us that these types
10. of modest improvements would not be covered by the
11. nonconforming status that we have been granted previously.
12. And DPP also recently advised us that they would like to see
13. a longer term solution for the Waikiki property and the
14. Department felt that the best long range solution for that
15. would be to seek a zone change but, of course, the only way
16. we can do that is be consistent with the sustainable
17. communities plan. We would then have to go to the State
18. Land Use Commission, and then we have to go to City Council
19. to get a zone change. So, we have a rather arduous path
20. ahead of us. This is the first step, and we hope you will
21. consider our request favorably.

For those of you that are not familiar with the
22. property, the property is over 500 acres and takes up the
23. entirety of Waikiki Gulch and some land above the gulch
24. otherwise known as Waikiki Bluff. So, we’re just to the
1 structures on the property were legally constructed while
2 the property was still under the control of the Navy and as
3 a result the tunnels, sites and buildings would be
4 considered legally nonconforming upon transfer of the
5 property from the federal to private ownership.
6 We're only asking to acknowledge the uses and the land that
7 are in industrial use today. We are not asking to expand
8 the extent of the industrial use and would only like to be
9 able to move forward with maintaining the property in a
10 fashion and manner that is safe for all of the users and
11 allows industrial to continue on the property. I would like
12 to also mention that the property is being taxed as
13 industrial by the budget and finance folks and again we've
14 got a pretty extensive submittal. It's dense and if there
15 are any other questions and, I think that's going to
16 conclude my—Oh, I would like to add that we have reached
17 out; we've met with the Waikiki Community Association. We
18 will be meeting with the Waipahu Neighborhood Board next
19 week. We've been trying to get on the Millilani Neighborhood
20 Board for two months. We may or may not be on their agenda
21 for next week. I think we will find out today and if we do
22 not get on their agenda for next week, I've been told we
23 will not be able to make their agenda until September.
24 We're available for questions or comments.
25
26 Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, any
27
28 questions at this time? [no response] Okay. Seeing none,
29 2 thank you, sir.
30
31 Okay. At this time, we'll call back up the
32 Department to discuss your testimony.
33
34 Ms. Stancilj: Thank you, Chair Hazama. I'm just
35 going to read through the testimony put in the record.
36 7 Kipapa SPE LLC and Savio Bluffs Venture LLC have proposed
37 amendments to the growth boundaries and the text to the
38 proposed Central Sustainable Community Plan to relocate the
39 10 Community Growth Boundary to include their property and to
40 allow industrial use for 12 sites comprising 32 acres which
41 are currently operating as nonconforming industrial uses.
42 The Department of Planning and Permitting is not
43 opposed to such a change if it's narrowly constrained to
44 resolve the issue with the existing 12 non-conforming
45 industrial use areas which we have been informed our outside
46 17 the 100-year flood plan, and restricts uses for portions of
47 the gulch inside the 100-year flood plain to remain in
48 19 preservation open uses serving storm water retention and
49 flood plain purposes.
50
51 We note that we've not had much time to review the
52 Kipapa/Savio proposal that there are some issues yet to be
53 resolved including major issues of drainage, emergency
54 access, recreational opportunities, and perhaps less major
55 Hawaii Revised Statute 6E Historic Preservation discoveries,
1 view impacts. At the Central Oahu Sustainable Community Plan
2 level, only the concept of entertaining the change to the
3 growth boundary and supporting industrial use in text and
4 illustrating those industrial uses for the 12 sites on the
5 Urban Land Use Map is being considered. This would allow
6 the project to be considered by the State Land Use
7 Commission for inclusion in the State Urban District, and by
8 the City for industrial zoning, and possible subdivision.
9 At these other entitlement stages many issues will have to
10 be evaluated, conditioned and resolved. It's likely that an
11 EIS be required.
12 We believe that the use created by the military
13 without regard to civilian reuse and impacts is unlikely to
14 decline and devolve into preservation uses. The storage
15 area has been sold as condominium properties making it
16 extremely difficult to change especially to less intense
17 use. And we acknowledge the need for industrial space
18 islandwide and the current industrial areas in Waipahu will
19 eventually need to relocate due to TOD influences. So this
20 area may be useful to keeping industrial jobs in the Waipahu
21 area for the long term. Also, note as a late breaking
22 proposal it has not been vetted with the surrounding
23 community.
24 In short, the Department would be unlikely to
25 support this proposal if it was being established right now.

