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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Technical Report documents the process of revising and updating the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (WSCP). The report presents the rationale behind the changes and additions to the original Wai‘anae SCP (2000), which have been included in the updated Wai‘anae SCP (2010). The revisions were based primarily on input from community members, gathered through three open public meetings and a series of six working meetings of the Wai‘anae Planning Advisory Committee (PAC).

The process of updating the Wai‘anae SCP was implemented by the City and County of Honolulu’s Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) and planning consultant, Townscape Inc. (the Consultant), who was a subconsultant to PlanPacific, Inc. Townscape’s primary roles and responsibilities were to listen to the various community concerns, evaluate which issues could be addressed by the WSCP (and which could not), and recommend how best to do so. There was also significant input from DPP staff, who reviewed and commented on the various drafts, and met with the Consultant regularly throughout the process.

The report is organized into the following Chapters and Appendices:

- Chapter 1 provides a record of the review process with a detailed description of the major steps.
- Chapter 2 describes and analyzes the major issues facing the region and how the WSCP addresses them.
- Chapter 3 presents a description of the specific revisions and additions to the WSCP.
- The rest of the background information is contained in Appendices A through H.
This page intentionally left blank.
1. REVIEW PROCESS

The purpose of the Wai'anae SCP five-year review was to update the original Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan that was adopted by the Honolulu City Council in 2000. Project objectives included:

1. Measure progress toward achieving the vision, as well as the policies and guidelines.
2. Identify land use development trends and potential new development proposals that have implications for SCP, as well as possible General Plan policies.
3. Identify relevant, significant issues that the previous SCP did not adequately address.
4. Propose modified or new policies and guidelines for those issues for which satisfactory progress has not been achieved, and for emerging or new needs that require attention.

This chapter describes the process that was undertaken to accomplish the five-year review of the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan (WSCP). The description has been organized into the four main phases of work:

1.1 Initial Tasks: March to May 2007
1.2 PAC Meetings: June to December 2007
1.3 Public Review: 2008
1.4 Finalize: 2009 & 2010

1.1 INITIAL TASKS: MARCH TO MAY 2007

The Consultant’s initial tasks for the update process were to talk with residents and community leaders about their major land use concerns through individual and small group interviews, and to attend community meetings to listen to the issues that were raised. Townscape also participated in the “Empower Wai’anae SpeakOut,” held at Mā‘ili Beach Park in November of 2006 (notes from the SpeakOut are in Appendix E). This event was held specifically to hear from the numerous homeless people living at that beach park and neighboring areas at that time. The information gathered from all of these sources helped to point out specific issues that the updated Plan needed to address. In addition, the SpeakOut was the main source of input from the rather significant population of homeless people living in Wai’anae (estimated to be anywhere from 2,000 to 6,000 people in 2007).

A. Individual Stakeholder Interviews
Between March 21st and April 27th, 2007, the Consultant met with the following community leaders:

1. Puanani Burgess, Executive Director, Wai’anae Coast Comprehensive Alternative Development Corp.
2. Patty Teruya, Chair, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (in 2008 she became Chair of the newly formed Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board)
3. Cynthia Rezentes, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (in 2008 she became a member of the newly formed Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board)
4. William Aila, Harbor Master, Wai‘anae Harbor
5. Melva Aila
6. Landis Ornellas, Capital Investments Corp.
7. Eric Enos, Programs Director, Kaʻala Farm
9. Todd Apo, City Councilman for the Wai‘anae District
10. Karen Awana, House Representative for the Nānākuli area
11. Maile Shimabukuro, House Representative for the Wai‘anae area

While numerous topics surfaced during these initial meetings, there are seven that emerged as priority issues that the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review needed to address:

1. Homelessness/Affordable Housing
2. Population Growth/Loss of Rural Character
3. Lack of Transportation Options/Farrington Highway
4. Military Land Use and Ordnance in Coastal Waters
5. Support for Agriculture
6. Recreational Parks
7. Jobs/Unemployment/Economics

Chapter 2 of this Report contains analysis of these issues, along with a matrix that tracks how these issues were addressed in the revised WSCP.

B. Public Informational Meeting #1
The first Public Informational Meeting for the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review was held on May 3, 2007 at 7 pm at the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Community Center. The purpose of this meeting was to inform the community of the function and significance of the WSCP, the process to update the WSCP, and the various ways that they could be involved in the process. Participants were also asked to briefly discuss their priority land use concerns. (Meeting notes are included in Appendix E.)

C. Formation of PAC
At the first Public Informational Meeting, 25 people signed up to participate in the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) to help guide the review process. From that point, the next step was to look closely at the list and think about which important stakeholder groups were not represented. A list was developed of possible missing stakeholder categories that could be filled, including young people, farmers, certain ethnic groups, educators, and business owners.
The Consultant then called some of their community contacts and asked them for recommendations of people who might represent these “under-represented” groups. Overall, this networking led to 16 additional members, for a total of 41.

Although this number (41) is relatively large for a working group, it was not expected that all of the members would attend every meeting. Instead, it was anticipated that the Committee would have a somewhat flexible membership, and that some new members might join during the process. While DPP had planned for a more structured PAC membership and formal invitation process, it was believed that the Wai‘anae community needed this type of flexible and inclusive PAC format. This is because the Wai‘anae community is a relatively tight-knit group that is actively involved in various community planning projects. Accordingly, many of them are skilled planners themselves, who feel a real sense of ownership over this SCP Update process. Thus, they preferred to select their own membership, instead of having it chosen by DPP. In addition, many of the most respected community members are involved in a number of organizations and projects. Although they were not able to attend every PAC meeting, they still had important insights to contribute when they could attend, and therefore were not excluded.

Thus, as recommended by the scope of the SCP Comprehensive Review, the Wai‘anae Planning Advisory Committee was composed of “knowledgeable community leaders that represent a broad range of interests and affiliations.” Several of the members were involved in numerous organizations and businesses. In addition, the membership residency was distributed fairly equally among each of the four major ahupua‘a within the District: Nānākuli, Lualualei/Mā‘ili, Wai‘anae, and Mākaha. The PAC membership list is included in Appendix F, Working Paper #3.

D. Outcomes of the Initial Tasks

- Identification of major issues that needed to be addressed in the WSCP 5-year review process
- Formation of Planning Advisory Committee

1.2 PAC MEETINGS: JUNE TO DECEMBER 2007

The most significant amount of ideas and input that went into the Wai‘anae SCP revisions were generated and gathered during the five PAC meetings that were held between June and September of 2007. This input was incorporated into the WSCP, Preliminary Draft (2007). An overview of what was covered at each of those meetings is presented below:

A. PAC Meeting #1 – June 7, 2007

- Reviewed original WSCP (2000) in more detail than at Public Informational Meeting.
- Discussed how to “score” the effectiveness of the 2000 WSCP, by looking primarily at the Vision and the Vision Elements. The idea was to have the community give their
input on how well the 2000 WSCP had been implemented or not, in the form of a “Scorecard,” or “Performance Assessment” (included in Chapter 3).

- Created a list of possible revisions to the WSCP.

**B. PAC Meeting #2 – June 30, 2007**
- Presentation on how this Plan fits into Hawai‘i’s and O‘ahu’s land use planning and regulatory structure.
- Reviewed draft “Scorecard” that had been created based on input from PAC Meeting #1.
- Split up into three groups to discuss:
  - 1. Natural and cultural resources (sections 3.1 – 3.7),
  - 2. Land use (sections 3.8 – 3.12), and
  - 3. Infrastructure (Chapter 4).
- Each group made a list of what aspects of those sections needed revising.

**C. PAC Meeting #3 – August 11, 2007**
- The purpose of this meeting was to review Chapter 3, on Land Use, in more detail and to suggest possible revisions and additions. There were numerous suggestions, so only sections 3.1 through 3.6 were covered.

**D. PAC Meeting #4 – September 6, 2007**
- Continued discussion from the previous PAC meeting; discussed possible revisions and additions for sections 3.7 through 3.12.

**E. PAC Meeting #5 – September 25, 2007**
- Reviewed Chapter 4, on Infrastructure and Public Facilities; suggested possible revisions and additions.

**F. Outcomes of PAC Meetings (June to December 2007):**
- WSCP Performance Assessment; “Scorecard” (first draft)
- Memo entitled, “Summary of Proposed Revisions” (first draft)
- Wai‘anae SCP (Preliminary Draft, December 2007).

**1.3 PUBLIC REVIEW: 2008**

From February through July 2008, DPP met with the various consultants working on the SCP/DP Updates to discuss how to make the Plans more consistent in their format. They believed that consistent formatting could improve implementation, since doing so would allow DPP staff to locate the pertinent information more readily. This process resulted in several format changes, which were then incorporated into the WSCP.
Thus, during August, DPP and the Consultant decided there should be another Preliminary Draft with the recently approved format changes and updated data. This second Preliminary Draft was submitted on September 5, 2008. The PAC met on September 18th to review this Preliminary Draft. Those comments were incorporated, along with DPP’s comments, and the Public Review Draft was created and submitted by early October. Lastly, two Public Informational Meetings were held to review that draft, as described below:

A. PAC Meeting #6
The sixth PAC meeting was held on September 18, 2008. The purpose of this meeting was to review the 2008 Preliminary Draft. The Consultant then incorporated the input gathered at this meeting, along with comments that were submitted via mail, email, and phone calls from other community (and PAC) members who could not attend the September 18th meeting, as well as from DPP. The result was the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (Public Review Draft, 2008), which was submitted to DPP and released to the public on October 2, 2008. Public comments were initially accepted until November 15, but the comment period was then extended to December 15, 2008. Late comments were accepted until September 2009.

B. Public Informational Meeting #2
The second Public Informational Meeting (PIM) was held on October 27, 2008. The major proposed revisions to the Wai‘anae SCP that were included in the Public Review Draft were presented, and community comments and concerns were recorded. Overall, the Wai‘anae community was in agreement that the changes and additions accurately reflected their input. The most controversial issue of the meeting was the proposed addition of a light industrial area in Lualualei. The group did not reach a consensus on whether or not to add the light industrial area to the Land Use Map, and so it was decided to continue the discussion on this issue and the rest of the Public Review Draft at a third Public Informational Meeting in November. More information on this issue is included in Chapter 2.

C. Public Informational Meeting #3
The third PIM was held on November 25, 2008. Townscape gave a brief presentation on the proposed light industrial area, including distribution of a map of the project area, the definition of “I-1 limited industrial district,” the approval processes the developer needs to go through, and the resolution recently passed by the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board in support of the project. There was then a facilitated “go-around” to hear people’s comments, which were recorded in the meeting notes. There was no final decision or consensus on the issue. The meeting finished with a brief review of the major revisions to Chapters 4 and 5 that were included in the Public Review Draft. There were a few questions and suggestions, and the meeting was closed.

D. Presentations to Neighborhood Boards
In addition to the Public Informational Meetings, Townscape also regularly reported the progress of the Wai‘anae SCP review process to the District’s Neighborhood Board(s). When the project began in March 2007, there was only the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (NB), which covered
the entire District. During 2007, the Consultant attended many of those meetings, both to listen to the issues and present updates on the project. Then in March 2008, the area split into two separate NBs – the Wai‘anae NB (#24), which now includes the land from Wai‘anae Valley west to Ka‘ena Point, and Nānākuli-Mā‘ili NB (#36), which includes Lualualei/Mā‘ili and Nānākuli. During this timeframe, Townscape presented a project update at the Nānākuli NB meeting in October, and at the Wai‘anae NB meeting in December 2008.

