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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes the purpose and documents the process used to review and prepare recommended revisions to the 2002 Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan (CO SCP or the Plan). The review covered major issues identified during the review process and resulted in recommendations for Plan revisions and implementation improvements based on analysis of the issues and comments and suggestions received during the review.

The report is prepared in two volumes.

Volume One:

Chapter 1 describes the review process and community outreach program.

Chapter 2 evaluates how the Plan vision and policies have been implemented, and discusses major issues identified during the review process.

Chapter 3 presents proposed revisions to the Plan and implementation changes.
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CHAPTER 1: THE REVIEW PROCESS

The Central O‘ahu SCP was adopted as Ordinance 02-62 in 2002. A comprehensive review of the Plan is required to begin five years after adoption of the ordinance. The purpose of the review is to update and assess the appropriateness of the Plan’s vision, policies, and implementing actions, and to report these findings and any recommended Plan changes to the City Council.

The Department’s review of the Central O‘ahu SCP began in 2007 with research on land use, socio-economic trends, development proposals and issues and concerns in the region since the Plan’s adoption. It also included consultation with community leaders, land owners, developers, and other stakeholders in Central O‘ahu.

Community outreach was conducted between 2007 and 2015, and included interviews and a series of discussion groups with stakeholders, presentations at neighborhood board meetings, and three public workshops in Central O‘ahu; these are summarized in Volume Two: Appendices E to H.

The Public Review Draft was published in early 2015. Copies were distributed at Central O‘ahu Neighborhood Board meetings and sent to Federal, State, and City agencies for review and comment. Copies were also made available online, at regional libraries, and at the Department of Planning and Permitting.

Comments received on the Public Review Draft and DPP’s responses to those comments are included in Volume One: Appendix B.

CHAPTER 2: ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

Required Scope of Review. Ordinance 02-62, which adopted the 2002 Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan, requires the DPP’s evaluation of the Plan to answer four questions. The questions and the conclusions we drew from our outreach and analysis are as follows:

1. Are the Plan vision, policies, and implementing actions still appropriate?

   The vision, policies, and implementing actions of the Plan are still appropriate, but implementation, especially for the vision and policies to provide adequate infrastructure, needs to be improved.

2. Is the purpose of the Plan’s development priorities being achieved?

   The purpose of the Plan’s priorities to provide guidance for public facility investment and private development is being achieved.
3. Should the **Plan** priorities be revised?

   The priorities need to be updated to reflect existing conditions and needs.

4. Is the **Community Growth Boundary** achieving its purpose as envisioned in the 2002 Plan?

   The Community Growth Boundary has protected open space and agricultural lands from urban development, achieving its purpose as envisioned in the 2002 Plan. Minor revisions to the boundary should be made to exclude lands shown as inside the boundary in the 2002 Plan, including the State’s Kunia Agricultural Park, Kipapa Stream from Kamehameha Highway to H-2 Freeway, and the East Range Military Training Area.

**Implementation of the Vision.** The 2002 Central O‘ahu SCP has five major vision elements.

1. **Protect Agricultural Land, Open Space and Greenways**
2. **Protect Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources**
3. **Support Economic Development and the Revitalization of Waipahu and Wahiawa**
4. **Create Master Planned Communities that Enhance Multi-modal Travel**
5. **Provide Adequate Infrastructure**

Our assessment of the success of implementing each of these vision elements is shown in Table ES-1.
### TABLE ES-1: VISION IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protect Agricultural Land, Open Space and Greenways | • Since adoption of the **Plan** in 2002, no agricultural or open space lands outside the Urban Community Boundary have been rezoned for urban use.  
• 150 acres for an agricultural park located within the Urban Community Boundary at Royal Kunia was deeded to the State Department of Agriculture. Development is anticipated to start in 2017 or 2018, contingent on funding and permit approvals.  
• 1,700 acres of agricultural lands north of Wahiawā formerly held by the Galbraith Trust were conveyed to the State agencies with the help of the Trust for Public Lands. Most of the land will be reserved for agriculture.  
• Several properties in the Whitmore Village area were also purchased by the State to develop a food processing hub as support for diversified agricultural activities in Central O‘ahu.  
• The U.S. Army acquired a 1,400-acre area south of Schofield Barracks for use as a training area, removing it from agricultural use.  
• Island Palm Communities (formerly Army Hawai‘i Family Housing), acquired a 1,925 acre parcel to the south of Schofield Barracks and west of Kunia Road. It remains in agricultural use, but some of the land may eventually be needed to meet demand for family housing at Schofield Barracks  
• Patsy T. Mink Central O‘ahu Regional Park opened in 2001, and provides a diverse range of active and passive recreation facilities. Gains have also been made in community-based park acreage.  
• The potential for creating the proposed Open Space Network which would link together open space areas with a network of paths and bikeways running in ravines and greenways still exists, but the proposed linkages have not yet been accomplished.  
• Connections necessary to create the Waipahū Shoreline Park, which would link Waipahū with the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail, Pouhala Marsh wildlife sanctuary, and the Waipio Peninsula Soccer Park, have not advanced.  
• The **Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan** proposes the restoration of Kapakahī Stream and an adjacent stream walk for bikes and pedestrians. The Plan also calls for mini-parks between one and two acres in size throughout the Farrington / Mokuola Station area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protect Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources | o Protection of natural, historical and cultural resources has been included as a standard condition of land use approvals when significant resource impacts have been identified in environmental assessments.  
  o The importance of protection of the Pearl Harbor aquifer is recognized in policy changes, programs, and projects proposed in the 2007 BWS Central O‘ahu Watershed Study.  
  o The Board of Water Supply has begun community outreach to produce a Central O‘ahu Watershed Management Plan by 2017.  
  o The City has completed improvements to the Wahiawā Wastewater Treatment Plant which make it capable of producing R-1 quality recycled water which could be used to irrigate parks and some agricultural lands pending State Department of Health certification.  
  o Kūkaniloko is being maintained by members of the Wahiawā Hawaiian Civic Club and Friends of Kūkaniloko. The lands surrounding Kūkaniloko are held and managed by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.  
  o The landmark Waipahū Mill Stack was retained, and adaptive use made of the mill buildings as part of the Waipahū YMCA complex.  
  o Historic plantation villages at Poamoho and Kunia continue with new ownership structures evolving to protect resident owners (Poamoho) and farm workers (Kunia). At Kunia, the Hawaii Agricultural Research Center is promoting new agricultural uses for existing structures.  
  o Extension of the historic OR&L train operation from Ewa to the Waipahū Cultural Park and Plantation Village is not feasible due to the presence of energy pipelines buried in the rail bed.  
  o Most significant viewsheds identified in the 2002 Plan are still intact, although a couple of the views have been blocked by trees. |
### TABLE ES-1: VISION IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Economic Development and the Revitalization of Waipahū and Wahiawā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Between 2000 and 2010, non-construction jobs in Central O'ahu increased by over 14,000, with 25 percent of the new jobs estimated to be in Waipahū and in Wahiawā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Redevelopment of the Waipahū Mill site with the adaptive use of the Mill Building for a full service YMCA (2007), and construction of the Filipino Community Center (2002), helped re-establish the Mill site as a center of Waipahū activity. The nearby Waipahū Festival Marketplace revitalized the old Big Way supermarket building (2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Other new development in Waipahū has included two mid-rise affordable housing projects near the proposed Mokuola transit station and commercial/industrial development around the former Mill site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o The Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan was approved by the City in 2014. The Plan calls for mixed-use, higher density transit oriented development areas around the proposed Waipahū and West Loch transit stations. Proposed zoning to implement the Plan is under review for action by the City Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Much of Wahiawā town is designated as a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area. A Community Strengthening Program and a Community Based Development Organization were formed to coordinate community-based revitalization projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Far less new development has occurred in Wahiawā than in Waipahū or Mililani.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Element</td>
<td>Evaluation of Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Master Planned Communities that Enhance Multi-modal Travel</strong></td>
<td>o More than 5,000 homes were added to Central O‘ahu between 2000 and 2010, 24% of O‘ahu’s growth, most before 2008. Since then, housing development in major projects has slowed to around 25 units per year due to economic conditions, build-out of Mililani Mauka, and legal challenges to entitlements for new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Affordable housing units have been required in all major Central O‘ahu developments, resulting in the construction of over 8,000 affordable units since 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No new town centers/Main Street areas have been established since 2002. The Koa Ridge project proposes to establish such a town center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Since 2004, increased attention has been paid to ensuring that subdivision layouts support walking, biking, utility vehicle circulation, connectivity to adjacent areas, and transit usage. Policy support for these concerns was provided with the City Council adoption of a Complete Streets ordinance in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o New Express Buses and a hub-and-spoke system of collector buses have been established since 2002. Transit centers were established at Waipahū, Wahiawā and Mililani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The <strong>Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan</strong> calls for mixed use residential and commercial development within easy walking distance of two rail transit stations in Waipahū.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE ES-1: IMPLEMENTATION (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Adequate Infrastructure</td>
<td>State and County infrastructure development has continued, but providing transportation and schools capacity concurrently with residential development remains a challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since 2003, improved express bus service and the Zipper Lane have provided alternatives for the commute to Honolulu, but the quality of travel to and from town has not improved for most commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The congestion-reducing H-1 Freeway PM Contraflow Project broke ground in 2012 and is still in progress. Pearl City and Waimalu Viaduct deck repairs were completed in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rail transit system is under construction between East Kapolei and Ala Moana Shopping Center, and will provide substantial capacity for commuting as an alternative to traveling by auto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A flyover to link H-2 and the Pearl Highlands rail station parking lot is planned, allowing easy bus and high-occupancy auto access to the Pearl Highlands train station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renewable energy development is being explored at several sites, largely in the form of photovoltaic (PV) installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With little new housing construction under way, demand for new schools and other public facilities has slowed for the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City has supported the DOE’s efforts to provide capacity for existing and new developments by requiring developers to provide their fair share toward construction of new or expansion of existing schools, either under the terms of the impact district or the provisions of existing agreements required as a condition of zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Kunia Phase I is within the area covered by the ‘Ewa Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance (since the Kunia Interchange project was eligible for funding under the ordinance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facility District financing for infrastructure for new development received preliminary Council approval for Gentry Waiawa, but was never used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New rules regarding stormwater drainage standards went into effect in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Wahiawa Wastewater treatment plant was upgraded for peak wet-weather flows and the Mililani WWPTF received upgrades to pre-treatment facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR ISSUES ANALYSED IN THE REVIEW

The major issues that emerged from research, interviews, and comments include:

- **Protecting Agricultural Land, Open Space and Greenways**
  - Agricultural Lands Protection
  - Farming Community Support
  - “Gentlemen’s Estates” On Agricultural Land

- **Protecting Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources**
  - Light Pollution
  - Water Conservation, Water Quality, And Aquifer Recharge
  - Low-Impact Development (LID) And Xeriscaping
  - Non-Point Source Pollution, Sedimentation And Stream Erosion
  - Clean Energy and Energy Efficiency
  - Plantation Villages
  - OR&L Historic Train Operations

- **Economic Development and Revitalization**
  - Revitalization Of Waipahū and Wahiawā
  - Waipahū Transit-Oriented Development
  - Support For Diversified Agriculture And Associated Job Centers In Wahiawā, Whitmore Village, and Kunia Village

- **Building Master Planned Communities**
  - Place-making and Creation of Complete Communities
  - Age-Friendly Communities
  - Housing Affordability And Availability
  - Infrastructure Concurrency and Adequacy
    - Commuting Between Central O‘ahu And Downtown Honolulu
    - Connectivity And Mobility Within Central O‘ahu
  - Complete Streets and Safe Routes to School
  - Alternatives To Automobile Use

- **Adapting to Climate Change and Improving Hazards Resiliency**
  - Planning for climate change impacts
  - Improving hurricane shelter resilience and accessibility

Each of these issues was analyzed to determine:

1. If the Plan needs to be revised to better address the issue; or

2. If better implementation of the Plan vision, policies, and guidelines is needed.
A summary of proposed recommendations for either improving the Plan or implementation of the Plan is shown in the tables below. Detailed discussion of the basis for the proposed changes is in Chapter 3 of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE ES-3: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Protect Agricultural Land, Open Space and Greenways | o The Public Review Draft integrates the Plan’s support for agriculture and open space into a broader commitment to sustainability and protection of resources.  
o Retain the Community Growth Boundary.  
o Recognize that pineapple is no longer cultivated in Central O’ahu. | o Implement regulations limiting development of non-productive estates on agricultural lands and explore ways to help farmers use agricultural land productively.  
o Assess feasibility of plans for gulch trails with a pilot study in Wahiawā.  
o Assess the implications of public/private partnerships on U.S. Navy and Army land for implementation of City and County policies for Central O’ahu. Continue dialog with military agencies on appropriate uses of adjoining military and civilian lands. |
| Protect Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources | o Recognize the importance to all of O’ahu of recharge for aquifers in Central O’ahu  
o Require developers to conduct surveys for endangered and threatened species before development.  
o Support reduction of light pollution that can affect wildlife or community quality of life.  
o Amend the Plan to clarify that developers are required under State law to conduct surveys of historic and cultural resources, and to get approval for historic and cultural mitigation plans from SHPD.  
o Delete the policy calling for extension of historic train operations in Central O’ahu. | o Assess the impact of watershed planning for land use and land use regulations, especially upon the release of the Central O’ahu Watershed Management Plan (anticipated in 2017).  
o Require that any development in upland high rainfall areas (>50 inches) does not lessen groundwater recharge.  
o Continue to participate in advisory committee for a possible statewide light pollution law. Identify best practices for O’ahu communities.  
o Support low impact development that will reduce the amount of runoff into the ocean. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommended Changes to the Plan</th>
<th>Recommended Improvements to Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Economic Development and the Revitalization of Waipahu and Wahiawa</strong></td>
<td>o Incorporate recommendations from the Waipahu Neighborhood TOD Plan.</td>
<td>o Pass ordinance for Waipahu Neighborhood TOD areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Support private/public collaboration in TOD redevelopment.</td>
<td>o Continue to support efforts to revitalize Wahiawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Conduct a circulation study to improve access and parking or Wahiawa business areas while supporting renovations in line with the town’s historic character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create Master Planned Communities that Enhance Multi-modal Travel</strong></td>
<td>o Strengthen support for the City and County’s inclusionary zoning policy.</td>
<td>o Continue to enforce Unilateral Agreement conditions that require developers to provide or fund infrastructure and public facilities and enforce UA provisions on affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Support implementation of Compete Streets.</td>
<td>o Amend the LUO to allow mixed-use development including affordable housing on parcels in B-1 and B-2 districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Support implementation of Age Friendly Communities guidelines and policies.</td>
<td>o Encourage connectivity wherever feasible throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Encourage provision of space for pedestrian and bicycle travel in new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Recommended Changes to the Plan</td>
<td>Recommended Improvements to Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Provide Adequate Infrastructure   | - The Plan calls for timely development of infrastructure. The challenge of concurrency lies with financing, collaboration of developers and agencies, and development regulations and standards.  
- Treat emergency shelters as public facilities that are in short supply. Incorporate policies supporting meeting the shortfall in public shelters and encouraging private provision of shelters and safe rooms.  
- Call for assessment of sea level rise risks before developing new public projects, and incorporating measures to reduce risk and improve resiliency. | - Complete the fixed guideway rapid transit system as soon as possible.  
- Build the flyover linking the H-2 with the Pearl Highlands transit station and lot.  
- Continue work to relieve congestion on H-1 through Zipper lanes and other means.  
- Support low impact development (LID) that will reduce runoff into the ocean.  
- Encourage DOE and DPR to renew discussions on co-location of schools and parks, coordination of public facilities for recreation and emergency shelters.  
- Study ways to provide incentives for development of both public emergency shelters and private “safe rooms.”  
- Require risk assessment and assess results before granting land use and building permits for new public projects. |

**WHAT’S NEXT**

**Transmittal.** The draft proposed revised Plan and the draft adopting Ordinance for a revised Plan, along with this Review Report, will be transmitted to the Planning Commission and the City Council for official review and action.

**Distribution and Outreach.** Before the Planning Commission begins its review of the proposed revised Plan, the Department of Planning and Permitting will distribute copies of the proposed revised Plan and the Review Report, and meet with the Neighborhood Boards and the public to answer questions about what is proposed and how members of the public can participate in the official review and action.

Information about how to get copies, when and where presentations and discussions will be held, and how to participate in the official review can be obtained on the Department’s Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan web page at http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/DevelopmentSustainableCommunitiesPlans/CentralOahuPlan.aspx
or by contacting Noelle Cole by phone at 768-8055, by fax at 768-6743, or by email at noelle.cole@honolulu.gov.

The draft revised Plan, draft Ordinance, and this Review Report will be posted on the DPP website, distributed to the public at Neighborhood Board meetings and public information meetings, and can be picked up at the Department of Planning and Permitting located on the seventh floor of the Fasi Municipal Building (650 South King Street).

**Planning Commission Public Hearing and Recommendation.** After the Planning Commission receives the proposed Plan from the Department, they will hold a public hearing on the proposed revisions. However, the hearing will be at least two months after the Department makes copies of the Plan and related information available to the public so that the public will have sufficient time to review the materials and prepare their testimony for the Planning Commission hearing.

Members of the public are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to provide written and/or oral testimony on the draft revised Plan to the Planning Commission.

Contact the Planning Commission at 768-8007 or visit the Planning Commission website (http://honoluludpp.org/AboutDPP/AdministrativeServices.aspx) for information regarding the public hearing on the proposed Plan and procedures for submitting written and/or oral testimony to the Planning Commission.

After the public hearing is closed, the Commission will discuss the proposed revisions and make recommendations for what action the Council should take. Those recommendations, along with the proposed revised Plan and draft adopting ordinance, will be sent to the City Council.

**City Council Review and Action.** Once the Council receives the Planning Commission recommendations, a bill will be introduced to adopt the proposed revised Plan. For a revised Plan to be adopted, the bill will have to pass three votes by the full Council (called first, second, and third reading).

After the bill passes the first reading, it will be assigned to the Transportation and Planning Committee. The Committee may decide to hold the bill for further discussion, vote to amend the proposed revisions, or decide that the bill is ready to go to the full Council for a public hearing and the second reading vote.

After the second reading vote, the bill goes back again to the Transportation and Planning Committee for further discussion, possible amendments, and determination if the bill is ready to go back for the final vote.
When the Transportation and Planning Committee has agreement on the revisions to be made to the Plan, they will send the adopting bill to the Council for the third reading vote. To be adopted, five of the nine Councilmembers must vote on third reading to approve the revisions and send the bill to the Mayor for his review and action.

Members of the public are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to offer testimony to the Council on the proposed Plan revisions both at the meetings of the full Council and at the Transportation and Planning Committee meetings.

Contact the City Clerk at 768-3822 or visit the City Council website at http://www.honolulu.gov/council.html for status of bills, City Council meeting agendas, and procedures for submitting written or oral testimony.

**Mayoral Review and Action.** The Mayor has ten working days to review the bill and determine what action should be taken:

- He can sign the bill which will cause it to become law,
- He can return the bill to the Council without his signature which will allow the bill to become law but indicate that it is doing so without his support; or
- He can veto the bill.

If the Mayor vetoes the bill, the Council can overturn the veto if six of the nine Councilmembers vote to approve the bill.
1. THE REVIEW PROCESS

1.1 PURPOSE

The **Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan** was adopted through Ordinance 02-62 in 2002. The ordinance calls for a comprehensive review of all the elements of the **Plan** to begin five years after the adoption of the plan. As specified in Sec. 24-5.10 of the ordinance and Sec. 5.5 of the **Plan**, the review is to:

1. Evaluate whether the vision, policies, guidelines, and implementing actions are still appropriate;

2. Evaluate whether the **Plan** is consistent with the Oahu General Plan;

3. Evaluate whether the purpose of the **Plan**‘s development priorities are being achieved and if the priorities should be revised; and

4. Evaluate the Community Growth Boundary to see if it is achieving its intended purpose.

This report represents the results of the Review and outlines the Department’s recommended revisions to the **Plan** and its implementation.

1.2 PROCESS AND MILESTONE EVENTS

**ORIENTATON WORKSHOP (OCTOBER 27, 2007)**

The review process began with an orientation workshop at Mililani ‘Ike Elementary School. The workshop was well attended with representatives from the Neighborhood Boards, developers, land owners, professionals, and area political leaders.

The workshop opened with a presentation providing an overview of the **Central O‘ahu Sustainable Community Plan Review Program**, and was followed with a Question and Answer session.
Participants then broke into four Issue Groups:

- Transportation
- Schools,
- Development Process, and
- Economic and Jobs Development

to discuss what information they felt they needed to understand and help plan for the issue, to identify questions and concerns, and to allow participants to provide suggestions for how the issue could be addressed.

Copies of the Workshop Handouts, the PowerPoint Presentation, a listing of Comments from Workshop Participants, and Responses by the Planning Team are available in Appendix E.

DISCUSSION GROUPS (JULY – SEPTEMBER 2008)

Stakeholders were invited to a series of discussion groups to collect information and views on key Central O‘ahu issues.

- **Agriculture** (July 25, 2008 and August 7, 2008)
- **Transportation** (September 3, 2008 and November 5, 2008), and
- **Revitalization of Wahiawā** (September 6, 2008)

Points of agreement that emerged from the discussions included the following:

- **Agriculture**
  - Agreement on the importance of maintaining agricultural land for agricultural use in Central O‘ahu;
  - Concern about finding ways to reduce the costs of land and water for agricultural use;
  - Interest in developing agricultural tourism as an ancillary use;
  - Opposition to “gentlemen’s estates” on large agricultural lots and to speculation on agricultural lands that drive up prices.

- **Transportation**
  - Agreement on the importance of concurrent development of infrastructure -especially highways- with new development;
  - Interest in rapid transit, improved bus service, transit centers, and bikeways while acknowledging expectation that Central O‘ahu will remain highly dependent on automobiles and on the H-2 and H-1 freeways;
• Interest in additional roadways, notably a Central Mauka road, from Wahiawā to Mililani Mauka to the coastal plain;
• Interest in the development of communities that include jobs, commercial venues and recreation, as well as housing, to reduce the need to travel long distances;
• Agreement on the importance of Kunia Road as both an access route to Mililani and Schofield and the route to farmlands, and the conflicting needs of farm and commuter traffic.

○ Revitalization of Wahiawā
  • Support from the Wahiawā community for agriculture, not gentlemen’s estates, on the Galbraith lands north of Wahiawā and agreement that it is important to find ways to encourage agricultural uses there;
  • Agreement that traffic movement in the commercial area of Wahiawā is often congested, and parking is hard to find;
  • Agreement that revitalization for Wahiawā may depend on improved parking, but should also be in keeping with the Wahiawā urban design guidelines;
  • Support for City sponsorship of a circulation and parking study for Wahiawā.

PROCESS UPDATE WORKSHOP (JANUARY 31, 2013)
Recognizing that a long time had passed since the initial meetings on the CO SCP Review, DPP held a workshop in January 2013 to alert members of the public to the ongoing process and to elicit feedback on what has changed since 2003. Materials prepared for the workshop included a Vision Implementation Summary Scorecard and Preliminary Findings from the review process. Participants broke into groups and reviewed the status of the region in terms of the major themes of the Plan. Distributed materials and a summary of all discussion comments received are in Appendix G.

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT WORKSHOP (FEBRUARY 14, 2015)
A draft version of the revised Plan and preliminary findings from the Plan Review were circulated for public review and comment in January 2015.

○ Copies of the Public Review Draft Plan (PRD) and associated handouts were distributed, either in hard copy or on CDs, to key stakeholders and public agencies.
The PRD and associated handouts were posted on the Department’s Central Oahu SCP web page along with notice of upcoming presentations to the Neighborhood Boards and the February 14, 2015 public workshop.

In addition, notifications were sent by mail or email to persons who had signed up requesting notifications of release of publications or the opportunity to attend and participate in meetings on the PRD.

DPP staff made short presentations and distributed copies of the PRD and associated handouts to the Neighborhood Boards (Pearl City, Waipahū, Mililani, Mililani Mauka, and Wahiawā) located in the SCP area at their January 2015 meetings.

A public workshop was held on February 14, 2015 at the Mililani Mauka Elementary School to share results of the process to date and elicit questions and statements of community viewpoints. Presentations made at the workshop, and handout materials provided included in Appendix H.

After April 2015, the Department reviewed all comments on the PRD from the public and governmental agencies, either collected at Neighborhood Board presentations, and the February 14, 2015 workshop, or subsequently submitted to the DPP. The result of that review along with the Department’s responses is reported in Appendix B. As shown in the Appendix, there are a number of cases where we agreed that a change either to the Plan or to implementation should be made. In other cases, where we did not agree, we provide an explanation for why we felt no change was needed.

**FINAL PROPOSED REVISED PLAN**

After the review of comments was completed, the final proposed revised Plan was prepared, incorporating all of the changes resulting from the PRD review.

The final proposed revised Plan, in modified Ramseyer format showing where changes have been made to the vision, policies, guidelines and implementing actions, will be submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council along with this Review Report. Copies of the proposed Plan, and the Review Report will also be available for pickup at the Department, and will be posted on the Department’s Central O‘ahu SCP website.

Before the Planning Commission begins the official review of the proposed Plan, the Department will make presentations and distribute copies of the proposed Plan to the Central O‘ahu Neighborhood Boards, provide an opportunity for discussion of the
proposed Plan in one or more public meetings, and will ask the Planning Commission to delay their public hearing until all of the Central O‘ahu Boards have had an opportunity to meet and discuss what positions they want to take on the proposed revision.

After the Planning Commission holds their public hearing on the proposed Plan, they will agree on what recommendations they want to make on the proposed Plan, and then send the proposed Plan along with their recommendations to the City Council.

The City Council will take up a new bill to adopt a revised Plan upon receipt of the Planning Commission recommendations. For the revised Plan to be adopted, it must pass three votes of the full Council called the first, second, and third readings. Between the full Council votes, the bill will be discussed at meetings of the Council Transportation and Planning Committee. There are opportunities to provide public testimony at all of the Council and Committee meetings.