1 However, this is a unique situation with a long-standing use
2 that provides jobs and benefits the community. If narrowly
3 crafted under the SCP, we would not be opposed so as to
4 allow the project to seek further entitlements to remove the
5 restrictions as non-conforming use and resolve outstanding
6 issues in ways that would benefit the larger community.
7 That's our testimony.
8 Chairman: Okay. Commissioners, any questions of
9 the Department regarding this issue at this time regarding
10 their testimony?
11 Can I ask the Director to come up.
12 Ms. Sokugawa: Good afternoon. Kathy Sokugawa
13 Acting Director.
14 Chairman: Hi. So, in order to change--Currently,
15 this property or this site is zoned preservation?
16 Mr. Stanfield: It's zoned F-1, which was the
17 military zoning--
18 Chairman: So, it's federal?
19 Mr. Standfield: But it’s treated as P-2.
20 Chairman: Okay. It's treated as P-2. So, in
21 order to change that to allow for industrial use, they would
22 need a change in the Urban Growth Boundary to change it to
23 an Industrial Use?
24 Mr. Stanfield: To make it consistent with the
25 Plan. To make that consistent with the Plan, it would need
26 to be inside the Growth Boundary and indicated for
27 Industrial Use in the text and in the map.
28 Chairman: Okay. So, the zone change that's being
29 referred to then would be a zone change from technically F-1
30 to some kind of "I" designation or I-1 or IMX or something
31 like, right?
32 Mr. Stanfield: But before they can do that, it
33 needs to be in the state urban district. Currently, it's in
34 the ag district.
35 Chairman: Oh, it's in the ag district. So,
36 that's why you need the urban boundary amendment?
37 Mr. Stanfield: Both in terms of the zoning. When
38 we go to Council and in terms of the State Land Use
39 District, when we go to the State Land Use Commission for
40 the City to support those changes or to consider those
41 changes, it needs to be consistent with the Plan. So, this
42 would be the first step making the Plan, allowing the
43 industrial uses in that area and moving the boundary so that
44 it's inside the area that's being developed for urban uses
45 and to indicate in the text and on the maps that industrial
46 use would be permitted in that area.
47 Chairman: Okay. So, that zone change in the
48 future would come before the Planning Commission as well?
49 Mr. Stanfield: Yes.
50 Chairman: Okay. And in regards to, I guess
51 there's a statement in your testimony regarding the fact
52 that you believe that an EIS would be required. Is it
53 because of the change between P-2 to the IMX or "I"?
54 whatever?
55 Ms. Sokugawa: Well, it might be also triggered
56 just by the boundary amendment.
57 Chairman: Just by a straight boundary amendment.
58 Okay. I guess I had a question regarding—we believe that
59 the use created by the military without regard to civilian
60 use and, in fact, it's unlikely to decline? But the
61 military is not using that and anymore, right? So--
62 Ms. Sokugawa: As Bob said it was a thriving
63 outdoor, indoor ammunitions depot. And then there was this
64 provision where they needed to fundraise for Ford Island and
65 other things. So, the Congress said—they had this deal
66 where create your own funds. So, part of it was selling off
67 the Kalaehoa lands. There was a number of properties that
68 they offered for sale to raise cash. This was one of them.
69 So, it’s in their interest to highly value the land as much
70 as possible. So what happened, as I recall, is it did not
71 go directly to Mr. Savio. I went to Hunt, and Hunt behind
72 the gates, as they call it, did a lot of improvements
73 because they were not under City or civilian zoning.
74 It was still under federal jurisdiction. So, there are a
75 number of improvements that have been. And so at the end of
1 the day now we have an industrial outdoor storage area that 2 has been condominuiized. So, it’s no longer under one 3 owner. 4 Chairman: Okay. So in essence the federal 5 government converted that property to all these 6 non-conforming uses? 7 Ms. Sokugawa: They released it as is which 8 was--And this is not unusual. Manana, if you recall, had a 9 bunch of warehouses from the Navy. Aloha Stadium used to be 10 military land. Kalaeloa, again, had a bunch of Navy 11 housing. This one is unique in that it’s in the state 12 agricultural district. The others were in the state urban 13 district. 14 Chairman: Okay. 15 Member Sodaro: Thank you, Kathy. Is it known what 16 the zone change would be? I know we’re using industrial for 17 the General Plan designation, but for zoning are the uses 18 allowable under light industrial or they’re going for heavy 19 industrial? 20 Ms. Sokugawa: You can ask the Applicant or agent. 21 Member Sodaro: Okay. 22 Ms. Sokugawa: I guess it would depend on where 23 outdoor storage is and when the zoning is applied for. 24 Because it could change. But they have to look for zoning 25 that allows outdoor storage which includes I-2. I don’t 1 think they qualify for I-3. 2 Member Sodaro: Okay. But it would also not need 3 to universally apply to the parcel? 4 Ms. Sokugawa: No. You can do portions of-- 5 Member Sodaro: Right. So, they can portion it 6 out if there were other issues. 7 Ms. Sokugawa: Yes. 8 Member Sodaro: Okay. Thanks. 9 Chairman: Any other questions? [no response] 10 Thank you, Director. Okay. Our next registered speaker is 11 Kim Rose Nakamoto. Oh, I’m sorry. No. Okay. David 12 Seaholzer. 13 Mr. Seaholzer: Good afternoon. My name is David 14 Seaholzer. I’m the current Chairman of the Board of Wahilawa 15 General Hospital. I’m also the Vice Chair of the Wahilawa 16 Hospital Association. I think I’m here to make a point that 17 if you’re going to have a sustainable community, you also 18 have to have medical services consistent with the size of 19 that community and the demographic mix of those people tha 20 occupy the community. I know that people have a viewpoint 21 Wahilawa General Hospital. It might be good, it might be bad 22 depending upon what they know. Just recently we’ve had 23 an open house and a number of people came through to tour 24 the new ER, the brand new ER. It’s a wonderful ER. And 25 thank you for the state for giving us the money to make 1 those changes and expand it to what it is today. There’s a 2 very nice mammogram facility that been operating. But more 3 important than that it was about oh maybe the spring of last 4 year when the board concluded that the direction that we 5 were going was not going to take us where we needed to be. 6 And we asked the current CEO to find a resource or us to 7 replace him, who would manage the hospital and who had the 8 background experience with rural hospitals having financial 9 difficulties. And, if you find that sort of organization we 10 would put them on contract and have them write them out if 11 you will. Because we were perhaps spending too much time 12 bailing and not enough time growing. So, in December of 13 last year we fell under a contract a company by the name of 14 Community Hospital Corporation. They’re headquartered in 15 Plano, Texas. They are a non-profit like the Wahilawa 16 General Hospital is, 501(c)3, and their objective is to find 17 rural hospitals that are going out of business because they 18 got more expenses then they do revenues and finding ways to 19 correct that and save them. I don’t know what their survival 20 rate is but it’s up there pretty high. It’s up in the 70%, 21 80%. I’ll have to make a mental note to actually find what 22 those real numbers are. But they are truly remarkable. In 23 December, they brought in immediately upon signing the 24 contract a CEO, they brought this person out of retirement 25 and hit the street running. They brought a CFO out of 1 retirement and hit the street running and they have been 2 introducing a number of changes mostly from the financial 3 side of things to get the revenues up because there are ways 4 to code things in the medical domain to get more payment 5 from the insurance companies and they find a more precise 6 way to do that, which has (inaudible), and also by flexing 7 staff as volume changes throughout the calendar year to get 8 the expenses down. Also, group purchasing plan which 9 allowed--We are part of their national group purchasing plan 10 which meet whatever we buy is much less expensive because 11 they buy in bulk and is kind of a Costco approach to buy 12 things, buy in bulk. So, I in know I’m taking a lot of time 13 describing that but it’s important that everybody realize 14 the ship is rated and it’s sailing in the right direction. 15 We are about $4 million better financially now that they 16 were this time last year. And that is all the direct result 17 of what the community health corporations, skills being 18 applied to the day-to-day management side of the hospital. 19 Now, also, and everybody sitting in front of me 20 that there has been 26 acres of land that was gifted to 21 Wahilawa General Hospital has a part of (settle grown 22 crouch) that we have until April of next year to offer a 23 viable plan to Castle & Cooke to retain that land for the 24 use of medical services, and we do have--For us to go 25 forward without a partner would never past muster because we
1 are not financially rich, Wahiawa General Hospital.
2 But so we needed a partner and we are engaged in conversations as we speak with more than one partner who have shown definite interest. So, it looks like there's someone who has, in fact, the capacity to fund and build-out at a bridge in the medical facility. That is one is going to want to associate with us. When I look at--And, I'll give you some personal opinions. And, I'm a Wahiawa resident. I can imagine a hospital that gets slowly changed and modernized in Wahiawa as medical facilities and Koa Ridge are, in fact, built out. The original Koa Ridge plans, what was going to be there, you can forget that. Now, that may be was a pipe dream and was a view from maybe ten years ago. How long ago? I don't know maybe even more than 10 years ago. But the medical world is changing so fast, that almost everyone who is starting out with major modifications is going to a micro-hospital configuration. And micro-hospitals can take any kind of configuration because it is based upon the community off servicing. So, I would see the Wahiawa changing quite a bit over the years, retaining it's campus, being in place there, and then contemplate services becoming available in Koa Ridge. So, I guess the bottom line is somebody a long time ago had enough foresight to say, you know you're going to need a medical facility in Central Oahu. Thank God they did. Thank

1 God those 28 acres are available, and I want to keep it available. I don't want to see anything, yank it away, so it can't be used for the purpose that was intended. So, with that, any questions?
Chairman: Okay. Are there any questions?
Member Sodaro: I just had a question. Thank you, sir. We received testimony from Representative Oshiro's office that your Board didn't have an opinion about the State of Hawaii High Tech Development Corporation because it contemplates geriatric related businesses that are associated with Wahiawa General Hospital. Do you concur with that testimony submitted by his office?
Mr. Seeholzer: I think I understand what you're talking about. It's a geriatric center facility and, I think looking for the opportunity for federal funds to flow into that and use that facility for that kind of thing.
Well, if that were to happen that would be a high class problem have to solve. There would be a lot of money coming in and a lot of opportunity to do different things. But we and the hospital can't depend upon that likelihood to happen. So, we move along as if that cannot happen. We're not against it. It'll be great to have that money and the state to be able to do things with. But we cannot assume it's going to happen. We have to stick with out knitting and keep plugging away to keep that hospital--Get our slide

1 slope up and become profitable. My goal is by the time that the Community Hospital Corporation is done with their 3-year contract. They renew at six months. That we will be at that moment financially viable without any need for subsidy. That's my own personal objective.
Chairman: Thank you. Any other questions?
Mr. Seeholzer: Thank you.
Chairman: Okay. Our next speaker, testifier is Daniel Neyer.
Mr. Neyer: Good afternoon, members of the Commission. My name is Daniel Neyer. And most of this I support, but there's a bunch I have questions and comments on. One, is making Wahiawa town a special TOD district with Waipahu. That would ruin the town with all of the TOD, the new TOD going in. It would increase the number of military moving into those units with the assisted COLA, the rent would go up even higher and the people in Wahiawa could not even afford to move into those because of the increase in rents. Okay. Two, on Koa Ridge they're going to built 12,300 units. The increase in population is going to be 12,800 people. That means 11,800 of the unit is going to have one person in it and 500 will going to have two persons in it.