E. Outcomes of the Public Review (August to December 2008):
- Second Preliminary Draft WSCP (submitted September 5, 2008)
- Public Review Draft WSCP (submitted October 2, 2008)

1.4 FINALIZE: 2009 & 2010

To finalize the five-year review of the WSCP several milestones had to be met by the Consultant, including submission of the Draft Technical Report, the PreFinal WSCP, the final Technical Report, and the final Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010). The last step consists of the final public meeting to present to the Wai‘anae PAC and community the finalized Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan and the process for the Plan to be adopted into ordinance. The rest of the process will be handled by DPP, the Planning Commission, and the City Council.

The outcomes of the final year of work on the WSCP five-year review process are presented below. At the time of submittal of this Report, some of these items had already been completed and some had not, which explains the differences in verb tense used:

- PreFinal Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (submitted July 2009)
- Final Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan & Technical Report (submitted December 2009)
  - Both the final WSCP and Technical Report were labeled “January 2010”.
  - DPP required further revisions to both of these “final drafts.”
- “Almost Final” Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (submitted July 2010)
- Final Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan & Technical Report (submitted October 2010)
- Townscape schedules and facilitates a final community meeting to present the final draft and adoption process.
- DPP submits the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010) and Technical Report with their comments to the City and County of Honolulu Planning Commission.
- The Planning Commission submits their recommendation on the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010) to the City Council.
- The City Council considers the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010) for adoption.
2. ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSES

While the previous chapter outlined the major steps of the revision process, this chapter describes the major issues facing the region that were identified during that process, and how the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan was revised to address them. During the initial interviews with community leaders, seven major issues were raised. Later in the process, a proposal to develop a light industrial park became a major concern to be addressed, as well as a Nānākuli Regional Park. These eight issues are discussed below.

In addition to these eight major issues facing the region, a prominent concern that was voiced throughout the process was the implementation of the WSCP. Community members questioned why some parts of the Plan were carried out, while others were not. DPP was also concerned with implementation, and so made one component of the revision process an assessment of the original WSCP, to examine how well it had been implemented or not. This was the purpose of the “Scorecard,” which was later re-named the “Performance Assessment.” The WSCP was also revised to address the outcomes of this assessment, as described below.

2.1 MAJOR ISSUES FACING THE REGION

The seven major issues facing the region, as identified by the community leaders interviewed at the outset of the project, are discussed below and then summarized in the subsequent Issues Matrix. There is also discussion on how these issues were addressed in the Wai`anae SCP (2010).

1. Homelessness/Affordable Housing

The issue of homelessness is generally regarded as one of the most, if not the most prominent issue facing the Wai`anae District in recent times. While the causes include a wide range of socio-economic factors, the one most directly related to land use and the WSCP is affordable housing. However, the large number of homeless people living in Wai`anae also impacts other aspects of land use and infrastructure. The WSCP does not attempt to offer a comprehensive solution to homelessness, but instead it looks at these impacts and how land use and infrastructure decisions should account for the homeless population.
First, Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 include an estimate of the number of homeless individuals living in Wai’anae. In 2008, the homeless population was estimated to be over 6,000, including those living on the beaches, the “hidden homeless” (those living “doubled up” or “tripled up” with friends or family), and those living in transitional shelters (this data was collected from Wai’anae Community Outreach, various shelters, and the Hawaii Housing Policy Study done in 2003 by SMS). It is important to include this information because the current population estimate for the District may not count the entire homeless population. For example, the 2007 population estimate was 43,655. This number plus 6,000 brings the total up to almost 50,000 residents. Thus, land use and infrastructure decisions may not be being made based on accurate population counts. Some residents argue that this is one of the reasons the District has overloaded infrastructure and public facilities, such as the sewer system, water system, roads, parks, the public school system, health care, and police and fire protection services. The WSCP includes this information in order to encourage the departments and agencies that are responsible for these services to utilize the true population count while doing their planning.

Regarding land use, a commonly proposed solution is to build more homeless shelters and affordable housing projects within the District. However, many of the Wai’anae residents involved in the WSCP revision process felt that building more shelters and affordable housing projects would not fix the problem. Instead, some believed it would only aggravate the problem, since no preference is given to Wai’anae residents, and so it sends the message that if you live on O’ahu and are homeless or in need of affordable housing, you should go to Wai’anae. They believe this message is already out there, since the Wai’anae District already has a relatively high proportion of such facilities compared to the rest of the island. In fact, some homeless participants in the Empower Wai’anae SpeakOut said they had come to Wai’anae from other islands because they felt more comfortable here.

Thus, a Policy and a Guideline on affordable housing were added to Section 3.8 on Residential Land Use. The Policy (3.8.2.5) is to “Allow Only Affordable Housing Projects that Meet Wai’anae SCP Guidelines.” Similarly, the Guideline (3.8.3.1) that was added states that proposed new affordable housing project should meet the following criteria:

- Affordable housing projects should be distributed equally around the island (i.e., Wai’anae should not have a significantly higher proportion of affordable housing units than the other Districts).
- The project needs to address the needs of the community, such as new and/or improved infrastructure and facilities. These needs should be discussed and decided upon through extensive community outreach and collaboration initiated by the proposed developer.
• 201H projects should conform to the Policies and Guidelines within the Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan.”

Overall, many community members felt that the more significant need, and one that offers at least a partial solution, is for appropriate economic development – more jobs. This is discussed more in Issue #7 below.

2. Population Growth/Loss of Rural Character

The issue of increasing population is directly related to Issue #1. However, it is not only the homeless population that is increasing in Wai’anae. The entire island of O’ahu has been experiencing steady population growth, and Wai’anae is no exception. Overall, the District’s percentage of the island’s total population has been increasing as well, as shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population of Wai’anae District</th>
<th>Population of Island of O’ahu</th>
<th>Percentage of O’ahu Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>353,020</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>16,452</td>
<td>500,409</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>24,077</td>
<td>630,528</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>31,487</td>
<td>762,565</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>37,411</td>
<td>836,231</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42,259</td>
<td>876,156</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>44,490</td>
<td>911,841</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>46,776</td>
<td>969,467</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>48,667</td>
<td>1,017,576</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>49,217</td>
<td>1,038,317</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census, 2000 and DPP, 2009
(Note: Numbers for years 2010 through 2035 are projections from DPP, 2009)

There are numerous impacts of such large population increases, which have affected the District’s overall rural character. As shown above, the region had as few as 7,000 people living there only a little over 50 years ago. Recent estimates have the District population close to 50,000. Thus, long-time residents have experienced dramatic changes to their home during their lifetime.

The area that has been changed most notably is the corridor along Farrington Highway. What was once a narrow, dirt road that meandered along the coast and through small villages, is now a major four lane highway bordered by urban, suburban, and resort development on both sides.
It serves as both the local coastal road for trips within the District, as well as the only commuter highway for trips outside of Wai‘anae. During peak traffic, Farrington Highway is heavily congested, especially between Wai‘anae Town Center and Nānākuli.

In addition, Wai‘anae has a strong agricultural history. Not long ago, the District was home to numerous farms, which produced milk, eggs, poultry, pork, and various fruits and vegetables. In 1997, production in the District included six dairies that produced over half of the State’s milk, 20 piggeries that accounted for over half of the State’s pork production, three egg operations that provided over half of the State’s egg production, three broiler chicken farms that accounted for 98% of the State’s total, the State’s largest pullet operation with about 50,000 birds, and various cattle-grazing, sheep and goat farms. As of 2007, only 9 farms over 50 acres in size remained. This decline in agricultural activity is discussed more in Issue #5, but its importance here is to note the impact of its decline on the character of the region, both economically and in land use.

Because of this dramatic population growth and change in character, many residents would like to see stronger controls in preventing further population increases. This is the main reason why many residents do not support the construction of more large-scale affordable housing projects in the District, even though most agree that the lack of affordable housing is one of the main causes of homelessness. There is no easy answer to this dilemma.

Overall, much of the community would also like to see more support for agriculture and more land designated or preserved as open space, such as parks. Numerous Policies and Guidelines that have been included within the WSCP are intended to support or maintain what remains of Wai‘anae’s rural character.

### 3. Lack of Transportation Options/Traffic along Farrington Highway

Regarding transportation problems within the Wai‘anae District, the main issue is with Farrington Highway. As described in the previous issue, as well as within Chapter 4 of the WSCP itself, Farrington Highway serves as both the local coastal road for trips within the District, as well as the only commuter highway for trips outside of Wai‘anae. Because of this situation, the road is often heavily congested, and has become one of the most dangerous roads in the state.

Although the State Department of Transportation website does not offer statistics on the number of traffic accidents specifically in the Wai‘anae District, various sources report Farrington Highway as one of the most dangerous roads in the state:
“Honolulu Police target the Waianae Coast for speeders because 25 percent of the island’s fatal accidents happen there…”

“More than 80 people have been killed in traffic accidents on Farrington Highway between Honokai Hale and Ka'ena Point since 1990.”

In 2002, the State of Hawai‘i House of Representatives passed a Resolution requesting the O‘ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (OMPO) to conduct a study that would offer solutions to the traffic problems on the Wai'anae Coast (H.R. No. 160 H.D.1). That Resolution began:

“WHEREAS, the Waianae Coast is plagued with numerous traffic problems, including the lack of an alternative route in times of emergency, speeding and unsafe drivers, pedestrian safety, and growing traffic on Farrington Highway due to a growing Leeward population”.

Unfortunately, no major changes have been made to the District’s main highway yet. Nonetheless, residents active in the WSCP update were very vocal about the continued need for improvements to Farrington Highway to make the area safer for drivers and pedestrians, as well as other routes to improve commuting. The group generally agreed that the priority need is to establish an Emergency Bypass Road (suggested route is up Lualualei Naval Road, through the Kolekole Pass, to Kunia Road). The secondary, or long-term goal is to create a Second Access Highway to provide an alternative route for commuting into and out of the District – at all times, not just during emergencies (suggested route is also up Lualualei Naval Road, but then through the Pohakea Pass to Kunia Road).

In addition, residents would like to see more transportation options besides driving. Some of the ideas mentioned include increased bus service, water transportation (ferries), and more bikepaths. Specifically, there was much discussion about the creation of a new walking/jogging/biking path along the coast, which would connect four Community Gathering Places, one in each of the major ahupua‘a (Nānākuli, Lualualei/Mā‘ili, Wai‘anae, and Mākaha), in their beach parks. All of these ideas have been incorporated into the Policies and Guidelines of the WSCP (2010).
4. Military Land Use & Ordnance in the Ocean

Military land use is controversial throughout Hawai‘i. One of the most controversial areas has been in Wai‘anae, where the U.S. military occupies 34.2 percent of the District's land. As in other places throughout the state, many residents see this occupation as a major factor contributing to the lack of land available for other uses, such as housing, agriculture, and cultural practices.