If you feel that there are still changes that should be made to the Plan, you still have the opportunity to make your suggestions to the Planning Commission and then the City Council for their consideration during the official review and action process. **We strongly urge you to take advantage of your opportunity to testify on the proposed revisions, telling the Commissioners and the Council what you do or do not support and why.**

If you do intend to submit testimony to the Planning Commission and/or the City Council asking for changes, we would appreciate you providing a copy of your testimony.

And If you feel you have found an error, or have a suggestion for how language in the Plan could be made clearer or more effective , or see something that was missed in the Review, we will be glad to consider it, to meet to discuss it with you, and, if your suggestion makes sense to us, add our support to the proposed change.
2. ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter provides findings on the items that are required by law to be covered in the review of the **Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan**, including the success of implementing the Plan vision and policies, and on how well the Plan priorities address critical issues.

2.1 FINDINGS ON THE REQUIRED SCOPE OF REVIEW

1. *Is the Plan vision, along with its land use and infrastructure policies and implementation methods, still appropriate?*

The Plan vision and policies enjoy general support from the community. Implementation methods need to be improved regarding adequate infrastructure, connectivity, and community centers.

Stakeholders‘ assessment of implementation is mixed.

a) Public agencies and the private developers have taken important steps to realize elements of the vision such as:
   a. Development of the Patsy Mink Central O‘ahu Regional Park,
   b. Redevelopment at the Waipahū mill site, and
   c. New residential and commercial development in Waipahū and Mililani Mauka.

b) DPP has instituted procedures to align the development of transportation infrastructure and of new subdivisions, addressing the issue of concurrency.

c) Development of the elevated rail system and planning for transit oriented development (TOD) in Waipahū, at Leeward Community College, and Pearl Highlands is proceeding.

d) Still, stakeholders have serious concerns with regard to insuring infrastructure concurrency with new development (especially for transportation) and with the perceived loss of agricultural lands.
2. Is the purpose of the Plan’s development priorities being achieved and should the priorities be revised?

The 2002 Plan includes Sec. 5.1 which provides Public Facility Investment Priorities and Private Development Priorities.

City public infrastructure investments have been substantially consistent with the Public Facility Investment Priorities adopted in the 2002 Plan but do need to be revised in the proposed revised Plan to reflect actions taken since 2002 and provide guidance on emerging community needs.

Private development has been consistent with the Private Development Priorities adopted in the 2002. All zoning changes and development permit approvals have been in the Urban Expansion Areas as called for in the 2002 Plan. There is sufficient land within the Community Growth Boundary for Central O’ahu and for the other parts of O’ahu to meet the residential, commercial, and industrial needs so there is no need to revise the Private Development Priorities.

3. Is the Community Growth Boundary achieving the purpose envisioned in the 2002 Plan?

The adopted CO SCP has a Phasing Map, Map A4 in Appendix A, whose purpose is to show, inside the Community Growth Boundary, the Existing Urban Areas which are the areas already developed for urban uses, and the Urban Expansion Areas where new urban development is to occur as entitlements and development permits are approved.

The adopted vision is that, in order to protect agricultural and preservation lands, no additional areas will be approved for residential, commercial, or industrial development beyond the Urban Expansion Area.

From 2002 to the present, that vision has been achieved since no urban development has been approved outside the Community Growth Boundary.

The Boundary has served its function as a protection for high quality agricultural lands and open space while including, island-wide, sufficient land to meet urban development needs for the foreseeable future. As a result, the Boundary should remain fixed through the 2035 planning horizon.
2.2 FINDINGS ON VISION IMPLEMENTATION

The 2002 Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan vision has six major elements. The vision elements and our evaluation of how well the vision has implemented since adoption of the Plan in 2002 are as follows:

1. **Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space.** There has been success in protecting agricultural lands and open space areas outside the Community Growth Boundary and identified open space areas inside the Boundary. Much more is needed to realize the vision of creating an Open Space Network within the Boundary.

2. **Revitalize Waipahū and Wahiawā.** Redevelopment of Waipahū has resulted in new job centers and residential construction; Wahiawā has had far less new development and faces a major challenge with the planned relocation/redevelopment of Wahiawā General Hospital.

3. **Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources.** Strong protections are in place for these resources, but challenges, such as protecting and promoting aquifer recharge or reducing light pollution, need to be addressed, and opportunities, like reuse of recycled water or creation of a shared-use path for pedestrians and bikes, need to be pursued.

4. **Build Master Planned Communities that Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use.** Approved plans, regulations, and conditions for new master planned developments in Central O‘ahu since 2002 do require or support affordable housing, a range of housing types, transit friendly street networks, and community center place-making.

5. **Design Communities to Reduce Automobile Usage.** Approved plans, regulations, and conditions for new master planned developments in Central O‘ahu since 2002 do require or support complete streets, connectivity, and transit friendly development, and will provide easy access to the rail system stations in Waipahū and at Pearl Highlands.

6. **Provide Adequate Infrastructure to Meet the Needs of New and Existing Development.** Significant State and City infrastructure development has occurred, but provision of sufficient transportation and schools capacity remains a challenge.

For more details, see Table 2-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protect Agricultural Land and Open Space</td>
<td>- Over 10,000 acres of agricultural lands along Kunia Road, above Wahiawā, around Millilani and on the Waipiʻo Peninsula are outside the Community Growth Boundary. Since adoption of the CO SCP in 2002, no agricultural or open space lands outside the Urban Community Boundary have been rezoned for urban use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 150 acres for an agricultural park located within the Community Growth Boundary at Royal Kunia was deeded to the State Department of Agriculture. Development is anticipated to start in October 2016, contingent on funding and permit approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 1,700 acres of agricultural lands north of Wahiawā formerly held by the Galbraith Trust were conveyed to the State agencies ADC (1200 acres) and OHA (500 acres around the Kukaniloko historic site) in 2012, with the help of the Trust for Public Lands. Most of the land will be reserved for agriculture. Several properties in the Whitmore Village area were also purchased by the State to develop a food processing hub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The U.S. Army acquired a 1,400-acre area south of Schofield Barracks for use as a training area, removing it from agricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Island Palm Communities (formerly Army Hawai‘i Family Housing), a partnership of Actus Lend Lease with the U.S. Army, acquired a 1,925 acre parcel to the south of Schofield Barracks and west of Kunia Road. It remains in agricultural use, but some of the land may eventually be developed to meet demand for family housing at Schofield Barracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Patsy T. Mink Central O‘ahu Regional Park opened in 2001, and is being developed to provide a diverse range of active and passive recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The potential for creating the proposed Open Space Network which would link together open space areas with a network of paths and bikeways running in ravines and greenways still exists, but the proposed linkages have not yet been accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Connections and park developments necessary to create the Waipahū Shoreline Park, which would link Waipahū with the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail, Pouhala Marsh wildlife sanctuary, and the Waipio Peninsula Soccer Park, have not advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan</strong> adopted in 2014, proposes the restoration of Kapakahī Stream and an adjacent stream walk for bikes and pedestrians, linking the Old Town area and the Festival Marketplace with the Pouhala Marsh. The Plan also calls for mini-parks between one and two acres in size throughout the Farrington / Mokuola Station area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Vision Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Revitalize Waipahu and Wahiawa** | - Between 2000 and 2010, non-construction jobs in Central O‘ahu increased by over 14,000 with 25 percent of the new jobs estimated to be in Waipahu and in Wahiawa.  
  - Redevelopment of the Waipahu Mill site with the adaptive use of the Mill Building for a full service YMCA (2007), and construction of the Filipino Community Center (2002), helped re-establish the Mill site as a center of Waipahu activity. The nearby Waipahu Festival Marketplace revitalized the old Big Way supermarket building (2007).  
  - Other new development in Waipahu has included two mid-rise affordable housing projects near the proposed Mokuola transit station and commercial/industrial development around the former Mill site.  
  - **The Waipahu Neighborhood TOD Plan** was approved by the City in 2014. The Plan calls for mixed-use, higher density transit oriented development areas around the proposed Waipahu and West Loch transit stations. Proposed zoning to implement the Plan is under review by the City Council as Bill 76 (2015).  
  - Much of Wahiawa town is designated as a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area. A Community Strengthening Program and a Community Based Development Organization were formed to coordinate community-based revitalization projects.  
  - Far less new development has occurred in Wahiawa than in Waipahu or Mililani.  
  - As a result of two Central O‘ahu Enterprise Zones established in 1996 under State and City legislation, 14 businesses received tax rebates, exemptions, and credits in return for creating new jobs in Waipahu or Wahiawa. |
Vision Element Evaluation of Implementation

3. Protect Natural, Cultural, and Historic Resources

- Since 2002, protection of natural, historical and cultural resources has been included as a standard condition of land use approvals when significant resource impacts have been identified in environmental assessments.
- The importance of protection of the Pearl Harbor aquifer is recognized in policy changes, programs, and projects proposed in the 2007 Central O‘ahu Watershed Study.
- The Board of Water Supply has begun community outreach to produce a Central O‘ahu Watershed Management Plan by 2017.
- The City has completed improvements to the Wahiawā Wastewater Treatment Plant which made it capable of producing R-1 quality recycled water. That water could be used to irrigate parks and some agricultural lands. However, State Department of Health certification as R-1 quality is pending.
- Kūkaniloko is being maintained by members of the Wahiawā Hawaiian Civic Club and Friends of Kūkaniloko. The lands surrounding Kūkaniloko are held and managed by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.
- The landmark Waipahū Mill Stack was retained, and adaptive use made of the mill buildings as part of the Waipahū YMCA complex.
- Historic plantation villages at Poamoho and Kunia continue with new ownership structures evolving to protect resident owners (Poamoho) and farm workers (Kunia). At Kunia, Hawaii Agricultural Research Center is promoting new agricultural uses for existing structures.
- The Plan calls for establishment of bikeways and historic train operations on the OR&L corridor from Aiea to Nanakuli.
  - The existing bikeway runs on the OR&L corridor from Aiea to Waipahū Depot Road.
  - The State DOT Leeward Bikeway project would extend the bikeway to the ‘Ewa Plantation Villages in Phase 1 and on to Nanakuli in Phase 2.
- Extension of the historic train operation from ‘Ewa Plantation Villages to the Waipahū Cultural Park and to Rainbow Marina is not feasible due to the presence of energy pipelines buried in the rail bed which are permitted under a long term lease.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Build Master Planned Communities that Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use</strong></td>
<td>- More than 5,000 homes were added to Central O‘ahu between 2000 and 2010, 24% of O‘ahu's growth, most before 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Since then, housing development has slowed to around 25 units per year due to economic conditions, build-out of Mililani Mauka, and legal challenges to entitlements for new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affordable housing units have been required in all major Central O‘ahu developments, resulting in the construction of over 8,600 affordable units since 1984.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No new town centers/Main Street areas have been established since 2002. Castle &amp; Cooke, whose Koa Ridge Makai project’s zoning was approved in 2013, proposes to establish a town center as part of that project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Development of three master planned communities identified in the 2002 Plan:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Koa Ridge Makai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Royal Kunia II, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Waiawa Ridge/ Waiawa Castle &amp; Cooke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>has been delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Design Communities to Reduce Automobile Usage</strong></td>
<td>- New Express Buses and a hub-and-spoke system of collector buses were established since adoption of the Plan in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Since 2004, increased attention has been paid to ensuring that roadway master plans for new subdivisions support walking, biking, utility vehicle circulation, connectivity with adjacent areas, and transit usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The City adopted a Complete Streets ordinance in 2012, and is establishing standards to ensure that streets provide safe access and mobility to all users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>The Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan</strong>, adopted in 2014, calls for mixed use residential and commercial development within easy walking distance of two transit stations in Waipahū. Implementing zoning regulations are currently under consideration by the City Council as Bill 76 (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A flyover lane connecting the H-2 Freeway to the parking structure for the Pearl Highlands rail station is under construction, and when completed, will allow express bus riders from Central Oahu to easily transfer to the rail system for the trip to and from downtown Honolulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Element</td>
<td>Evaluation of Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide Adequate Infrastructure</td>
<td>- State and County infrastructure development has continued, but providing transportation and schools capacity concurrently with residential development remains a challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The City Department of Transportation Services has developed transit centers at Waipahu, Mililani and Waihawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Since 2003, improved express bus service and the Zipper Lane have provided alternatives for the commute to Honolulu, but the quality of travel to and from town has not improved for most commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The congestion-reducing H-1 Freeway PM Contraflow Project broke ground in 2012 and is still in progress. Pearl City and Waimalu Viaduct deck repairs were completed in 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The rail transit system, when construction is completed, will provide substantial capacity as an alternative to commuting by auto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Renewable energy development is being explored at several sites, largely in the form of Photovoltaic (PV) installations. A demonstration plant for biofuel development from algae has been established by Phycal at Poamoho Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- With little new housing construction under way, demand for new schools and other public facilities has slowed for the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The City has supported the DOE’s efforts to provide capacity for existing and new developments to provide their fair share toward construction of new or expansion of existing schools, either under the terms of the impact district or the provisions of existing agreements required as a condition of zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Royal Kunia Phase I is within the area covered by the ‘Ewa Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance (since the Kunia Interchange project was eligible for funding under the ordinance). The ordinance is being reviewed, and a revision will be proposed to the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Facility District financing for infrastructure for new development received preliminary Council approval for Gentry Waiawa, but was never used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.3 EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

Major issues identified from research, interviews, focus groups, workshop discussions, and comments submitted during the review include:

2.3.1 Protecting Agricultural Lands and Open Space 2-10
   2.3.1.1 Agricultural Lands Protection and Support of Diversified Agriculture 2-10
   2.3.1.2 Pedestrian and Bike Path Network 2-16

2.3.2 Protecting Historic, Cultural, and Natural Resources 2-19
   2.3.2.1 Railroad Operations on the OR&L Right-of-Way 2-19
   2.3.2.2 Access to Pearl Harbor as a Recreational Resource 2-19
   2.3.2.3 Protection of Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites 2-21
   2.3.2.4 Protection of Groundwater Resources 2-22
   2.3.2.5 Reduction of Light Pollution 2-23

2.3.3 Revitalizing Waipahū and Wahiawā 2-25

2.3.4 Managing and Mitigating the Development Process 2-29
   2.3.4.1 Infrastructure Concurrency 2-29
   2.3.4.2 Housing Affordability 2-34
   2.3.4.3 Complete Streets and Age-Friendly Communities 2-36
   2.3.4.4 Place Making 2-40

2.3.5 Coordinating City Land Use Plans and Uses on U.S. Military Landholdings 2-43

2.3.6 Ensuring Transportation Infrastructure Adequacy 2-46

2.3.7 Improving Resiliency and Climate Change Adaptation 2-53

The relation of these issues to the Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan vision, policies, guidelines and implementation methods was analyzed to determine whether the Plan needed to be revised to better address the issue or whether the problem was one of improving implementation to better realize the Plan vision. The analysis of each of the issues is summarized below.
2.3.1 PROTECTING AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND OPEN SPACE

2.3.1.1 Agricultural Lands Protection and Support of Diversified Agriculture

Issue Analysis

Protection of Agricultural Land

- Key island-wide growth management policies were adopted in the General Plan (GP) in the late 1970's and have been supported since then by all subsequent City Councils and Mayors through plan approvals, zone changes, and appropriations for infrastructure. Those GP policies are:
  - Keep the Country country;
  - Fully develop the Primary Urban Center (Urban Honolulu from Kāhala to Pearl City); and
  - Develop O‘ahu’s second city at the City of Kapolei and develop master planned residential communities around it in the ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu urban fringe.

- Developing master planned residential communities in ‘Ewa and parts of Central O‘ahu has necessarily caused the loss of the sugar fields that once covered those areas. That is the price paid to reduce the development pressure on agricultural areas in Windward O‘ahu, the North Shore and areas in Central O‘ahu.

- As part of the review and revision of the O‘ahu General Plan, the Department of Planning and Permitting commissioned a study of the situation and outlook for agricultural use of land on O‘ahu\(^1\). Among the findings in the study are the following:
  - In 2010, there were 42,600 acres of high-quality agricultural lands outside the Community Growth Boundaries of the eight Development Plan and Sustainable Communities Plan (DP/SCP) areas which cover the island of O‘ahu.
  - A significant share of those lands outside the Community Growth Boundaries (over 10,000 acres) are located in Central O‘ahu, especially along Kunia Road and north of Wahiawā.

---

\(^{1}\) Department of Planning and Permitting, *Oahu Agriculture: Situation, Outlook and Issues*, by Plasch Econ Pacific LLC (February 2011)
The estimated land farmed on Oahu in 2010 was about 12,000 acres.

As a consequence, in 2010, there were over 30,000 acres of good farmland on O'ahu outside the Growth Boundaries and protected against urban development which were not being farmed and available if someone wanted to start farming.

For those concerned about O'ahu's reliance on agricultural imports and would like us to be self-sufficient, the City’s consultant also estimated that all the fruits and vegetables that are now being imported and have been successfully grown in Hawai'i in the past could be grown on 23,000 acres.

As a result, the consultant concluded that:

- “Assuming that the necessary water improvements are made, . . . land supply appears more than sufficient to accommodate realistic increases in . . . import substitution of fresh fruits, vegetables, and melons and (in) new export crops;” and

- “The supply of farmland does not appear to be the limiting factor to the growth of agriculture. Instead, the limiting factor is likely to be the size of the market than can be supplied profitably by Hawai'i farmers.”

Preliminary conclusions from the Department’s review of agriculture objectives and policies in the O‘ahu General Plan and community comments on proposed revisions indicate that:

- The community would like to preserve high quality agricultural lands, support sustainable agriculture, and would like to see an increase in local food consumption;

- The General Plan agriculture policies should emphasize supporting diversified agriculture in place of the current emphasis on preserving land as the primary way the City supports agriculture uses; and

- The General Plan should support protection of agricultural land outside Community Growth Boundaries from urbanization.

---

Changes to Agricultural Operations

- The vision, policies, and guidelines in the 2002 Plan reaffirmed the O‘ahu General Plan policies which call for support of diversified agriculture activities in Central O‘ahu and provision of “sufficient agricultural land . . . to encourage the continuation of a viable pineapple industry.”

- However, since 2002, pineapple operations by Del Monte and Dole in Central O‘ahu have ended. (Del Monte stopped production in 2007. Dole currently only grows pineapple on North Shore lands for sale to visitors to the Dole Plantation visitor attraction on Kamehameha Highway, north of Wahiawa.)

- Seed corn is now the islands’ largest single agricultural product. Annual production of the seed crop industry in Hawai‘i exceeds $200 million.\(^5\)

- Plasch noted in his General Plan report that
  
  - “the seed companies have replaced sugar and pineapple companies as the highest bidders for land, giving them access to much of the best land in Hawai‘i; and
  
  - “In terms of acreage, the largest farm operations on O‘ahu are (1) seed companies with farms located in Kunia and the North Shore; (2) a group of related farms managed by Larry Jefts who grows a variety of vegetable and melon crops in Kunia, ‘Ewa, and the North Shore; and (3) Aloun Farms which grows a variety of vegetable and melon crops in ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu . . .”\(^6\)

- A number of major historic land holdings and leases have ended and/or been reorganized since adoption of the 2002 Plan.

---


\(^5\) That amount is based on industry costs. Seed products are shipped to other divisions of the growing corporations, and are not sold on the market. http://www.nass.usda.gov/Statistics_by_State/Hawaii/Publications/Sugarcane_and_Specialty_Crops/2014HawaiiSeedCrops.pdf

\(^6\) DPP, O‘ahu Agriculture, p. 15.
New initiatives include

- Purchase in 2005 of 2,400 acres of agricultural lands south of Schofield Barracks by Island Palm Communities (a joint venture of the private company Lend Lease and the U.S. Army);
- Operation of a private 220-acre agricultural park along Kunia Road under a partnership of the Hawaii Agricultural Foundation, Island Palm Communities and Monsanto Hawaii⁷;
- Planned development of a 150-acre agricultural park above the Royal Kunia development by the State of Hawai‘i Department of Agriculture⁸; and
- Acquisition by the State of Hawaii, in collaboration with the Trust for Public Lands, of the 1,750-acre Galbraith lands north of Wahiawā with the aim of stimulating diversified agriculture and protecting open space and cultural resources.⁹

Important Agricultural Lands

- The State Legislature adopted laws on “Important Agricultural Lands” in 2005, allowing landowners and counties to identify such lands, and offering incentives to preserve agricultural land for long-term agricultural use (HRS 205).
- HRS 205:45-5 allows “farm dwellings” on Important Agricultural Lands but limits their use to farmers, their families and employees, and mandates that plans for farm dwellings be supported by agricultural plans approved by the State Department of Agriculture.

---

⁷ The Hawaii Agricultural Foundation is managing development and leasing for the agricultural park. (See http://www.hawaiiafoundation.org/haf-ag-park-kunia)
⁸ The State Kunia Agricultural Park is to include 24 leases for farmland and clustered farm dwellings (http://oeqc.doh.hawaii.gov/Shared%20Documents/EA_and_EIS_Online_Library/Oahu/2010s/2013-03-23-OA-5B-DEA-Kunia-Agricultural-Park.pdf).
⁹ Contributors to the land purchase included the State of Hawai‘i, the City and County of Honolulu, the U.S. Army, and D.R. Horton-Schuler Division.
The City has moved forward to identify candidate properties on Oahu which could be identified as Important Agricultural Lands (IAL), has notified owners that their lands have been selected as candidate properties, and held meetings to discuss the IAL process and solicit comments before proceeding to the City Council for final approval of the IAL lands.\footnote{10}

**Non-Agricultural Uses of Agricultural Land**

- Various regulations to restrict “gentlemen’s estate” development on agricultural lands have been considered by the Honolulu City Council, including limits on the size of farm dwellings. The issue of “gentlemen’s estates” has been especially contentious on the North Shore, which lead to inclusion of explicit policies to control “fake farms” in the 2011 \textbf{North Shore Sustainable Communities Plan} \footnote{11}

- Currently DPP relies on the State Department of Agriculture to assess farms’ viability, but that agency lacks resources to make such determinations.

- The State adopted laws in 2012 that allow construction of some farm structures without building permits. These laws make it difficult to regulate building activities on farms. After receiving complaints about “unauthorized activities,” the City has issued a number of citations for illegal construction of residential units and a temple structure on Kunia Loa Ridge project along Kunia Road.\footnote{12}

**Recommendations for Revision to the Plan**

- Remove references to protection of pineapple lands as an element of the vision for Central O’ahu and of the Chapter 3 open space protection policies (p. 1-2, p. 3-4).

\footnote{10}{See \url{http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/ImportantAgriculturalLands(IAL).aspx}}
\footnote{11}{City and County of Honolulu, \textit{North Shore Sustainable Communities Plan} (2011), Sec. 3.2.1. Posted at \url{http://www.honoluludpp.org/Portals/0/pdfs/planning/NorthShore/NSSCP_May_2011.pdf}}
Update the vision to clarify that

- Some loss of prime agricultural land in Central O'ahu and 'Ewa was necessary to provide the development capacity needed to divert development from Windward and rural areas and realize the policy of “keeping the Country country” (p. 2-3); and

- City policy is to save substantial amounts of high quality agricultural land from urban development islandwide and to nurture and strengthen the community of farmers conducting agricultural and related activities on those lands (p. 2-3).

- Continue protection for agricultural lands and open space along Kunia Road, above Wahiawā, and mauka of the H-2 Freeway by making the Community Growth Boundary more restrictive, moving the Boundary to exclude both the State’s Kunia Agricultural Park and the Department of Defense’s East Range Military Training Area (pp. 2-8 to 2-10, Appendix A).

- Add language supporting development of infrastructure needed to support diversified agricultural activities in Central O'ahu, including water system improvements and economic infrastructure like grower cooperatives, storage and distribution systems, and an expanded network of farmers’ markets (pp. 2-14, 2-25, 3-48, 3-76).

- Strengthen policies regarding use of non-residential farm buildings to insure the structures are consistent with the intent and purpose of the agricultural zoning districts and in compliance with flood hazard regulations (p. 3-7).

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- Deny applications for zone changes to allow urban development in agricultural or conservation land outside the Community Growth Boundary as inconsistent with the CO SCP and not eligible for processing and submittal to the Planning Commission.

- Work with farmers, the State, and other stakeholders to support the use of lands that had been in plantation agriculture for diversified agriculture.
Support efforts to insure that developments of agricultural lands are for working farms, not a hobby, and that all structures are farm structures.

Explore data collection and analysis improvements and propose legal and regulatory changes to improve the ability of the City to insure that non-residential structures built on agricultural lands without building permits conform with City and County laws and regulations.

2.3.1.2 Pedestrian and Bike Path Network

Issue Analysis

- There has been limited progress in establishing the pedestrian and bike paths running on greenways, grassed drainageways, utility corridors, and natural ravines as part of the open space network, as envisioned in the Plan.
  - There is no one City or State agency responsible for creating the pedestrian and bike path network by linking together roadway paths, drainageways, and utility corridors and developing a trail network in the ravines.
  - Most drainageways have not been dedicated to the City, with the result that a pedestrian and bike path system running on the drainageways would involve coordinating with a wide variety of private and public owners.
  - The agency responsible for maintaining City drainage systems views grassed channels, landscaping, and pedestrian and bike paths as causing problems and adding maintenance costs.
  - The agency responsible for providing City outdoor recreation facilities does not have the staff or funding to take on additional responsibilities, given the needs of traditional parks, ball fields and courts.

- In several major projects approved for zone changes, pedestrian and bike paths have been provided either on the street network or as separate systems. For example, the Koa Ridge Makai project does include seven miles of bike and pedestrian shared paths separated from the roads.

- The City has adopted Complete Streets as a requirement for new roadways and redevelopment of existing roadways which will eventually
create improved conditions and connectivity for bicycle riders and pedestrians.

Pearl Harbor Historic Trail / Leeward Bikeway

- The 2002 Plan calls for construction of a parallel paved shared-use path for bicycles and pedestrians along the length of the OR&L rail right-of-way from Aiea to Nānākuli, either within or adjacent to the right-of-way, even in those sections where there are no historic train operations.