1 I think those unrealistic numbers. If we have 12,000, a 300-unit we are going to need medical facilities for those. You see, we don't need a birthing center, are none of those 12,800 people going to have babies? Or is it that the original owners of St. Francis West went bankrupt because of other hospital had (inaudible) slow where they couldn't succeed. St. Francis bought it. They went out of business that after they went bankrupt, Queen's went in and bought the facility and made hospital. They don't want competition. They don't want anyone from Central going either Queen's or Pali Momi. But it was required to get the zone changes to develop the houses. Also, you want to protect trails. When it rains, those gulches flood. They're deep. If you have a trail you ain't going to be able to get out of it (inaudible). It won't connect you. You're using gulches to divide community, but you want a trail to connect. Are you going to have walks up the side of all those mountains. So, you have access to connect the communities. Now, Wahiawa connecting Botanical Garden and the fresh water park are good. So, you have to remember when it rains that floods. So, you have to build it in such a way that there is no liability for the dumb people that are in it when it's raining and get drowned. Thank you.
1 speaker is Marcus Oshiro.
2 Mr. Oshiro: Thank you, Chairman Hazama and
3 Commissioners. Thank you all for allowing me to testify this
4 afternoon to present my written submittal and commentary
5 on the draft Plan for consideration by the City and County
6 of Honolulu, City Council. In general I support the work of
7 the Commission and also the staff, and I want to give kudos
8 to Bob your work. And, Kathy, I think you guys done an
9 excellent job on revising and updating the vision admission
10 of the planning the document.
11 I just have several concerns. I'll touch up on
12 them very briefly. You have my written submittal before
13 you.
14 First one is under Section 3-11 Industrial Centers
15 found on page 3-76. The proposed language reads as follows,
16 and this is new language to the current proposed draft. I
17 read, proposals to create packaging and processing
18 facilities and an agricultural technology park next to
19 Whitmore Village and associated agricultural support
20 facilities in Wahiawa have been circulated, and received
21 some funding from the State, most recently with the purchase
22 of a warehouse in Wahiawa. In addition, a proposal to
23 create and fund a geriatric research and technology park in
24 Wahiawa to be operated by the State High Tech Development
25 Corporation has been circulated but did not receive approval
26 in the 2014 State Legislature. That's found on page 3-76,
27 Land Use Policies and Guidelines.
28 Let me describe my concern. I think the
29 description for the proposal for the "agricultural
30 technology park next to Whitmore Village" has yet to be
31 publicly vetted by or with the affected communities namely
32 Whitmore Village, Poamohi Camp and Wahiawa by the lead State
33 agency. And just for your information that is the
34 Agricultural Development Corporation. And, likewise, it's
35 unclear and ambiguous what the term "circulated" means. As
36 many residents who live there and key non-governmental
37 organizations have contacted my office repeatedly over the
38 years inquiring into the status and plans for the state
39 facilities and lands and many are very concerned over the
40 fact of community engagement and consultation.
41 This includes a City and County of Honolulu's own
42 Neighborhood Board No. 26. That's a typo there, it's 26.
43 As such, it is suggested that the Commission appreciate the
44 current status of the State facility and know that it has
45 not received endorsement and level support from the nearby
46 and adjacent communities. Likewise, some funding from the
47 State does not and should not be interpreted as community
48 and neighborhood approval as it may have arisen from
49 legislative whim and/or agency expansion. These
50 appropriations have not been priorities of the past or
51 present Governors and it is uncertain if these plans are
52 sustainable and financially viable.
53 Additionally, the purchase of a warehouse in
54 Wahiawa should not likewise be interpreted to stand for
55 community endorsement or buy-in. The Plans for the use of
56 the warehouse called the Tamura's warehouse by Wahiawa
57 folks, like the agricultural technology park next to
58 Whitmore Village has not been publicly vetted or explained
59 in a public setting to provide support, rejection or comment
60 from the immediate Wahiawa community. The fact is, since
61 its acquisition by the State in 2012, questions have been
62 raised by community members regarding the purchase, plans,
63 and uses both present and future of the 20,000 square foot
64 warehouse. There are questions being raised by the
65 community for the Plans for the warehouse and the Commission
66 to understand this. Again, merely purchasing the warehouse
67 does not and should not be read as community endorsement or
68 support for any current and future use. At best, it is
69 uncertain as to any degree of community support for the use
70 of the warehouse without any information and understanding
71 the scale and scope of the packaging and processing,
72 suggested in the proposed revised plan language.
73 Furthermore, the addition of the geriatric
74 research and technology park in Wahiawa to be operated by
75 the State High Tech Development Corporation is another
76 addition to the proposed revised Plan that grossly
77 exaggerate the communities' endorsement and suggest support
78 for this idea that does not currently exist. In a nutshell,
79 it too suffers from the same deficiency of being ambiguous
80 and vague as the term "circulated" does not reveal or
81 indicate among whom and where and when it was shared, if at
82 all, and most important any public engagement occurred.
83 As such, it may misled the casual reader or unfamiliar
84 agency or staff to conclude that this idea has the community
85 endorsement and support. Nothing could be further from the
86 truth. In fact, any reference to the geriatric research and
87 technology park in Wahiawa to be operated by the State High
88 Technology Development Corporation should not be adopted
89 because this proposal is still pending at the High
90 Technology Development Corporation, now known as the Hawaii
91 Technology Development Corporation, Act 69, Senate Bill 902,
92 17 Section Laws of Hawaii 2017. Certainly, the inclusion of
93 18 disclosure did not receive approval in 2014 State
94 19 Legislature, may mitigate the perception of support by the
95 20 legislature, but the inclusion in the Sustainable
96 21 Communities Plan itself suggest merit and purpose and hence,
97 22 community endorsement and buy-in. And this is not the case.
98 23 In 2014, both Senate Concurrent Resolution 108, Senate Draft
99 24 1 and Senate Bill 2399, Senate Draft 2, House Draft 1, 25
100 failed in the Senate and failed to gain approval in the
101
1 Senate and House Conference Committee respectfully.
2 Moreover, no such measures or similar measures were approved
3 by either House or Senate in the 2015, 2016 or 2017
4 Legislature Sessions.
5 Finally, it needs to be understood and known that
6 the present board of directors of the Wahiawa General
7 Hospital have not been consulted and have not reviewed the
8 geriatric research and technology park in Wahiawa to be
9 operated by the State Tech Development Corporation. Hence,
10 the board of directors do not have an opinion on the
11 proposal. The Wahiawa General Hospital is a community asset
12 and last remaining community owned and operated hospital in
13 the State of Hawaii. Its recent financial challenges and
14 successes is common knowledge and well understood by the
15 Central Oahu and North Shore communities. But the idea of a
16 geriatric research and technology park in Wahiawa to be
17 operated by the State High Technology Development
18 Corporation is not an idea that has been vetted by the
19 community and it is unknown whether the establishment of
20 such a facility will be a blessing or a burden to the
21 community and its hospital. Its inclusion in the revised
22 plan gives a false impression of endorsement and support,
23 which without prior hospital review by the board of
24 directors is premature and may be antagonistic to Wahiawa
25 General Hospital’s mission and purpose.
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1 In summary, I respectfully suggest that the
2 Commission review and reconsider any inclusion of the
3 aforementioned new language and descriptions regarding and
4 related to the aforementioned plans and/or projects in the
5 draft Revised Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan for
6 the City and County of Honolulu. In the alternative, review
7 and reconsider whether proposed language may be amended
8 and/or redrafted to more accurately reflect the communities’
9 true and accurate support and endorsement of the Plans and
10 the projects as distinguishable and set apart from the state
11 agency or State Corporation.
12 Section 4.9.1 General Policies. This is on page
13 4-42 of the draft Proposed Amendments.
14 Generally, this pertains to the General Policies
15 currently in the Development Plans, sustainable plans. What
16 you have here before you is striking of language dealing
17 with the Central Oahu Regional Park, now known as the Patsy
18 Mink Park and Koa Ridge Makai where we currently have marked
19 and situated a site approval for a medical park. In this
20 Ransmeier file map it has the effect of making substantive
21 changes to the Public Facilities and Infrastructure Policies
22 and Guidelines.
23 I respectfully request that the Commission review
24 and reconsider this change as it strikes any reference to
25 the medical park at Koa Ridge. This would not be congruent
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1 with the current and previous plans and draft plans that
2 were adopted and approved by area and neighborhood boards,
3 area legislators, and debated and discussed in various
4 public forums and panels. It was conspicuous and extremely
5 relevant new community facility in the much scrutinized and
6 litigated State Land Use Commission decision. The Hawaii
7 Supreme Court final decision in April of 2016, allowing for
8 the development to proceed included the policy determination
9 of having a medical park on the Koa Ridge site.
10 I believe Mr. David Seeholzer articulated the
11 reason for the 28 acres and how the 28 acres came to be.
12 I disagree with him that it could be construed as a gift.
13 It is part-and-parcel of a settlement agreement between
14 Castle & Cooke and Wahiawa Hospital Association.
15 My concern is that failure to include designation
16 on the sustainable communities plan may create problems for
17 Wahiawa General Hospital Association in moving forward in
18 any kind of proposal be developed that site for a medical
19 facility.
20 Consequently, one of the most costly watched and
21 litigated land use cases in Hawaii’s history that cover a
22 span over 10 years, it would be startling and a rude
23 awakening to the communities of Wahiawa, Millilani, Waipio
24 and the North Shore to learn that the 2017 amendment to the
25 Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan struck the medical