The U.S. Navy owns 9,227 acres in Lualualei Valley, which consists of land particularly well-suited for agriculture, since it is flat, there are a number of wells for irrigation purposes, and the soil type is the unique vertisol series, which is known to be very fertile. However, instead of being farmed, most of the land in this valley is used for the storage of various kinds of ordnance (ammunition and explosives) in the “Naval Magazine Lualualei Headquarter Branch” and for high and low frequency radio signal transmissions from the two towers in the “NCTAMS EASTPAC, RFT Lualualei.” The impact of the military on the area’s farmers is discussed more in the subsequent Issue.

While there are definite cultural concerns with the Navy’s presence in Lualualei, the U.S. Army’s impact on cultural sites and practices in Mākua Valley has been much more contentious. As stated in Section 3.12 of the WSCP (2010):

“For many members of the Wai‘anae community, Mākua Valley has a special cultural and religious significance. This significance predates the Army’s presence and use of Mākua Valley. There are a number of important heiau and other significant cultural and religious sites found there."

Because of the presence of these cultural sites, many Wai‘anae residents advocate for the return of Mākua Valley to community control and use. In addition, the Army’s use of Mākua in recent years has been minimal. Many in Wai‘anae believe that the Army has demonstrated its ability to train at alternate locations, thus negating the need for Mākua Valley as a training area.

Lastly, there is the issue of ordnance in the coastal waters off of the Wai‘anae Coast. Many residents have long known that the U.S. military dumped chemical and conventional weapons in these waters, and they are reminded by the ordnance that continues to wash up along the coast. As a result, community members have put forth significant effort to get these dumping grounds cleaned up.
As of August 2009, the Army had reviewed more than 2 million documents under a congressional mandate to pinpoint and determine the effects of dumping chemical and conventional weapons into the ocean – which was banned in 1972. In addition, the Pentagon had spent $7 million to determine the location of these munition dumpsites in Hawai‘i, analyze the effects on the environment, and determine ways to remove the unexploded ordnance (Star Bulletin, 2009).

According to an August 4, 2009 article in the Star Bulletin:

“The Army Corps of Engineers hopes to begin clearing the reef and the ocean bottom of conventional munitions at Ordnance Reef, using robotic techniques beginning next summer. The Pentagon's goal is to clear the water from the shoreline to 120 feet of unexploded munitions.”

This issue was not addressed in the WSCP (2010) because the issue is on the Federal level, and deals with ocean waters, not land use. However, it remains a major issue for Wai‘anae residents.

5. Support for Agriculture

The “big picture” of the agricultural situation in Hawai‘i is that the islands have become almost completely dependent on outside sources for food. If the barges and planes stopped coming, there would only be enough food to feed everyone for one to two weeks (Maui Sierra Club, 2008). In addition, many of Hawai‘i’s residents lack the income and/or ability to acquire food that is safe and nutritious, which also denotes “food insecurity”.

As mentioned previously, agriculture is on the decline in the Wai‘anae District. The primary reason for this decline is the same throughout the state and the entire U.S – large-scale commercial farms can sell their products at such low costs that small-scale farmers cannot compete. In addition, rising fuel costs have pushed up the cost of transportation. This hits Hawai‘i especially hard, since most fertilizers, pesticides, and feed are not produced here and must be shipped in.

One of the major issues surrounding agriculture in Wai‘anae is land availability and affordability. In order to be competitive, farms must be a minimum size to have economy of scale – where they can buy supplies and sell products in bulk. Otherwise they cannot compete. The District has very few areas with large contiguous areas of land that are not controlled by the U.S. military. Other issues include lack of technical expertise, lack of capital for start-up and
expansion, limited exposure to agriculture and related subjects in school, and lack of local consumer support in deference to “big box” retailers like Costco and Sam’s Club.

Overall, Wai’anae’s farmers need support in order to survive, and the community wants their agricultural tradition not just to survive, but to thrive. Appendix D of this Report contains items that were removed from the original WSCP, including agricultural “Issues and Proposed Solutions”. This section was moved to the Technical Report because it contains ideas that are somewhat general, rather than specific Policies or Guidelines to be implemented. Those that are specific enough to be Policies have been included as such. Below is an overview of these ideas (see details in Appendix D):

- **Proposed Solutions**
  - **Protection** – Community and Agriculture Boundaries, Land Use Regulations, Agriculture Easements, Farmland Trusts, Development Rights Transfer.
  - **Incentives** – Tax Incentives, Agricultural Subdivision, Affordable Water, Right-to-Farm Programs.

In sum, implementation of the Proposed Solutions from the original WSCP (2000) would be a major step in helping Wai’anae’s farmers. Among these solutions, the farmers have emphasized their need for large contiguous land areas that are affordable, along with access to low-interest loans to purchase it.

### 6. Recreational Parks

The main issue regarding recreational parks in the Wai’anae District is simple and straightforward – there is a shortfall of parks based on the City’s community-based park standards. The solution to this issue is similar to the agricultural issue discussed above – implement the Policies from the 2000 WSCP. This issue is clearly explained in the WSCP, Section 3.11, and therefore is not repeated here.

As of 2010, a Regional Park has been proposed for Nānākuli. If developed, it would be the District’s first Regional Park, consisting of 50 acres. It is planned to provide facilities for active recreational sports activities such as baseball, softball, football, tennis, basketball, and volleyball. While development of this park would greatly improve the situation, it would not solve it, and the shortfall of Neighborhood and District Parks should still be filled.
An additional and related issue is the large number of homeless living on the beaches. Many of these areas are City Beach Parks, which normally offer camping through the Parks Permitting System. While there is no simple solution to this homelessness, as previously discussed, it should be noted that this “user conflict” further aggravates the shortfall of parks.

7. Jobs/Unemployment/Economics

Section 3.1.3 “Economics” of the WSCP (2010) presents facts on how the Wai’anae community has “lagged” behind the rest of O’ahu in terms of economic development and employment opportunities. A few statistics of note: the 2000 U.S. Census put the Wai’anae District at one of the highest levels of unemployment in the state at 8.73%, compared to 3.8% statewide; and the per capita income of the District is 62% of the State’s per capita income. The growing homeless population demonstrates the significant number of people who do not have enough monthly income to support monthly rent payments.

The issue of unemployment has two components that are related, but distinct. First, there is a general lack of skills and qualifications for jobs. The second component is the lack of jobs available within the District. These issues are larger than the scope of the WSCP, which focuses on land use and infrastructure. Nonetheless, the land use and infrastructure need to support economic development opportunities. In addition, it should be noted that in 2007, the Governor formed the “Leeward Coast Initiative” to address Wai’anae’s “lagging” economy.

The most obvious solution to the lack of skills is to offer more training opportunities. The WSCP supports two programs that are currently growing to serve this need: the Leeward Community College (LCC) at Wai’anae and the Wai’anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center (WCCHC). LCC has plans to expand both in size and in courses offered. The WCCHC is already the largest employer in the District, and has been expanding their health career training opportunities for several years, both for high school and university students.

Other ideas were incorporated into the WSCP, including the following:

- New Vision Element 2.4.9, “Develop and support community-based businesses,” which supports agriculture, cultural, educational, and healthcare facilities and job opportunities.
- Policy 3.8.2.4, “Support Home-Based Businesses,” which strives to allow new, flexible job opportunities.
- Policy 3.9.2.3, “Support the Continued Viability of the Mākaha Resort.”
Policy 3.9.2.5, “Encourage Light Industrial Businesses” is not a new policy, but it has been modified to now include the new industrial site in Lualualei Valley. This new site is encouraged to provide affordably priced lots and a vocational training school.

Overall, the Policies and Guidelines within the WSCP support various types of economic development within the District. However, the implementation of projects and programs that will create more jobs calls for proactive efforts on the part of Wai‘anae residents and entrepreneurs.
Table 2: Issues Matrix:
Major Issues facing the Region During this 5-year Review and how they were Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Brief Description of Concern (in 2007)</th>
<th>Summary of Changes Made to WSCP (2010) to Address Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | **Homelessness/Affordable Housing:** Community was concerned with growing number of homeless and lack of appropriate infrastructure and public facilities to accommodate. DPP felt the SCP should offer more direction/guidance on affordable housing projects. | - Added community concern regarding increasing numbers of homeless in Chapter 1.  
- Added detailed data on homeless in Chapter 3.  
- Added Policy 3.8.2.5 “Allow Only Affordable Housing Projects that Meet Wai’anae’s SCP Guidelines.”  
- Added Guideline 3.8.3.1 “Follow Wai’anae SCP Affordable Housing Guidelines,” which are intended to give DPP guidance on future proposed affordable housing projects.  
- Added narrative on homeless living in parks in Section 3.11.                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Issue &amp; Brief Description of Concern (in 2007)</th>
<th>Summary of Changes Made to WSCP (2010) to Address Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. | **Support for Agriculture:** Concern that ag is dwindling within District for various reasons, especially the lack of available land.                                                                                                           | - Revised narrative in Section 3.7 to reflect current issues.  
- Updated agricultural data and highlighted problem of lack of available land that is large enough for large-scale operations, has uncontaminated soil, and is affordable.                                   |
| 6. | **Recreational Parks:** According to the City’s community-based park standards, there is a shortfall of number of parks and park acreage in region. Park space available for camping and picnicking has been further limited by homeless living in parks.  | - Pointed out that the shortfall of parks and park acreage has not been addressed since original WSCP (Section 3.11).  
- Added community concern regarding lack of park space for camping and picnicking due to homeless living in parks.  
- Updated park data, including proposed Nānākuli Regional Park.                                                                                                                            |
| 7. | **Jobs/Unemployment/Economics:** The WSCP should acknowledge and address the fact that Wai‘anae has the some of the highest levels of unemployment in the State. This socio-economic condition is directly related to homelessness, which impacts land use.  | - Added Vision Element #9 “Develop and support community-based businesses” to Chapter 2.  
- Added Section 3.1.3 on Economics, including data on income, poverty, and unemployment.  
- Added Policy 3.8.2.4 “Support Home-Based Businesses.”  
- Added Policy 3.9.2.3, “Support the Continued Viability of the Mākaha Resort.”  
- Discussed support for a new light industrial park in Section 3.9.1, and added description of what is intended for the new industrial site in Lualualei Valley. |
2.2 PROPOSED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AREA

In addition to the issues discussed above, one topic that received a significant amount of attention during the 5-year review process was the light industrial park proposed by Tropic Land LLC, for their land in Lualualei. This was the only major development that was proposed during this review. The landowner contacted Townscape to inquire how to be involved in the process, in hopes of obtaining the necessary revisions to the WSCP for their development to go forward. The main changes they needed were the addition of an “Industrial” area on the Land Use Map (where their property is located), amendment of the Rural Boundary to include this land, and various text revisions to SCP Policy that support light industrial in this area of the District.

Although there were many strong supporters of a new light industrial park, there was no agreement within the community that this was the best location. Therefore, the issue led to heated debates and no conclusion on the part of the community on whether or not to allow the necessary changes to the WSCP. Below is a summary of the basic facts of the proposed light industrial park, along with the community support for the project, and community concerns with the project.