- While the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail (PHHT) exists and is used, it is not consistently maintained. Access to the harbor is limited, and no signage or trail-related infrastructure has been put in place.

- Community meetings in 2015 called for “enhancing and beautifying” the PHHT, and addressing a “homeless encampment along the trail.”

- The Leeward Bikeway project of the State Department of Transportation has been underway since 1977.
  - As a requirement of the deed transferring the OR&L right-of-way from the Federal government to the State in 1980, the State must develop “bicycle lanes or paths and pedestrian walkways” on the OR&L right-of-way.
  - Phase 1 of the project will connect with the PHHT and extend to the Hawaiian Railway Station in ‘Ewa. Phase 2 of the project will continue on to Nānākuli.
  - Although plans and designs are complete, a Final Environmental Assessment approved in 2000, and funding approved, construction of the project has not yet begun.

Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Retain language in the Plan supporting creation of an open space network within the Community Growth Boundary, linked by shared pedestrian and

---

bicycle paths running on greenways along roadways, drainage ways, utility corridors and natural gulches.

- Add language supporting retaining drainageways as natural or man-made vegetated channels rather than concrete channels where practical.
- Add language supporting provision of pedestrian and bicycle access to natural gulches and drainageways where these can be safely accommodated.
- Strengthen and clarify policies supporting use of the OR&L Right-of-Way/Pearl Harbor Historic Trail as a shared use pathway for pedestrians and bicycle riders.

**Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation**

- Study the feasibility, liability and cost of development and maintenance of making improvements to the gulch between the City’s Wahiawā Botanical Garden and the State’s Wahiawā Freshwater Recreation Area to allow use of the gulch as a pathway between the two.
- Resolve lack of agency support for creation and maintenance of the open space network.
  
  - Study whether a public-private regional open space and greenway ‘ohana of State and City agencies, recreational stakeholders, and landowners should be established to advocate for creation of the network, raise funds to support the network, and coordinate development, operation, and maintenance of the open space network.
  
  - Study whether public access easements could be used to give private owners tax incentives to allow establishment of public pedestrian and bike paths on utility corridors, drainage ways, and natural gulches and ravines.
2.3.2 PROTECTING HISTORIC, CULTURAL, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

2.3.2.1 Railroad Operations on the OR&L Right-of-Way

Issue Analysis

- The 2002 Plan calls for adaptive reuse of the historic OR&L right-of-way for train operations to provide historic and educational rides between the ‘Ewa Plantation Villages and the Waipahū Cultural Garden.

- DPP staff research and discussions with the State Department of Transportation (DOT) have led to the conclusion that repair and reconstruction of the railway and operation of trains on the historic railway between ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu is not feasible.
  - There are fuel lines, which are permitted under long term leases, buried in the railroad right of way.
  - According to State DOT staff, the utilities operating the fuel lines have stated that they will not allow railway operations over their lines, which makes extension of railroad operations between ‘Ewa and Waipahū impossible in the coming decades.

Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Remove references to railroad operations in the OR&L right of way from the Plan.

2.3.2.2 Access to Pearl Harbor as a Recreational Resource

Issue Analysis

- The 2002 Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan calls for providing public access to the Pearl Harbor shoreline at intervals of
approximately one mile, except where access is restricted by the military for security reasons.\textsuperscript{15}

- The \textbf{Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan} calls for fostering neighborhood improvements and future urban development around the two rail transit stations planned for Waipahū (the West Loch Station at the intersection of Farrington Highway/Leoku Street, and the Waipahū Transit Center Station at the intersection of Farrington Highway/Mokuola Street). A key element of the \textbf{TOD Plan} is creation of a connected greenway network that would reconnect Waipahū neighborhoods with Pearl Harbor. The proposed network would involve:

- Restoration of the drainage channel between Leokane and Leoleo Streets as a natural greenway path and linear path providing a connection to the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail and Pearl Harbor shoreline, and

- Restoration of Kapakahi Stream as a green walkway that connects Pouhala Marsh, the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail, a new Festival Marketplace, and the Hawaii Plantation Village.

- Any proposed use of Pearl Harbor waters would need to be negotiated with the U.S. Navy, which has installations in Middle Loch and along the West Loch shoreline.

\textbf{Recommendations for Revision of the Plan}

- Retain existing policies in the Plan calling for provision of access to Pearl Harbor shoreline.

- Add policies supporting giving access from Waipahū to the Pearl Harbor shoreline through a network of pedestrian and bicycle paths.

\textsuperscript{15} Department of Planning and Permitting, \textit{Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan} (December 2002), p. 3-5.
2.3.2.3 Protection of Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites

Issue Analysis

○ The 2002 Plan calls for

- preservation of significant historic features from the plantation era and earlier periods, and

- review, on a case-by-case basis and in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, of Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites which may be affected by development to determine if they should be preserved and protected as is, or if an adaptive re-use of the site is appropriate.

○ Under State law, there are protections and review requirements for Native Hawaiian pre-historic and historic burial sites and for historic property listed on the Hawaii register of historic places.  

○ In addition, before development approvals can be given for any project which may affect historic properties or burial sites, the State Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) must be given the opportunity to review and comment on the effect of the project on historic properties.

○ Conditions of Unilateral Agreements (UA) which are approved as part of entitlement approvals for master planned communities which have historic and cultural resources identified in surveys typically require respectful preservation of historic and cultural sites, artifacts and remains, either identified as part of surveys done as part of entitlement approvals, or discovered as part of the construction process. The content of such UA conditions will often be based on the comments and suggestions by the State Historic Preservation Officer provided during the entitlement approval process.

---

17 Ibid.
Recommendations for Revision of the Plan

- Amend the Plan to clarify that the vision is that cultural and historic resources will be preserved and enhanced, as required under State law, by conducting surveys of historic and cultural resources, and, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, by identifying and requiring use of the appropriate measures to preserve the historic and cultural values of the resources.

2.3.2.4 Protection of Groundwater Resources

Issue Analysis

- The 2002 Plan calls for protection of the Central O'ahu watershed “to maintain an adequate supply of good quality water and to retain sufficient acreage to ensure infiltration into groundwater aquifers.”

- Climate change, for Hawaii, is expected to lengthen periods of drought and concentrate rainfall in more intense storms, increasing flash flooding and reducing aquifer recharge.  

- A 2007 Honolulu Board of Water Supply study recommends protecting recharge of the Pearl Harbor aquifer by:
  - Limiting development and/or requiring conformance with Low Impact Development Standards for any developments on lands above what is termed the 50-inch-isohyet (the lower boundary of areas where 50 inches or more of rain fall annually); and
  - Replanting of native species and removal of invasive species in forest areas, especially in areas where forests have been damaged by wildfires and are susceptible to invasion by non-native species.

---

19 Honolulu Board of Water Supply, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and City and County of Honolulu Department of Environmental Services, Central O‘ahu Watershed Study Final Report prepared by Oceanit, Townscape, Inc, and Eugene Dashiell (May 2007). See p. 2-121, p. 3-38, pp. 4-12 to 13, pp. 4-16 to 4-19, and p. 4-56.
Recommendations for Revision of the Plan

- Recognize protection of the watershed and underlying aquifer as a land use policy priority for Central O‘ahu, and add specific policies and guidelines to support water conservation and efficient use, clean up and prevention of contamination, reclamation and use of non-potable water, aquifer recharge, capture and reclamation of stormwater, and reduction of sedimentation and pollution of streams.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- To protect aquifer recharge, adopt regulations and standards to prohibit urban development in agricultural or open space areas above the Pearl Harbor aquifer where 50 inches or more of rain fall annually unless applicants can demonstrate that use of Low Impact Development practices will sustain or increase the amount of recharge.

2.3.2.5 Reduction of Light Pollution

Issue Analysis

- Light pollution is defined as light that shines into areas where illumination is not needed or wanted, or interferes with natural processes such as bird flight patterns or movement of turtle hatchlings from nests to the ocean.

- There has been significant discussion nationally of the adverse impacts of light pollution and ways to mitigate the impacts, along with increasingly widespread adoption of shielded fixtures that limit dispersion of light at night.

- A California energy expert estimated that use of efficient outdoor lighting systems with smart controls could reduce energy use for outdoor lighting in the United States by 30%, "saving enough energy to power over 3.6 million homes for a year."

---

20 Lee Cooper, Manager, Emerging Technologies, Pacific Gas & Electric, presentation at June 20, 2008 International Dark-Sky Association Congressional Briefing.
Environmental experts have provided evidence of significant adverse impacts of light pollution on wildlife, including the death of millions of birds in the United States due to light interference with night time flights and migration.\textsuperscript{21} Locally, 300 to 500 birds downed due to light interference are brought to Sea Life Park for rehabilitation every year.\textsuperscript{22}

Medical experts have provided evidence of adverse health impacts due to light interference with natural circadian rhythms.\textsuperscript{23}

In a series of settlements, public and private agencies on Kaua‘i have agreed to implement measures to reduce the number of birds that are harmed by outdoor lighting on the island.

- Fines for the taking of a bird protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are substantial.
- Kaua‘i County faced maximum fines of $15,000 to $25,000 for each MBTA or ESA violation.\textsuperscript{24}

In 2012, the State Legislature passed the Hawaii Night Sky Protection Act. It mandates the use of shielded lights by State agencies (with some exceptions, e.g., for emergency response and construction projects).\textsuperscript{25}

In 2013, the Honolulu City Council passed Ordinance 13-4, directing that all new and replacement municipal street lights project at least 90 percent of illumination downward rather than skyward.

\textbf{Recommendations for Revision of the Plan}

- Add Light Pollution policies and guidelines to the Plan

\textsuperscript{23} David E. Blask, Ph.D., M.D., Bassett Research Institute, Presentation at June 20, 2008 International Dark-Sky Association Congressional Briefing.
\textsuperscript{25} HRS 201: 8-5.
Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- Adopt standards to define the minimum outdoor lighting necessary for public safety, security, and community aesthetics consistent with the goals of energy conservation and environmental protection.

- In order to minimize glare and obtrusive light from outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive or unnecessary, require fully shielding of lighting fixtures so that no light escapes above the horizontal plane and use of lower wattage where feasible.

- Adopt outdoor night lighting standards for rural areas that reflect the rural character of those areas.

2.3.3 REVITALIZING WAIPAHŪ AND WAHIAWĀ

Issue Analysis

Waipahū

- After the closure of the Waipahū mill, land near the mill site was redeveloped for light industrial and commercial uses. At the mill site itself, the smokestack was integrated into a new YMCA facility.

- The Honolulu Rail Transit line will run along Farrington Highway in Waipahū with stations at Leoku Street near Kunia Road (West Loch Station), and at Mokuola Street, below the mill area (Waipahū Transit Center Station).

- The Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan, building on earlier plans for Waipahū, identified changes in land use conducive for revitalization in the areas near the two transit stations. That plan has been submitted to the City Council, and will be the basis for an ordinance with zoning overlays for the immediate Transit Oriented Development area around each station, and the surrounding Transit Influence Zone (TIZ).

- An ordinance establishing the specific land use regulations for the local TOD area is under consideration by the City Council. In the mean time,
landowners can apply for IPD-T permits to develop property to the extent allowed in the BMX-4 zone.\textsuperscript{26}

- An immediate impact of the rail transit project has been closures of lanes on Farrington Highway during construction. Upon completion of the first phase of the transit project (from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center) and the attraction of riders to board and debark at the two Waipahū stations, it is expected redevelopment will begin to occur around the stations, and continue over decades.

Wahiawā

- Wahiawā has seen little new development since the passage of the Central Oʻahu SCP in late 2002.
- Since 2015, the number of Army active duty soldiers stationed at Schofield Barracks and Fort Shafter has been reduced by over 1,700.\textsuperscript{27}
- Wahiawā General Hospital has sought to develop new facilities at Koa Ridge Makai while operating the existing facility until the new facility is built. The existing facility in Wahiawā, as the largest employer in Wahiawā, is an important institution for the town.
- In 2015, the State High Technology Development Corporation (HTDC) issued a request for proposals for establishment of a geriatric research and technology park in Wahiawā in conjunction with the existing Wahiawā aging and disability resource center, Aged to Perfection.\textsuperscript{28}
- In a discussion of the town’s revitalization, local stakeholders reaffirmed their support for the policies and guidelines for Wahiawā in the Plan.
- A task force from the Wahiawā Community and Business Association submitted an application for parts of the town to be recognized as a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area in 2009 and have formed a

\textsuperscript{26} Ordinance 14-10 applies to parcels of 20,000 square feet or greater, located within a half-mile of a planned rail station, in the State Urban district and with Apartment, Apartment Mixed Use, Business, Business Mixed Use, Resort, Industrial or Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use zones. Once a Neighborhood TOD ordinance is passed for the area, no further IPD-T permits will be issued.

\textsuperscript{27} City and County of Honolulu, \textit{Comprehensive Community Impact Analysis/Assessmentb} (January 2017), p. 2-3. (As of August 2016, eighty percent of the troops stationed at the two bases were at Schofield Barracks.)

Community-Based Development Organization. Goals include economic revitalization and community well-being.  

- Development of an agricultural technology sector based in Wahiawā has been proposed as part of the Whitmore Project. With the purchase of the Galbraith Trust lands north of Wahiawā in 2012, and acquisition of a 29,000 square foot warehouse in Wahiawā and a 24-acre industrial site next to Whitmore Village in 2013, the Agribusiness Development Corporation has begun the process of creating job centers supporting diversified agricultural in Central O‘ahu and on the North Shore.  

- Parking spaces on Kamehameha Highway and ‘Ôhai Street were removed to improve circulation and safety.  

- Parking spaces on California Avenue, which are underutilized most of the day due to the presence of ample off-street parking, are proposed to be removed to accommodate pedestrians and bicycle users.

**Recommendations for Revision to the Plan**

**Waipahū**

- Make support for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in Waipahū a development priority.  

- Incorporate policies and guidelines from the **Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan** into the CO SCP, including policies/guidelines supporting  
  - Mixed use development of the areas within a ¼ mile radius of the two rail stations;

---

29 For further details, see [http://www.orgsites.com/hi/wcba/](http://www.orgsites.com/hi/wcba/).  
33 Honolulu Department of Transportation Services, **Honolulu Complete Streets Implementation Study Location Report: California Avenue From Kamehameha Highway to Wahiawa District Park (Draft II)** (June 2015)  
[https://www.honolulu.gov/rep/site/dts/dts_docs/150918_CSIS_Wahiawa_Draft_v2.pdf](https://www.honolulu.gov/rep/site/dts/dts_docs/150918_CSIS_Wahiawa_Draft_v2.pdf)
• Creation of a network of green spaces, parks, plazas, paths, trails and shaded “complete streets”; and

• Redevelopment of Kapakahi Stream to create a Stream Walk linking the Waipahū Plantation Village to the Waipahū Shoreline Park and Preservation Area.

  o Add support for drainage improvement to reduce the risk of flooding and improve resilience to impacts of flooding for areas near the Waipahū Transit Center Rail Station currently in the 100-year flood way.

Wahiawā

  o Make support for creation of new job centers in Wahiawā and Whitmore Village a development priority.

  o Update policies for Wahiawā calling for:

    • Protection for the historic architectural character of the town;
    
    • Prohibition of urban development of agricultural lands north of Wahiawā; and
    
    • Creation of job centers supporting Central O‘ahu and North Shore diversified agriculture and providing research, technology, and services for age-friendly communities.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

  o Adopt an ordinance establishing the zoning needed to implement the Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan.

  o Explore public/private partnerships to bring about TOD redevelopment in Waipahū.

  o With help from Federal, State and City agencies, assess limits on redevelopment in Waipahū due to flooding, identify opportunities in the watershed to mitigate the problem, and develop a joint response to the problem. Assess whether improvements along the Kapakahi Stream corridor can contribute to flood control and urban redevelopment.

  o Conduct a circulation study for Wahiawā to support commercial tenants and landowners as they renovate their properties.
2.3.4 MANAGING AND MITIGATING THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

2.3.4.1 Infrastructure Concurrency

Issue Analysis

- Many residents of Central O‘ahu and ‘Ewa see new residential development as occurring without adequate investment in infrastructure, especially State highways and schools.

- The 2008 recession affected the pace of development in Central O‘ahu. While residential areas in Mililani Mauka had been built out by 2008, no major new housing subdivision was developed in the region through 2016, giving some breathing room to catch up on infrastructure needs.

- Complaints that critical infrastructure is not being built concurrently with residential developments revolve around problems with transportation capacity and with a lack of permanent classrooms which the DOE meets with temporary classrooms, multi-track scheduling, or busing.

- The City and County has addressed this concern with transportation capacity and lack of permanent classrooms through conditions on zoning, and through regulation of subdivisions and construction and building permits.

- Developers of new projects typically are required to provide significant transportation capacity, both on-site and off-site, and to provide a fair share contribution towards land and construction of new schools as a Unilateral Agreement (UA) condition of their zone change approvals. If the developer cannot show that they are in compliance with the UA condition, subdivision approvals and construction or building permits will not be issued.

- There are not "concurrency" issues with most other infrastructure because City subdivision and building permit processes do not allow development to proceed if the developer cannot show that adequate capacity can be provided. For example, if the Board of Water Supply does not say
adequate water is available for fire suppression and home use, subdivision approvals and building permits will not be approved.

Transportation Capacity Concurrency

- Transportation concurrency problems have resulted when there are gaps in the Central O'ahu roadway system or planned islandwide transportation system capacity is not provided in a timely manner.

- Gaps in the Central O'ahu roadway network are likely if developers must build most of the missing roadway network using conventional project infrastructure financing.

- As each new phase of a project begins, the developer will borrow enough money to build just the portion of the roadway network serving that phase because it would be too risky to borrow the funds for the entire project, since the cash flow needed to repay the financing might be inadequate if the market went bad.

- A Community Facility District which is a special assessment district financed by a special property tax on all the owners within the district can be used to fund key public infrastructure improvements and facilities like the spine roadway system so that they all can be built at the beginning of the project instead of incrementally. (Long-term, fixed-rate, tax-exempt bonds secured by the land within the district are used to raise the needed funds; the bonds are paid off over thirty years by the special property tax.)

- As a condition of zone change approval and/or subdivision approval, DPP can require that, before construction or building permits are issued, developers must provide on- and off-site improvements to address traffic congestion and capacity problems which will be caused by proposed development.

- Through the subdivision approval process, DPP now requires new planned communities to have at least two points of connection to major roadways, attempting to avoid the congestion that occurs when there is only one way in and out.

- As a condition of zone change approval, a new H-2 Freeway interchange is planned for the Pineapple Road Overpass at the northern end of the Koa Ridge Makai master planned community which
will provide an alternative to the Ka Uka Boulevard interchange as an H-2 access and exit.

- For the Waiawa master planned community, a link to Waihona Street in Pearl City would complement access via H-2 at Ka Uka Boulevard. However, the capacity of the Pearl City roadways to handle additional traffic from Central O‘ahu needs study.

  o Problems providing regional and island-wide transportation capacity have also led to lack of concurrency. The on again, off again planning for providing a rapid transit system to serve ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu has resulted in transportation capacity lagging behind residential development approvals.

- Starting in the 1970s, environmental assessments prepared for Council use in deciding whether to approve large residential communities in both ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu assumed that significant capacity for the daily commute would be provided by a rapid transit system running on the corridor between downtown Honolulu and Central O‘ahu and ‘Ewa as was called for in the General Plan and included in the island-wide transportation plans.

  o However, each time the rapid transit projects got to critical points in the approval process, they were abandoned, leaving ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu residents without an alternative to use of the freeways.

  o The State Department of Transportation has faced both funding challenges and legal hurdles as it seeks to reduce congestion on the major highways through roadway and interchange improvements.

**School Permanent Classroom Capacity Concurrency**

  o No new schools have been built in Central O‘ahu since 2002. New schools have been planned for Koa Ridge Makai and Royal Kunia. The DOE’s Leeward O‘ahu Impact Fee will raise part of the funding needed for new schools.

  o For many years, permanent classroom capacity has lagged behind residential development because there has been a persistent shortfall in State appropriations for the Department of Education (DOE) capital improvement program.
• Funds are needed by the DOE for ongoing repair and maintenance of existing facilities, periodic rehabilitation of older facilities, construction of new facilities at existing schools, and meeting the need for new schools. More recently, the need for heat abatement improvements has also emerged.

• For example, in 2009, DOE estimated that the amount needed to meet the Department's infrastructure development, heat abatement, repair and maintenance needs was $573 million.\(^33\)

• The average funding the DOE received from Fiscal Year 2005 through Fiscal Year 2009 was $278 million\(^33\).

• Even with $14 million per year provided by developers and homeowners as part of fair share impact fees, the average shortfall in funding was $283 million\(^33\).

  o Since the 2009 Fiscal Year, the shortfall between the DOE Capital Improvement Program request and the actual appropriation has closed somewhat, averaging around $100 million.\(^34\)

  o Currently, the DOE has funding for designing a new classroom for Mililani Middle School, and will seek funds for construction of a new classroom for Waipahu High School and a new elementary school for Koa Ridge which are in the DOE 2017 Six-Year Capital Improvement Program.\(^35\)

  o The State Board of Education gained legal authority to levy its own impact fees for schools for new developments,\(^36\) and authorized a Leeward O'ahu impact fee in 2012 which covers the Aiea, Pearl City, Waipahu, Campbell and Kapolei complexes.\(^37\) The fee is intended to help develop new schools for Koa Ridge Makai and for Waiawa, as well as in 'Ewa. The fee ($2,141 for single-family units, $1,683 for multifamily units) is collected when

\(^34\) Ibid, p. 32.
\(^36\) Hawaii State Legislature, Act 245 Relating to Education, Session Laws 2007,
\(^37\) The analysis for the fee is posted in the Board of Education minutes for January 17, 2012 as Attachment F: https://lilinote.k12.hi.us/STATE/BOE/Minutes.nsf/ebb43af14ca5cdb30a2565cb006622a8/6101b96969ea9c710a25799f0070c910?OpenDocument
building permits are processed. The Mililani and Leilehua complexes in Central O‘ahu are outside the impact fee district, and not affected by it.

**Recommendations for Revision to the Plan**

**Transportation Capacity Concurrency**

- Transportation capacity currency is called for by the adopted Plan vision and policies; the concurrency problem is not with the Plan but with the challenges of implementation, particularly with financing, incentives, and development regulations and standards.

- Add a vision element calling for completion of the Rail Transit system as critical to providing adequate transportation infrastructure for Leeward O‘ahu, and add construction of the Honolulu Rail Transit project as a Public Facility Investment Priority.

- Add a vision element calling for provision of adequate funding for infrastructure through methods such as Tax Increment Financing and Community Facilities District which provide funding for infrastructure concurrently with, or in advance of, residential and/or commercial development

- Add policy statements calling for
  - Developing the roadway elements and other transportation projects listed in the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan to meet the existing and projected transportation needs in Central O‘ahu;
  - Providing sites for bus transit centers and park-and-ride facilities in new development; and
  - Developing bikeways as indicated in the [Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan](#) and the City’s [O‘ahu Bike Plan](#).

**School Permanent Classroom Capacity Concurrency**

- School permanent classroom capacity currency is called for by the adopted Plan vision and policies; the concurrency problem is not with the Plan, but with the challenges of implementation, particularly with financing, incentives, and development regulations and standards.
Add policy language supporting the DOE’s establishment of impact districts to obtain fair share fees from developers so that the DOE can provide adequate school facilities at new and existing schools to meet the needs of residents.

**Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation**

- Continue to aggressively enforce Unilateral Agreement (UA) conditions requiring provision and/or support of needed infrastructure and public facilities.
- Support creative financing programs like Community Facilities Districts and public-private partnerships as a way of financing critical roadways and transit support infrastructure so that infrastructure is built as new residential, retail and office development is built.
- Study the possibility of using Community Facilities District funding to build permanent classroom capacity in anticipation of legislative appropriations to cover the cost of the new classrooms.

**2.3.4.2 Housing Affordability**

**Issue Analysis**

- The adopted Plan states that one of Central O‘ahu’s key roles is to provide affordable housing both in new master-planned communities, and in the traditional plantation villages as affordable housing for diversified agriculture workers.
- Housing prices on O‘ahu remain high relative to median income, and housing affordability is a continuing problem.  

[citation]

Honolulu has a pent-up demand for housing estimated at 24,000 units. Of this demand, 75 percent is for rentals affordable to those making less than 80% of the median household income.  

[citation]

---

38 City and County of Honolulu, *Housing Oahu: Affordable Housing Strategy Draft for Review and Discussion* (September 8, 2015). pp. 6-7 and p. 10. (More than 60 percent of Honolulu households spend more than the recommended national guideline of 45 percent of income for housing and transportation combined.)
Islandwide annual production of new homes in major residential projects between 2010 and 2015 averaged about 2,100 units. “Most homes were built for higher income households and for-sale units.”

Honolulu has a long established inclusionary zoning policy requiring that 30% of the units in new developments be affordable to low and low-moderate income households. The requirement is established by Council as a condition of zone change approvals.

Since the inclusionary zoning policy was adopted in the 1980s, major private developers have built over 26,250 units in Central O’ahu, of which 7,500 were affordable units required to meet conditions of zoning.

A revision to the policy, applying the policy to all new developments of 10 units or more and mandating that units stay affordable for thirty to sixty years, is currently being proposed.

Transit-oriented development (TOD) projects can help reduce total transportation and housing costs. Catalytic TOD projects will be encouraged to include affordable, workforce and market-rate housing for low- and moderate-income families with incentives based on the number and share of units at affordable prices.

One suggestion for providing more affordable rental housing options is to build smaller units, including “micro-units.” Micro units are generally around 300 square feet and occupied by no more than two persons. Both the State and the City have recently supported micro-unit projects in Kakaako and Chinatown.

**Recommendations for Revision to the Plan**

- Amend the plan to clarify that the vision for provision of affordable housing can be partially achieved though accessory dwelling units and ohana units.

---

42 City and County of Honolulu, *Housing Oahu*, p. 4
43 Ibid., p. 21.
44 Ibid., p. 7.
Strengthen the vision for master-planned communities by stressing the need for them to be complete communities including affordable housing, particularly affordable rental housing for students, families, seniors, and those with special needs.