COSCP July 19, 2017 meeting
been some draft documents, and I will use the work
circulated amongst the agencies themselves Ewa Business
Development Corporation and their board members. But
nothing is by in form of outreach into the community with
those residents who live in an about Whitmore Village has
ever occurred. It's been selective. It's been subscribed as
to what individuals have any knowledge of the project.
In fact, at a public meeting that was held by the Ewa
Business Development Corporation. I believe it was in March
or April of this past year 2017 at the State Capitol
Auditorium. Many of us thought that was a public meeting
but, in fact, it was board meeting for the board members
themselves. But those who were informed the meeting, did
learn at that time, of the scope and scale of this project.
It's a massive project that will have substantial changes to
the infrastructure, the appearance, the site lines, in and
around the Whitmore Village community. So, some of those
members who also sat on the Neighborhood Board for Wahiawa,
were frankly shocked at the school scale of the proposal
that was brought to the Agricultural Business Corporations
of the board. That was the first time and that was the last
time that any of use got any idea of the proposal moving
forward. And that's the concern I wanted to bring to the
Commissioners themselves. So, as you folks go ahead and
draft the final language for consideration that you do not
overstate the communities endorsement, buy-in or support of
these projects. Because at this point in time we do not
know. Conceptually, we can all sit here and would agree
that we should support diverse agricultural. We should
support economic development. We should try and grow it and
create new economic enterprises and retool our agricultural
infrastructure. But not knowing some of the details that
may be brought upon us. I think it would not be honest for
me to say that it has the endorsement of the community.
Conceptually, yes, but not knowing the scope and scale. Let
me touch really quickly on the geriatric research facility.
That is currently being investigated by the High Technology
Corporation. They have done some preliminary research, done
some feasibility work, and I can't disclose some of the
details because that's a private document of the
Corporation. But you might want to inquire into where they
are in that process. My understanding is that they have
done a Stage 1 feasibility looking at the Wahiawa Hospital
site. Also a site on Kauai, but they have not made a
determination of what's the most appropriate site.
And as Mr. Seeholzer alluded to. The concern I have is
that something like that inconsistent with where the
hospital is right now. Could propose financial problems for
the hospital that's struggling to operate and survive as is
currently set up. I'm not saying that we should reject or

Oshiro said is true. We have not been talked to, reviewed
or anything regarding the ag business.
And, I did go to the meeting downtown showing this huge
structure they were going to put on Whitmore Avenue, which
does not in keeping with your documents saying the building
should be in keeping with the community. And they're
planning on a lot of things and when I asked them if they
had actually talked to the residents in Wahiawa and
Whitmore, and they said, "well, we talked to some people"
and they said, "oh, no, we designed it. So, now we can
approach the community to let them see what they can see,
the design that they use, the University of Arkansas design
center to design." But they still have not, and I keep
asking the Chairman, please have them come before our board
to tell us what they're doing in Whitmore because they're
6 talking about a pedestrian bridge, which I understand
they've already put into the budget with the Senate because
our Senator is the Ways and Means Chair now, you know. So,
all I want is transparency. Okay.

And, also too, another comment I made in reviewing
the huge document. When you're talking about pedestrian,
friendly and everything else, please remember that you have
to have space for the handicap. I, myself cannot walk long
distances. I have trouble with stairways. And, if you have
everything pedestrian friendly that you have to walk five
1 blocks to the nearest bus stop that's not going to be very
2 friendly aging people or those people who are handicap. So,
3 please keep that in mind when you're talking about planning
4 a community for everyone.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Any questions,
7 there anyone else wishing to testify? [no response] Going
8 once, going twice. Okay. Commissioners, can I get a motion
9 to close public testimony.
10 Member Sodaro: So moved.
11 Member G. Chang: Second.
12 Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections? [no
14 testimony portion has been closed. Can we ask the
15 Department again to come up this time?
16 Okay. Commissioners, questions for the Department
17 at this time.
18 Member Sodaro: Thank you, staff. Was there
19 testimony submitted from Waipahu Neighborhood Board or
20 Millian Neighborhood Board, just verifying that the
21 distributed testimony is limited to the Wahawa/Whitmore
22 Village Neighborhood Board?
23 Mr. Stanfield: Not aware of a testimony from any
24 of the other Boards.
25 Member Sodaro: Okay. I'm looking at the Ramseyer

1 Version, 4-41, to follow up on Representative Oshiro's
2 testimony. Could you just clarify there's a description
3 while you're looking it up about the contemplated 100 acre
4 medical park that was part of the previously proposed Koa
5 Ridge mauka and makali community being reduced to a 20 acre.
6 Could you just explain the change.
7 Mr. Stanfield: So, in 2002 there was a proposal
8 for a 100-acre medical park at Koa Ridge. Those Plans were
9 modified and changed and basically in the zone change that
10 happened before Koa Ridge. There is some 28 acre something
11 like that area that is set aside for Wahawa Hospital as was
12 noted if they can meet their development agreements with
13 Castle & Cooke. But there is no acreage set aside for the
14 100 acres of medical park that was planned in 2002. So, in
15 2002 we put in something that recognized what Castle & Cooke
16 and the hospital had agreed. They would try to develop at
17 Koa Ridge indicating that there was support for that. The
18 current revision reflects the reality what is possible now
19 with the established zoning already established with Koa
20 Ridge as acreage for the hospital and medical offices but
21 nothing as extensive as was planned before.
22 Member Sodaro: So while—I'm trying to
23 understand, while it's included in the narrative even though
24 it's stricken later under the General Policies—
25 Mr. Stanfield: What's included in the narrative?