Basic Facts

Tropic Land LLC's landownership and proposed land use are the following:

- Tropic Land owns three parcels (260.1 acres) in Lualualei. The industrial park is proposed for the 236-acre parcel on the east side of Lualualei Naval Access Road (TMK 8-7-009-002).
- The proposal is for the parcel to be split: 96 acres to be re-zoned from P-2 (general preservation district) to I-1 (limited industrial district) and the remaining 140 acres to all P-2 (from combination of P-1 and P-2). The 96 acres would also need a State Land Use Boundary amendment to reclassify the land from Agricultural to Urban use.
- The 96 acres would be used for the development of the “Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project, a Light Industrial Park.” The light industrial park would consist of 35 lots, averaging two acres each, and an “Incubator Center” for new or developing businesses.
- A map that shows the location of Tropic Land’s property and a draft site plan are shown in Exhibits 1 and 2.
- Currently, Tropic Land’s land is mostly vacant. The proposed development area (96 acres) is relatively flat, while the area that would remain zoned for preservation (140 acres) is relatively steep, along the ridge.
- There is limited development directly surrounding Tropic Land’s land. However, makai of their land, on the other side of Lualualei Naval Road, is a 25-acre parcel zoned I-1, which is used by West Oahu Aggregate Co. They supply sand, gravel, and other road building materials. Just makai of West Oahu Aggregate is the PVT construction and demolition debris landfill. Lualualei Valley is also home to the U.S. Naval Magazine Lualualei Headquarter Branch (7,498 acres) and “NCTAMS EASTPAC, RFT Lualualei” (1,729 acres), which is used for high and low frequency radio signal transmissions.
Exhibit 1: “Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project, a Light Industrial Park” Locational Map
Exhibit 2: Draft Site Plan for the “Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project, a Light Industrial Park”

Source: Tropic Land LLC
Summary of Community Support for the Project

There was a significant amount of community support for the project, including a Nānākuli-Māʻili Neighborhood Board #36 Resolution (dated July 15, 2008) “Supporting the Development and Concept of the Proposed Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project, a Light-Industrial Park in Lualualei Valley, Nānākuli, Oahu” (attached in Appendix C, as part of Working Paper #5). Tropic Land also gathered over 590 signatures/letters of support for the project.

During the WSCP meetings, the main reasons residents gave for supporting the project included the following:

- Job creation and economic development – both of which are greatly needed in the District, especially in Nānākuli and Lualualei.
- Waiʻanae’s young people need these kinds of opportunities: blue-collar jobs and vocational training.
- There is a significant need for this type of business space in this District. Currently, most new industrial business owners must go outside of the District to open this type of business.

Summary of Community Concerns about the Project

The main reasons for some strong reservations and even opposition include the following:

- There is not enough information. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be done first, so all potential impacts are made known to the public before this project goes forward.
- Allowing this WSCP change could set a bad precedent.
- Allowing this WSCP amendment and this project could open up our valleys for more development, producing a “domino effect.”
- Impacts to Farrington Highway, which is already congested.

Outcome

In 2010, DPP decided to include the proposed industrial site in the WSCP. Thus, an industrial area is shown in Lualualei Valley on the Land Use Map, and narrative supporting the site has been included in Section 3.9.
2.3 IMPLEMENTATION

Throughout the WSCP update process there were numerous comments from community members regarding implementation, such as “Does this Plan have any real teeth?” The reason for such comments was that people saw various Policies and Guidelines from the original WSCP that were never carried out or enforced, such as “3.11.2.1 Development of Adequate Public Parks a Top Priority” and “3.8.3.1 Height of Residential Structures.” This Policy on parks (3.11.2.1) called for the creation of more community-based parks, which did not happen. The Guideline (3.8.3.1) said residential building heights should not exceed two stories or 30 feet, yet the new affordable housing project called Hale Wai Vista, with a proposed 7 stories, was approved in 2007. Because of examples like these, some community members have questioned the value or authority of this Plan. They wanted to know if working on this update was worth their time and effort.

In response to such concerns, Townscape and the DPP staff that attended these meetings explained how DPP has used the WSCP (2000). Basically, DPP sees the WSCP as their “Bible” for land use decisions, meaning that any development proposals must be examined against the Vision and Policies in the WSCP (Stated by DPP at PIM#3, held on November 25, 2008).

However, other City Departments do not necessarily base all of their decisions on the SCPs. These Departments are encouraged to read all of the SCPs and take them into account when they do their planning, but they have other factors to consider as well. In addition, there are certain agencies that are exempt from SCP Policies, such as DHHL and State housing agencies. One such example was the State’s use of the 201H exemption for the Hale Wai Vista project. By state law, these affordable housing projects can be exempted from SCP compliance.

Overall, the main advice from Townscape and DPP was for the community to make sure they know their SCP well and then “watchdog” the various agencies to make sure the WSCP is being implemented. In some cases, the community may have to take the lead to get certain projects up and going, as in the case of the Nānākuli Regional Park.

Lastly, one change that was made to all of the SCPs was the addition of an Implementation Matrix. The purpose of this Matrix was to compile all of the Plan’s Policies and Guidelines in one place, and to show who the primary “implementers” are. This way, community members can monitor the implementation of the Plan, and support implementation more effectively. In some cases, the Implementation Matrix shows that there is no “lead” entity, so this needs to be decided first.
2.4 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

One of the initial components of the scope of the 5-year review was the development of a “Scorecard,” or “Performance Assessment.” The purpose of the Performance Assessment was to look specifically at the 10 Vision Elements from the original WSCP, and measure their level of implementation. Several iterations of this assessment were completed with input from the community and DPP. One finding from this exercise was that there is a shortage of available data. Thus, the “measures” of implementation are somewhat general, but aim to show whether or not some action has been taken.

The main outcome of this Performance Assessment was the refinement of the Vision Elements in order to improve implementation and better reflect the main goals of the Plan.

Please note that the Performance Assessment, which begins on the following page, is based on the Vision Elements from the 2000 WSCP. The key to the symbols used in the “Status” column is at the top of each page.
### Table 3: WSCP Performance Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognize the traditional ahupua<code>a land divisions of the Wai</code>anae Coast and adapt the Ahupua`a Concept as a framework for land use and open space planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wai<code>anae Watershed Management Plan (WWMP) recognizes the importance of the traditional ahupua</code>a. BWS will be presenting the WWMP to CWRM &amp; City Council in 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2010.</td>
<td>- Ahupua<code>a lines are not all accurate. They should be defined accurately with surveyors. - Ahupua</code>a lines should extend 2-3 miles out into the ocean. - The Ahupua`a Concept is really about values related to sustainability &amp; community. These values should be incorporated into all planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All new Plans for Wai<code>anae use the Ahupua</code>a Concept</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Land use plan (SCP) needs to be integrated with watershed plan (WWMP).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each of the 4 major ahupua<code>a have a functioning Ahupua</code>a Council</td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>In the late 1990s 4 Ahupua<code>a Councils were created, but only the Mākaha Ahupua</code>a Council is still functioning with monthly meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There are 4 Hawaiian Civic Clubs that meet on similar issues, and have similar membership to the 4 Ahupua`a Councils: Nānāikapono, Lualualei, Wai`anae, & Mākaha.

- There are 4 DHHL Homestead Associations that meet regularly: Nānākuli, Wai`anae Kai, Wai`anae Valley, & Princess Kahana Estates.
**WAI'ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN – VISION-BASED SCORECARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish four major land and resource types with defined boundaries</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major new developments were allowed in the Preservation lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>There have been a few small coastal developments makai of Farrington Highway (see Element #8 for more detail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Overall, the amount of agricultural activity in Wai'anae has declined. The last broiler chicken farms in the District closed in 2004. The last dairy farm (Pacific Dairy) closed in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>MA'O Organic Farms, located in Lualualei, began in 2000 and has since grown to become a leading producer of organic vegetables, fruits, and herbs. Their products supply various supermarkets, farmers markets, and high-end restaurants on O‘ahu. In addition, MA'O focuses on youth leadership and social enterprise development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Community Areas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No major new developments were allowed outside of the Rural Community Boundary (now called the Community Growth Boundary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WAI`ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN – VISION-BASED SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Designate Country Town and Village Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wai`anae Country Town</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There has been no planning for the development of a Wai`anae Town Center. However, the number of businesses in &amp; around the mall has increased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nānākuli Village Center</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Nānākuli Village Center is planned to hold the NFL-YET Boys &amp; Girls Club of Hawai`i, Nānākuli Commercial Center, Hale Makana o Nānākuli, Agnes K. Cope Learning Center, &amp; Surfing Hall of Fame. The State Legislature allocated $1.2 million for infrastructure in 2008.</td>
<td>Several retail stores have signed leases to move into the Center when it is completed. The organizers of the Center are working to secure more such leases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mā`ili/Lualualei Village Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There has been no planning for the development of a Mā`ili/Lualualei Village Center.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mākaha Village Center</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>There has been no planning for the development of Mākaha Village Center. However, there has been some private re-development of commercial &amp; retail space at the former Coronet Store along Farrington Hwy.</td>
<td>Ideally, the Mākaha Village Center (whether it is located at that site or another) would also provide restaurants, social services, &amp; other amenities reflective of community needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WAI’ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN – VISION-BASED SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Plan and Develop Community Gathering Places for Nānākuli, Mā’ili, Lualualei, Wa‘i‘anae, Mākaha, and other subcommunities of the District, as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There have been various ideas on what Community Gathering Places should look like and what functions they should provide. One example is the WWMP, which includes a plan for 4 Cultural Learning Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa‘i‘anae</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ka‘ala Farm is a Cultural Learning Center that serves some of the functions of a Community Gathering Place for the Wa‘i‘anae ahupua‘a.</td>
<td>According to the WSCP, a Community Gathering Place (whether it is Ka‘ala or another location) would provide a space for other functions, such as hosting celebrations &amp; selling local products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nānākuli</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The Nānākuli Village Center is planned to have numerous functions, including the Agnes K. Cope Learning Center, which will provide space for community organizations to gather.</td>
<td>The plans for this Village Center also include spaces to host celebrations &amp; sell local products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mā‘ili/Lualualei</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There has been no planning for the development of a Community Gathering Place in Mā‘ili/Lualualei.</td>
<td>The community would like to develop a place for agriculture, learning, &amp; a community center in the area that is currently controlled by the US Navy (RFT Lualualei &amp; NAVMAG Lualualei).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mākaha</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>The community organization, Mohala I Ka Wai planned a Community Gathering Place, which BWS supported by allocating $48,000 for planning/ visioning, archaeological survey, and a topographical survey of the proposed site, which were conducted in 2009.</td>
<td>Status as of 2010: awaiting RFP for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2010, Jeff Stone gifted 300 acres of land in Mākaha Valley to Kamehameha Schools for a multi-generational learning center &amp; to DHHL for the development of over 500 homes. This area could eventually include a Community Gathering Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preserve and restore important stream and stream corridors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No action has been taken.</td>
<td>- Water rights should be based on an ahupua’a system; used for sustainability. Streams need protection, restoration, to be de-channelized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of Stream Conservation Corridors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Mohala I Ka Wai has partnered with BWS, Ka’ala Farm, and area high schools to restore the valley and stream in Mākaha. They have been doing stream flow monitoring, rainfall data collection, restoration of archaeological sites, and overseeing the reduction in pumping from BWS Mākaha wells to observe impact on stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish minimum in-stream flow standards</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>BWS turned off 2 BWS pumps in Mākaha Valley to see if it would increase streamflow.</td>
<td>Need to establish permanent in-stream flow standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamflow is restored to all Wai'anae streams</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>BWS and the community organization, Mohala I Ka Wai, worked together to monitor flow rates for Mākaha Stream, from about 2004 to 2006.</td>
<td>Wai'anae Watershed Partnership was signed in April 2010 by BWS, DLNR, Army, Navy, Ka’ala Farm, MA’O Farm, &amp; the Gill Family Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement projects from WWMP that are related to preservation &amp; restoration of streams</td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerous other projects have been identified in the WWMP, including Projects: #13: Spring &amp; Stream Flow Restoration #16: Concrete Flood Channel Redesign #17: Stream Biological Assessments #18: Water Quality Testing and Monitoring #19: Stream Dumping Prevention &amp; Clean Up #20: Surface Water Inventory #21: Surface Water Quality Improvement Project #22: Forest Restoration Program #23: Wildfire Management Plan #25: Mākaha Research Watershed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key to Status:
- **Positive action/Goal completed**
- **Positive action**
- **Negative action**
- **No action**
- **Further action needed**