Add City affordable housing policies and accessory dwelling unit guidelines to the Existing and Planned Residential Communities section.

Add a policy permitting multi-family residential use above the first floor in commercial centers.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

Amend the Land Use Ordinance (LUO) to allow allowing multi-family residential units as a permitted use above the first floor for parcels zoned B-1 or B-2 as a way of supporting place making and increasing the supply of affordable and appropriate housing for seniors and low-income households.

Study amending the LUO to allow micro-units in TOD districts or in other areas where groups with inadequate housing options could use them.

2.3.4.3 Complete Streets and Age-Friendly Communities

Issue Analysis

Complete Streets

“Complete Streets are part of a transportation and design approach that aim to create a comprehensive, integrated network of streets that are safe and convenient for all people whether traveling by foot, bicycle, transit, or automobile, and regardless of age or ability. Complete Streets move away from streets designed with a singular focus on automobiles toward a design approach that is context-sensitive, multi-modal, and integrated with the community's vision and sense of place. The end result is a road
network that provides safe travel, promotes public health, and creates stronger communities.\(^{45}\)

- In 2009, the State passed legislation requiring the counties to adopt Complete Streets policies.\(^{46}\) In 2012, the City adopted the Complete Streets Ordinance\(^{47}\) and began a study of how to implement the ordinance. As part of the study, the City identified sixteen sites around the island for an in-depth study to illustrate how the Complete Streets concept can be applied to a specific location. Central O‘ahu street sites chosen included streets in Waipahū, Wahiawā, and Mililani.\(^{48}\)

- In 2016, the City and County of Honolulu finalized its Complete Streets Design Manual and hired a Complete Streets Program Administrator to move toward implementation of improvements that make Honolulu’s streets and neighborhoods safe and inviting for all users, regardless of age or ability.\(^{49}\)

- The term “Safe Routes to School” was first used in Denmark in the late 1970s as part of a very successful initiative to reduce the number of children killed while walking and bicycling to school. Safe Routes to School spread internationally, with programs springing up throughout Europe and in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.\(^{50}\) It is supported in Hawaii by both State and City programs.

- As part of the Complete Streets program, the City has supported complete streets and safe paths to schools, mandating that roadway design and maintenance accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic as well as motor vehicles.

---


\(^{46}\) The State Legislature passed Act 54 in 2009, directing the State Department of Transportation and county agencies to “seek to reasonably accommodate convenient access and mobility for all users of the public highways.”

\(^{47}\) Honolulu Ordinance 12-15, “Every transportation facility or project, whether new construction, reconstruction, or maintenance, provides the opportunity to implement complete streets policy and principles. This policy provides that a context sensitive solution process and multi-modal approach be considered in all planning documents and for the development of all city transportation facilities and projects.”


\(^{49}\) Ibid.

In response to suggestions in 2004 from national experts on smart growth practices, the City studied how connectivity among subdivisions and other urban areas in ‘Ewa could reduce traffic congestion, and promote walking, bicycle riding, and transit use. The terrain in Central O’ahu makes connectivity more challenging than in ‘Ewa, but opportunities for improved connectivity, both within and between subdivisions, are been considered in the review and approval of master roadway plans for new subdivisions.

Age-Friendly City

- The Hawai‘i population is aging “at a faster pace than the rest of the nation.” Between 2010 and 2040, Hawai‘i’s population 65 years and older will increase 104%, compared with . . . total population increase of 28% over the same period.

- In 2006, the World Health Organization launched its Age-Friendly Cities and Communities Program, an international effort to help cities prepare for rapid population aging and the parallel trend of urbanization.

- In 2013, the City and County of Honolulu applied for and was accepted into the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities and AARP’s National Network of Age-Friendly Communities.

- Starting in 2013, the Age-Friendly Initiative process brought together experts and community members to prepare an Action Plan to make Honolulu age-friendly. The Plan, which was finalized in 2015, addresses six areas of focus, including:
  - Outdoor Spaces and Buildings;
  - Transportation;

---

51 DPP. *Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study* (2009)
52 Honolulu’s Age-Friendly City Initiative, *Making Honolulu an Age-Friendly City: An Action Plan* (June 2015), p. ix. Since 2015, the Honolulu’s Age-Friendly City Initiative organization has re-named itself Age-Friendly Honolulu.
54 The World Health Organization has championed the notion of Age-Friendly Communities and organized a Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities, as described at [http://www.who.int/ageing/age_friendly_cities_network/en/](http://www.who.int/ageing/age_friendly_cities_network/en/).
• Housing;
• Communication and Social Involvement;
• Civic Participation and Employment; and
• Community Support and Health Services.\textsuperscript{56}

The Age-Friendly City Action Plan provides a vision and goals for each of the focus areas that would make each more accessible to persons of all ages. For example, recreational facilities and infrastructure that were designed to meet the needs of young families in the past may need modifications to better meet the needs of senior citizens. Seniors who want to continue to stay in their own homes rather than move to a care home—“aging in place”—may need home modifications, mobile services, and community support.

Many of the goals concern land use and infrastructure planning, design, and regulation, including the following: \textsuperscript{57}

• Implementing Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in outdoor spaces;
• Maximizing wayfinding and accessibility in parks;
• Increasing pedestrian and bicycle safety;
• Planning sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, and bike lanes in new communities to accommodate the entire population, including senior citizens;
• Considering seniors’ access to park spaces as part of community design;
• Streamlining the processing of home modification permits;
• Incorporating age-friendly design in new housing communities and units;

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Ibid.}, p. x. The process included community meetings and task forces to deal with specific issues (transportation, housing, civic participation, etc.). The City’s goals and process are posted at \url{www.kupunatokeiki.com}.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Ibid.}, p. xi to xviii.
• Allowing and supporting inclusion of Accessory Dwelling Units and micro-units suitable for older persons in new housing communities; and

• Supporting a variety of housing types, such as co-housing, which can include seniors in larger communities

Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Incorporate Complete Streets policies and guidelines in policies and/or guidelines for Waipahū, Wahiawā, Existing and Planned Residential Communities, Planned Commercial Retail Centers, and Transportation Systems.

- Include support for planning and implementation of Age Friendly Community goals, including supporting inclusion of Accessory Dwelling Units in new housing communities, and supporting a variety of housing types which can include seniors in larger communities.

- Add a Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes policy calling for use of environmental design to reduce crime and encourage “positive interactions” among park users.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- Study changes in the LUO and other regulations to facilitate seniors’ access to park and other community facilities, streamline processing of permits for home modifications needed to allow seniors to live at home longer, encourage incorporation of age-friendly design in new housing communities and units, and support seniors’ active involvement in their community.

2.3.4.4 Place Making

Issue Analysis

- The 2002 Plan vision emphasizes that new developments should be well designed, livable communities with centers accessible to pedestrians and bicycle riders, not just sprawling suburban residential projects.
With support from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, a team of nationally renowned developers and experts in urban planning, architecture, transportation planning and urban economics visited Honolulu in 2004 to conduct workshops and provide evaluations and recommendations for improving Honolulu planning.\(^{58}\)

- The team recommended that the City focus on place making in villages and neighborhoods because they felt the current development practices were producing "a 'place-less' suburban development pattern lacking urban amenities" and "neighborhood-serving commercial districts," characterized by "small automobile-oriented commercial sites ... at occasional major intersections throughout the area."\(^{59}\)

- The team saw the need to encourage "a close-knit, mixed-use pattern" of land uses\(^{60}\) in "key locations —such as Village Centers, . . ., and . . . sites along current and proposed transit routes"\(^{61}\)

- To make these places successful, the team recommended adoption of standards, "either through an update of the Subdivision Regulations or through design guidelines, [to] support a vibrant pedestrian environment."\(^{62}\)

- DPP has urged developers to create Main Streets and develop mixed-use community centers in their projects.

- Castle & Cooke has submitted plans for Koa Ridge Makai that respects this vision. The Master Plan for Koa Ridge includes a Village Center surrounding a Village Green.\(^{63}\)

- The **Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan** vision supports place making, calling for creating a "Mixed-use Village-like setting in the core areas" around the two rail stations in Waipahū.\(^{64}\)

---

61 **Ibid.**, p. 2
62 **Ibid.**, p. 6.
Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Strengthen the vision for master planned communities by adding language stressing the importance of each community having a central gathering place, and add policies to the residential and commercial center sections calling for identifying and creating a central gathering place or center as part of the development.

- Incorporate the Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan place making policies in the Waipahū Town section.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- Study how the development process standards and regulations can be changed to encourage or require large developments to be designed with a specified "Main Street", "Town Center" or community center which is pedestrian friendly and accessible from surrounding residential areas.
  Desirable features include:
  
  - Placing buildings along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage up to the build-to line as shown in Exhibit 2-1;
  
  - Hiding most parking behind the buildings so that a pedestrian friendly environment is created along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage; and
  
  - Building the first floors of buildings along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage to allow commercial uses.

---

2.3.5 COORDINATING CITY LAND USE PLANS AND USES ON U.S. MILITARY LANDHOLDINGS

**Issue Analysis**

Support for military-related employment in Central O‘ahu

- The 2002 *Oahu General Plan* (GP) calls for encouraging “the continuation of a significant level of Federal employment on Oahu.” More specifically for Central O‘ahu, the GP calls for encouraging “the continuation of a high level of military-related employment in the . . . Wahiawa . . . areas.”

---

Military bases in the region include, from south to north, Navy lands at Waipiʻo Point that are part of the Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Wheeler Army Airfield, Schofield Barracks and the Naval Communications and Telecommunications Master Station (NCTAMS) Pacific at Wahiawā. The Army also leases large areas in Central Oʻahu for training.

**Buffers around military areas in Central Oʻahu**

- The 2002 *Central Oʻahu Sustainable Communities Plan* calls for creation of adequate buffers between the training areas surrounding Schofield Barracks/Wheeler Army Airfield and adjacent residential areas.
- The U.S. Army has been concerned to assure that it has enough land for operations, and addressed this concern by buying 1,400 acres immediately south of Schofield Barracks which is used for training.
- In addition, the Army formed a joint venture with Actus Lend Lease, and bought 1,220 acres southwest of Schofield Barracks from the James Campbell Companies in 2006. While a portion of the land may eventually be used for family housing, it is currently available for agriculture.
- The U.S. Army has further acted to limit potential conflicts between military activities and nearby urban development by contributing to the State’s purchase of the Galbraith Estate Trust lands.

**Non-conforming Uses Created by Leases of Military Lands**

- The 2002 *Plan* calls for “the major natural gulches [in Central Oʻahu to]... be retained as flood plains and open space resources” and states that “further development of ... industrial uses within the gulches should be avoided.”\(^{66}\)
- In 2003, Navy lands in Waikele Gulch and on the Waikele Gulch bluff were leased with an option to buy to the Hunt Companies’ subsidiary, Ford Island Ventures (FIV), in exchange for Hunt’s redevelopment of Ford Island.
  - Starting in 2004, FIV began leasing 128 bunkers and 3 outdoor storage areas in the gulch for a variety of uses that were not consistent with the P-2 general preservation district standards that are supposed to be

\(^{66}\) Department of Planning and Permitting, *Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan* (December 2002), p. 4-25.
applied to F-1 zoned lands when they are no longer under Federal control.

- By 2008, FIV had 99% of the areas in the Gulch under lease, and had converted the area to a “thriving commercial/industrial storage and self-storage park.”

- In 2010, in response to a Notice of Violation issued by the Department, FIV obtained a letter from the Navy which asserted that, although the Gulch lands were being leased and used by FIV for non-DOD activities, the lands were exempt from local land use planning and regulation because they were still owned by the Navy.

- In 2011, an explosion in one bunker, used by a firm that disposed of confiscated fireworks, caused the death of five workers.

- On July 14, 2014, the Navy conveyed the land to Ford Island Properties in fee. FIV staff agreed, in meetings with the Department, that they needed to conform to City regulations. The Department told FIV that portions of the site which had been used for storage purposes or office uses by the Navy could continue to be used as non-conforming uses under the use regulations of the P-2 General Preservation District.

- In 2016, Peter Savio’s Kipapa SPE, LLC acquired FIV’s interest in Waikele Gulch and created a leasehold condominium project in the Gulch, the Waikele Storage Park, consisting of 127 bunker units and 76 storage site units covering the bunker, office, and outdoor storage areas previously allowed by the Department as non-conforming uses.

- Over the course of discussions and communications during 2016 and 2017, representatives of Kipapa SPE, LLC indicated that they may wish to eventually pursue zoning to allow industrial uses in the Gulch and remove the non-conforming use status of their existing industrial uses. Before an application for such zoning could be processed, Council would have to approve amendment of the CO SCP, and the

---


Land Use Commission would have to approve a State Land Use District Boundary Amendment from the Agricultural District to the Urban District.

Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Add a policy supporting a high level of military-related employment in Central O’ahu, as called for in the O’ahu General Plan.
- Add a policy clarifying that the purpose of providing policies and guidelines for military areas in Central O’ahu is to inform the Department of Defense and to request their cooperation with and support of the City’s land use plans within the limits set by the military mission.
- Add a policy clarifying that the City’s position is that private users leasing Federal owned lands for purposes unrelated to Federal government or military uses should be consistent with the Central O’ahu Sustainable Communities Plan and in compliance with the Land Use Ordinance.

2.3.6 ENSURING TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ADEQUACY

Issue Analysis

- The 2002 Plan calls for provision of “adequate capacity for peak-hour commuting to work in the Primary Urban Center,” reduction in “reliance on the private passenger vehicle,” and meeting “projected demand for peak-hour transportation in Central Oahu” . . . [by] increased use of transit” and “transportation demand management.”

- Since 2003, improved express bus service and the Zipper Lane have provided alternatives for the commute to and from downtown Honolulu, but the quality of travel to and from town has not improved for most commuters. Construction of freeway improvements and the rail transit elevated guideway have added to the congestion delays and uncertainties experienced by commuters.

---

69 DPP, Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan (December 2002), pp. 4-12 to 13
Rail Transit

- Construction of the rail transit system elevated guideway from Kualaka’i Parkway in Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center began in 2013. The first ten miles of elevated guideway from East Kapolei to Aloha Stadium will be finished in May 2017. Construction of the next segment from Aloha Stadium to Middle Street is expected to begin in 2017.  

- Completion of the rail transit system from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center will provide an effective alternative to commuting by auto for a significant number of commuters from Leeward O’ahu and the North Shore.

  - The system will have the capacity to carry 8,650 passengers per hour. (And if that is not sufficient, the system capacity could be increased by adding more cars to each train, and by reducing the time between trains.)

  - In contrast, automobiles traveling to Honolulu in 1988 carried an average of 1.28 persons per car, which is probably still a reasonable estimate of the average number of persons per car. At that rate, it would take over 6,700 cars to carry the same number of passengers as the train will be able to carry.

  - Not only will the rail transit system provide ample capacity for Central O’ahu commuters, it will also complete the trip from either the Waipahū stations or the Pearl Highland station to Ala Moana Shopping Center significantly faster than the equivalent commute by the auto on the freeway, and will be much more reliable since it will travel on its own

---

72 Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation, Rail Facts, FAQ (Feb. 28, 2017) states that four-car 'trains will arrive at stations about every five minutes during peak travel times, and about every 11 minutes during non-peak times.” See http://www.honolulutransit.org/inform/rail-facts?catid=0
73 Honolulu, Honolulu High Capacity Transit EIS., p. 3-9.
74 Time from station to Ala Moana Shopping Center for West Loch Station (34 minutes), for Waipahū Transit Center Station (31 minutes), and for Pearl Highlands (28 minutes). See Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation, Interactive Route Map (Feb. 28, 2017), https://www.honolulutransit.org/ride/route-map
separate guideway and will not be subject to the delays caused by accidents on the freeway.

- When the rail system opens, City bus services will be re-organized to encourage use of buses as circulators to and from the rapid transit line.

- As noted below, requests have been made to extend the rail fixed guideway from Pearl City to Mililani. That option is being evaluated by the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Central Oahu Transportation Study.\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{Transit Centers}

- Since 2002, Bus Transit Centers have been created in Waipahu (2004), Mililani (2007), and Wahiawa (2012).

- The Waipahu Bus Transit Center serves routes to and from ‘Ewa, Waipahu and associated subdivisions, along with upland Central O‘ahu communities. It is adjacent to the future site of the Waipahu Transit Center Rail Station at the intersection of Farrington Highway and Mokuola Street.

- In addition, new bus transit centers will be created in association with the West Loch Rail Station (in Waipahu at the intersection of Farrington Highway and Leoku Street) and the Pearl Highlands Rail Station.\textsuperscript{76}

- A “flyover” linking the Pearl Highlands rail station park-and-ride and bus transit center to the Express Lane of the H-2 freeway will be built as part of the contract for construction of the Pearl Highlands rail station parking garage, and bus transit center. The flyover will provide access to the Rail Station and the rail system for residents traveling by auto or bus from Central O‘ahu and North Shore communities.\textsuperscript{77}

\textbf{Transportation Project Planning and Finance}

- Since 2002, the DOT has sought to improve traffic flow and relieve congestion on State roadways in Central O‘ahu.


\textsuperscript{77} Communications with Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation staff, April 2017. The contract for the Pearl Highlands station parking garage and associated features, including the flyover, will be let once funding for completion of the rail system has been resolved.
• Work on H-1 and H-2 between Central O‘ahu and Honolulu has included widening to create additional lanes.

• On older roadways, congestion and safety issues have been recognized for narrow stretches and bridges, notably at:
  ▪ Kamehameha Highway over Kipapa Gulch; and
  ▪ Both the north and south entries to Wahiawā. (Repairs to the Karsten Thot Bridge, which provides the northern entry to Wahiawā, began in 2015, and were to be completed by December 201678).

  o Funds for road transportation projects are limited in Hawai‘i and nationwide. Federal and state funding depends on gasoline taxes. Because tax rates have not increased while fuel efficiency has improved and gasoline consumption consequently declined, revenues have not kept up with roadway usage wear and tear, and increased costs of road repair and construction. This shortfall has constrained the number of projects that can be funded.

  o As part of the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan (ORTP) process, requests have been made to address traffic congestion and access problems in Central O‘ahu by building a Central Mauka Road (running from Wahiawā to Mililani Mauka to Pearl City, in one version)79 or extending the rail system fixed guideway from Pearl City to Mililani80. (Projects must be included in the ORTP to be eligible for Federal funding.)

  o Although the projects have been included in the ORTP, neither have been approved for funding because they were listed either as “unfunded illustrative projects” which could be added to the ORTP projects if future funding became available, or as long range projects expected to be funded ten to 24 years in the future.

  o In response to the requests for the Central Mauka Road and extension of the rail system to Central O‘ahu, the O‘ahu Metropolitan Planning

---

78 See http://www.rrkarstenthot.com/
80 See “illustrative” project 80 in OMPO, Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035 (2011), p. 27, and “illustrative” project 754 in OMPO, Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2040 (2016), p. 39.
Organization is currently conducting the Central Oahu Transportation Study, a study of multi-modal transportation needs of the region, to identify transportation improvements strategies and improvements that are financially feasible and sustainable.\textsuperscript{81}

**Alternative Access Road to Wai’anae from Central O’ahu**

- Wai’anae currently suffers the consequence of having only one way in out via Farrington Highway. Traffic accidents and police or fire emergencies, especially during peak commute hours, can cause length delays for residents.

- Development of an alternative access route for Wai’anae (linking Wai’anae to Central O’ahu by a road over Kolekole Pass in the Wai’anae Mountains through Schofield Barracks and connecting to Kunia Road) has been included as a project in the ORTP since 2001. However, the listings have not resulted in Federal and local funding for the project because it has been listed either as “illustrative” or as long range project that would be begun until ten or more years in the future.\textsuperscript{82}

- The proposed route follows the route of an emergency bypass road that was operational until 2011. That route passed through Navy land in Lualualei used in part for ammunition storage, up a Kolekole Pass Road through Army lands used for training at Schofield Barracks, and out one of the Schofield gates to Kunia Road.

- In 2011, heavy rains made the road completely impassible. Since then, a prefabricated Bailey bridge, obtained with federal funds, was installed over the most eroded area. Even with this improvement, the Navy views the Kolekole Pass Road as in very poor condition, and does not use it.\textsuperscript{83}

- A Memorandum of Agreement between the State of Hawai’i, the Navy and the Army established procedures to open the Kolekole Pass route for one-way traffic by light vehicles (i.e., automobiles and pickup trucks) in the case of emergency conditions resulting from a disaster like a tsunami or a

---


\textsuperscript{83} Personal communication, Victor Flint, Community Planning & Liaison Officer, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam Facility Board Office, May 6, 2014.
hurricane in Wai’anae. A revised Memorandum of Agreement has been drafted, but is still being reviewed by the State. A key issue is liability in the event of accident. Responsibility for maintenance and monitoring any traffic allowed on the road also needs to be considered.

- The City and County Department of Emergency Management would support revisions to the Memorandum of Agreement to allow some emergency vehicles (e.g., ambulances and light fire trucks) on the road, along with additional improvements to make it passable. However, costly additional improvements to the Kolekole Pass Road would be needed before civilian traffic could be allowed by the Navy, even in emergency conditions.  

- Since the Navy and Army do not need to use the road to carry out their missions, any improvements to make the road even minimally usable in an emergency would not be funded from their budgets.

- If the Wai’anae Coast population is isolated by the impacts of a disaster on Farrington Highway in the Kahe Point area, no workable procedure is currently in place to reach the population of Wai’anae, evacuate those in need, and supply relief supplies or personnel.

**Bikeways**

- **The O'ahu Bike Plan** identifies an extensive network of lanes, paths and routes for O’ahu, including Central O’ahu, which would support the vision of creating communities that encourage walking and biking as alternatives to using automobiles. Proposed bike facilities would add over 400 miles to the existing 130 miles of bikeways on O’ahu. Seventy one miles of new facilities are planned for Central O’ahu.  

- The State Department of Transportation is responsible for development of the Leeward Bikeway. When completed, it will extend from the end of the city’s Pearl Harbor Bike Path to Nānākuli. The first phase, which has been

---

84 In addition, the State Department of Transportation has analyzed the potential additional traffic from Wai'anae on the access road if regular non-emergency civilian traffic was allowed on Kolekole Pass Road and determined it would be enough to make it necessary to widen Kunia Road from Schofield Barracks to H-1 – an additional cost that would need to be considered in the decision whether to make Kolekole Pass Road usable again. OahuMPO, ORTP 2040 (2016), Projects 702 and 708, p. 38  

planned and designed and has funding appropriated for construction will extend from the Waipiʻo Point Access road to the Hawaiian Railway Society Train Station near ʻEwa Plantation Villages. The second phase will extend on from the Hawaiian Railway Society Train Station to Lualualei Naval Road in Nānākuli. 86

Recommendations for Revision to the Plan

- Add visions statements emphasizing the importance of
  - Reducing automobile use and congestion by providing connectivity within and between communities;
  - Seamlessly integrating bus service with rail service using local shuttles and bus rapid transit to connect Central Oʻahu communities and rail stations; and
  - Completing the Rail Transit System from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center.

- Add policies supporting:
  - Provision of pedestrian pass-throughs or mid-block cross walks if possible where blocks exceed 350 feet on a side;
  - Requiring master roadway plans to provide transit access for commercial developments with more than 10 workers; and
  - Requiring provision of sites for bus transit centers and park-and-ride facilities in new developments.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

- Support development of the mid-range and long-range projects for Central Oʻahu identified in the Oʻahu Regional Transportation Plan 2040.

- Support development and maintenance of Central Oʻahu bikeway projects identified in the 2012 Oʻahu Bike Plan.

Support development of the Waianae Alternate Access Road, at least to allow emergency supply and transport.

2.3.7 IMPROVING RESILIENCY AND CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION

Issue Analysis

- Since 2002, as noted by the American Planning Association, a series of disastrous events, including hurricanes Katrina and Sandy and the Tahoku earthquake and tsunami in Japan, have shown the importance for “communities to incorporate an awareness of their hazards into their long term planning” and “to anticipate and plan for potential disasters [because] land-use choices greatly affect the outcomes with their resulting losses of lives and property.”

- The reason for incorporating disaster preparedness and mitigation into land use planning is that, by preparing for potential disasters, adapting to changing conditions like climate change, and anticipating and planning for recovery, the community can become more resilient, recovering more quickly and in ways that are better and smarter that before. This approach to planning has been termed “community resilience planning.”

- There is no discussion of resiliency planning in the 2002 Plan beyond the Sec. 4.8 Public Safety Facilities policy calling for adequate staffing and facilities needed to ensure public safety.

- In 2012, the Department of Emergency Management prepared a Multi-Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan which identifies the significant natural hazards for O’ahu, assessed the relative severity of the hazards, and proposed 46 mitigation projects to improve O’ahu’s resilience, including:

---

• Incorporation of “natural hazard policies [in] . . . the General Plan & Community Development Plans.”  

• Retrofitting “public shelter buildings to increase capacity” to withstand hurricanes;  

• Refining “actual [hurricane] evacuation demand and [updating] . . . policies to decrease sheltering deficit;” and  

• Providing “incentives for homeowners and businesses to retrofit their structures” to protect against hurricanes.  

o It is prudent to require adequate proximity to Outdoor Warning Sirens, and the provision of safe and effective emergency evacuation routes and access to emergency shelters as a condition of approval for any new development or redevelopment.  