1 it'd be okay?
2 Mr. Stanfield: We didn't see why we would try to
3 have a policy calling for a 100-acre medical park at Koa
4 Ridge when that wasn't what was going to happen. It's an
5 attempt to describe the vision and the policies that we are
6 following. So, that decision was made after 2002 in the
7 interactions between the various parties and the zoning that
8 was awarded to Castle & Cooke for Koa Ridge. That's simply
9 reflecting the reality that we're not establishing a
10 100-acre medical park in Central Oahu.
11 Member G. Chang: I think the concern from your
12 opposition side is that by striking it out it might restrict
13 them from their expansion, and I think that's the concern
14 right now. Would you consider not striking it or you should
15 still recommend that?
16 Mr. Stanfield: Our recommendation is that it
17 should be stricken because it's not a reality anymore and
18 there's no zoning to support a 100-acre medical park at Koa
19 Ridge.
20 Member G. Chang: Had it not been a 100-acre
21 medical park, but let's say a several acre medical park, how
22 would that effect this?
23 Mr. Stanfield: I don't see there's any barrier. If
24 somebody wants to come in and establish a specific medical
25 center in the 28 acres they have at Koa Ridge or any other
1 locations, there's nothing that would stop them from doing it.

3 Member G. Chang: So, in reality then, if we allow that to not be stricken, it would be okay then?
4 Mr. Stanfield: Our recommendation is to strike it.
5 It's not reflecting the reality.
6 Member G. Chang: Thank you.
7 Chairman: Any other questions?
8 Member Sodaro: If we turn to a different section.
9 Section 2-2, on the Ramsayer Report. It was just a question under the Shoreline Parks and Preservation Area, why the historic railroad was stricken?
10 Mr. Stanfield: The problem that exists there, is there gaslines running under the right-of-way and they have a long term lease for that easement to run their utility lines and they're unwilling to let the trains run over the top of their utility lines on a regular basis. So, there's, you know, for 40, 50 years and more, they have the right to be there.
11 Member Sodaro: So, there's a portion of the railroad that is currently run by a non-profit out of Ewa Villages. They run twice a week.
12 Mr. Stanfield: Yes. They run into Ewa, the tracks and the town side of Ft. Weaver Road. Basically were taken out by the Navy. So, the right-of-way still exits. And the

1 area. The problem starts at the edge of Waipahu just below where the industrial areas are. The pipe comes in and goes underneath the railroad right-of-way.
2 Mr. Sodaro: Right.
3 Mr. Stanfield: Starting at that point. So, it's at that point where there is a problem with interaction between the gas lines and the railroad operations.
4 Member Sodaro: Okay. Thank you.
5 Chairwoman: Any other questions? [no response]
6 I have a couple questions. Bare with me. On your executive summary, page 4, regarding the Island Palm Communities which is the Army Facility. The last sentence is basically, it says it remains in agricultural use, but some of the land may be eventually needed to meet demand for family housing at Schofield Barracks. Should the Army change that requirement? Would that require a zone change for that property.
7 Mr. Stanfield: I don't believe that military will have to do get a zone change.
8 Chairman: They can just go ahead and convert that ag land to housing?
9 Mr. Stanfield: I should be directing your question to the fellow to your left as to whether--Our experience is that the Navy said local land use laws and plans do not apply to them as they own it. This is property

1 original in 2002, it was thought to be possible that train rides operations could be extended from Ewa Villages to run to the Waipahu Culture Center. But as we were involved in the review for this and in talking with the Department of Transportation about what were the conditions for that right-of-way we discovered near the beginning of Waipahu, running on that right-of-way into town, the pipelines for the gas were running in that right-of-way and made it clear to the Department of Transportation that we would not allow the railroad operations to run along on top of the tracks over the top of the pipes that are running. As you may recall, they've had some problems with those pipes leaking and having gas problem. So, it's understandable from a safety standpoint they don't want a train running over the top on a regular basis. So, given that they have that long term lease and given that is their policy, we felt that it wasn't reasonable to include in the Plan the idea of the train would be running on that part of right-of-way.
2 Member Sodaro: But this change wasn't done a DOT's request? Because DOT is running a programmatic EIS on the right-of-way now because there is so many community groups that are pushing to use the rail right-of-way. So, I guess my question is if it comes out of the Central Sustainable Community Plan. It's in the Ewa Plan because--
3 Mr. Stanfield: There's not a problem in the Ewa

1 that's sort of a strange public/private ownership. So, I'm sort of speculating here. Perhaps beyond my confidence, but I don't believe that the Army or the military needs the land for housing that they would seek City zoning. I believe they are building housing on P-1 land property.
2 Chairman: Okay. In regards to, I guess, page 7-23 of the Plan, regarding, I guess revitalization and development of the community. It's mentioned using methods like tax increment financing or community facilities 4 10 districts to provide funding for infrastructure, concurrently in or advance of residential and commercial development. Can you explain, I guess how that is going to work or--
5 Mr. Stanfield: The way the tax increment financing works and both of them essentially work is that the funding for infrastructure for development is financed by far and against future property tax revenues and the tax increment financing is usually used in redevelopment of areas that have gone downhill and the community facility districts are typically used for new development areas, but the idea behind both of them is the--If we make these investments, sewer system, water system, roadways, etc. it'll increase--and there's development that's based on 21 that, that we will then tax the building that happens, take that and pay off these investments and infrastructure. A
1 situation similar to what Herbert Horita did for West Beach, 2 in which he put in all the infrastructure in advance. It's 3 sort of a similar situation. In his case it didn't work out 4 too well. But it was great for the people that bought the 5 property from him because they had all that infrastructure 6 in place. So, rather than wait in a typical situation where 7 we get the first increment roadway and then the next 8 increment of the roadway is going in, he put in all that 9 stuff in advance. This TIF and Community Facilities 10 District has been used in other locations so that you can 11 get the infrastructure in place in advance of the build out, 12 so you don't have that situation that it's lagging behind. 13

Chairman: Okay. As long it get can get approval 14 their investment.

Mr. Stanfield: A lot of the risk is with the 16 private owner. The developer is that if the sales don't 17 come through then he's stuck with paying the property tax. 18 It's basically the property tax is raised just on the 19 property that is benefiting from the infrastructure.

Chairman: Okay. Regarding, I guess the section 21 Chapter 3, page 63, regarding accessory dwelling and chana 22 unit as a way to provide affordable housing. There's no 23 mention of accessory units would be allowed in certain 24 communities. For example, what if it conflicts with 25 existing C&Rs that disallows units in those communities.