### WAI’ANAЕ SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN – VISION-BASED SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Preserve and restore important cultural sites and cultural landscapes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No action has been taken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a district-wide cultural assessment to create an updated and accurate Cultural Resources Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop &amp; implement a “Cultural Resource Preservation and Access Plan”</td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Identification and protection of cultural sites are still being done on a project-by-project basis. Some sites have been protected and restored.</td>
<td>Needs follow-up/implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>“Elements of a Plan for the Preservation of Nānākuli Valley” was completed in October 2000.</td>
<td>Ka‘ala Farm &amp; the DLNR DOFAW have been creating a firebreak road &amp; restoring Punana Ula Heiau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Ka‘ala Farm has been restoring cultural landscapes, including loʻi kalo &amp; native dryland forest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Hui Mālama o Mākuʻa has been working for many years to preserve the numerous cultural sites in Mākuʻa Valley (with US Army).</td>
<td>The community’s long-term goal is to regain control of Mākuʻa Valley from US Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Mohala I Ka Wai has been involved in ongoing restoration efforts for Kaneaki Heiau in Mākahā.</td>
<td>Mohala I Ka Wai did maintenance (fixed wall) to Kuiloloa Heiau in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Waiʻanae Coast Baseline Study: recommended an Ocean Recreation Management Area (ORMA), which would protect ocean as a cultural resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WAI’ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN – VISION-BASED SCORECARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Preserve all lands north of Kepuhi Point as open space lands</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>No building permits were issued for this area. No SMA permits were granted.</td>
<td>There has been some unpermitted camping/living by squatters in this area, mostly on City &amp; County land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>The Wildlife Society Hawai’i Chapter, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and DLNR proposed to build a 500-yard predator-proof fence to protect the Ka’ena Point Natural Area Reserve.</td>
<td>As of May 2010, the necessary permits for the fence had been secured, but an application for a contested case hearing was subsequently submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Night-time access has been allowed in the form of Keawa’ula Fishing Permits as a pilot project.</td>
<td>Planning is underway to allow camping permits for Mākua Beach Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>- The US Army maintains control of Mākua Valley, where they have invested in native species restoration efforts. - The Army launched a Military Munitions Response Program in 2007 to clean up unexploded weapons along the coast in Mākua and at the Mākua Training Area, which is comprised of approximately 856 acres west and north from the Mākua Military Reservation boundary.</td>
<td>The community’s long-term goal is to regain control of Mākua Valley from the US Army to restore the natural and cultural resources, and to gain access to their cultural/religious sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Restrict Urban/Suburban or resort development makai of Farrington Highway</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>There has been some small-scale development makai of Farrington Highway: - Kai Kai Ramen restaurant at Pokai Bay (2,000 sq ft; built in 2004). - Wai’anae Police Station renovation and reconstruction started in FY 2009, estimated budget: $5 Mil.</td>
<td>Significant development already exists makai of Farrington Highway. With sea level rise being probable, many of these buildings will need to be relocated or abandoned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Status:**
* Positive action/Goal completed
+ Positive action
– Negative action
X No action
O Further action needed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. Plan and implement safety improvements and beautification programs for Farrington Highway | + / O  | The following projects are listed in the OMPO 2008-2011 Transportation Improvement Program for Farrington Highway for:  
|                                          |        | FY08:  
|                                          |        | - Traffic Signal Modernization  
|                                          |        | FY10:  
|                                          |        | - Bridge Rehabilitation – Kaupuni Stream Bridge  
|                                          |        | - Bridge Replacement – Maipalaoa Bridge, Makaha Bridges #3 & #3A  
<p>|                                          |        | - Intersection Improvements – Haleakala Avenue, Lualualei Homestead Road, &amp; Nānākuli Avenue                                                                                                                             | The TIP lists projects that were planned with Federal funds. To find out exactly which projects were funded (with Federal &amp; other funds) and completed, the DOT office requests an official letter from DPP that states exactly what data is being requested and why. |
|                                          |        | In 2008, an agreement was reached between the State and Hawaiian Electric Co. to underground utility lines along Farrington Highway, in order to prevent another incident of utility poles being toppled onto Farrington Highway during high winds. Until the extensive (13 to 17 miles of lines) and expensive (estimated to cost tens of millions of dollars) undergrounding project is undertaken, HECO has been testing and replacing the old wooden poles with steel poles as needed (11 were replaced in 2008). | As of 2010, the above-ground utility poles were still being utilized. |
|                                          |        | Landscaping along Farrington Hwy + / O Ulehawa Beach Park was upgraded, which resulted in improvements along that section of the highway (Budget = $60,000 in FY02).                                                                 |                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION ELEMENT &amp; ELEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ACTION OR ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>COMMUNITY COMMENTS / IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluate the feasibility of a new roadway that will divert commuter traffic from Farrington Highway</td>
<td>+ / O</td>
<td>Short feasibility study was done in 2001 “(Lualualei Naval Road/Kunia Road Connector Road Concept Study”). The findings were that such a Highway would cost approximately $250 Mil. (More recent estimates put the cost closer to $500 Mil), and was not economically feasible.</td>
<td>- This is definitely still a priority. It would help us regain control of Farrington Highway. With another access road, it may be possible to reduce the number of lanes that Farrington Hwy has, which would make it safer and more pedestrian-friendly. - A Second Access Highway could also mean another 40,000+ people move into our District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take action on the building of a Second Access or Reliever Highway</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Wai‘anae Coast Emergency Alternate Route (WCEAR) was completed in 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Status:

* Positive action/Goal completed
+ Positive action
– Negative action
X No action
O Further action needed
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3. RECOMMENDED CHANGES

While the previous chapter outlined the major issues brought up during this revision process, this chapter discusses the specific revisions that were included in the updated Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010). This chapter begins with a summary of overarching themes for revisions, the main types of revisions, and how they are shown in the Ramseyer Version of the WSCP. The remainder of the chapter presents a detailed discussion of the proposed revisions to the WSCP.

Overarching themes for revisions
Chapter 2 of this Report discussed nine issues or topics that were identified as needing to be addressed in the revised WSCP. Those issues include:

1. Homelessness/Affordable Housing
2. Population Growth/Loss of Rural Character
3. Lack of Transportation Options/Farrington Highway
4. Military Land Use and Ordnance in Coastal Waters
5. Support for Agriculture
6. Recreational Parks
7. Jobs/Unemployment/Economics
8. Proposed Light Industrial Area
9. Implementation
10. Native Hawaiian Culture – The community voiced their desire for this plan to be based on Native Hawaiian traditional values – those of the host culture. Their sentiment was that certainly, other cultures should be supported and respected. However, because Native Hawaiians were the original caretakers of this land, and they did so successfully and sustainably for hundreds of years, their land management values should be recognized and incorporated into this land use plan.

In most cases, many small changes were made to incorporate these topics, both in the Overview sections, as well as revisions and additions to Policies and Guidelines throughout the Plan.

In addition to incorporating these issues into the WSCP, other changes were made, such as updating data and re-formatting various sections to make them more succinct and clear in their meaning. The types of revisions made and how they were shown in the Ramseyer Version of the 2010 WSCP are described below.
Types of revisions
Overall, the numerous revisions fit into a few main categories, listed below. How the changes are shown in the Ramseyer Version are explained in the second tier of bullets.

- **Content changes** – Revisions and additions to narrative, Policies, and/or Guidelines that were intended to make a substantive change to the WSCP. Such revisions were usually prompted by a change in situation, change in community sentiment, change in a related policy, or else they are addressing a previous oversight.
  - These changes are generally shown by underlining new content.
- **Updated data**
  - Updated data is shaded.
- **Standardization of Format** – Although the general frameworks of the eight DPs are similar, there has been an increased focus on consistent format and coverage of issues. These include:
  - All Policies have been **re-written as active statements**.
  - All **document titles** are now underlined. In the Ramseyer version, **document titles** are now underlined and bolded to differentiate them from new content.
  - The WSCP has been edited to be as succinct as possible. It was suggested that the WSCP would be better implemented if it was easy to read, with the key points highlighted. Thus, all extra information was removed and put into an appendix or the Technical Report.
  - Minor revisions are not indicated; **Substantial additions are underlined**; Sections that have been rephrased or edited are shaded.

Here begins the chapter-by-chapter description of the changes incorporated into the **Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2010)**.

### 3.1 TITLE & PREFACE

The title page was revised as follows:
- City & County of Honolulu logo in color was added.
- Replaced picture with new landscape photo.

The main revisions to the Preface include the following:
- **The planning horizon of the DPs was changed from 20 to 25 years.**
- **Added several paragraphs of narrative on sustainability and “Integrating principles of sustainability into decision-making processes,”** which will appear in all DPs.
- **Section P.4 was replaced with the purpose of the 5-year review.**
3.2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- A new introductory paragraph was added (page ES-1). This new paragraph was added because community members expressed their desire for an introduction that made a bold overarching statement about the District that set the tone for the document. They wanted to introduce their Plan with a statement that got straight to the point about who they are as a community, and what kind of land use they support, as well as what kind they do not support.

- All Policies and Guidelines were updated as per changes in Plan.

3.3 CHAPTER 1: WAI‘ANAÉ’S ROLE IN O‘AHU’S DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

- Updated Policies from General Plan (page 1-1)
  - The General Plan was revised after the 2000 WSCP was adopted. Thus, the new language of “Objective C,” related to population distribution, was updated.

- Moved map of O‘ahu’s eight planning Districts from Preface to Chapter 1 (1-2).

- Added community concerns about Wai‘anae’s population count and projections being low (page 1-3).
  - The community voiced concerns about the District’s population throughout the process. One of the primary concerns was that recent population counts were low because they under-counted the number of homeless living in the District. Many reasoned that if the current population count was low, then the projections that were based on those numbers must be low too.

- Added community concerns about the General Plan’s use of distributive population percentages to direct growth in the island’s eight Districts
  - Community members claimed that such percentages do not reflect reality and cannot be implemented. They also stated that if O‘ahu’s total population eventually reaches 1.5 million, then Wai‘anae’s “share” of the population at 4% would be 60,000. They were concerned that the current infrastructure would not be able to handle this number of people, and the rural character would be lost.