Climate Change  

o The 2002 Plan does not include any policies or guidelines concerning how land use or infrastructure plans should adapt to the impact of climate change, including changing exposure to hazards.  

o Climate change is projected to impact O'ahu in a variety of ways, including:  

• Increased and hotter heat waves;  

• Changes in rainfall patterns that will result in longer dry seasons and more intense rainstorms;  

• Reductions in crop yields due to temperature changes, drought, and pests;  

• Increased threats to ecosystems due to invasive species, spread of tropical diseases, reef bleaching and ocean acidification;  

\[89\] Honolulu Department of Emergency Management, Multi-Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan for the City & County of Honolulu (August 2, 2012), p. xxiii.  

\[90\] Ibid., p. xxiv.  

\[91\] Ibid.  

\[92\] Ibid.  

\[93\] Ibid., p. 19-14.
• an increase in the number of high intensity storms with more intense rainfall and higher wind speeds; and
• increased coastal flooding, groundwater inundation, and erosion due to sea level rise.\textsuperscript{94}

Sea Level Rise

o Sea level rise due to climate change is likely to have a major impact on shoreline areas on Oahu in the future. Sea level rise in Hawaii by 2100 is quite likely to be at least 1.6 feet higher than 1992 levels, and there is a significant chance that it will be four feet higher, according to a recent report by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration\textsuperscript{95}.

o The result of this sea level rise will be to cause:

• Coastal erosion for shorelines that are not armored or composed of rock;
• Increased flooding due to
  ▪ Groundwater inundation in areas below sea level,
  ▪ Permanent marine flooding of areas with a direct connection to the ocean, and
  ▪ Episodic flooding due to annual high tides and wave conditions; and
• Increased risk of episodic destructive flooding due to hurricane storm surge or tsunamis.\textsuperscript{96}

o Since 2013, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (US ACE) has been requiring that all US ACE projects for O'ahu be designed, built, and


\textsuperscript{95} National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States (NOAA Technical Report NOS CO-OPS 083, January 2017), p. 22 (probabilities) and pp. 29-31 (regional sea level projections for Hawaii and Pacific Islands).

\textsuperscript{96} Dr. Chip Fletcher, Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Hawai'i’s Changing Climate, Center for Island Climate Adaptation and Policy Briefing Sheet, 2010, p. 4.
operated in ways that take into account a possible future rise in sea levels between 1.6 feet and 4.9 feet by 2100.\textsuperscript{97}

- A team from the University of Hawaii School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology (UH SOEST) is modeling and preparing mappings of the impact of three feet of sea level rise (SLR) on statewide coastal flooding and erosion as part of a report to the 2018 State Legislature from the State’s Inter-agency Climate Adaptation Committee.\textsuperscript{98} Preliminary mappings suggest three feet of SLR would cause significant impacts from permanent and episodic flooding, groundwater inundation, and coastal erosion and beach loss. \textsuperscript{99}

- Under a Department of Planning and Permitting contract, University of Hawai‘i experts have conducted studies of historical coastal erosion at sandy beaches around the island. The studies could provide a historic basis for establishing setbacks for new coastal developments based on the likelihood of coastal erosion impacting structures during their typical life, as has been done by the counties of Kauai and Maui\textsuperscript{100}.

- It is prudent to assess the potential risk of SLR for O‘ahu coastlines, to set up systems to monitor SLR, and to design projects and buildings to take the risk of flooding and coastal erosion due to SLR into account.

- Central O‘ahu’s exposure to the risk of coastal flooding and erosion caused by SLR will be along the Pearl Harbor shoreline where the threat would primarily be to recreational areas and pathways, wildlife habitat, and to City, State, and Federal facilities.


\textsuperscript{98} Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, Hawaii Climate Adaptation Portal, Archives, January 7, 2017 Workshop, ICAC Workshop II Session 1, Dr. Chip Fletcher. \url{http://climateadaptation.hawaii.gov/january-2017-workshop/}

\textsuperscript{99} For illustration of impacts on low-lying areas on O‘ahu, see \url{http://www.soest.hawaii.edu/coasts/sealevel/index.html}.

\textsuperscript{100} Charles Fletcher, et. al., \textbf{Living on the Shores of Hawaii: Natural Hazards, the Environment, and Our Communities} (University of Hawaii Press, 2010), Chapter 10: Beach Erosion and Loss, p. 252.
Changes in Rainfall Patterns

- The Board of Water Supply (BWS) 2016 Water Master Plan notes that historically, “Hawaii has seen an overall decline in rainfall of 13 percent in the last 90 years, and an even steeper decline of 23 percent in the last 30 years.” 101

- The BWS Master Plan also notes that “Climate change has the potential to affect the availability of water supply as rainfall and temperature patterns change in the future.” 102 Among the findings reported are that:
  
  - Average annual temperatures for Oahu are projected to be three to five degrees higher by 2100;
  
  - Projections of changes to total rainfall are uncertain, ranging from a two-percent decline to a four-percent increase by 2100; and
  
  - There is agreement that
    - Existing wet areas will get wetter and dry areas dryer;
    - Periods of drought will lengthen due to higher temperatures; and
    - Rainfall intensity will increase, causing increased flash flooding and runoff to the ocean and reduction in aquifer recharge. 103

- The BWS 2007 Central O’ahu Watershed Study notes that “urban contaminants such as metal and sediment are being discharged into storm drain systems, streams, and the receiving waters of Pearl Harbor and fringing wetlands.” 104 These contaminants and pollutants adversely impact aquatic life and wetland habitat of endangered birds, reduce the capacity of drainage systems, and require expensive dredging of Pearl Harbor and stream mouths. 105

- The projected increase in high intensity storms and flash flooding due to climate change will increase the amounts of these “non-point”

---

102 Ibid.
103 Ibid.
105 Ibid., p. 4-36.
pollutants carried by storm waters downstream and into Pearl Harbor and surrounding wetlands.

- Recommendations for ways of reducing the non-point pollutants and sedimentation include:
  - Reduction of stream erosion;
  - Reduction of sediment volumes through replanting of forests with native species;
  - Creation of vegetated buffers around streams;
  - Control of storm flows and contaminants from impervious surfaces, including roads and highways, through Low Impact Development (LID) designs.

- The BWS CO Watershed Study notes flooding problems for low-lying parts of Waipahu and recommends “drainage improvements at chronic flooding sites and restriction of development within floodways and gulches.”

**Hurricane Shelter Shortage**

- According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, “Most of the existing residential structures on Oahu are under-designed for high wind, depending on their construction type and topographic location. High expected wind losses on Oahu make tropical cyclones the hazard of greatest risk.”

- As reported in a recent Hawaii Business article, “Hawaii’s current building code does not require construction that could withstand a storm as powerful as Hurricane Iniki. . . . Even more worrisome is that many homes constructed under older codes are even less wind resistant.”

---

106 Ibid., pp. 2-122 to 123; pp. 4-12 for LID; p. 4-38 for stream erosion and sediment controls; and p. 4-46 for riparian buffer zones;
109 Noelle Fuji, “Storm Warning,” *Hawaii Business* (September 2016). Article notes that Hurricane Iniki had gusts of up to 175 mph, that some new homes are built to withstand gusts of only up to 100
FEMA also concluded that “For wind hazard, medical facilities and school buildings [on O’ahu] used as tropical cyclone shelters are indicated to be at highest risk of the individual facilities modeled. Basically all essential facilities are expected to lose functionality for some period of time in the event of a Category 2 hurricane . . .. Average time of inoperability may range from 3-4 months.”

There is a shortage of public emergency shelter space in Central O’ahu to shelter the 30 percent share of the population expected to seek public shelter during a major hurricane.\textsuperscript{110} \textsuperscript{112}

In addition, as noted above, most existing shelters, principally school facilities like gyms and cafeterias, were not built with the secure roofs or window protection needed to withstand the wind pressure and flying debris caused by a Category 3 hurricane (sustained winds of 111-130 mph), and many would be unsafe even with a Category 1 hurricane (sustained winds of 74 to 95 mph).\textsuperscript{113}

- For comparison, Hurricane ‘Iwa was a Category 1 hurricane with peak winds of 90 mph on its closest approach to Kaua’i\textsuperscript{114}
- Hurricane ‘Iniki was a Category 4 hurricane with peak winds of 145 mph when it made landfall on Kaua’i).\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid. p. 105.
\textsuperscript{111} For share of public likely to seek shelter during the storm in event of a major hurricane, see City and County of Honolulu, \textbf{Emergency Operations Plan} (January 12, 2007), Annex T, Appendix 1, p. 5, 9.
\textsuperscript{112} In Central O’ahu, 23 public emergency shelters were reported by the Department of Emergency Management to have capacity for 50,000 people in 2009, based on 10 square feet (s.f.) per person. (At the more preferable standard of 15 s.f. per person used in the current building code, that capacity would be reduced to 33,300. The resident population in 2010 was 168,643, according to the Census. The share of the population expected to need public shelters -- 30\% of residents -- was 50,593 in 2010.
\textsuperscript{113} The current building code calculates capacity of shelters on a 15 square feet/person basis. The State will calculate potential shelter occupancy for buildings erected since the current code was adopted on this basis (Phone conversation, Steve Yoshimura, State Civil Defense, May 6, 2014).
\textsuperscript{114} Telephone interview with Gary Y.K. Chock, President, Martin & Chock, July 22, 2010.
\textsuperscript{115} National Weather Service, Central Pacific Hurricane Center, \textbf{The 1982 Central Pacific Tropical Cyclone Season}.
\textsuperscript{116} National Weather Service, Central Pacific Hurricane Center, \textbf{Hurricane ‘Iniki Natural Disaster Survey Report}. 
• In some cases, shelter managers are able to shelter people in classrooms such as music classrooms or other rooms which offer protection against flying debris and have been built to withstand wind damage.

• The latest State building code requires all new State and City public buildings which could serve as public shelters to be built to withstand a Category 3 Hurricane.\textsuperscript{116}

  o Tropical cyclone activity near Hawaii is expected to significantly increase in the future as a result of climate change\textsuperscript{117}, resulting in greater exposure to the hazards of damage, injury, and loss of life from hurricane strength winds.

  o Some funding for improvements to shelter have been appropriated, but much more is needed to retrofit existing shelters to meet the FEMA standard of being able to withstand a Category 3 hurricane.\textsuperscript{118}

• The State has been making improvements to existing school assembly areas, following an agreement among the State Department of Education, the Department of Accounting and General Services, and the Civil Defense Division of the State Department of Defense.

• While such improvements will make these facilities more suitable as shelters, none of the parties involved has committed to raise shelters statewide to a standard such as the Building Code’s minimum life safety design criteria for enhanced protection areas. These include structural criteria, protection from wind-borne missiles, provision of emergency generators, and other items.

  o Most of the public is not expected to go to a public shelter. Civil Defense agencies do encourage the public to shelter at home if adequate shelter is provided.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{116} The City and County Building Code now includes this provision in Section.16-14.3c (per Ordinance 12-34).
\textsuperscript{118} FEMA, Safe Rooms for Tornadoes and Hurricanes: Guidance for Community and Residential Safe Rooms, FEMA P-361, Third Edition (March 2015), Figure A2-3, p. A2-7. FEMA describes their standard as providing “a very high probability of (occupants of the shelter) being protected from injury or death.”
Revisions to the State Building Code which took effect in May 2011 call for all new homes in areas susceptible to damage from wind borne debris to either have “impact resistant window protection for all exterior windows” or a "Residential Safe Room.”

Incentives for individual home owners and community associations to retrofit structures to “reduce susceptibility to high wind storms” and build private shelters in homes or community association buildings would help reduce the pressure on the public shelters.

- In the past the State has provided financial support for such shelters.
- Kaua’i provides tax breaks for owners who build a safe room at home.

Climate Change Impacts on Water Supplies

Climate change is expected to change rainfall patterns which may lead to longer periods of drought and more intense rainstorms. Overall rainfall may not decrease, but higher rainstorm intensity may lead to less aquifer recharge and increased pollution of streams and coastal waters.

These impacts of climate change make water conservation, water reclamation, protection of aquifer recharge, storm water retention, and aquifer, stream and coastal water quality protection more urgent.

Use of low impact development practices for new developments or redevelopment of existing structures can help promote groundwater recharge and reduce pollution of streams and coastal waters by requiring

---

119 Telephone conversation with State Civil Defense staff, July 22, 2009.
122 Hawai‘i State Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs Insurance Division, Loss Mitigation Grant Program Report (December 2009).
123 Dennis J. Hwang and Darren K. Okimoto, Homeowner’s Handbook To Prepare for Natural Hazards (University of Hawai‘i Sea Grant Program: June 2007), p. 73.
holding the most frequent storm’s rainfall on site and filtering the water before it flows off site.\textsuperscript{124}

- Use of low impact development practices can also help conserve potable water by encouraging capturing and storing storm water for irrigation and other uses.

- Use of xeriscaping and planting drought-resistant native Hawaiian plants can help conserve water.

- Reforestation to replant native trees and remove invasive species in forest areas can improve water infiltration into the aquifer. \textsuperscript{125}

- Undeveloped lands over the Pearl Harbor Aquifer which are above the 50-inch isohyet are critical to recharge of the aquifer. \textsuperscript{126}

**Recommendations for Revision to the Plan**

- Strengthen the vision statement’s support for water quality protection, water conservation, use of dual water systems when feasible, and contamination cleanups.

- Add policies requiring assessment of impacts of historic and projected coastal flooding and erosion in setting shoreline setbacks and in designing and operating new public and private projects.

- Add policies supporting protection of the Pearl Harbor aquifer, prohibiting urban development above the 50-inch isohyet if aquifer recharge is reduced, protecting against water contamination, supporting infiltration enhancement, promoting water use efficiency and conservation, requiring use of dual water lines, promoting use of recycling water recovered from wastewater, and promoting capture and storage of stormwater.

- Add policies to encourage Central O’ahu communities to be disaster resilient by:

\textsuperscript{124} Honolulu Board of Water Supply, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Honolulu Department of Environmental Services, *Central O’ahu Watershed Study: Final Report* (May 2007), pp. 4-12 to 4-13

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., p. 4-18.

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., pp. 4-16 to 4-17.
• Requiring new developments to have adequate Outdoor Warning Siren coverage, and a safe and effective emergency evacuation and shelter program;

• Surveying and retrofitting existing shelters to make them hurricane resistant;

• Requiring new City buildings capable of serving as shelters to be designed and built to withstand a Category 3 hurricane;

• Providing incentives for private organizations and individuals to provide shelters and/or safe rooms to reduce the demand on public shelters; and

• Reducing the risk of flooding and improving resilience to impacts of flooding to portions of Waipahū by improvements to channels and berms, use of upstream flood retention basins, or other appropriate measures.

Recommendations for Improvement of Implementation

o As called for by the 2012 Multi-Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan:

• Incorporate awareness of natural hazards and the anticipation and planning for potential disasters into the O‘ahu General Plan and the Development Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans in order to reduce risk and improve resilience in recovery from the disasters;

• Incorporate all-hazard assessments in the land development application process;

• Consider adopting coastal erosion setbacks based on historical and/or projected erosion rates;

• Consider requiring disclosure of historical and projected coastal erosion rates in real estate transactions; and

• Consider requiring disclosure of projected coastal flooding in real estate transactions;
• Study and identify the critical facilities most vulnerable to natural hazards and fund their hardening to reduce risk and improve resilience;

• Identify private sector buildings suitable for self-sheltering and create a voluntary/certification system for private refuges;

• Create incentives for homeowners and businesses to retrofit their structures to serve as hurricane shelters; and

• Consider participating in the Federal Emergency Management Agency National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System as a way of reducing risk and improving resilience to impacts of flooding.\(^\text{127}\)

  o Adopt regulations requiring assessment of the impact of coastal flooding and erosion due to sea level rise on public and private projects in the shoreline areas and, as appropriate and feasible, use of measures (protection, adaptation, or relocation) to reduce risks and improve resilience to recovery from impacts.

  o As called for by the 2007 *Central O’ahu Watershed Study: Final Report*, fund efforts and adopt requirements to retain gulches within the Central O’ahu watershed as natural drainageways, support water conservation and water reclamation, protect aquifer recharge, retain stormwater, and protect aquifer, stream, and coastal water quality.\(^\text{128}\)

---

\(^{127}\) Honolulu Department of Emergency Management, *Multi-Hazard Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan: Executive Summary* (August 2, 2012), Table 3, pp. xxiii to xxvi.

\(^{128}\) Honolulu BWS, et. al., *Central O’ahu Watershed Study*, pp. 4-1 to 4-69.
### 3. RECOMMENDED CHANGES

This chapter provides:

- Proposed updates and revisions to the **Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan (Plan)**,
- Proposed improvements to the implementation of the **Plan** vision and policies, and
- Proposed follow-up studies and research needed to understand how key issues should be addressed.

### 3.1 PROPOSED UPDATES AND REVISIONS TO THE PLAN

Based on our review of the implementation of the **Plan** since adoption in 2002, our research on new and continuing issues, and our evaluation of concerns, comments, questions and suggestions raised in interviews, focus groups, workshops and public meetings, and the agency and public review of the 2015 **Public Review Draft Plan**, we have concluded that there is no need for major amendments to the **Plan**.

However, there is a need to update the **Plan** to incorporate policies and guidelines addressing issues, like light pollution, climate change, age friendly communities, complete streets, or low impact development standards, that were not addressed in the 2002 Plan.

**The Vision for Central O‘ahu.** There is widespread support for the **Plan**‘s vision for the region’s future development, and the policies needed to realize that vision. That vision is to:
Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space, particularly along Kunia Road, above Wahiawā, and on Koa Ridge Mauka;

- Revitalize Waipahū and Wahiawā;
- Build Master Planned Residential Communities with accessible town centers and homes that meet the needs of a wide range of families and age groups;
- Design and Redevelop Communities to Reduce Automobile Usage;
- Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources; and
- Provide Adequate Infrastructure to address current deficiencies and needs of new development.

The most significant concerns are how we can do a better job of realizing that vision and improving implementation, especially the vision of providing adequate infrastructure, especially for transportation and schools.

Most of the changes that are proposed for the Plan help clarify existing policy or are logical extensions of or additions to existing policy.

**Two Versions of the Plan.** We have prepared and circulated two versions of the proposed revised Plan for the official review by the Planning Commission and City Council.

The modified Ramseyer version shows how the proposed revised Plan differs from the 2002 Plan. It is marked to identify two types of changes that are proposed in the revised Plan:

- Changes to Background Information. Shading is used to identify background information that has been changed, such as updates to factual data (numbers, dates, place and project names), revisions to exhibits and tables, and clarifications of context and background information. If the reader wants to see exactly how the shaded text, exhibits, or tables differ from the background and context information in the 2002 Plan, the Ramseyer version can be compared with text of the 2002 Plan, which is available online at [http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/DevSust_CentralO'ahu.asp](http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/DevSust_CentralO'ahu.asp).
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- Changes to Vision Elements, Policies, Guidelines or Implementation. Changes to the core of the Plan, such as the vision elements, policies, guidelines, and implementation actions, are identified with strike-throughs for 2002 Plan text that is deleted and underlining for text that is added.

We also made some basic changes, including putting all policies and guidelines in active verb/object format, correcting spelling and grammar, and adding Hawaiian diacritical markings, but did not provide any markings to identify where those changes had been made.

We also prepared a clean version of the proposed revised Central O'ahu SCP without the shadings, strikeouts, and underlines of the modified Ramseyer version. It shows what the Plan would look like if Council adopted all the proposed changes.

A copy of the clean version is attached as Exhibit A to the draft adopting ordinance which has been transmitted to the Planning Commission and City Council for formal review and decision making.

At the end of the official review and discussion of the proposed revised SCP, the City Council will adopt a clean version of the SCP, including any amendments approved by Council, as the new Central O'ahu SCP, replacing the Plan adopted in 2002.

3.1.1 CHANGES MADE THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PLAN

- All policies and guidelines have been put in an active verb/object format. For example, “Design golf courses to provide view amenities for adjacent urban areas” replaces “Golf courses should be designed to provide view amenities for adjacent urban areas.”

However, the use of this format does not indicate a change in the role of the policies and guidelines. As with the existing adopted Plan, the revised Plan policies and guidelines, when adopted, will provide guidance to administrators and policymakers for how they should implement the vision for Central O‘ahu’s future in their decision making regarding land use and infrastructure approvals, rules and regulations, and best practices.

- In the 2002 Plan, Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 included policies, principles, and guidelines. The proposed revised Plan has only policies and guidelines because, upon examination, it was felt that the principles from
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the 2002 Plan could be better stated as either policies or guidelines. The principles were sorted and moved either into the policy sub-section or guidelines sub-section.

3.1.2 SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES BY SECTION OR CHAPTER

Proposed substantive changes (changes to vision elements, policies, guidelines, or implementation) are listed below both by page number location in the modified Ramseyer version (and the clean version) of the proposed revised Plan.

Key:
S = Significant Change

Preface and Executive Summary

1. Revises Exhibit ES-1 to show the Primary Urban Center, Secondary Urban Center, Urban-Fringe, and Rural areas for O‘ahu, p. ES-2 (p. ES-2).
2. Explains that sustainability principles and concerns and the O‘ahu General Plan directed growth strategy to “keep the Country country” provide the basis for the City’s strategy for developing a Sustainable Future for the City and County of Honolulu, pp. ES-3 to ES-5 (pp. ES- ).
3. Clarifies that the Development Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans are guides for decision-making; not regulations, p. ES-7 (p. ES-7).

Chapter 1: Central O‘ahu’s Role in O‘ahu’s Development Pattern

1. Revises Exhibit 1.1 to show the Primary Urban Center, Secondary Urban Center, Urban-Fringe, and Rural areas for O‘ahu, p. ES-2 (p. ES-2).
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Chapter 2: The Vision for Central O‘ahu’s Future

1. S Explains that some prime agricultural land loss is a necessary part of the O‘ahu General Plan growth management strategy that directs growth away from rural areas to ‘Ewa and Central O‘ahu, p. 2-3 (p. 2-3)

2. S Explains that City policy is to protect thousands of acres of good agricultural lands in Central O‘ahu, the North Shore, and other areas on O‘ahu from development, and to go beyond preserving those agricultural lands to find ways to nurture the community of farmers using those lands, p. 2-3 (p. 2-3)

3. S Design Master Planned Communities to include “gathering places” which are centers or "Main Street" areas supported by existing or planned commercial space or other job centers, pp. 2-4, 2-20 (pp. 2-4, 2-20)

4. S Use accessory dwelling units and ohana units to provide more affordable housing, p. 2-4 (p. 2-4).

5. S Provide connectivity, to the extent permitted by geography, to reduce automobile use and promote walking and biking, pp. 2-5, 2-22 (pp. 2-5, 2-22)

6. S Integrate bus and rail service by using local shuttles and Bus Rapid Transit to connect Central O‘ahu communities to the rail system and reduce automobile use, p. 2-5 (p. 2-5);

7. S Protect and conserve water supplies through cleanups, greater efficiency, use of non-potable water, reclamation of non-potable water from wastewater, and use of low-impact development practices, pp. 2-5, 2-20 (pp. 2-5, 2-20).

8. As specified by State law, require surveys to identify historic and cultural resources that could be affected by development and determine appropriate preservation measures before new developments are approved, p. 2-6 (p. 2-6)

9. S Complete the Honolulu Rail Transit System because it is critical to providing adequate transportation infrastructure for Leeward O‘ahu and to
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implementing the **O'ahu General Plan** growth management strategy, pp. 2-7, 2-22 (*pp. 2-7, 2-22*)

10. Revises the Community Growth Boundary, pp. 2-8 to 2-10, Appendix A maps pp. A-17 to A-23 (*pp. 2-8 to 2-10, Appendix A maps, pp. A-17 to A-23*)

   a. To show the State’s Kunia Agricultural Park outside the Boundary, and
   b. To show the military’s East Range Training Area outside the Boundary.

11. Updates Table 2.1 to show development capacity and entitlement status for major Central O'ahu projects, p. 2-12 (*p. 2-12*)

12. **S** Develop infrastructure needed to support diversified agriculture, including water system improvements and economic infrastructure (such as grower cooperatives, distribution systems, and an expanded system of farmers’ markets), p. 2-14 (*p. 2-14*)

13. As is consistent with the overall vision for Central O'ahu, support military job centers in Central O'ahu as important sources of employment which provide an alternative to commuting to downtown, p. 2-20 (*p. 2-20*)

14. **S** Design infrastructure for master-planned communities to conserve water and reduce water pollution through the use of low impact development best practices, p. 2-20 (*p. 2-20*)

15. **S** Design and develop master-planned communities to be complete communities, combining affordable housing, jobs and amenities so residents can live, work and play without leaving Central O'ahu, p. 2-20 (*p. 2-20*)

16. **S (PRD ▲)** Clarifies and strengthens support for including affordable housing in all master planned communities, particularly affordable rental housing for students, families, seniors, and those with special needs, pp. 2-20 and 2-22 (*pp. 2-20 and 2-22*).

17. **S (PRD ▲)** Clarifies that support for protection and refurbishment of Kunia Village and Poamoho Village is not to retain them as nostalgic “museum attractions” but rather to support them as vital rural villages.
18. **S** Conserve natural resources by
   a. Protecting open space outside the Community Growth Boundary from urban development,
   b. Using water efficiently through conservation measures and leak repairs,
   c. Cleaning up contaminated areas, and
   d. (PRD ▲) Reducing light pollution, p.2-23 (p.2-23)

19. **S** Recognizes Waipahū’s Plantation Village as a historic and cultural resource to be preserved and enhanced, p. 2-24 (p. 2-24)

20. **S** Recognizes as development priorities:
   e. Revitalizing Waipahū through TOD, p. 2-25 (p. 2-25);
   f. Revitalizing Wahiawā through job centers supporting Central O‘ahu and North Shore diversified agriculture and supporting age friendly communities, p. 2-25 (p. 2-25);
   g. Requiring adequate facilities as a condition of zoning for new developments, p. 2-25 (p. 2-25); and
   h. Using methods like Tax Increment Financing or Community Facilities Districts to provide funding for infrastructure concurrently or in advance of residential and/or commercial development, p. 2-25 (p. 2-25).

**Chapter 3: Land Use Policies and Guidelines**

1. Clarifies that public access to mountain areas should be provided only where sensitive resources are not affected and that parking should be provided in addition to vehicular access to trail heads, p.3-6 (p.3-6).

2. As required by State law, identify and protect areas important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices, p. 3-6 (p. 3-6).

3. **S** For Natural Gulches and Drainageways,
   a. Retain drainage ways as natural or man-made vegetated channels rather than concrete channels, where practical, p. 3-6 (p. 3-6)
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

b. Provide pedestrian and bikeway access where these can be safely accommodated, p. 3-6 (p. 3-6)

4. **S** Clarifies that the “expansion of the shoreline setback to 150-feet where possible” called for in the 2002 Plan should be based on historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion rates, p. 3-7 (p. 3-7).