1 Mr. Stanfield: You're right. I think that's one 2 of the difficulties getting housing through the accessory 3 dwelling units or the chana situation is where there is 4 C&Rs don't allow it. So, we had a case where somebody was 5 asking about Westlock whether they can do one of these and 6 the C&Rs there don't allow them to have another unit.
7 So, the public policy says let's do that, but changing the 8 rules of the community association is a daunting task.

Chairman: But you wouldn't be opposed to just 10 putting a clarifying statement in there saying that as 11 allowed by existing conveyance or something like that?

Mr. Stanfield: I defer to my Director to interpret 13 whether we would want put that language in.

Chairman: Okay. Just a clarifying statement 15 because right now the Plan just says--And, I understand it 16 the intent is to address the affordable housing requirements 17 and the housing shortage. It's just that certain areas 18 we're not just allowed to put those units in this based on 19 conveyance.

Ms. Sokugawa: My hesitancy is that there's idle 21 talk then you can go to the guy on your left again. But 22 whether there can be legislation at the state level perhaps 23 that would say that you can override those conveyance to 24 allow for them. So, the case of that, you know this would 25 be an unnecessary obstacle if you say accepted to restricted

1 covenant prohibits you from doing that. Right now we are 2 complying. So, if there is a restricted covenant that's 3 taking precedent over whatever we allowed. But that's my 4 only hesitancy. So, You can disclose that. I'm just not 5 sure that in another session there might be a request to say 6 those could be overwritten.

Chairman: Okay. Moving on to Section 3-78, 8 there's a statement in there regarding new plane for 9 industrial structures over 100 feet. Section 3, page 78, it 10 says require a view plane study to be conducted for proposed 11 industrial structure over a hundred feet to determine if 12 they can be sited or designated to minimize visibility from 13 residential and commercial areas, public rights-of-ways or 14 the shoreline. I'm trying to find out if there's any 15 specifics on what's driving this particular change?

Mr. Stanfield: I'm not aware of any right now. I 17 think this came up a number of years ago. It may have been 18 associated with reaction to wind turbines. Not particularly 19 appropriate. This is not a (inaudible). It just arose at 20 the time when there was concern that there might be 21 structures that would be that height. The Plan should have 22 a policy that would call for that to be analyzed as part of 23 permit application review and decision-making.

Chairman: Okay. So there was no specific 25 incident?

Ms. Sokugawa: I would just say that most of our 2 industrial areas are 60 feet. So any request for a 100 feet 3 is a little unusual which probably comes from a variance and 4 all this is saying is you should take into account the view 5 impacts of looking at higher heights.

Chairman: And the only reason why I triggered it 7 is the specific height. You said a 100 feet and change--

Ms. Sokugawa: Oh, the 100 feet. I'm not sure.

Chairman: Okay.

Ms. Sokugawa: It might have been by request.

Chairman: Okay. Moving on to Section 40, page 12 20, regarding the water allocation, development policies. I 13 guess in regards to protecting Pearl Harbor aquifer. The 14 properties or the land that is affected by this particular 15 change, can you describe or identify what those properties 16 are?

Mr. Stanfield: It's mostly on the east, on the 17 slopes of the Koolau mountains and probably the upper ridges 18 of K `Aamoa, Waiawa properties and the band going up 19 towards Wahiawa. The upper Castle & Cooke, Millili Tech 20 Park properties, the undeveloped part of it, the 50-inch 21 Park Line goes through those parts. The Koa Ridge Kauka 22 area that Board of Water Supply testified that the Land Use 24 Commission said it should be developed because it's a 25 recharger. That's basically the major area is band along
Chairman: So, again what is driving this particular change in the Plan?

Mr. Stanfield: This is one of a series of changes that Board of Water Supply asked us to incorporate because they're very concerned about drought and recharge of the aquifer and they wanted to establish a principal that if you were above that 50-inch line. Unless you can prove that you weren't going to adversely affect the recharge of the Pearl Harbor aquifer, you shouldn't be given permission to do it. So, basically, a condition that they want to see met. If somebody is developing those areas up there.

Chairman: Well, I guess I have some serious concerns with this change because one can argue that the KSBB, Waiawa project is fully entitled. The Millani Tech Park, Phase II project, I believe the state is in the process of finalizing the sale and purchase for their First Responders--I don't know what they're calling it, some kind of First Responders Tech Park campus and putting a restriction that says that you must--you cannot--Basically, the statement says you cannot do any urban development unless you can demonstrate that your LID practices will sustain or increase the amount of recharge. So, I mean it could be zero degradation of that. I mean, zero, according to the statement by definition, but yet we've entitled these projects already to move forward and now this is basically going to put a burden on their projects as far as how to go about constructing them.

Mr. Stanfield: Statement of fact, I don't believe they are entitled. They do not have the zoning that they would need.

Chairman: Tech Park, Phase II?

Mr. Stanfield: Tech Park II is in the urban district but it's agricultural zoned. And it's in their urban district and the conditions that we developed as tech park, which means it has to go back to the Land Use Commission and get it changed from the Land Use Commission approving an alternative use to tech park.

Chairman: You'd have to argue that the First Responders station would be non-high tech, which I think you would probably have a hard time convincing somebody.

Mr. Stanfield: The dormitories and the other things associated with it. I'm not wanting to quibble on it. I'm just saying I don't think that they can be considered to be entitled for urban given where they are.

Chairman: But isn't the Waiawa project entitled for residential? They already got their--

Mr. Stanfield: Portion of it is; portion of it isn't.

Chairman: Let's not quibble about the split, but I mean, I guess it's just the fact that trying to make a change in this Plan now, but these projects were already forward. I guess the change came in after their entitlements were granted.

Mr. Stanfield: I understand the concern but, in fact, they're already subject to low impact development requirements and the federal government is very insistent that we have those low impacts and requiring them to prove that they are retaining water on the side in ways that make it percolate. I don't think that's unreasonable.

Chairman: I don't have a problem with that part. It's just the qualifying statement. They can either sustain or not increase the amount of discharge at all. So, it's kind of restricted in that sense. Would you be opposed to say minimize, for example, would may be a better measure.

Ms. Sokugawa: You know, I should know this, but I've been only Acting Director for seven months. So, I don't know everything. But the stormwater rules, the water quality rules that take effect next month, I kind of like that already. They're much more stringent in terms of prohibiting run off of any kind of property especially major projects. So, this may be kind of redundant with the rules that are going to go into effect next month.