3.4 CHAPTER 2: THE VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF THE WAI‘ANAÉ DISTRICT

- 2.1 Replaced Vision Statement
  - During the first few PAC meetings, several community members said they wanted the Vision Statement to be more culture-based. More specifically, they wanted it to be based on the host culture of Native Hawaiians. A few of the long-time community leaders proposed a new Vision Statement. Key pieces were
condensed into a shorter version, while keeping the important points and the “feel” of the narrative. In addition, the longer version was edited and placed in the Plan, but in the subsequent section, entitled “Inside Our Vision.”

- **Added sections 2.1.1 “Inside Our Vision” and 2.1.2 “Native Hawaiian Connection to the Land”**
  - Both sections were written by community members and edited by the Consultant.
  - As mentioned above, Section 2.1.1 “Inside Our Vision” includes the longer passage that was written by community leaders as their Vision Statement, which was shortened into the Vision Statement currently in the proposed WSCP.
  - Section 2.1.2 was written by another community member, who is a long-time resident and of Native Hawaiian ancestry.

- **Removed several sections from Chapter 2:**
  - “2.2 Community Values” was moved to Appendix D of the Technical Report.
  - “2.3 Rural Values and Qualities” was removed; however, much of the content was incorporated into Section 2.3.2.
  - “2.5 The Ahupua’a/Ecosystem Concept” was removed; however, much of the content was incorporated into Section 2.3.1.
  - “2.6 Environmental Criteria for Land Use Planning” was revised and moved to Section 3.1.6.

- **2.2 Updated Community Participation Process**
  - This section now gives a brief summary of the community participation process for the original WSCP (2000) and the updated WSCP (2010), while the details of the processes are included in the Technical Report (Appendix D).

- **The Wai’anae Concept Map was removed from the Plan.**
  - This graphic was removed to prevent confusion between this map and the Land Use Map in the Appendix.

- **2.3 Re-organized Vision Elements and added some new ones**
  - The original WSCP did not label the “Vision Elements” as such, but it did say “The principal elements of the Wai’anae Concept are…” It then went on to list 11 bullet points that described the Wai’anae Concept, which were graphically represented by the Wai’anae Concept Map, and described in the subsequent pages.
  - The revised WSCP includes a separate section entitled “Vision Elements,” which include 10 such elements. They are basically a re-organization of those in the original, with a few new ones, described below. The process to get to these 10 Elements was an iterative one. The 11 elements from the original SCP were used to create a “Scorecard.” Each element was discussed with the PAC. The question asked was: how well was each element implemented, and should it be
kept? Although there was some difficulty in finalizing the Scorecard concept, the exercise helped the group decide to keep and/or create the following 10 Vision Elements:

- **2.4.1 Recognize the traditional ahupua’a of the Wai‘anae District and adapt the ahupua’a concept as a framework for land use and open space planning**
  - This element was retained from the original WSCP with minor edits. Some new narrative was incorporated about the need for each ahupua’a to be recognized as having different concerns and needs, and how the decision making must be flexible enough to take this into account.

- **2.4.2 Delineate the 4 major land and resource types: Preservation Lands, Coastal Lands, Agricultural Lands, and Rural Community Areas**
  - This subsection was kept largely intact. One addition was the discussion on the importance of “access to” Preservation Lands and Coastal Lands.

- **2.4.3 Restrict coastal urban, suburban, and resort development makai of Farrington Highway**
  - This element was kept from the original WSCP, with the addition of one paragraph describing one possible use of coastal lands – that of a walking/jogging/biking path and community gathering places.

- **2.4.4 Preserve all lands north of Kepuhi Point as open space lands**
  - Again, this was largely maintained from the original, with the one main revision being the description of Mākuʻa Valley. This change is similar to the revisions made to section 3.12 on military use of this area.

- **2.4.5 Preserve and restore streams and stream corridors**
  - No major changes.

- **2.4.6 Preserve and protect cultural sites and cultural landscapes**
  - No description was included for this element in the original WSCP, Chapter 2, so all of this narrative is new. It briefly describes the extensive cultural sites in the District and their need for protection, beginning with a complete archaeological survey. There is also a short discussion of the community’s desire to eventually have community-based groups take over responsibility and management of these cultural sites.

- **2.4.7 Improve transportation systems within the District**
  - This element consists of new wording, but it basically combines two elements from the original WSCP that related to transportation – safety
improvements and beautification programs for Farrington Highway and creating an alternative route to Farrington.

- 2.4.8 Designate, plan and develop Town Centers and Community Gathering Places for Wai'anae, Nānākuli, Lualualei/Mā ‘ili, and Mākaha
  - Again, this Vision Element combines elements of the original SCP. The only new component is the idea of having the gathering places located along the coast, instead of mauka.

- 2.4.9 Develop and support community-based businesses
  - This is a totally new Vision Element, added because of community concern that this WSCP did not put enough emphasis on economic development and job creation. The community brought up this need on numerous occasions, including the point that communities cannot be sustainable or self-sufficient if they are not economically viable.

- 2.4.10 Government agencies should partner with community-based organizations in order to better manage Wai‘anae’s natural and cultural resources
  - This idea came from community members who are actively involved in creating more local control and management of their resources. They pointed out that these groups are already forming on their own, organically, and they should be supported. By partnering with these community groups, the agencies that currently have the management responsibilities can benefit from local knowledge, and thus develop stronger resource management programs.

### 3.5 CHAPTER 3. LAND USE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

- 3. Introduction
  - The introductory section was re-organized.

- 3.1 Overview of Land Use, Population, Economics, and Environmental Conditions
  - 3.1.2 Added subsection on Population
    - This data was added because of community concerns regarding increasing population within the District, and the resulting pressures on their infrastructure systems and public facilities.
  - 3.1.3 Added subsection on Economics
    - The Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board provided this economic data. However, they were not the only group to mention that Wai‘anae’s economic situation should be included in this Plan.
  - Removed subsection entitled “State and City Land Use Designations”
This information was removed from the WSCP and placed in the Technical Report because much of the data has not been updated by the State or the City (acreages for each of the SLU Designations, DP Land Use Map Categories, and Existing Land Use).

- Moved information on Mākaha Valley to Section 3.8
  - The information seemed to fit better in the Residential Land Use section. Also, the Mākaha Special Area Plan has since been written, which addresses many of the concerns discussed here.
- 3.1.6 Moved “Environmental Conditions” to this section (from Chapter 2)
  - This move was made because Chapter 2 discusses more of the hypothetical, visioning type of narrative, while Chapter 3 has more factual data, such as these Environmental Conditions contain.
  - This section was renamed “Environmental Conditions and Implications for Planning.”
- 3.1.7 Added section on Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan (WWMP)
  - Because water and land are so inextricably linked, and many aspects of the WWMP are applicable to this WSCP. DPP and the City Board of Water Supply have a long-term goal of integrating these plans.

- Added new Policy that Government Agencies Should Partner with Community-Based Organizations in order to Better Manage Wai‘anae’s Natural and Cultural Resources in the following Sections: 3.2 Open Space, 3.3 Coastal Lands, 3.4 Mountain Forest Lands, 3.5 Streams, and 3.6 Cultural Resources
  - Same as discussed in Chapter 2, Vision Element #10.

- 3.2 Revised “Protection of Open Space” to “Open Space and Important Views”
  - All Section headings were revised to include only the topic. All headings that previously began “Preservation of…” were changed.
  - Narrative and Policies now state that no new development should impact important open space OR public views.
  - 3.2.1 Expanded information from the “Coastal View Study” (1987)
    - The Coastal View Study’s “Significant Stationary Views” were mentioned briefly in the original SCP. This updated version also includes “Significant Road Views” and mauka views, as broad categories of views that need to be protected. A more detailed list of views, along with photos of some of these views are included in this Technical Report.
  - Added Policies 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.2.4 regarding Important Views.
  - Added Policy: “3.2.2.7 Minimize Outdoor Lighting”
  - New Guidelines were added: “3.2.3.1 Minimize Glare by Utilizing Shielding Light Fixtures” and “3.2.3.2 Adopt Outdoor Night Lighting Standards”

- 3.3 Coastal Lands
  - Added “Wai‘anae Boat Harbor” to list of beach parks and coastal access areas
• Added short paragraph about the need for planning for coastal area to consider the potential effects of sea level rise.

• Policy 3.3.2.1 – Added “Wai‘anae Boat Harbor” to the list of exceptions for new development or redevelopment along the coast.

• Policy 3.3.2.2 – Added last sentence “The U.S. Army Rest Camp should be programmed for eventual return to the general public…” as requested by the community.

• Added new Policies:
  ▪ “3.3.2.5 Do Not Grant Permits that Negatively Impact Coastal Lands”
  ▪ “3.3.2.6 Prevent the Introduction of Alien Species”
  ▪ “3.3.2.7 Maintain Beaches/Sand”

• 3.4 Mountain Forest Land
  ▪ 3.4.1 Overview – This section was expanded to include the community’s perspective on the cultural significance of their mountain forest land.
  ▪ Added new Policies:
    ▪ “3.4.2.7 Allow Public Access to Hiking Trails”
    ▪ “3.4.2.8 Develop Wildfire Management Plan”

• 3.5 Streams and Floodplains
  ▪ No major changes.

• 3.6 Historic and Cultural Resources
  ▪ The Overview section was edited, and new language was added.
  ▪ Overarching change to section was to emphasize the need for access to cultural resources, in addition to preservation.
  ▪ Added new Policies:
    ▪ “3.6.2.4 Create Signage for Cultural Sites” – this is something the community strongly recommends that funding be allocated for. Many feel it is important to have such signs to educate community members and visitors alike.
    ▪ “3.6.2.7 Conduct a Thorough Cultural Survey of the Wai‘anae District”

• 3.7 Agricultural Lands
  ▪ The overview section was re-written because much of the data needed to be updated. Information was gathered from various sources, including the University of Hawaii’s CTAHR (College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources), newspaper articles, and agricultural data compiled by MA’O Farms.
  ▪ Agricultural “Issues” and “Proposed Solutions” were moved to this Report.

• 3.8 Residential Land Use
  ▪ Data in overview section was updated.
• Summary of key recommendations from the Mākaha Special Area Plan was added.
• Policy “3.8.2.2 Coordinate with DHHL” was amended to recognize DHHL’s proposed development of “up to 600 residential units” in Mākaha Valley.
• Added new Policies and Guideline:
  - “3.8.2.4 Support Home-Based Businesses”
  - “3.8.2.5 Allow only affordable housing projects that meet Waiʻanae SCP Guidelines”
  - “3.8.3.1 Follow Waiʻanae SCP Affordable Housing Guidelines”

• 3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses
  - Added narrative regarding need for local, light industrial jobs.
  - Added Policy “3.9.2.3 Support the Continued Viability of the Mākaha Resort.”
  - Also added Policy “3.9.2.4 Prohibit ‘Big Box’ Stores” because the community wants to support local, mom-and-pop stores. They also wanted to support local farmers, who are better able to sell their products without having to compete with large “big box” chain stores.
  - Added description of intended uses for the new industrial site in Lualualei Valley.

• 3.10 Country Towns, Rural Community Commercial Centers and Gathering Places
  - Added information on the new Nānākuli Village Center, which secured funding and began site construction at the end of 2007. It was noted that the creation of such a village center was proposed in the original WSCP. Special note of the fact that the implementation is being led by a combination of agencies and departments.
  - Changed the proposed locations of the Community Gathering places from mauka to locations “along the coast,” with a walking/jogging/biking path connecting them.