5. **S** Require analysis of the impacts of sea level rise for new public and private projects in shoreline areas and where appropriate and feasible, incorporation of measures to reduce risks and increase resiliency to the impacts of sea level rise, p. 3-7 (p. 3-7).

6. Clarifies that permitted accessory activities on agricultural lands include distribution, sales or agri-tourism facilities, p. 3-7 (p. 3-7).

7. **S (PRD ▲)** Ensure that uses of non-residential farm buildings are consistent with the intent and purpose of the agricultural zoning district and that the structures are in compliance with the regulations regarding flood hazards, p. 3-7 (p. 3-7).

8. **(PRD ▲)** Updates policies for development of Patsy T. Mink Central O’ahu Regional Park, Wahiawā Botanical Garden, and the Waipahū Shoreline Park Complex to reflect recent development and plans, pp. 3-11 to 3-14, 3-16 (pp. 3-11 to 3-14, 3-16).

9. **S (PRD ▲)** Use park site design to maximize visibility, encourage positive interactions, and deter crime by increasing likelihood of being caught, p.3-14 (p.3-14).

10. **S** Deletes language about golf course development requiring a “Community Integration Program,” p. 3-15 (p. 3-15).

11. **S** Use xeriscaping, especially the use of drought-resistant native Hawaiian plants, in parks and recreation complexes, pp. 3-15 to 3-16, 3-23, 3-66, 3-73, 3-75, 3-77 (pp. 3-15 to 3-16, 3-23, 3-66, 3-73, 3-75, 3-77).

---

Ordinance 14-06 (passed March 2014) specifies that indigenous or Polynesian-introduced plants are to be used for public landscaping, where feasible.
12. Clarifies standards for community-based parks, including that the need for parks can be met either through public parks or private community parks and recreation centers, p. 3-18 to 3-22 (p. 3-18 to 3-22)

13. **S** Use community parks for farmers’ markets and community gardens, pp. 3-22 to 3-23 (pp. 3-22 to 3-23).

14. Updates the Table 3.2 list of historic and cultural features to be protected to include the Waipahū Cultural Garden Park and the Kipapa Gulch Tunnel Complex and revises the list of significant views and vistas to replace the tree obstructed view from the end of Koa Street with the view of the Waiʻanae Mountains from the intersection of Kamehameha Highway and Whitmore Avenue, pp. 3-26, 3-53 (pp. 3-26, 3-53)

15. **S** Clarifies that protection of Kukaniloko should be achieved through consultation with the Hawaiian Council of Elders, the Wahiawā Hawaiian Civic Club as the longtime caretakers of the site, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs as the owner of the site, the State Historical Preservation Officer, and other stakeholders, p. 3-27 (p. 3-27).

16. **S** Deletes guidelines calling for railway repairs and restoration of historic train operations on the OR&L Historic Railway between the 'Ewa Plantation Villages and the Waipahū Cultural Garden since this is not feasible due to energy pipelines buried in the railway right-of-way, pp. 3-29 to 3-30 (pp. 3-29 to 3-30)

17. Adds a new Section 3.5 Natural Resources with policies and guidelines for
   a. **S** Water conservation, p. 3-32 (p. 3-32);
   b. **S** Wildlife habitat protection, p. 3-32 to 3-33 (pp. 3-32 to 3-33);
   c. **S** Preservation of the major Central O'ahu ravines for storm water retention and possible use as a recreational resource, p. 3-32 (p. 3-32); and
   d. **S (PRD ▲)** Reduction of light pollution, p. 3-32 to 3-33 (pp. 3-32 to 3-33).
18. **S** Updates Sec. 3.6 Waipahū Town to incorporate key policies and guidelines from the Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan,\(^{130}\) pp. 3-35 to 3-47 (pp. 3-35 to 3-47).

19. **(PRD ▲)** Clarifies that reopening Waipahū’s shoreline will depend on approval by the Navy, p. 3-35, 3-40, 3-85 (p. 3-35, 3-39, 3-84).

20. **S (PRD ▲)** Incorporates Complete Streets policies and guidelines in Sec. 3.6 Waipahū Town, Sec. 3.7 Wahiawā Town, and other sections dealing with residential and commercial development, pp. 3-45, 3-52, 3-64, 3-66, and 3-72 (pp. 3-45, 3-52, 3-64, 3-66, and 3-72).

21. **S** Adds policies to Sec. 3.8 Wahiawā Town to:
   a. Protect the historic architectural character of the town, p. 3-48 (p. 3-48);
   b. Support development of new job centers serving Central Oʻahu and North Shore diversified agriculture, p. 3-48 (p. 3-48);
   c. Prohibit urban development in Central Oʻahu north of Wahiawā, p. 3-49 (p. 3-49); and
   d. Support creation of a research and technology park in Wahiawā to support age-friendly communities, p. 3-49 (p. 3-49).

22. Clarifies that expansion of off-street parking in Wahiawā is to be where needed to support local businesses, p. 3-53 (p. 3-53).

23. Replaces the view from the end of Koa Street with the view from the intersection of Kamehameha Highway and Whitmore Avenue as a significant vista, given the existing trees blocking views from the end of Koa Street.

24. Clarifies that public access requirements for Kunia Village and Poamoho Village are the same as for any other community and that roadways should be improved as necessary to provide such access, p. 3-57 (p. 3-57).

---

25. **S (PRD ▲)** Require provision of affordable housing in new residential developments, particularly affordable rental housing for students, families, seniors, and those with special needs, p. 3-60 (*p. 3-60*)

26. **S** Design Master Planned Communities to include gathering places which are community centers or "Main Street" areas supported by existing or planned commercial space or other job centers, p. 3-60, pp. 3-69 to 3-72 (*p. 3-60, pp. 3-69 to 3-72*).

27. **S** Provide connectivity in residential areas, to the extent permitted by geography, to reduce automobile use and support pedestrian and bicycle travel and transit use, pp. 3-60 to 3-61, pp. 3-64 to 3-66 (*pp. 3-60 to 3-61, pp. 3-64 to 3-66*).

28. **S** Use accessory dwelling units and ‘ohana units to provide more affordable housing and support creation of an age-friendly community, p. 3-63 (*p. 3-63*).

29. Clarifies that the Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan policies have precedence over the **Plan** policies, and as a result, amendment of the **Plan** is not needed in case of a conflict, p. 3-67 (*p. 3-67*).

30. **S** Permit multi-family residential uses above the first floor wherever possible in commercial centers, p. 3-69 (*p. 3-69*).

31. **S (PRD ▲)** Allow business hotels providing short term accommodations in major commercial centers where compatible and subject to appropriate conditions, p. 3-70 (*p. 3-70*).

32. **S (PRD ▲)** Allow building heights in Major Community Commercial Centers up to 90 feet if these are mixed use structures including residential uses, and are justified by community benefits (*p. 3-74*).

33. **S** Support diversified agricultural jobs in Central O'ahu and the North Shore from industrial areas in Wahiawā, p. 3-76 (*p. 3-76*).

34. **S** Require a view plane study to be conducted for proposed industrial structures over 100 feet high to determine if they can be sited or designed to minimize visibility from residential and commercial areas, public rights-of-way, or the shoreline, p. 3-78 (*p. 3-78*).
35. Clarify that it is City policy to:
   a. Support military uses at existing Central O'ahu military bases in order
      to encourage a high level of military-related employment, p. 3-83 (p. 3-
      83); and
   b. Request Department of Defense co-operation with and support of the
      City’s land use plans within limits set by the military mission, p. 3-84 (p.
      3-84).

36. **S** Require private uses operating under leases on Federal-owned lands
    which are for private purposes not related to Federal government or
    military uses to be consistent with the **Central O'ahu Sustainable
    Communities Plan** and compliant with the Land Use Ordinance, p. 3-84
    (p. 3-84).

**Chapter 4: Public Facilities And Infrastructure**

**Policies And Guidelines**

1. **S** Incorporates Complete Streets policy into Transportation Systems
   policies p. 4-13 (p. 4-13).

2. Develop the roadway elements and other transportation projects listed in
   the **O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan** to meet the existing and
   projected transportation needs in Central O'ahu, p. 4-13 (p. 4-13)

3. **S** Provide sites for bus transit centers and park-and-ride facilities in new
   developments, p. 4-13 (p. 4-13)

4. **S** Develop bikeways as indicated in the Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan
   and the City's O'ahu Bike Plan, p. 4-14 (p. 4-14)

5. **S** Support providing connectivity, to the extent permitted by geography, to
   reduce automobile use, pp. 4-14 to 4-15 (pp. 4-14 to 4-15)

6. **S** Create community-level street standards and design street networks to
   support connectivity and encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel within
   residential communities and commercial centers, pp. 4-15 to 4-16 (pp. 4-
   15 to 4-16).
7. Strengthen Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and Development policies by adding policies that:

a. (PRD ▲) Protect lands above the Pearl Harbor aquifer which are zoned for agriculture or preservation and annually receive 50 inches or more of rainfall from urban development if it cannot be demonstrated that use of Low Impact Development practices will sustain or increase the amount of recharge, p. 4-20 (p. 4-20);

b. Require use of best practices in managing urban and agricultural land to ensure chemicals and nutrients do not contaminate the underlying potable aquifers, p. 4-20 (p. 4-20);

c. Enhance watershed infiltration through replanting of native species and removal of invasive species in forest areas, soil conservation practices in agricultural areas, and low impact development practices in urban areas, p. 4-20 (p. 4-20);

d. Require implementation of water efficiency and conservation measures as a condition of issuing building permits in new developments, p. 4-21 (p. 4-21);

e. Encourage owners of existing plumbing systems to conduct regular water audits and repairs of leaks to reduce water loss, p. 4-21 (p. 4-21);

f. Require developments with large landscaped areas, roadway landscaping, or industrial process that consume water to have dual water lines supplying both potable and non-potable water so that non-potable water can be used for irrigation and other appropriate uses, p. 4-21 (p. 4-21);

g. (PRD ▲) Promote use of non-potable water recovered from wastewater at U.S. Army and City facilities in Central O’ahu for urban and agricultural irrigation in Central O'ahu and of gray water for on-site irrigation, as allowed by State Department of Health and Board of Water Supply standards, p. 4-22, p. 4-24 (p. 4-22, p. 4-24); and

h. Promote individual rain catchments and large-scale storm water impoundment systems for stormwater reclamation, p. 4-22 (p. 4-22).
11. Supports increasing the share of energy from “clean” sources through increased efficiency and production of energy from renewable sources, p. 4-26 (p. 4-26)

12. S (PRD ▲) In approving solar facilities on agricultural lands, require protection of high quality agricultural lands and maintenance of aquifer recharge, and encourage incorporation of complementary agricultural uses where feasible, p. 4-26 (p. 4-26).

13. S Require developers of master-planned communities to consult with the Department of Environmental Services for how solid waste will be handled, p. 4-27 (p. 4-27).

14. S Although natural and man-made vegetated drainageways and retention basins are preferred, allow concrete-lined channels if no other reasonable alternative exists, p.4-30 (p.4-30).

15. S Reduce the volume of sediment in Central O’ahu streams by identifying sources and volumes of sediment and developing projects to address problem areas, p. 4-30 (p. 4-30).

16. S Strengthens Sec. 4.6 Drainage Systems by adding guidelines that call for:

   a. Developing and maintaining stream erosion control projects, p. 4-31 (p. 4-31);

   b. Encouraging and requiring use of Best Management Practices for reducing erosion and impacts on stream water quality, p. 4-31 (p. 4-31);

   c. Establishing vegetated stream buffer zones, p. 4-31 (p. 4-31); and

   d. Controlling flooding in Waipahū, p. 4-31 (p. 4-31)

17. Support the Department of Education’s establishment of school impact fee districts while continuing to enforce conditions requiring developers of residential projects to provide land and/or contributions as their fair share contribution to help provide adequate school facilities, p. 4-35 (p. 4-35).
26. **S** Encourage disaster resilient communities by adding policies to Sec. 4.8 Public Facilities, p. 4-40 (*p. 4-40*), that

   a. **(PRD ▲)** Require new developments to have adequate Outdoor Warning Siren coverage and a safe and effective emergency evacuation and shelter program, p. 4-40 (*p. 4-40*);

   b. Support survey and retrofitting of DOE and other public buildings, as appropriate, to make up the shortfall in hurricane resistant shelters;

   c. Require new City buildings which are “critical facilities used for public assembly and able to perform as shelters” to be designed and built to withstand a Category 3 hurricane; and

   d. Support provision of incentives for private organizations to create hurricane resistant shelter areas in their facilities and for homes to include hurricane resistant “safe rooms.”

27. **S** Deletes policies calling for development of a multi-service medical park at Koa Ridge Makai, reflecting existing plans for the medical center at Koa Ridge Makai, p. 4-43.

28. **S** Encourage co-location and minimization of visual impacts of antenna installations, p. 4-43 (*p. 4-43*).

29. Deletes the outdated policy on approval of major facilities and the section on added or changed public facilities, p. 4-43.

Chapter 5: Implementation

1. **S (PRD ▲)** Encourage public-private partnerships and develop new financing mechanisms to facilitate Plan implementation, p. 5-1 (*p. 5-1*).

2. Update Public Facility Investment Priorities, p. 5-2 (*p. 5-2*) to reflect the need to:

   a. Complete construction of the Honolulu Rail Transit project; and

   b. Recycle non-potable water recovered from wastewater.
3. Clarifies that under Sec. 21-2-2.40-2(c) of the Land Use Ordinance, the Director has the authority to deny zone change applications for urban zoning for parcels outside the Urban Community Boundary or parcels identified as part of the Open Space Network without submitting the applications to the Planning Commission and City Council for review and action, p. 5-6 (p. 5-6)

4. Adds procedures and requirements for Zone Change Environmental Assessments and Project Master Plans, also found in the adopting ordinance, so that the Plan is a more comprehensive reference, pp. 5-6 to 5-10 (pp. 5-6 to 5-10)

5. Deletes the outdated section on “Transition from the Current System,” p. 5-12.

6. Updates Sec. 5.8 Review and Revision of Development Codes to reflect current needs and issues, pp. 5-13 to 5-15 (pp. 5-13 to 5-15).

7. Adds an implementation matrix which lists the policies and guidelines of the Plan, along with the roles of public agencies in implementing, regulating or supporting them, pp. 5-15 to 5-33 (pp. 5-15 to 5-33)
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   a. Show the State’s Kunia Agricultural Park as outside the Boundary;
   b. Show Kipapa Stream as outside the Boundary; and
   c. Show the East Range Military Training Area as outside the Boundary.

2. Corrects the description of the Historic Bikeway corridor on p. A-13 to remove references to historic rail operations in the Central O’ahu segments of the OR&L right of way.
3.2 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN VISION AND POLICY

The revised Plan is more explicit than the current version with regard to policies and the responsibilities of agencies and developers to implement them. This is largely a matter of clarifying procedures and policies that have emerged over the last two decades.

Key improvements to the Plan include:

1. Actively support implementation of Complete Streets, connectivity, TOD planning, the O‘ahu Bike Plan and improved transit facilities, including the planned rail system, to reduce dependence on automobiles.

2. Increased attention to sustainability principles and protecting natural, historic and cultural resources by means of DPP policies and reviews of proposed development;

3. Clarifications on agricultural land uses and the implementation of the State Important Agricultural Lands program.

4. Strive to meet community park ratio standards for residents of Central O‘ahu, and continue to develop the regional parks and trails.

5. Orient planned commercial centers in a “main street” configuration.

6. Support for affordable housing through proposed changes to City regulations;

7. Increased attention to water conservation and management issues including encouraging xeriscaping, water recycling, and supporting stormwater management and LID best practices to reduce flooding and non-point source pollution.

8. Encourage public-private partnerships and innovative funding mechanisms to facilitate implementation of Plan vision and policies.

9. Clarification of procedures for zone change and other development applications, including criteria for finding a zone change “significant,”
3.2 CHANGES TO IMPLEMENTATION

needing an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement; and

10. Provision of an implementation matrix that shows the roles and responsibilities of agencies involved in land use issues.
3.3 PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP STUDIES AND RESEARCH

3.3.1 PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Two follow-up studies were recommended in the January 2015 Public Review Draft:

1. A circulation study of the business district in Wahiawā (including Kamehameha Highway and major cross streets, e.g., California and Kilani Avenues) to identify ways to improve both traffic movement and parking for businesses. Provision of off-street parking needs study as a way of helping commerce and traffic movement, and as a step towards renovation of aging commercial buildings.

2. A study of the feasibility, risks and costs of developing and maintaining a gulch trail linking the Wahiawā Botanical Garden with the Wahiawā State Park will be useful to develop this recreational feature and to document the challenges of a gulch trail network.

3.3.2 OUTSTANDING ISSUES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND CONSIDERATION

1. **Incentives to Revitalize Aging Towns and subdivisions.** Concern over the fate of older towns resulted in the town plans for Waipahū and Wahiawā prepared in the 1990s. In later discussions, residents of these communities and of Waipi'o Acres have asked whether new planning and new incentives are needed to spur redevelopment in locations that have seen little successful preservation or redevelopment.

2. **Land Use Implications of Growth of Distributed Generation and Renewable Energy.** In 2003, little energy development occurred in Central O'ahu. In recent years, biofuel development, solar farms, and rooftop solar have spread. Recently, rooftop solar installations were on
hold in many areas until Hawaiian Electric could assure that power will be generated consistently.

At the same time, utility-scale renewable energy projects are being proposed for Central O‘ahu, ‘Ewa and the Wai‘anae Coast. Whether utility scale renewable plants and distributed generation are competing to supply the grid is not determined as yet.

Nor is it clear whether additional resources, such as battery technology, will be located in Central O‘ahu. Continued attention to these issues could result in new proposals for regional infrastructure planning in the years to come.
APPENDIX A: DRAFT ADOPTING ORDINANCE FOR THE FINAL PROPOSED REVISED CENTRAL O‘AHU SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN
TO ADOPT THE REVISED CENTRAL O'AHU SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU.

BE IT ORDAINED by the People of the City and County of Honolulu:

SECTION 1. Purpose. The purpose of this ordinance is to repeal the existing Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) for Central O'ahu, Article 5, Chapter 24, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, and to adopt a new Article 5 incorporating the revised Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan.

This development plan ordinance adopts a revised sustainable communities plan for Central O'ahu that presents a vision for Central O'ahu’s future development consisting of policies, guidelines, and conceptual schemes that will serve as a policy guide for more detailed zoning maps and regulations and for public and private sector investment decisions.

This ordinance is enacted pursuant to the powers vested in the City and County of Honolulu by Chapter 46, and Section 226-58 Hawaii Revised Statutes.

SECTION 2. Article 5 of Chapter 24, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, as amended ("Central O'ahu"), is repealed.

SECTION 3. Chapter 24, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, as amended, is amended by adding a new Article 5 to read as follows:

"Article 5. Central O'ahu

Sec. 24-5.1 Definitions.

Unless the context otherwise requires, the definitions contained in this section shall govern the construction of this article.

"Charter" or "Revised Charter" means the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu 1973, as amended.

"City" means the City and County of Honolulu.

"City Council" or "Council" means the city council of the City and County of Honolulu.
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"County" means the City and County of Honolulu.

"Department" or "department of planning and permitting" means the department of planning and permitting of the City and County of Honolulu.

"Development" means any public improvement project, or any public or private project requiring a zoning map amendment.

"Development plan" or "sustainable communities plan" means a plan document for a given geographic area which consists of conceptual schemes for implementing and accomplishing the development objectives and policies of the general plan for the several parts of the City and County of Honolulu.

"Director" means the director of the department of planning and permitting.

"Environmental assessment" or "EA" means a written evaluation prepared in compliance with the environmental council's procedural rules and regulations implementing Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343 to determine whether an action may have a significant environmental effect.

"Environmental impact statement" or "EIS" means an informational document prepared in compliance with the environmental council's procedural rules and regulations implementing Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343, and which discloses the environmental effects of a proposed action, effects of a proposed action on the economic and social welfare of the community and State, effects of the economic activities arising out of the proposed action, measures proposed to minimize adverse effects, and alternatives to the action and their environmental effects.

"Finding of no significant impact" or "FONSI" means a determination based on an environmental assessment that the subject action will not have a significant effect and, therefore, will not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

"Functional plan" means the public facility and infrastructure plans prepared by public agencies to further implement the vision, policies and guidelines set forth in the revised Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan.

"General plan" means the general plan of the City and County of Honolulu as defined by Section 6-1508 of the Charter.
"Hawaii Revised Statutes" or "HRS" means Hawaii Revised Statutes, as amended.

"Central O'ahu SCP" means the revised Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

"Planning commission" means the planning commission of the City and County of Honolulu.

"Project master plan" means a conceptual plan that covers all phases of a development project. The project master plan describes how the project conforms to the vision for Central O’ahu, and the relevant policies and guidelines for the site, the surrounding lands, and the region.

"Revised Ordinances of Honolulu" or "ROH" means Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, as amended.

"Significant zone change" means a zone change which involves at least one of the following:

1. Changes in zoning of 25 or more acres of land to any zoning district or combination of zoning districts, excluding preservation or agricultural zoning districts;

2. Any change in zoning of more than 10 acres to a residential or country zoning district; or

3. Any change in zoning of more than five acres to an apartment, resort, commercial, industrial, or mixed use zoning district; or

4. Any development which could have a major social, environmental, or policy impact, or major cumulative impacts due to a series of applications in the same area.

"Special area" means a designated area within the Central O'ahu SCP area that requires more detailed planning efforts beyond what is contained in the Central O'ahu SCP.

"Special area plan" means a plan for a special area.
"Unilateral agreement" means a conditional zoning agreement made pursuant to ROH Section 21-2.80 or any predecessor provision that imposes conditions on a landowner or developer’s use of the property at the time of the enactment of an ordinance for a zoning change.

"Vision" means the future outlook for the Central O’ahu region extending out to the year 2035 and beyond that encompasses the protection of agricultural lands and open space, the revitalization of Waipahu and Wahiawa, the expectation of master-planned residential communities designed to reduce automobile usage and with identifiable town centers, the provision of adequate infrastructure, and the protection of natural, historic and cultural resources.

Sec. 24-5.2 Applicability and intent.

(a) The Central O’ahu Sustainable Communities Plan area encompasses the upland plateau between the Waianae and the Ko’olau Mountain Ranges. The area includes the towns of Waipahu, Mililani, and Wahiawa and their surrounding communities.

(b) It is the intent of the Central O’ahu SCP to provide a guide for orderly and coordinated public and private sector development in the Central O’ahu SCP area in a manner that is consistent with applicable general plan provisions, including the designation of Central O’ahu as an urban fringe area which is to be developed to relieve development pressures in the remaining urban fringe and rural areas and to meet housing needs not readily provided in the primary urban center.

(c) The provisions of this article and the Central O’ahu SCP are not regulatory. Rather, they are established with the explicit intent of providing a coherent vision to guide resource protection and land use development for Central O’ahu, public investment in infrastructure, zoning and other regulatory procedures, and the preparation of the city’s annual capital improvement program budget.

Sec. 24-5.3 Adoption of the Central O’ahu Sustainable Communities Plan.

(a) This article is adopted pursuant to the Revised Charter Section 6-1509 and provides a self-contained sustainable communities plan document for Central O’ahu. Upon enactment of this article, all proposed developments will be evaluated against how well they fulfill the vision for Central O’ahu enunciated in
the Central O'ahu SCP and how closely they meet the policies and guidelines selected to implement that vision.

(b) The plan entitled, "Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan," attached as Exhibit A is hereby adopted by reference and made a part of Chapter 24, Article 5, ROH.

(c) Chapter 24, Article 1, entitled "Development Plan Common Provisions," in its entirety is no longer applicable to the Central O'ahu SCP area. This article and the Central O'ahu SCP, as adopted by reference by this ordinance, supersede any and all common provisions previously applicable to the Central O'ahu SCP area.

Sec. 24-5.4 Existing zoning and subdivision ordinances, approvals, and applications.

(a) All existing subdivisions and zoning approved prior to the effective date of this ordinance, including but not limited to those subject to unilateral agreements, shall continue to remain in effect following the enactment of this ordinance.

(b) Subdivision and zoning ordinances applicable to the Central O'ahu SCP area enacted prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall continue to regulate the use of land within demarcated zones of the Central O'ahu SCP area until such time as those subdivision and zoning ordinances may be amended to be consistent with the Central O'ahu SCP.

(c) Notwithstanding adoption of the revised Central O'ahu SCP, applications for subdivision actions and land use permits accepted by the department for processing prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall continue to be subject only to applicable ordinances and rules and regulations in effect at the time the application is accepted for processing.

Sec. 24-5.5 Consistency.

(a) The performance of prescribed powers, duties and functions by all city agencies shall conform to and implement the policies and provisions of this article and the Central O'ahu SCP. Pursuant to Revised Charter Section 6-1511.3, public improvement projects and subdivision and zoning ordinances shall be consistent with the Central O'ahu SCP, as adopted.
(b) Any questions of interpretation regarding the consistency of a proposed development with the provisions of the Central O‘ahu SCP and the objectives and policies of the general plan shall ultimately be resolved by the council.

(c) In determining whether a proposed development is consistent with the Central O‘ahu SCP, the responsible agency shall primarily take into consideration the extent to which the development is consistent with the vision, policies, and guidelines set forth in the Central O‘ahu SCP.

(d) Whenever there is a question regarding consistency between existing subdivision or zoning ordinances, including any unilateral agreement, and the Central O‘ahu SCP, the existing subdivision or zoning ordinances shall prevail until such time as they may be amended to be consistent with the Central O‘ahu SCP.