Member Sodaro: If this is limited to preservation and ag zoned land anyways. So this is just part of the
1 Chairman: Okay. All right. Any other questions
2 for the Department at this time?
3 Member Tolentino: I have a question. This is in
4 line with Representative Oshiro's response. Would you say
5 that this measure is premature and based on the lack of
6 proper vetting disclosure and having no community approval
7 or endorsement and having that geriatric research and
8 technology park in Wahiawa may not be unison with
9 community's vision and may be detrimental not having all the
10 information and approval of all the residents. Would you
11 say it's premature?
12 Mr. Stanfield: I'd like to back up a bit to
13 explain. My basic response is, no, it's not premature.
14 But it's not premature because the sections that
15 Representative was taking exception with are basically basic
16 information and descriptive information about what we knew
17 as of October of last year. There have been these proposals
18 for these ag support jobs, circulated, publicized and
19 announced in newspapers, published on the web, whether that
20 was adequate vetting, I don't know from the Representatives,
21 we might not. The same with regard to the geriatric center.
22 The issue is what jobs are going to be created in Wahiawa
23 to make Wahiawa economy work. Especially if the hospital
24 moves a big portion of its operations down to Koa Ridge.
25 What the Plan suggest is that there should be support for

---

1 jobs in Wahiawa that support diversified agricultural
2 operations in Central Oahu and the North Shore, and it
3 suggests that the possibility of a geriatric center should
4 be explored. That's the only policy changes that are
5 suggested by this proposed Plan. There's background
6 information presented there that tries to put the context
7 behind why we're saying there should be a policy supporting
8 diversified ag jobs in Wahiawa. Why a possible geriatric
9 center should be explored. We certainly support the idea
10 that these proposals should be widely discussed by the
11 Wahiawa folks and the actions on them at the State level or
12 the City level should be based on support from Wahiawa folks
13 but in terms of what you're being asked to consider and
14 recommend, support for changes on the specific policies that
15 we're recommending are we should try to create jobs in
16 Wahiawa that support diversified agricultural in Central
17 Oahu and the North Shore and the possibility of a geriatric
18 center should be explored. That's all you're being asked to
19 essentially support.
20 Member Tolentino: So, you're saying that you
21 somewhat reached out to the community? Was there any
22 response to your reaching out to the community. Did you get
23 any approval ever since?
24 Mr. Stanfield: We got approval for the idea that
25 Wahiawa does need revitalization that there's various

---

1 efforts going forward in Wahiawa that needs support. There
2 was support for the idea that if the hospital moves there
3 should be some use of that property. We do have the
4 testimony that you received from the Wahiawa Neighborhood
5 Board that indicated they weren't happy with the aspects of
6 the Plan, and we would like to meet with them and talk to
7 how they think the Plan could be improved, but in their
8 testimony doesn't specifically say what they would want
9 changed or improved in the Plan. And we'd be more than
10 willing to meet with them and talk about it to see if we
11 could come to agreement. But basically what we recommend is
12 diversified agricultural jobs could provide some basis for
13 the jobs in Wahiawa and a geriatric center might be
14 something that could be going in and it should be explored.
15 Member Tolentino: Thank you.
16 Member G. Chang: I'm still back on this issue
17 about this medical park thing, and I'm sorry. I'm just
18 concerned that I think we should see if you could comfort
19 the people and allow medical park to be located at the Patsy
20 Mink Central Regional Park on Koa Ridge Makai area, because
21 I think that's a concern. Now, if you want to strike out
22 the other issues that should be okay, but I don't know if
23 there's common ground on that.
24 Mr. Stanfield: Just want a clarification.
25 You're suggesting that the medical park should go in Patsy

---

1 Mink Park?
2 Member G. Chang: On page 4-42, under 4.9.1
3 General Policies.
4 Mr. Stanfield: That is located near the park.
5 It was actually in Koa Ridge.
6 Member G. Chang: Right.
7 Mr. Stanfield: Makai, and it was 100 acres right
8 adjacent Waipio Gentry, and it's now currently zoned for a
9 variety of other uses.
10 Member G. Chang: And could a medical park be
11 there?
12 Mr. Stanfield: Only if--There could be a medical
13 park, but it would require a lot of heavy lifting and
14 rezoning, I guess. A different development plan for Castle
15 & Cooke, different zoning. The current zoning does not
16 support a 100-acre medical park in that location.
17 Member G. Chang: What I'm trying to clarify for
18 myself. It was put in before and now we're taking it out.
19 So--
20 Mr. Stanfield: It was put in at the time at the
21 request of Castle & Cooke and Wahiawa Hospital that there be
22 support in the Plan for a medical park, a 100-acre medical
23 park at that location to be in the text and beyond the map
24 because that's what they were asking the Land Use Commission
25 conceptually to approve when the proposal was before the
1 Land Use Commission. Since then, finally got approved by
2 the Land Use Commission and got its zoning from the City
3 Council, from the City and the zoning that was adopted in
4 and the changes in the Plans since 2002 was such that
5 there's no longer a 100-acre medical park plan for that
6 location. There is some 20 acres that is planned for a
7 hospital and medical office buildings as part of Koa Ridge
8 but they're long past the site plan and they're working on
9 installing the infrastructure to support a site plan that
10 only has the 28 acres for the hospital does not have this
11 100 acre site. So, this is simply cleaning up a part in the
12 Plan that's no longer relevant to this location in Koa Ridge
13 Makai.
14
15 Ms. Sokugawa: So, let me see if I can help. In
16 retrospect we shouldn't have itemized all those uses. I'm
17 not sure why that was important to do that in point of time.
18 And I'm not so sure everybody has in their mind, what is a
19 medical park. But the Plan today still represents a
20 hospital in Wahiawa and a hospital at Koa Ridge. The extent
21 to which the facilities and services are offered there is
22 not really the purview of this Plan. That's why too
23 detailed. But all of the uses that are itemized in that
24 section could be in any of those places. A hospital, it's
25 just primarily the downscaling of the vision from a
26 100-area. It was huge a thing. Understanding that a

1 100-acre is twice, two times the size of Ala Moana Shopping
2 Center. So, this was a huge project. I think what now they
3 have done is down scaled it to the essentials of what a
4 hospital is required for that region, what is financially
5 feasible for the owners of the hospital. I personally would
6 like to have some elements of it left at Wahiawa and the
7 Plan provides for that. But, again, the zoning for this
8 area, which already has past for review a few years ago,
9 will still provide for an expanded facility if they need to
10 beyond 28 acres. They have more than enough zoning that can
11 accommodate if they shift to a larger scale vision. So, I'm
12 not sure what the concern is between we're going to kill
13 references to medical park, but that services and facilities
14 remain very flexible under this Plan.
15
16 Member G. Chang: I'm just concerned because over
17 the years that word medical park has been into play for
18 definition, and so when you start removing it after the
19 definition of medical park, now people are concerned.
20 That's what I'm trying to say.
21
22 Ms. Sokugawa: And, again, it was a big vision
23 several years ago, but our understanding, and I could be
24 wrong, but my understanding is neither the hospital nor
25 Castle & Cooke are envision that scale of a facility at this
26 time. But what I'm saying is the zoning will accommodate
27 should that come back to as a vision, but it doesn't

1 necessarily have to be reflected in the Plan to move
2 forward.
3
4 Member G. Chang: I see. So, the word medical park
5 is something large scale, but it really could be small
6 scale, but we're letting it go.
7
8 Ms. Sokugawa: And accessorized as you want it to
9 be.
10
11 Member G. Chang: All right. Okay.
12
13 Mr. Stanfield: We were specifically asked to put
14 this into the Plan. The 2002 Plan we were specifically
15 asked to describe a 100-acre park with all these things in
16 it and say that it was part of the vision to Central Oahu.
17
18 Chairman: Okay.
19
20 Ms. Sokugawa: I think in all, not be
21 argumentative, but to me this is a public process.
22
23 This is a community hearing. The proposals that we reflect
24 in here is part of the community vetting. So, it is an
25 opportunity for the community to opine on the medical park
26 versus hospital and all of the other things that we are
27 proposing in it so that as it comes to you, as it comes to
28 City Council, it is part of a vetting process. I'm not sure
29 I can agree with a statement that this has not been vetted.
30
31 Member Tolentino: I'm trying to wrap my head
32 around this thing also. At the time the 100 acre medical
33 park was proposed, was there 100 acres allocated for it?