• 3.11 Parks and Recreational Areas
  - The Overview narrative was expanded to include the two major issues associated with the District’s parks: (1) the significant shortfall in the number of community-based parks and in the total acreage of park lands, and (2) the large number of homeless people living on the beaches, many of which are City Beach Parks that normally offer camping through the Parks Permitting System.
  - The data in Table 3-8 “City Parks and Park Facilities” was updated with information provided by the Department of Parks and Recreation.
  - Added new table “City Park Requirements per City Standards for 2009 Waiʻanae District Population (+/- 45,000)”
  - Added description of proposed Nānākuli Regional Park, which when developed, will be the District’s first Regional Park (50 acres).
  - Added new Policy “3.11.2.3 Plan for a System of Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Parks”
• 3.12 Military Land Use
  o 3.12.1 Overview – This subsection was entirely re-written. Overall, the narrative reflects the prevailing community sentiment of wanting the land currently owned by or leased to the military to be returned to community use and management.
  o This sentiment is reflected in Policy 3.12.2.1, which was changed to “Preserve and Transition Military Lands to Civilian Use”
  o Removed Policy 3.12.2.2 “Recognition of Military Use”

3.6 CHAPTER 4. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

• 4. Introduction
  o The original WSCP does not have an introductory section, but instead it goes straight into Transportation Systems. This revised WSCP includes a relatively short narrative on how the Wai'anae community would like their community’s “original infrastructure” to be recognized – the landscape and cultural resources, such as the pu'u and heiau that the ancient Native Hawaiians living here used on a daily basis.
  o Added 2 new General Policies (for entire chapter):
    ▪ “The latest technology that allows the Wai'anae Community to be as sustainable, or “green” as possible, should be implemented whenever possible.”
    ▪ “Rural Infrastructure Standards should be considered and, where possible, developed by the City and State to maintain and reinforce a country feel and character. Standards would consider less impervious surfaces, attention to roadway quality of service – in addition to level of service, preference for bioretention solutions for storm waters, and alternative landscaping requirement for street trees. These standards would need to be such that they would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for vehicular or pedestrian traffic, or negatively impact abutting private property.”

• 4.1 Transportation Systems
  o Overview – Updated the data with information from the various City and State transportation departments (TIP – Transportation Improvement Program, 2030 ORTP – O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan, and CIPs – Capital Improvement Programs).
  o Added narrative on Roadways, including the community sentiment that their top transportation priority is the creation of an Emergency Bypass Road (through Kolekole Pass), to allow another way in and out of the District during those times
when Farrington Highway is closed. Their second priority is to eventually have a Second Access Highway, opened all the time for daily commuting.

- Added narrative on Public Transportation, Bikeways, Sidewalks, and Redevelopment of Town and Village Centers, and on “Complete Streets”
- Removed Policy for a “Reliever Road” that would basically parallel Farrington Highway, mauka.

- **4.2 Potable and Nonpotable Water Systems**
  - Updated narrative and data on potable water systems
  - Added section on nonpotable water systems
  - Added section on Water Conservation
  - Replaced all original Policies with Policies from the Wai’anae Watershed Management Plan (2010):
    - “4.2.4.1 Implement Watershed Protection Strategies to Improve Forest Health & Perennial Stream Flows”
    - “4.2.4.2 Encourage Water Conservation”
    - “4.2.4.3 Diversify Water Supply, Matching Quality with Use”
    - “4.2.4.4 Support the Goals and Objectives of the Wai’anae Watershed Management Plan”

- **4.3 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems**
  - The data was updated with information from the Wai’anae Watershed Management Plan (BWS, 2010).

- **4.4 Electrical Power and Communications**
  - Information on renewable energy-related activities sponsored by HECO (Hawaiian Electric Company) was added.
  - Narrative and “general principles” governing utilization of antennas were added.
  - Policy 4.4.2.1 was changed because the community wants to make sure that utility lines are eventually under-grounded both for visual AND safety reasons AND to improve the reliability of service.
  - The community also wants to encourage the development of alternative energy sources, so a Policy stating exactly that was added (4.4.2.2), along with Guideline 4.4.3.1 that calls for all new developments to be powered at least 50% by alternative energy sources.

- **4.5 Drainage Systems**
  - The only change to this section was the Policies were made into action statements.

- **4.6 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal**
  - The overview section was updated with information from the Department of Environmental Services.
Solid waste disposal is a hot issue in Wai’anae due to the proximity of the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill. The community wanted to be absolutely clear that no new landfills should be allowed on the Wai’anae Coast. Thus, Policy 4.6.2.1 says exactly that, “Prohibit New Landfills.”

Also added Policy 4.6.2.3 “Encourage Green Waste Composting.”

- 4.7 Civic, Public Safety and Educational Facilities
  - Updated narrative on services offered at Wai’anae Satellite City Hall
  - Updated data on Police services and schools
  - Added information on Emergency Shelters, including their locations.
  - Revised Policies:
    - “4.7.2.1 Improve Quality of Facilities and Adequacy of Staffing”
    - “4.7.2.2 Selection of Sites for New Schools should comply with the WSCP”
    - “4.7.2.3 Consider Multi-Purpose Function of Schools”
  - Added new Policies:
    - “4.7.2.4 Encourage Charter Schools”
    - “4.7.2.5 Increase Ambulance Service”
    - “4.7.2.6 Provide Adequate Emergency Shelters”

- 4.8 Health Care Facilities
  - The main revision to this section was the updating of the information provided on the District’s health care facilities. Information was obtained through contacting the various facilities.
  - Revised Policies:
    - “4.8.2.1 Support Quality, Community Health Care Facilities”
    - “4.8.2.2 Assess the Need for New Health Care Facilities and Services”

3.7 CHAPTER 5. IMPLEMENTATION

- 5. Introduction
  - A new introductory paragraph was written to summarize the numerous community concerns with implementation, and to emphasize the need for better implementation of this and all SCP/DPs.

- 5.2 Implementation Matrix
  - This matrix puts all of the Policies and Guidelines found in the document in one place for easy reference, with information on how it is expected they will be implemented. The table indicates what program the Policy or Guideline should be implemented under, the lead entities, and their role, as Implementer, Advocate, or Regulator.
• Removed the following Sections and Sub-Sections, as per Standardization of Format for all DPs:
  o 5.5 Functional Planning
  o 5.6.2 Adequate Facilities Requirement
  o 5.8 Transition from the Current System
  o 5.8.2 Relation to General Plan Population Guidelines

3.8 APPENDIX: THE GRAPHIC MAPS: LAND USE, OPEN SPACE, AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

• The Graphic Maps have been revised to make them more clear and consistent:
  o They have been expanded to the extent of the page
  o Symbols were revised
  o Boundaries were made more distinct

• Changes to the Land Use Map include:
  o The “Rural Community Boundary” was renamed the “Community Growth Boundary,” and updated.
  o An industrial area was added in Lualualei Valley.
  o The Proposed Regional Park was added.

• Changes to the Open Space Map include:
  o The “Rural Community Boundary” was renamed the “Community Growth Boundary,” and updated.
  o Stream names were added to the main Stream Corridors.

• Changes to the Public Facilities Map include:
  o The “Rural Community Boundary” was renamed the “Community Growth Boundary,” and updated.
  o The proposed Walking/Jogging/Biking Path was added.
  o The Wai’anae Coast Emergency Access Road was added.
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APPENDIX A – VIEWS

Coastal View Study Details

The Wai‘anae SCP (2010) expanded its original section on “Open Space” to also include “Important Views.” This addition was prompted by DPP who recognized the omission from the original WSCP. Hence, the revised Section 3.2.1 “Overview of Large-Scale Open Space and Important Views” discusses the importance of views to Wai‘anae residents and to Native Hawaiian culture. It includes a brief paragraph that summarizes some of the highlights of the “Coastal View Study” commissioned by the City Department of Land Utilization and published in 1987. The details of that study, as pertinent to Wai‘anae, are included here.

In addition, the Consultant took photos of some of these important views, in order to document how they look at this point in time. It should be noted that a full documentation of the numerous important views throughout the District would take significant more time and resources. This is only intended to give a sampling.

The descriptions of each of the major viewsheds from the Coastal View Study below are followed by a reference to points on the “Wai‘anae View Map,” created in December 2009, which shows the location that the photos were taken from, as well as the numbers of the photos themselves. The description of the views below is followed by the View Map and the photos. Overall, the study looks at the Wai‘anae District in three major viewsheds, with the Wai‘anae Viewshed split into two sections, which results in four viewshed sections: 1. Mākua Viewshed; 2. Wai‘anae Viewshed – Mākaha; 3. Wai‘anae Viewshed – Pōka‘i Bay; and 4. Nānākuli Viewshed.

- **1. Mākua Viewshed** – extends from Ka‘ena Point to Kepuhi Point, and consists of a large contiguous bay containing 7.5 miles of shoreline. Except for a few small military facilities mauka of the highway, this viewshed is highly intact.
  - **Significant Road Views** – Farrington Highway provides one continuous roadway view, capturing coastal and mauka views of high visual quality.
  - **Significant Stationary Views** – are available from the entire length of the shoreline.
  - **Photos #1 through #8 are of the Mākua Viewshed. They were taken from Points 1a through 1c on the Wai‘anae View Map.**

- **Wai‘anae Viewshed** – extends from Kepuhi Point to Ma‘ili Point. Coastal views from the road are fairly limited. Prominent view objects include the Wai‘anae Mountains, Mākaha Valley, Mauna Lahilahi, Kamaileunu Ridge, and other coastal land forms. This viewshed is studied in two sections:
2. Section A = Mākaha – bracketed by a large descending ridge at Kepuhi Point and the prominent Mauna Lühlahi coastal land form. Both land forms are visible along the entire length of Farrington Highway. Mākaha Valley is another important view.

- **Significant Road Views** – A short segment of Farrington Highway at Mākaha Beach Park provides coastal views of Mākaha Beach and lateral views along the coastline.
- **Significant Stationary Views** – From Mākaha Beach Park and the public beach adjacent to Mauna Lühlahi Point.
- **Photos #9 through #14 are of the Wai‘anae Viewshed – Mākaha. They were taken from Points 2a through 2c on the View Map.**

3. Section B = Pōkaʻi Bay – ranges from Lühlahi Point to Māʻili Point. This section of Farrington Highway is the most urbanized area along the Wai‘anae Coast. There are few coastal views from the highway due to building placement and stands of vegetation. As a result, roadway views are generally oriented mauka.