**Sec. 24-5.6 Implementation.**

Implementation of this article relating to the Central O‘ahu SCP will be accomplished by the following:

(a) Initiating zoning and development code amendments to achieve consistency with the policies, principles, and guidelines of the Central O‘ahu SCP;

(b) Guiding development in the special areas of Waipahu and Wahiawa through the special area plans for each area;

(c) Guiding public investment in infrastructure through functional plans which support the vision of the Central O‘ahu SCP;

(d) Recommending approval, approval with modifications or denial of developments seeking zoning and other development approvals based on how well they support the vision of the Central O‘ahu SCP;

(e) Incorporating Central O‘ahu SCP priorities through the public infrastructure map and the city’s annual budget process;

(f) Evaluating progress in achieving the vision of the Central O‘ahu SCP periodically and presenting the results of the evaluation in the biennial report which is required by Revised Charter Section 6-1510.4; and
(g) Reviewing the vision of the Central O'ahu SCP every five years and revising, as necessary, on the basis of that review, the policies, guidelines, and capital improvement program investments therein.

Sec. 24-5.7 Review of development and other applications.

The review of applications for zone changes and other development approvals will be guided by the vision of the Central O'ahu SCP. Decisions on all proposed developments shall be based on the extent to which the project enabled by the development approval supports the policies and guidelines of the Central O'ahu SCP.

The director may review other applications for improvements to land to help the responsible agency determine whether a proposed improvement supports the policies and guidelines of the Central O'ahu SCP.

Sec. 24-5.8 Zone change applications.

(a) All zone change applications relating to land in the Central O'ahu SCP area will be reviewed by the department of planning and permitting for consistency with the general plan, the Central O'ahu SCP, and any applicable special area plan.

(1) The director will recommend either approval, approval with changes, or denial. The director's written review of the application shall become part of the zone change report which will be sent to the planning commission and the city council.

(2) A project master plan shall be part of an EA or EIS for any project involving 25 acres or more of land. The director shall review the project master plan for its consistency with the Central O'ahu SCP.

(3) Any development or phase of development already covered by a project master plan which has been fully reviewed under the provisions of this article shall not require a new project master plan, provided the director determines that the proposed zone change is generally consistent with the existing project master plan for the affected area.

(4) If a final EIS has already been accepted for a development, including one accepted prior to the effective date of this ordinance, then a subsequent project master plan shall not be required for the development.
(b) Projects which involve a significant zone change shall be required to submit an environmental assessment to the department of planning and permitting prior to an application for a zone change being accepted. Any development or phase of a development which has already been assessed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), HRS Chapter 343 (Hawaii Environmental Policy Act, HEPA), ROH Chapter 25, or the provisions of this article, and for which a FONSI has been filed or a required EIS has been accepted, shall not be subject to further EA or EIS requirements under this chapter unless otherwise required by NEPA or HEPA.

(c) The EA shall be reviewed by the department. Based on review of the EA, the director will determine whether an EIS will be required or whether a FONSI should be issued.

(d) If an EIS is required, the EIS must be accepted by the director before a zone change application shall be initiated.

(e) Zone changes shall be processed in accordance with this section, Section 5.4 of the Central O'ahu SCP and ROH Chapter 21.

Sec. 24-5.9 Annual capital improvement program review.

Annually, the director shall work jointly with the director of the department of budget and fiscal services and the city agencies to review all projects in the city's capital improvement program and budget for compliance and consistency with the general plan, the Central O'ahu SCP and other development plans, any applicable special area plan provisions, and the appropriate functional plans. The director of planning and permitting will prepare a written report of findings to be submitted to the council in accordance with Revised Charter Section 6-1503.

Sec. 24-5.10 Five-year review.

(a) The department of planning and permitting shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Central O'ahu SCP, every five years subsequent to the plan's date of adoption and shall report its findings and recommended revisions to the council.

(b) The Central O'ahu SCP will be evaluated to assess the appropriateness of the plan's regional vision, policies, guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as its consistency with the general plan.
(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the processing of a revision to the Central O'ahu SCP in the event either the biennial report of the director of planning and permitting or council recommends consideration of such a revision, pursuant to the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu.

Sec. 24-5.11 Authority.

Nothing in this article shall be construed as an abridgement or delegation of the responsibility of the director, or of the inherent legislative power of the council, to review or revise the Central O'ahu SCP pursuant to the city charter and the above procedures.

Sec. 24-5.12 Severability.

If any provision of this article or the application thereof to any person or property or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this article are declared to be severable.

Sec. 24-5.13 Conflicting provisions.

Any provision contained in this article shall, with respect to the Central O'ahu SCP area, prevail should there be any conflict with the common provisions or any other provisions under ROH Chapter 24."

SECTION 4. Effective Date of the Central O'ahu sustainable communities plan. The City Clerk is hereby directed to date the Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan with the effective date of enactment of this ordinance.
SECTION 5. This ordinance shall take effect upon its approval.

INTRODUCED BY:

DATE OF INTRODUCTION:

Honolulu, Hawaii Councilmembers

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

Deputy Corporation Counsel

APPROVED this _____ day of ____________, 20____.

KIRK W. CALDWELL, Mayor
City and County of Honolulu
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE 2015 PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT CENTRAL O‘AHU SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN

Comments by Source
City Agencies
State Agencies
Federal Agencies
Community Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.A</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2 p. 4-17</td>
<td>BWS is using 2040 projection of 164,558 as basis of projection of potable water demand in 2040. DPP’s projections in the PRD only go to 2035.</td>
<td>OK - Added note that BWS is using 2040 projection of BWS served population of 164,500 as basis for potable water demand projections. (p. 4-17) {p. 4-17}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.A</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.6 p. 2-19</td>
<td>Expand – Specifically address rental housing needs of Seniors and Families</td>
<td>OK - Expanded vision statement for Master-Planned Residential Communities to stress that complete communities should provide affordable housing for students, families, and seniors, especially those with low incomes and/or special needs. (p. 2-20, 22) (p. 2-20, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.B</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.1 p. 3-54</td>
<td>Add Specific – Low income affordable rental housing for Families, Seniors, Special Needs</td>
<td>OK – Affordable Housing general policy was expanded to note that, specifically, affordable rental housing is needed for students, working families, and seniors, especially those with low incomes and/or special needs. (p. 3-59) {p. 3-60}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.C</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.1 p. 3-55</td>
<td>Support existing CO SCP policy supporting provision of elderly and child-care centers</td>
<td>✓ - Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.D</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Sec. 5.9 Table 5.1 p. 5-33</td>
<td>Remove – CDBG/Home as an implementing method for support for Community Shelters and Safe Rooms</td>
<td>✓ - While it is correct that currently the CDBG funds are not used for this purpose, and the City has not adopted an incentive program to support Community Shelters and Safe Rooms as called for in proposed policies for Sec. 4.8.1, if the policies are adopted, the CDBG program could potentially be one method of implementing such a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.E</td>
<td>DCS</td>
<td>Sec. 5.3 p. 5-4</td>
<td>Add – reference to Draft Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development Needs. July 2015 – June 2020</td>
<td>OK – The Department of Budget and Fiscal Services and the Draft Consolidated Plan have been added to the list of agencies with functional planning responsibilities. (p. 5-4) {p. 5-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3.A</td>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>Sec. 3.2 p. 3-10</td>
<td>Remove – box car racing track has been relocated to another site and is not part of the Patsy T. Mink Central O’ahu Regional Park (CORP) Master Plan</td>
<td>OK – The reference was deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ No Change to Plan; OK: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/ Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3.B</td>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>Sec. 3.2.2.4 p. 3-14</td>
<td>The second bullet under Islandwide and Regional Parks calls for providing trails from Patsy Mink CORP to a trail system throughout Central O‘ahu’s gulches. Trails are not currently in Patsy Mink CORP Master Plan</td>
<td>√ - While it is correct that there currently are no plans to construct such trails as part of the Regional Park Master Plan, this guideline (adopted as part of the CO SCP in 2002) should be retained. It anticipates a future when a trail system is established in the gulches, and calls for retention of the possibility of providing access to the gulch trail system from the Regional Park if and when such a system is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5.B</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Sec. 4.8 p. 4-40</td>
<td>Add language about requiring adequate Outdoor Warning Siren coverage for new developments to ensure adequate audible coverage to ensure emergency warning and notification of tsunamis and other disasters.</td>
<td>OK – A new policy was added to Sec. 4.8 calling for approval of new development only if adequate outdoor warning siren coverage and safe and effective emergency evacuation and shelter can be ensured. (p. 4-38) (p. 4-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.A</td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2.1 p. 4-21</td>
<td>Correct description to read City’s Wahiawa WWTP and Mililani Wastewater Pre-Treatment Facility</td>
<td>OK – Description was corrected. (p. 4-21) (p. 4-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.B</td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>Sec. 4.3 p. 4-23</td>
<td>Correct year that Consent Decree requires Wahiawa upgrade to 2024</td>
<td>OK – Date was corrected. (p. 4-22) (p. 4-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6.C</td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>Sec. 4.3 p. 4-23</td>
<td>Change “is upgrading” to “has upgraded” in 3rd paragraph</td>
<td>OK – Sentence was updated to reflect current status. (p. 4-22) (4-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8.A</td>
<td>DPR</td>
<td>Sec. 3.3 Table 3.1 p. 3-17</td>
<td>Correct names of Wahiawa District Park, Mililani Town Center Neighborhood Park, and Waikele Neighborhood Park to reflect new names honoring community leaders</td>
<td>OK – Names were corrected: George Fred Wright Wahiawa District Park, Michael S. Nakamura Neighborhood Park, and Mitsuo “Mits” Shito Waikele Neighborhood Park. (p. 3-19, 20) (p. 3-19, 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.A</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.1 p. 2-10</td>
<td>Clarify what is meant by “hazardous areas.”</td>
<td>√ -See the definitions provided for Preservation Areas in the Appendix A: Conceptual Maps Glossary, (p. A-4 and A-5) (p. A-4 and A-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.B</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.6.2.6 p. 3-42</td>
<td>Add new guideline: “Incorporate complete streets features where ever feasible.”</td>
<td>OK – A complete streets guideline was added to the section. (p. 3-44) (p. 3-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.C</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7.2.1 p. 3-47</td>
<td>Correct misspelling of Kilani Avenue</td>
<td>OK – Correction was made. (p. 3-51) (p. 3-51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.D</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7.2.4 p. 3-48</td>
<td>Add new guideline: “Incorporate complete streets features where ever feasible.”</td>
<td>OK – A complete streets guideline was added to the section. (p. 3-51) (p. 3-52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.E</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.2 p. 3-59</td>
<td>Replace guideline re providing pedestrian pass-throughs or mid-block cross walks, if possible, where blocks exceed 350 feet on a side with “Provide pedestrian pass-through or mid-block crosswalks with complete streets features where applicable and where pedestrian activity demands a designated crossing.”</td>
<td>√ -Proposed specific guideline is appropriate to provide guidance for urban design and master roadway plans reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10.F</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.2 p. 3-60</td>
<td>Delete “narrow curb radius” from second bullet under Pedestrian and Bike Routes and Facilities and replace with “tighter curb radius.”</td>
<td>OK – The requested text replacement was made. (p. 3-65) (p. 3-66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adding 24,000 homes will cause traffic gridlock and delay response times for officers traveling through (the intersection of H-1 and Kunia Road). . . . We recommend implementing traffic flow improvements at the H-1 freeway and the Kunia Road interchange.

Table 4.1 lists 14 State and City projects designed to address congestion problems in Central Oahu by increasing capacity and relieving bottlenecks, including Improvements to Kunia Road. (Although not shown in the table, the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan does include a proposed State project improving the H-1 Kunia Interchange.)

In addition, the completion of the first segment of the Rail Transit project will offer a timely and reliable alternative to automobile travel for many commuters, allowing them to bypass these bottleneck conditions. Finally, development of planned housing capacity in Central Oahu, shown in Table 2.1 as over 24,000 housing units, will take place over many decades. Between 2015 and 2035, development of only 12,700 units is expected in Central Oahu.

The population growth will likely increase police services requested by the community. Current staffing may not be able to respond to the growing number of calls for assistance within a favorable amount of time. Additional resources and staffing and budget increases would be required.