1 Ms. Sokugawa: And there was a whole lot more
2 ambition about you know really fast tracking it, and they
3 actually put in zoning permits ahead of the State Land Use
4 Boundary because they were really enthusiastic about doing
5 that project. And now things happen. You know there was a
6 lot of things that created obstacles, so we are now here
7 where they redefined their vision. And I don't think it's
8 where the Plan or the City to tell them what their vision
9 is. We can at best opine on it, react on it, support it to
10 the extent that it complies with other policies, but we
11 can't force them to--
12
13 Member Tolentino: No. I totally understand what
14 you're saying, but was that bargaining chip. Was that a
15 bargaining chip in saying I'm going to build a 100 acre
16 medical park, and I need this zoning change and now it
17 changes.
18
19 Ms. Sokugawa: It's part of the vision. You're
20 absolutely right. That was part of the packet that was
21 given to the Land Use Commission. It was part of what was
22 given to you on the zone change and to City Council.
23
24 Member Tolentino: Right.
25
26 Ms. Sokugawa: Here, they're trying to adjust, at
27 least the City's position on what their vision is today.
28 It remains to be seen whether they have an obligation to go
29 to Land Use Commission and update that. I'm not sure what
1 their conditions of approval. I can’t remember that.
2 Member Tolentino: Thank you.
3 Member Sodaro: So, as written now, it conforms
4 with the zoning and agreements that are in place for the
5 parcels?
6 Mr. Stanfield: As proposed--
7 Member Sodaro: As proposed in the narrative for
8 the 28 acres.
9 Ms. Sokugawa: Yes. And we’ve been literally
10 working for many months with Castle & Cooke to approve the
11 Urban Design Plan for Koa Ridge and integral to that is the
12 relationship of the hospital campus to the rest of Koa Ridge
13 That is part and parcel of that whole process that we’re
14 going through right now.
15 Chairman: Okay. The Commission was provided with
16 testimony from Senator Dela Cruz himself, I guess asking for
17 the State First Responder Tech Campus to be, I guess,
18 mentioned in the Plan. The Department has any oppositions to
19 just conceptually mention it as a project in the Plan?
20 Ms. Sokugawa: In the same thing as the geriatric
21 facility?
22 Chairman: Probably they’re all conceptual at this
23 point.
24 Ms. Sokugawa: That would be something worth
25 considering. Again, if you feel--This is not to approve

1 projects. This is to come up with a vision, a concept. It
2 doesn’t have to be that every detail or every new project of
3 a major level has to be included in the Plan.
4 It’s nice if you give a stamp of approval that says, like
5 Bob said, explore this idea, consider this idea. Just to
6 say that’s part of the agenda to look at it, but not to be
7 necessarily commit approval, pre-approval for that project.
8 I think people have that concern that once it’s mentioned in
9 the Plan, it’s going to go. It’s going tomorrow and it’s
10 going to get approved. It’s guarantee. I would not agree
11 with that kind of thinking at all. As you know, there are
12 many, many other decision making points that have to be
13 approved before you can move forward with the actual
14 construction of any project.
15 Chairman: I agree. But as a conceptual--I mean,
16 since the Plan does mention conceptual projects, if we know
17 about a conceptual project now, then I guess it’s okay to
18 include it in the Plan.
19 Ms. Sokugawa: And, again, like Bob said we
20 provide a lot of information for background and context, not
21 necessarily to support the idea, but just to give people
22 reading it, like Bob said the man from Mars, although I
23 don’t know why he would be (inaudible), but you know what’s
24 the context of this Plan, why are you saying these things.
25 Chairman: Okay.
1 one, correct?
2 Hayashida: Yes.
3 McMurdo: And is it based on the Department's
4 recommendation of limiting its scope?
5 Hayashida: Yes. In accordance with the
6 Department's recommendation.
7 McMurdo: Thank you.
8 Chairman: Okay. Any further discussions? [no
9 response] Any objections to adding the States First
10 Responders Technology Campus, Technology Campus and
11 Cybersecurity Data Center Campus as a conceptual project to
12 be added to the Plan?
13 Hayashida: No objection.
14 Sodaro: No objection. I second that.
15 Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Any other discussion
16 items, Commissioners?
17 Sodaro: Can I offer an amendment on our motion?
18 Chairman: Yes.
19 'Sodaro: My only concern--I would like to unstrike
20 the historic railroad only because it is in the Ewa Plan and
21 while I recognize that there may be an issue with the use in
22 a certain portion of it because there is a Department of
23 Transportation programmatic EIS that does contemplate use of
24 the entire historic railroad, if one portion of it that's in
25 a community plan is left out.

1 Member Tolentino: Good. Thank you.
2 Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Okay. At this time,
3 Commissioners, I'd like to take a short 10-minute break.
4 Any objections? [no response] We have to give our staff a
5 break, too. Okay. Seeing none, any abstentions? [no
6 response] If not, we're on a 10-minute recess. [bangs gavel]
7 [Chairman Kazama called for a recess at 3:27 p.m.]
8 and resumed at 3:46 p.m.]
9 Chairman: Okay. Thank you very much. At this
time I call the [bangs gavel] the Planning Commission
11 meeting back into order.
12 Commissioners, do we have any other questions for
13 anyone? [no response] Okay. Swelling home, can we have a
14 motion or whatever the Commission desires.
15 Hayashida: Motion to Adopt the Revised Central
16 Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan for the City and County of
17 Honolulu with the Revised Amendment for the Kipapa Savio
18 request for accommodating Waikiki Storage Park as
20 Sodaro: Seconded.
21 Chairman: Okay. Moved and seconded.
22 Commissioners, we are in discussion of the motion on the
23 floor. Any further discussion?
24 McMurdo: I had a question about the motion. I
25 couldn't hear it very well. Are you just adding the Kipapa
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1 include the conceptual project for the State of Hawaii's
2 First Responders Technology Campus and Cybersecurity Data
3 Center Campus, and the third amendment is to reserve or
4 unstrike the deletion of the Oahu Railroad.
5 Sodaro: To remove the stricken--
6 Chairman: Yes, Oahu Railroad.
7 McMurdo: Can we add the clarification regarding
8 the Kipapa one?
9 Chairman: Yes.
10 McMurdo: Where you use the Department's wording
11 here to say that the change would be narrowly constrained to
12 resolve the issue with existing 12 non-conforming industrial
13 use areas.
14 Chairman: I think the statement that we would
15 accept the Department's recommendation. So, since that's
16 their testimony would be accepting it.
17 McMurdo: Well, the problem is the bottom part of
18 the recommendation says "DPP would be unlikely to support
19 this proposal if it was established now."
20 Sodaro: Without the narrow crafting--
21 Chairman: Yes. Without the top part.
22 Sodaro: That's how I interpreted it. So, we could
23 defer to Council to have them specify with the reservation
24 of recommendation that the Department is offering. We don't
25 have to maybe go into the nuance of that now, Commissioner.

1 McMurdo: Okay.
2 Chairman: Okay. So, did I state the motion,
3 correctly? Okay. As the motion is stated, any further
5 Seeing none, all Commissioners in favor of the current
6 motion on the floor, say aye.
7 All Commissioners: Aye.
8 Chairman: Any opposed? [no response] Any
10 Seeing that we have no further items on our agenda, can I
11 get a motion to adjourn.
12 McMurdo: So moved.
13 G. Chang: Second.
14 Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections?
16 Okay. Thank you very much, Commissioner. This meeting is
17 adjourned. [bangs gavel]
18 [Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:54 p.m.]