-We agree that population and economic growth may require increased police services. Adopted policies in the Plan call for provision of adequate staffing and facilities to ensure public safety and approval of new development only if adequate services will be provided to meet the needs created by the development.
| A13.A | DOA | Sec. 2.2.1 p. 2-8 | DOA supports the City policy of retaining the estimated 10,350 acres of prime agricultural lands (in Central Oahu) for productive agricultural use and looks forward to working with the City and State agencies . . and with the private sector to increase agricultural production. | √ -The support for City policy and the offer to work cooperatively is appreciated. |
| A13.B | DOA | Sec. 2.1 p. 2-3 | DOA has concerns about what is meant by “foster ag communities” Opposed to the introduction of uses or activities, particularly residential, on agricultural land that are not directly accessory or secondary to agricultural production. | √ -Plan does provide added details on what is meant by “foster agricultural communities” on (p. 2-14) {p. 2-14} where the adopted Plan calls for solution of the problems of lease terms and tenure, access to capital, research, and marketing, and proposed changes to the Plan call for water system improvements, and creation of economic infrastructure like grower cooperatives, storage and distribution systems, and an expanded network of farmers’ markets. |
| A13.C | DOA | Sec. 3.1 p. 3-2 | Correct information about which agencies are managing agricultural parks and properties. | OK – Corrections have been made. (p. 3-2) {p. 3-2} |
| A13.D | DOA | Sec. 3.1.3.4 p. 3-6 | City does not have implementing tools specific for agri-tourism. Agri-tourism facilities will have to be considered on a case-by-case basis via special permit. DOA recommends agricultural tourism only if it is accessory and secondary to a bona fide farming operation. | √ -Agree that agri-tourism facilities will have to be reviewed and approved on a case-by-case basis and that the tourism activities should be accessory and secondary to the agricultural activities and an non-intrusive element in the rural, open space landscape. |
| A13.E | DOA | Sec. 3.7.1.2 p. 3-45 | DOA strongly supports the addition of the policy statement prohibiting new urban development in Central Oahu north of Wahiawa so that Lake Wilson and Kaukonahua continue marking the northernmost extent of urban development in Central Oahu | √ -The support is noted. |
### Central Oahu SCP Public Review Draft Comments and DPP Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13.F</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 3.8 p. 3-52</td>
<td>DOA opposes any expansion of the footprint of plantation villages to provide additional rural residential housing</td>
<td>√ -The opposition is noted. The “exceptions from conventional subdivision and other development codes” allowed by the guideline on (p. 3-55) {p. 3-56} have to do with issues like curbs and gutters or parking requirements that would change the historic character of the plantation villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.G</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 5.9 p. 5-26</td>
<td>Clarify and define what is meant by “rural agricultural functions and activities” in the “surrounding area” of the Central Oahu plantation villages.</td>
<td>√ -The reference is to agricultural functions and activities, such as agricultural support and processing, that historically have been near the villages, particularly Kunia Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.H</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2 p. 4-17</td>
<td>The BWS estimate of agricultural water demand for Central Oahu is too low. DOA’s standard water application rate for diversified agriculture which they are using for the Kunia Agricultural Park is 3,400 gallons per acre per day (gpad), which is significantly higher than the 2500 gpad estimate used by BWS.</td>
<td>√ -We rely on the Board of Water Supply to provide the estimates of water usage likely given the projected population and employment resulting from our land use plans. We will forward your comment to them for their consideration in preparing the Central Oahu Watershed Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.I</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 4.3.1 p. 4-24</td>
<td>Strongly support the City’s effort to upgrade the Wahiawa Wastewater Treatment Plant to produce R-1 quality recycled water . . . (which) would lead to the availability of the 2.5 billion gallon Lake Wilson/Wahiawa Reservoir as the major irrigation water source for agricultural lands on the North Shore . . . allowing directly-edible food crop cultivation.</td>
<td>√ -The support for use of recycled water recovered from treated wastewater effluent for irrigation is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.J</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 4.4.1 p. 4-25 through 4-26</td>
<td>Address the use of agricultural land for utility-scale renewable energy production. Solar energy facilities are permitted on all agricultural lands under HRD Ch. 205, although Special Use Permits are required for the very good (A), good (B), and fair (C) suitability lands</td>
<td>OK – A policy calling for protection of high quality agricultural lands and encouragement of incorporation of complimentary agricultural uses in approving solar energy facilities was added. (p. 4-24) {p. 4-26}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; OK: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/ Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13.K</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 5.4 p. 5-6</td>
<td>Replace “should” with “shall” in the implementation policy calling for denying zone change applications for urban uses on parcels outside the community growth boundary or parcels identified as part of the Open Space Network.</td>
<td>✓ - The language legally required to be used in plans for policy statements is “should” because the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) policies are guidelines; they are not regulations like the Land Use Ordinance which does use the verb “shall.” The “should” in the SCP gets translated into “shall” when the Director determines that an application for a zone change to urban uses for a parcel is not consistent with the policy of the SCP that new urban uses should be permitted only within the growth boundary on areas not part of the Open Space Network and therefore denies the application without submitting it to the Planning Commission. The Charter requires that the City Administration and the City Council actions must be consistent with the SCP policies and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.L</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 5.4.1 p. 5-6</td>
<td>An application for a zone change from Ag-1 to Ag-2 for the purpose of allowing an application for a Special Use Permit should be considered a significant zone change requiring an Environmental Assessment (EA).</td>
<td>✓ - The City and County does not have the authority under State Law to require preparation of an EA for a change from Ag-1 to Ag-2. However, the information and analysis that would be required for both the Zone Change application and the Special Use Permit application would be the equivalent of what would be required for an Environmental Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A13.M | DOA | Sec. 5.8 p. 5-13 | The DOA strongly recommends that the DPP develop its own in-house expertise to review agricultural feasibility reports submitted in support of subdivision applications, and commit to City-administered monitoring and enforcement of agricultural subdivision covenants, conditions and restrictions | √ -The proposed City assumption of the State function of providing agricultural technical expertise and guidance is beyond the scope of review and revision of an individual Sustainable Communities Plan.  
R - The City’s role in monitoring and enforcing conditions required under subdivision approvals could be improved. Recommendations for improving implementation will be included in the CO SCP Review Report. |
<p>| A13.N | DOA | Sec. 5.9 Table 5.1 p.5-19 through 5-20 | “City does not have implementing tools specific for agri-tourism facilities” which will have to be considered on a case by case basis via special permit. Agricultural tourism should be approved only if it is accessory and secondary to a bona fide farming operation. | √ -We agree with the comment which reflects current practice. |
| A13.O | DOA | Sec. 3.1.3.4 p.3-6 Also, Table 5.1 p.5 -19 | What criteria will be considered to determine where “agricultural use is not feasible” in permitting limited outdoor recreation use? | √ -Precedents in HRS Ch. 205 concerning where location of solar energy facilities should be allowed without restrictions suggest that areas with Land Study Bureau land classifications of poor suitability (D) and very poor suitability (E) would be appropriate locations for limited outdoor recreation use under the Sec. 3.1.3.4 policy. |
| A13.P | DOA | Table 5.1 p. 5-20 | “The regulatory code (shown in Table 5.1) to effect (the guideline that residential use should be permitted only if it is accessory to agricultural use) is identified as the Special Use Permit.” This should be deleted from the Table. | OK – We agree that the SUP is not the means by which accessory residential uses in agricultural areas are approved. The LUO is the implementing regulatory code for approving farm dwellings. (p. 5-20) {p. 5-20} |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13.Q</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Table 5.1 p. 5-26</td>
<td>The DOA “would be unlikely to support any effort to seek approval to allow expansion of the physical boundaries of the (plantation community) subdivision to provide for rural residential housing and other questionable uses in the surrounding area.”</td>
<td>√ -The comment is noted. The policy listed calls for perpetuating rural agricultural functions and activities in the surrounding area in conjunction with village land uses and not for providing “rural residential housing and other questionable uses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13.R</td>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>Sec. 4.4.1 p. 4-25, Table 5.1 p. 5-31</td>
<td>The DOA recommends inclusion of a new guideline encouraging landowners and developers to first consider development of utility-scale solar energy facilities on D or E rated agricultural lands</td>
<td>OK – A policy calling for protection of high quality agricultural lands and encouragement of incorporation of complimentary agricultural uses in approving solar energy facilities was added. (p. 4-24, p. 5-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.A</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Preface pp. ES-1 to ES-5</td>
<td>OP commends and appreciates the clarification and discussion on the incorporation of sustainability principles in the SCP</td>
<td>√ -The support for incorporation of sustainability principles is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.B</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.6 p. 2-19</td>
<td>Include discussion of how master planned communities meet NPDES requirements for storm discharge</td>
<td>√ -The NPDES requirements are addressed in Sec. 4.2 (p. 4-20) {p. 4-20}, and Sec. 4.5.1 (p. 4-26) {p. 4-27}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.C</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.6 p. 2-19</td>
<td>The changes in (Sec. 2.2.6) . . . expands upon HRS Sec. 226-19 Housing with the . . . promotion of a mixture of housing and HRS Sec. 226-109 - Priority Guideline on Sustainability with the (policies calling for ) . . . expansion of green infrastructure, water conservation, and the promotion of Low-Impact Development (LID) Concepts to reduce water pollution.</td>
<td>√ -The support for incorporation of housing and sustainability policies is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.D</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.3.2 p. 3-5</td>
<td>OP recommends adding additional Low Impact Development concepts and expansion of the section to include preservation of undisturbed areas, open space design, reduction of impervious cover, (provision of) vegetated buffer/filter strips, infiltration practices, open vegetated channels, and utilization of rain gardens and bio-retention basins.</td>
<td>√ -Many of these elements are addressed in Sec. 4.2, (pp. 4-15 through 4-21) (pp. 4-16 through 4-23) and in Sec. 4.5, (pp. 4-25 through 4-26) (pp. 4-26 through 4-27).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.E</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.3.3 p. 3-5</td>
<td>DPP should consider the legal ramifications of regulatory takings with regard to the 60 foot setback with possible expansion to 150 feet guideline because under the ROH shoreline setback is 40 feet. See the ICAP publication &quot;Climate Change and Regulatory Takings in Coastal Hawaii&quot; (2011).</td>
<td>√ -Under the ROH, the shoreline setback for new subdivisions is 60 feet, not 40 feet. Expansion of the setback to 150 feet would not be considered a taking if based on historic or adopted projections of coastal erosion. As noted in the ICAP publication cited, US Supreme Court case law supports the City restrictions on property use where they are justified by the need to prevent &quot;loss of life and property due to flooding.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.F</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.3.3 p. 3-6</td>
<td>OP supports the DPP’s guideline calling for analysis of the possible impact of sea level rise on new public and private projects in shoreline areas and incorporation of measures to reduce risks and increase resiliency as consistent with State Climate Change Adaptation policy and the 2013 Ocean Resources Management Plan.</td>
<td>√ -The support for this “no regrets” climate change adaptation guideline is noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; **OK**: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A14.G OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.1.3.2 p. 4-8</td>
<td>OP recommends that the SCP include the recommendation of an alignment or route study for extending rail to Mililani.</td>
<td>√ -As noted in the proposed revised Plan, the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization adopted a 2040 Regional Transportation Plan which includes an illustrative project to build a connection of the rail transit system to Mililani. Including a policy calling for a rail alignment to Mililani in the Central O‘ahu SCP is premature at this time. Identification and evaluation of potential alignments, system technologies, and available funding resources should occur first during a community-based, technically-driven alternatives analysis and environmental review process. Over the near-term, Central O‘ahu communities will be connected to rail stations in Waipahu and Pearl Highlands with express, regional, and community circulator buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.H OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2.1 p. 4-20</td>
<td>Provide the rationale for the removal of the policy calling for use of reclaimed water and brackish water as non-potable sources in the coastal caprock area.</td>
<td>√ -This policy was removed because it does not apply to Central Oahu. The use of brackish water over the coastal caprock area occurs in Ewa, not in Central Oahu. A new section providing policies on use of recycled water in Central Oahu was added on (p. 4-21) (p. 4-22). Explanations for changes to the Plan will be provided in the Review Report to be published when the final proposed revised Plan is transmitted to the Planning Commission and City Council for review and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.I</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2.1 p. 4-22</td>
<td>Provide the rationale for elimination the policies on Water Reclamation and Integrated Resource Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.J</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 4.4 pp. 4-24 through 4-25</td>
<td>This section is consistent with the Hawaii State Plan. DPP should add “off-shore energy-related initiatives under consideration” to the section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.K</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 4.6 pp. 4-27 through 4-31</td>
<td>The section is consistent with the State Coastal Zone Management program objectives, policies, and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.L</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.6 p. 4-29</td>
<td>The plan should include a list of specific Best Management Practices (BMPs) involved in Low Impact Development (LID).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.M</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.6.1 p. 4-29</td>
<td>Opposed to proposed addition of option of allowing concrete channels instead of using natural and man-made vegetated channels when “there is no other reasonable alternative”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; OK: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
### Central Oahu SCP Public Review Draft Comments and DPP Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A14.N &amp; O</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.6.2 pp. 4-29 through 4-30</td>
<td>The plan should list the BMPs it plans on using in Central Oahu. The State’s Low Impact Development Practitioners Guide should be referenced in the Plan</td>
<td>√ -Specific BMPs important for addressing drainage and stream water quality issues for Central Oahu are listed in Sec. 4.6.2. A listing of all possible LID BMPs is not appropriate for a land use plan. The City provides extensive LID guides for builders and developers in handouts, standards, and guides available on the Web. The specific BMPs that will be used by Central Oahu developments that trigger the Low Impact Development requirements of the City’s storm drainage standards will be decided through the review and approval of the drainage plan for each development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.P</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Sec. 4.9 p. 4-40</td>
<td>Mention and describe Waiawa Correctional Facility</td>
<td>√ -As noted in the introductory paragraph of Sec. 4.9, Waiawa Correctional Facility is shown on the Public Facility Map A-3 in Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14.Q</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.5 p. 2-17</td>
<td>Define what support means re military bases in Central Oahu.</td>
<td>√ -See Sec. 3.13, (pp. 3-80 through 3-84) (pp. 3-81 through 3-85).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √: No Change to Plan; **OK**: Make Change to Plan (p. #); **R**: Propose Implementation Improvement; **?**: Needs Further Research Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/COMMENTOR</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15.B &amp; C</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 3.12.1 p. 3-74</td>
<td>DOD requests that overnight accommodations be allowed within the Mililani Tech Park (MTP) so that their Youth Challenge Academy can be moved to MTP and so that a new Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package and Civil Support Team facility (with a 210 bed dorm) can be constructed at MTP.</td>
<td>√ -Such a change would be a major change in policy for MTP which has been planned as a low density high tech business park since the 1990s. We have suggested that the major owner of MTP consider an alternative development plan for the site since the expected demand for a high tech center has not materialized. Since the major owner has not requested the needed change in SCP policy and there has been no public discussion of the change, it is premature to offer this as a change to the policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15.D &amp; F</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 4.8 Table 4.5 p. 4-37</td>
<td>Remove the Special Needs Shelter designations and the explanatory note from the Table 4.5 since Federal guidelines require that all special needs individuals must be integrated into and served by the shelters designated for the general population, and as a result, no shelters now have such designations.</td>
<td>OK – The Table has been revised to remove the Special Needs Shelter designations from individual shelters and to remove the explanatory note for such shelters. (p. 4-37) {p. 4-39}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15.E</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 4.8 Table 4.5 p. 4-37</td>
<td>Clarify that 15 square feet (sf) per person is a standard used to estimate how large shelters should be designed and does not reflect the maximum number of persons who can be sheltered in a facility</td>
<td>OK – The Table has been revised to show capacity based both on 10 sf per person and 15 sf per person, and notes explaining when each standard is appropriate have been added. (4-37) {p. 4-39}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15.G</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 4.8 p. 4-38</td>
<td>Correct the statements in the first paragraph regarding shelter readiness to withstand hurricane winds.</td>
<td>OK – The text has been corrected to say that two-thirds of the shelters would have to be retrofitted to be able to withstand any hurricane winds, and that few of the existing shelters are capable of withstanding a Category 1 hurricane like Hurricane Iwa. (p. 4-36) {p. 4-38}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; OK: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
### Central Oahu SCP Public Review Draft Comments and DPP Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A15.H</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 4.8.1 p. 4-40</td>
<td>Does the 2nd bullet policy calling for “survey and retrofit of DOE and other public buildings to make up the shortfall in hurricane resistant shelters” imply that the City and County will bear the cost of retrofitting DOE and other state facilities on Oahu to become hurricane shelters? (Historically, the) City and County... does not conduct surveys or do retrofits of State facilities.</td>
<td>√ - It will take coordinated actions by the State and City as well as by private organizations if the shortage of hurricane resistant shelters is to be addressed. Federal funds, if obtained by the City as part of resiliency planning or pre-disaster recovery planning, might support surveys of both State and City public buildings to determine suitability and requirements for retrofitting to resist hurricane winds. Finding ways to fund the necessary retrofits should be a high priority of both the City and the State, given the increasing exposure to hurricanes likely from climate change, as shown by the unprecedented number of hurricanes in the Central Pacific in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15.I</td>
<td>State DOD</td>
<td>Sec. 4.4 p. 4-24 Sec 5.4.3 p. 5-10</td>
<td>Add a policy requiring HECO to respond to electrical infrastructure issues for Kalaeloa</td>
<td>√ - The suggestion is noted. However, infrastructure policies for Kalaeloa are covered in the Ewa Development Plan, not in the Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16.A</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Sec. 4.7 p. 4.31</td>
<td>The second paragraph needs to be updated to reflect the fact that school impact districts have been established and fees collected since September 2013.</td>
<td>OK – Corrections have been made. (p. 4-30) {p. 4-32}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16.B</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Sec. 4.7.2 p. 4.34</td>
<td>In response to the guideline that requests DOE &quot;design school facilities to facilitate community use during non-school hours and weekends,&quot; DOE noted that while many of their schools do serve as community centers, they are designed for &quot;education and student safety as key objectives.&quot;</td>
<td>√ - The primacy of designing schools to accomplish education and student safety is acknowledged. The request is that where possible and not in conflict with those primary objectives, use as a community center be considered in the design of school facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16.C</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Sec. 4.7.2 p. 4-34</td>
<td>Section 4.7.2 suggests that DOE pursue co-locating or sharing parks and other facilities. DOE needs to secure facilities during school hours to ensure student safety. Sharing of facilities with the community after hours is a decision up to the school principal.</td>
<td>√ -The concerns that the DOE has with sharing locations with neighborhood and community parks and of sharing use of pools, gymnasiums or other athletic facilities are noted. However, the thrust of both of these policies are to guide City planning for City parks and facilities, not on DOE planning or operations. The City feels that locating parks next to schools makes sense because the City typically provides after school programs in those parks, and student access to those after school programs is safer when they are co-located. We also feel that, if feasible, shared development and use of expensive athletic facilities makes sense because there is little demand for public access during the hours that schools are open. Shared use minimizes the amount of time that these expensive public investments sit idle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16.D</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>App. A p. A-9 p.A-12</td>
<td>Statements in the Glossary entries for the Urban Land Use Map and the Public Facilities Map on where students from the Koa Ridge and Waiawa developments will attend high school are incorrect. The decision on where students from these areas will attend high school before the Waiawa high school opens is a decision made by the complex administrators (at some point in the future).</td>
<td>OK – The statements in the Glossary were corrected to reflect this information. (pp. A-9, A-13) { pp. A-9, A-13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17.A</td>
<td>DHHL</td>
<td>App. A Urban Land Use Map p. A-19</td>
<td>Incorporate DHHL’s plans for its lands in Central Oahu as shown in the DHHL Oahu Island Plan in the COSCP. Specifically, the 60 acres in Waiawa should be shown as Industrial.</td>
<td>√ -The Urban Land Use Map in Appendix A does show the area adjacent to the Leeward Community College which is owned by DHHL as appropriate for Industrial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18.A</td>
<td>DOH</td>
<td></td>
<td>We support the (proposed Plan) “because it promotes graywater reuse and the use of recycled water in the planned communities in Central Oahu.”</td>
<td>√ -The support for the water conservation policies in the Plan is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.A &amp; B</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.2 pp. 2-10 through 2-13</td>
<td>Include additional information about Central Oahu’s ability to contribute to food production. Specifically, add information about the Agribusiness Development Corporation (ADC) and OHA’s role in promoting agriculture on the Galbraith Trust lands.</td>
<td>√ -The roles of ADC and OHA in promoting agriculture on the Galbraith Trust lands are described in Sec. 3.1 (p. 3-2) (p. 3-2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.C</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.1 pp. 2-2 through 2-3, Sec. 2.2.2 pp. 2-10 through 2-13, Sec. 3.1 pp. 3-1 through 3-9</td>
<td>Agriculture should be discussed in its own section, as it is a primary characteristic of Central Oahu. A separate section will allow an easier determination of which lands are being actually dedicated to agriculture and not alternative uses.</td>
<td>√ -The recommendation is noted. We feel that the current organization which combines agricultural, open space, and preservation lands in one section helps understand how open space, including land in agricultural use, is being preserved and protected in Central Oahu. The Appendix A maps show which agricultural lands are being protected from urban uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.D</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1 pp. 3-1 through 3-9</td>
<td>. . . it would be helpful to have a map . . . addressing specifically agricultural lands within the appropriate section (where agriculture is discussed)</td>
<td>OK – A map showing qualified lands identified in the Oahu Important Agricultural Lands Study has been added to Sec 3.1. (p. 3-3) (p. 3-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; OK: Make Change to Plan (p. #); R: Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A21.E</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.2 p. 2-13</td>
<td>Important Agricultural Lands (IALs) should be discussed in the Plan. . . it should be discussed that lands in Central Oahu are being considered for IAL designation, and the role that this designation will play upon Central Oahu’s role in Hawaii’s agricultural future.</td>
<td>OK – A discussion of the State IAL program and the City IAL process has been added to Sec. 2.2.2. (p. 2-13) (p. 2-14) Note that Sec. 2.2.2 already included a discussion of the IAL designation of over 400 acres of Castle &amp; Cooke lands in Central Oahu, and that Appendix A (p. A-2) (p. A-2) contains a two paragraph description of the State IAL program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.F</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.2 p. 2-12</td>
<td>A map showing the Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii (ALISH) and a description of the intended use or current use of the lands would be helpful.</td>
<td>√ -The recommendation is noted. However, addition of the Exhibit 3.1 map of potential IAL and the descriptions of existing and planned agricultural uses in Sec. 2.2.2 and in Sec. 3.1 are considered sufficient for the purposes of this land use and infrastructure plan. Those interested in the specific ALISH designations can consult the ALISH study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.G</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.7 pp. 2-19 through 2-21</td>
<td>OHA appreciates the Plan’s emphasis on supporting non-automotive travel such as pedestrian and bike use within the community, and transit use for trips both within and outside the community. Community design, including complete streets . . ., is one of the social determinants of health.</td>
<td>√ -The support for the walkable community policies and guidelines because of their importance to elimination of health disparities of Native Hawaiians is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.H</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.9 pp. 2-22 through 2-23</td>
<td>OHA supports the Plan’s identification of archaeological and cultural sites and calls for continued community consultation and input to identify cultural and historical sites.</td>
<td>√ -The support for the Plan's historic and cultural resource policies and guidelines is noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21.I</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Sec. 3.4 p. 3-22</td>
<td>Add more detail about OHA’s role in protecting Kukaniloko.</td>
<td>OK – The descriptive paragraph in Sec. 3.4 has been expanded to include more detail on OHA’s role. (p. 3-24) (p. 3-24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/ Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A21.J | OHA | Sec. 3.4.2.3 pp. 3-26 through 3-28  
Sec. 3.4.2.4 pp. 3-28 through 3-29 | We suggest historic sites considered for adaptive reuse be identified early in the planning of individual projects in order to allow for comments and considerations from surrounding community members, whom ascribe value to these historic resources. | √ -The suggestion is noted. However, it is not felt necessary to include it in the Plan because existing State and City requirements already require such notifications.  
The State Historic Preservation Program (HRS Ch. 6E) requires the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) to be notified when historic resources are impacted by individual projects, to provide recommendations on the appropriate treatment of the historic resources before the project is approved, and to inform the public if otherwise there would be no public hearing or notification.  
If the historic site is on the National or Hawaii Register, an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement would be prepared and circulated for review and comment by members of the community.  
Applicants for major permits are required to notify adjacent land owners of their project applications and make presentations to the Neighborhood Board before their application can be accepted for processing.  
Notifications and requests for comments on the application are sent to the community during the processing of the application, and opportunities for community members to comment are provided during the formal review and action on the application. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/ Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A22.A</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Throughout SCP</td>
<td>Replace references to “Hickam Air Force Base” and “Pearl Harbor Naval Base” with “Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam”</td>
<td>OK – The references were changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.B</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Throughout SCP</td>
<td>Replace references to “West Loch Naval Magazine” with “Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, West Loch Annex” or “West Loch Annex”</td>
<td>OK – The references were changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.C</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Throughout SCP</td>
<td>Replace references to “Naval Computer and Telecommunications Area Master Station Pacific with Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Wahiawa Annex” or “Wahiawa Annex”</td>
<td>OK – The references were changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.D</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Throughout SCP</td>
<td>Replace references to “Explosive Safety Quantity Distance” with “Navy restricted areas”</td>
<td>OK – The references were changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.E</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.3 Table 2.2  p. 2-14</td>
<td>Replace “Blast Zone” with “restricted area”</td>
<td>OK – The references were changed. (p. 2-16) (p. 2-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.F</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.2.1, p. 3-12</td>
<td>Add: policy that Waipahu Shoreline Park should be designed to “provide visibility and surveillance by the public and public safety personnel”</td>
<td>OK – A new policy has been added to Sec. 3.2.1 calling for all parks and recreation complexes to be designed to promote visibility, positive interactions among users, and deter crime by increasing the likelihood of being caught. (p. 3-14) (p. 3-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.G</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7.1.2 p. 3-45</td>
<td>The new amended language prohibiting new development north of Wahiawa is not consistent with maps in Appendix A showing two islands of urban development north of Whitmore (Village).</td>
<td>√ -The proposed language is consistent with the maps because the two islands of urban uses are the existing communities of Whitmore Village and the residential housing that is part of the Joint Base Pearl Harbor Wahiawa Annex, both which have been in place for many years and have limited capacity for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.H</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.13 p. 3-77</td>
<td>Suggest updating of the discussion of Waikele Gulch and Bluffs because the Navy does not own the land.</td>
<td>OK – The discussion of the issues has been changed to note the completion of the transfer from Navy to private ownership. (p.3-82) (p. 3-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.13.1 p. 3-78</td>
<td>Delete policy that private uses on DOD land which are not supporting DOD mandated missions should be subject to City land use plans and regulations because it is inconsistent with Navy policy.</td>
<td>√ -The City position is that such leases, if not in support of Federal or DOD programs, must comply with City plans and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.I</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Appendix A Maps A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4</td>
<td>The area at the end of Whitmore Avenue should be shown as Agricultural, and not as a Residential area or an Existing Urban Area on the maps in Appendix A.</td>
<td>√ -The current use of this area in the Joint Base Pearl Harbor – Hickam Wahiawa Annex is for office, residential and community recreation uses and not for agricultural uses. Given those existing uses, if these lands were ever to be turned over to the City for private use as part of a base closure, it is very unlikely that it would return to agricultural uses. Consistent with the treatment of other military areas, this area is shown as an existing urban, low density residential community which has limited capacity for expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.2 p. 3-11</td>
<td>Recommend deletion/revision of policies and statements “that encourage fishing, boating, or other recreational uses in the water of Pearl Harbor” because of security issues and hazards from consumption of fish and/or shellfish from Pearl Harbor. DOH has issued warning about consumption of catch from PH. Catch and release pole and line fishing is allowed in some sections of PH, but not in West Loch</td>
<td>√ -The text and policies were revised to clarify the need for Navy approval. (p. 3-13, 3-35, 3-40, 3-85 and 5-28) (p. 3-13, 3-35, 3-40, 3-85 and 5-28). We recognize that the Navy has determined, due to security concerns, that recreational activities in Pearl Harbor should be restricted. However, local users who have historically enjoyed greater access to those recreational resources would like to have greater access if the Navy's concerns could be allayed or conditions change. The (p. 3-13) (3-13) reference is informational, notes that Navy permission would be required, and is not part of an adopted or proposed policy or guideline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.M</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td>Sec. 3.6.1 p. 3-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22.14</td>
<td>CNRH/ JBPHH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Base Pearl Harbor - Hickam needs to be included in reviews of all proposed projects along Pearl Harbor.</td>
<td>√ -The concern is noted. JBPHH is included in the mailing list for those who are informed about proposed revisions to City plans affecting Waianae, Ewa, Central Oahu, and the Primary Urban Center. Regulations concerning permits have varying requirements as to notifications of adjacent property owners. The Office of Environmental Quality Control sends notifications of environmental reviews of projects statewide. Requests can be made to the Planning Commission and City Council to be placed on mailing lists/email lists to receive notices of pending land use and infrastructure actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.A</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.1 p. 2-8</td>
<td>Koa Ridge Makai should not be identified as needing urban zoning.</td>
<td>OK – The reference was corrected. (p. 2-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.B</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.1 Table 2.1 p. 2-11</td>
<td>Correct the notes to show that Koa Ridge Makai was reclassified by the State Land Use Commission in June 2012, and to report the residential capacity for housing as 1,050 units.</td>
<td>OK – The notes were corrected. (p. 2-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.C</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.3.8 p. 3-8</td>
<td>Revise the 3rd bullet to read: “Place new transmission lines underground where feasible and possible under criteria specified in State law.”</td>
<td>√ -The suggestion is noted, but the revision will not be made because the existing language already implies that undergrounding is to be done only if feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.D</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.3 Table 3.1 p. 3-17</td>
<td>Correct the acreage shown for the Koa Ridge Community Park. The acreage was reduced to 17 acres in order to provide one acre for a fire station and one acre for a day care facility.</td>
<td>OK – The acreage figure was corrected. (p. 3-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.E</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.2 Table 3.3 p. 3-57</td>
<td>Request “that the 90 foot height limit apply to the Mixed-Use with Residential in the BMX-3 zoned lands in the Koa Ridge project.”</td>
<td>√ -The request is noted, but the change in height should be accomplished via a zone change application rather than an amendment to the CO SCP guidelines. The City approved a 60 foot height limit for the BMX-3 zoned areas in the Koa Ridge Makai project. We have proposed revision of the CO SCP to allow heights up to 90 feet to “be considered” for mixed-use residential areas. Accordingly, Castle &amp; Cooke could submit an application for increasing the BMX-3 area height limit to 90 foot. The application would be processed by the Department and submitted, with the Department’s recommendations, for official review and action by the Planning Commission and City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.F</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.2 p. 3-61</td>
<td>“There is concern that canopy trees . . .are known to have roots that over time crack and lift sidewalks resulting in safety issues for the residents and maintenance problems for the city and community’s homeowners’ association.”</td>
<td>√ -The concern with the impact of canopy trees on sidewalk safety and maintenance is noted. However, canopy trees have been shown to provide a wide range of benefits for communities including higher property values and reduction of storm runoff, energy costs needed for air conditioning, wear and tear on roadways and sidewalks, and air pollution. With adequate space and use of best practices and designs, canopy trees can be incorporated into new developments in ways that minimize infrastructure maintenance problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.G</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.9.3 p. 3-61 App. A Map A-2 p. A-19</td>
<td>Koa Ridge should be shown as a Medium Density Apartment/Community Mixed Use area on the Urban Land Use Map</td>
<td>OK – The map has been corrected to be consistent with the approved zoning which is mixed use and medium density apartment. [App. A Map A-2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.H</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 3.10.1 p. 3-65 Sec. 5.9 Table 5.1 p. 5-16</td>
<td>Add “Allow a business hotel to provide short term accommodations for business travelers and others who are not seeking resort accommodations.” to Sec. 3.10.1 and to Table 5.1</td>
<td>OK – Consistent with recent City amendments to the Land Use Ordinance, a policy allowing business hotels in Major Community Commercial Centers where compatible and subject to appropriate conditions has been added to Sec. 3.10.1 and to Table 5.1. (p. 3-69, p. 5-27) (p. 3-70, p. 5-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.I</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 4.1.2 p. 4-6</td>
<td>Request modification of the description of required transportation improvements to reflect the fact the specific improvements listed as conditions approved as part of the zone change must be approved and may be modified by the State DOT, City DTS, and/or DPP based on the most current updated Traffic Impact Assessment Report (TIAR) accepted or approved by those agencies.</td>
<td>OK – The descriptive information in Sec. 4.1.2 has been revised to reflect the fact that the required improvements will be established by DOT, DTS, and DPP based on the most current TIAR and may differ from those listed in the zone change. (p. 4-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.J</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>App. A p. A-2</td>
<td>Correct Important Agricultural Lands (IAL) information to reflect the fact that Castle &amp; Cooke has received LUC approval for IAL designation for over 400 acres in Central Oahu.</td>
<td>OK – The descriptive information in Appendix A has been corrected. (p. A-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.K</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>App. A pp. A-3-A-4 Sec. 2.2.1 Table 2.1 p. 2-11</td>
<td>Correct footnotes and text that indicate that areas above the 50 inch annual rainfall isohyet are outside the Community Growth Boundary, and correct references in Table 2.1 to the acreage in the Mililani Technology Park.</td>
<td>OK – The footnotes and text in Appendix A and the acreage in Table 2.1 have been corrected. (p. A-3, p. 2-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>AGENCY/Commentor</td>
<td>SECTION Old PRD page #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1.L</td>
<td>Castle &amp; Cooke</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2.1 p. 4-18</td>
<td>Revise the first bullet under Watershed Protection to read: “Development of the lands above the Pearl Harbor aquifer in Central Oahu which receive more than 50 inches of rainfall annually must employ Low Impact Development techniques in order to minimize impact on the recharge of the Pearl Harbor aquifer.”</td>
<td>OK – The policy has been amended to clarify that urban development of lands within the Community Growth Boundary receiving 50 inches or more annual rainfall can occur if it can be demonstrated that use of Low Impact Development techniques will result in no reduction in aquifer recharge. (p. 4-18) {p. 4-20}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P1.M | Castle & Cooke  | Sec. 3.12.1 p. 3-74    | Delete the list of uses not permitted in Miliani Technology Park (MTP) and the guideline that restricts retail and service uses to 10 percent of the total floor area of the business park because these conditions are already incorporated in the Unilateral Agreement (UA) for Phase 1 of the MTP. | √ -The request is noted, but we think it is premature to make such a piecemeal change to the policies and guidelines for MTP without any comprehensive plan for what is the desired future for the area, especially as noted in the request, the policies and guidelines are embedded in the UA that would continue to regulate uses at the MTP Phase 1.  
If the desire is to abandon the “campus-like high technology business park” vision for MTP Phase 1 and 2, Castle & Cooke should explain what is their vision for the area, and how that supports the CO SCP vision for Central Oahu’s future development.  
The appropriate mechanism for a community review and discussion of the changes for MTP might be for Castle & Cooke to submit an Independent Application for a SCP Amendment in conjunction with a Zone Change Amendment application for modification and/or deletion of Unilateral Agreement conditions and zoning districts as appropriate. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2.A</td>
<td>Wahiwa Hospital</td>
<td>Sec. 4.9 p. 4-40</td>
<td>Requesting confirmation that the proposed revised CO SCP will incorporate the Medical Complex features described in the LUC proceedings and City Council zone change review and approval for Koa Ridge</td>
<td>√ -The information in Sec. 4.9 regarding Koa Ridge does reflect the proposed development of the Medical Complex as described in the zone change application and testimony before the City Council on the Koa Ridge project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3.A</td>
<td>Wahiawa Historical Society</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7 p. 3-43 to 3-44</td>
<td>Wahiawa is unique because it is surrounded by water, making (it) an island on an island. It is surrounded by the North and South forks of Kaukonahua Stream . . . which splits on the eastern side of Wahiawa and joins together on the western side.</td>
<td>OK – The descriptive text in the overview of Wahiawa has been amended to include that unique perspective. (p. 3-46) {3-47}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3.B</td>
<td>Wahiawa Historical Society</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7.1.2 p. 3-45</td>
<td>The reference to Kaukonahua in the second bullet should be clarified to indicate if the stream or the road is being referenced.</td>
<td>OK – The policy has been revised to make it clear that the reference is to Kaukonahua Stream. (p. 3-47) {3-49}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4.A</td>
<td>Sandy Webb</td>
<td>Preface &amp; Exec. Summary p. ES-1</td>
<td>Upset about the description of Central Oahu’s role and the General Plan policy for development to be encouraged in Central Oahu. “I do not support any language in the Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan that promoted additional residential or commercial development and ask that it be amended.</td>
<td>√ -The Central Oahu Sustainable Communities Plan (CO SCP) is required by Charter to implement the Oahu General Plan (GP) which does call for development of urban fringe areas in Central Oahu. This text in the CO SCP was adopted in 2002 and simply describes what the GP objectives and policies are for Central Oahu. If you want to change the GP, you may want to participate in the review and revision of the General Plan which is currently underway. Visit the DPP Planning Web Page for more information on the GP revision process and opportunities to participate and provide testimony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Central Oahu SCP Public Review Draft Comments and DPP Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4.B</td>
<td>Sandy Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td>“the plan does not specifically state that open spaces, access to natural areas, bike pathways, etc should be completed in existing residential communities BEFORE further residential development”</td>
<td>√ -The adopted 2002 Plan and the proposed PRD do call for “public agencies (to) . . . work with the community . . . to address current deficiencies . . . and to create adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of the residential and working populations of the area (p. 2-6) {p. 2-6}. The 2002 Plan and the PRD also calls for “timely” development of infrastructure to “meet the needs resulting from new projects.” (p. 2-7) {p. 2-7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4.C</td>
<td>Sandy Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td>The COSP does not include any timelines for the implementation of the improvements described in chapters 3 and 4.</td>
<td>√ -In most cases, the Plan does not include timelines for specific implementation actions since those are established in the City and State long range plans for infrastructure or in specific project plans approved in Capital Improvement Budgets. Also, if we did include the most current timetables, it is likely that they would soon become out dated as conditions changed. However, in the PRD Table 4.1 (p. 4-3) {p. 4-3}, we have included time tables for the development of State and City transportation projects which are provided in the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan. Throughout the plan, you will find references to the relevant long range public facility and infrastructure plans for Central Oahu which you could consult to determine what the timetables are for specific project completions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Central Oahu SCP Public Review Draft Comments and DPP Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>AGENCY/Commentor</th>
<th>SECTION Old PRD page #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>DPP RESPONSE (New PRD page #) (Ramseyer version page #)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P5.A</td>
<td>Jonathan Kieffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>In the Mililani, Mililani mauka area, there are places where bicycle lanes or pass paths are needed on the road because some areas of Meheula Parkway there is room for a bike lane but the cars tend to use more than their lane.</td>
<td>√ -Your views are supported by the adopted Plan which includes language which calls for separate bike paths on major arterials (p. 3-10, 5th bullet) {p. 3-10, 5th bullet} and by new language proposed in the PRD which calls for existing and new streets to be “Complete Streets” which are described on (p. 3-63) {p. 3-64} as “streets (that) . . . provide safe access and mobility for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, and persons of all abilities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5.B</td>
<td>Jonathan Kieffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up in Mililani Mauka area, more paths are needed to be put in to create the environmental feel in the residential neighborhood areas. Right now, there are two public paths that leads you through a forest or grassy area that are more non natural the natural. There are areas in Mililani Mauka up farther which Castle and Cooke owns. They can be made public hiking paths that would enhance the environmental feel to the neighborhood. space</td>
<td>√ -Your desire for better access to mountain hiking is also supported by the existing Plan adopted by the City in 2002 and by the PRD. See the policies and guidelines in Sec. 3.1 Open Space Preservation and Development which call for o allowing access to mountain areas, o developing bike paths and pedestrian walkways through a network of greenways, and o creating linkages that would allow development of a trail system throughout Central Oahu gulches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6.A</td>
<td>Lendlease</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1 p. 3-2 Sec. 3.13 p. 3-76</td>
<td>Correct references to Lendlease, status of leases, and future uses of Island Palm Communities land south of Schofield Barracks.</td>
<td>OK – The corrections have been made. (p. 3-2, p. 3-81) {p. 3-2, p. 3-82}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No Change to Plan; **OK:** Make Change to Plan (p. #); **R:** Propose Implementation Improvement; ? Needs Further Research Study