- **Significant Road Views:**
  - *Makai* view from Farrington Highway fronting Mauna Lühlahi Beach Park.
  - Pōkaʻi Bay Road is the beginning of a continuous view which extends into the Māʻili section.
  - The *makai* side of the highway is predominantly park area, most of which remains undeveloped. Primary view objects include Puʻu Maʻiliʻili and Puʻu o Hulu Kai, both rising over 700 feet in elevation, the ocean, and lateral coastal views.
- **Significant Stationary Views** – All points along the coastline are designated Park and provide lateral coastal views in both directions. There are also coastal views available from the Lühlahi Beach Park, Wai‘anae Boat Harbor, Pōkaʻi Bay Beach Park, Lualualei Beach Park, and Maʻili Beach Park.
- **Photos #15 through #20 are of the Wai‘anae Viewshed – Pōkaʻi Bay. They were taken from Points 3a through 3b on the View Map.**

4. Nānākuli Viewshed – Includes all land from Māʻili Point to Kahe Point. Except for the old Nanaikapono Elementary School and one tract of residential lots, the entire *makai* side of Farrington Highway is designated park. Lateral coastal views are available from all points along the shoreline. The Kahe Point Power Plant, located on the *mauka* side of the highway, is the dominant man-made feature.

- **Significant Road Views** – This stretch of Farrington Highway provides significant *mauka* and *makai* views, as well as significant lateral views when looking down the highway and focusing on the land forms at either end of the viewshed.
Photos #21 through #24 are of the Nānākuli Viewshed. They were taken from Points 4a through 4b on the View Map.

Lastly, the Coastal View Study includes a section on “Wai’anae Viewshed Concerns and Opportunities.” This section points out that opportunities for view enhancement are possible since a substantial portion of the land between the coastal highway and the coastline is under public ownership. In such cases, the main vehicle for enhancement is the preservation and maintenance of Parks. In addition, the study states the underground placement of utilities could greatly benefit the visual appearance of the Wai’anae area. “Implementation of this policy would be a major step in improving the visual quality of the coastal highway environment.” (City & County of Honolulu, 1987, page 40)

The following pages contain the “Wai’anae View Map,” which as described previously, shows the location the photos were taken from, as well as the photos themselves. It should be noted that the Points where the photos were taken from were logged with GPS, so their exact location is known. Those coordinates are in the table below. It should also be noted that the exact direction that the photographer was facing was not logged. Therefore, the arrows on the map and the directions used in the descriptions of the photos are not exact, but are best-guess estimations.

### Table 4: GPS Coordinates for Wai’anae View Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>N 21° 32.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>N 21° 32.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>N 21° 31.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>N 21° 28.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>N 21° 28.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>N 21° 27.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>N 21° 27.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>N 21° 26.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>N 21° 23.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>N 21° 22.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT #5
Wai‘anae View Map
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan
Technical Report
Department of Planning and Permitting
City and County of Honolulu
December 2009
Photos #1 through #8 are of the Mākua Viewshed. They were taken from Points 1a through 1c on the Wai‘anae View Map.

**Photo #1** – Taken from Point 1a, facing northwest, towards Ka‘ena Point.

![Photo #1](image1.png)

**Photo #2** – Taken from Point 1a, facing north.

![Photo #2](image2.png)

**Photo #3** – Taken from Point 1a, facing southeast.

![Photo #3](image3.png)

**Photo #4** – Taken from Point 1a, facing south, towards Kepuhi Point.

![Photo #4](image4.png)
Photo #5 – Taken from Point 1b, facing southeast, towards Mākua Valley.

Photo #6 – Taken from Point 1c, facing northeast, into Mākua Valley.

Photo #7 – Taken from Point 1c, facing east, into Mākua Valley.

Photo #8 – Taken from Point 1c, facing southeast, into Mākua Valley.
Photos #9 through #14 are of the Wai‘anae Viewshed – Mākaha. They were taken from Points 2a through 2c on the Views Map.

Photo #9 – Taken from Point 2a, facing south along Mākaha Beach.

Photo #10 – Taken from Point 2a, facing southeast.

Photo #11 – Taken from Point 2a, facing east, into Mākaha Valley.

Photo #12 – Taken from Point 2b, facing northeast, into Mākaha Valley.
Photo #13 – Taken from Point 2c, facing southeast, towards Mā'ili Point.

Photo #14 – Taken from Point 2c facing east-southeast.

Photos #15 through #20 are of the Wai‘anae Viewshed – Pōka‘i Bay. They were taken from Points 3a through 3b on the Views Map.

Photo #15 – Taken from Point 3a, facing north.

Photo #16 – Taken from Point 3a, facing northeast, into Wai‘anae Valley.
Photo #17 – Taken from Point 3b, facing northwest, along the coast.

Photo #18 – Taken from Point 3b, facing north-northwest, over Pōka‘i Bay.

Photo #19 – Taken from Point 3b, facing southeast.

Photo #20 – Taken from Point 3b, facing south, towards Mā‘ili Point.
Photos #21 through #24 are of the Nānākuli Viewshed. They were taken from Points 4a through 4b on the View Map.

Photo #21 – Taken from Point 4a, facing southeast, along the coast.

Photo #22 – Taken from Point 4b, facing northwest, towards Mā ‘ili Point.

Photo #23 – Taken from Point 4b, facing north-northeast, mauka.

Photo #24 – Taken from Point 4b, facing northeast, into Nānākuli Valley.
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APPENDIX C – COMMENTS MATRIX

The comments received on the various drafts of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan are organized into a matrix, with Townscape’s response to each comment. The comments are presented in the subsequent pages as follows:

- Community Comments on WSCP, 2000
- Community Comments on WSCP, Preliminary Draft, September 2008
- DPP Comments on WSCP, Preliminary Draft, September 2008
- DPP Comments on WSCP, PreFinal Draft, June 2009

*Copies of earlier drafts of the WSCP are on file at DPP or available on the DPP website.
### Community Comments on the Wai'anae SCP, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (“TSI”) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>We should put a population cap on the Wai'anae District.</td>
<td>Revised. TSI did not include a population cap, but did include some comments from the numerous discussions on this topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>We need a new Vision Statement. It should incorporate more of a Hawaiian cultural perspective and identify the host culture.</td>
<td>Revised. See next comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A new Vision Statement was written by community members and submitted to TSI.</td>
<td>Revised. TSI reviewed and edited the Vision Statement that was submitted. This shortened version was used as the new Vision Statement, while the longer version was included as section 2.2 “Inside our Vision.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>The definition of “Preservation Lands” needs to include access for cultural purposes.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>“Community Gathering Places” should be “Spiritual Centers”.</td>
<td>Not revised. This was brought up as a discussion item, and it was decided that “Spiritual Centers” was not the correct intent. The intent is to provide a place for the community to gather for various purposes, including, but not limited to spiritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Add a new Vision Element expressing the need for affordable housing.</td>
<td>Not revised in Preliminary Draft. There were numerous discussions about how Wai'anae residents need affordable housing, but since there’s no way to regulate who gets the housing, the community doesn’t want to encourage an un-proportional share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Figure 2.1</td>
<td>The Wai'anae Concept Map – the ahupua'a lines should be revised for accuracy.</td>
<td>Not revised: Difficult to find the truly accurate boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>This section contains data that needs to be updated.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>3.0.1, last sentence</td>
<td>Should also emphasize the cultural importance. Community member read and submitted some suggested language.</td>
<td>Revised – new language was edited, shortened, and added to Chapter 2 (Section 2.1.2 “Native Hawaiian Connection to the Land”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Add a discussion of the cultural significance of open space as a cultural resource.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Comments on the Wai‘anae SCP, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Open space should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group that understands and allows for gathering, but only certain things at certain times.</td>
<td>Revised. Preliminary Draft includes Policy 3.2.2.6 “Management of Open Spaces”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>Add Wai‘anae Harbor to list of beach parks and maybe name the list “Coastal Access Areas”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.1, 2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Should be re-worded to stress the importance of coastal lands as cultural resources first, then scenic and recreational resources.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.2.1</td>
<td>Should be clarified to not limit future improvements to the Wai‘anae Boat Harbor.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy on management of coastal resources. It should explain what is allowed and what is not (e.g. laying nets and leaving them should be prohibited).</td>
<td>Revised. Preliminary Draft includes Policy 3.3.2.4 “Work towards Community Management of Coastal Lands”. Policy states that specifics will need to be decided by the appropriate organizations/people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that land use permits should not be granted to any uses of the District’s coastal lands that may degrade the natural ecology, scenic beauty, or cultural practices.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.3.2.4 “Management of Coastal Lands”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Every effort should be made to prevent the introduction of marine alien species.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.3.2.6 “Preventing the Introduction of Alien Species”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that “Sand cells should be managed in a sustainable manner and impacts from armoring should be considered.”</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.3.2.7 “Sand Cells should be Maintained”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Add a section about the importance of protecting the lowlands.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.4.1, 4th paragraph</td>
<td>Change to read “Preservation, restoration, and Native Hawaiian cultural uses of these mountain forest lands and forest resources are of great importance to the Native Hawaiian people, to the Wai‘anae community, and to the people of O‘ahu.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Add a section about the great cultural, historical, and medicinal importance of these forest resources (including for hula and lua).</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>3.4.2</td>
<td>Include the need for a wildfire management plan.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Comments on the Wai'anae SCP, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>3.4.3</td>
<td>A Guideline should be created that lists what species can be planted (should be natives only) and which species cannot (no invasives).</td>
<td>Revised. No list was added, but a reference to the Wai'anae SCP Background Report (1999), which lists such information, was added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>3.4.2.2</td>
<td>Should also include examples of good native trees to plant; need to remove kiawe trees; and possible groups to take the lead.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>3.4.2.3</td>
<td>To end of sentence add “…and access to the Native Hawaiian’s practices on these lands.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>3.5.1, 2”m” sentence</td>
<td>Change to “The streams traditionally provided precious fresh water for drinking, production of special marine life for human and ocean life development, a source of cultural and spiritual development, and agriculture…”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>3.5.2.3</td>
<td>“Uses and activities within these Stream Conservation Corridors should be restricted to…” add “the cultivation of kalo.”</td>
<td>Not revised because Policy already says “controlled diversion of stream waters for agricultural purposes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>Add new introductory paragraph, which begins, “The Wai’anae Coast, from Honouliuli to Ka’ena, is a geographical area that is known for its religious and spiritual significance…..”</td>
<td>Revised – added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-22</td>
<td>3.6.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy about the need for signage near cultural sites (names, mo‘olelo, rules, etc.)</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.6.2.4 “Signage for Cultural Sites”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>Figure 3-2</td>
<td>The Cultural Resources map needs to be updated – there is much that is missing.</td>
<td>Not revised because no money was included in review process for an archaeological survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>TSI needs to meet with some Wai’anae farmers to get more information on this section. It needs to include some innovative ideas to support farmers.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>TSI needs to update housing data.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-36</td>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>Need to address affordable housing issue.</td>
<td>Not revised in Preliminary Draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-37</td>
<td>3.8.3.1</td>
<td>Height limit of residential structures could possibly by changed from 30 feet to 25 feet.</td>
<td>Not revised. No consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-37</td>
<td>3.8.3</td>
<td>Add ‘Ohana Housing concept</td>
<td>Not revised. No consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-40</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Add Policy that prohibits big box stores.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.9.2.3 “Prohibit ‘Big Box’ Stores”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-40</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Maybe create a Special District for Wai’anae Town Center.</td>
<td>Not revised. No consensus, but could be followed-up on in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-40</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Recommend the building of a light industrial park.</td>
<td>Not revised. No consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Comments on the Wai'anae SCP, July 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-40</td>
<td>3.9.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that says “No new landfills”</td>
<td>Revised, but in Section 4.6.2. Added Policy 4.6.2.1 “No New Landfills”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-42</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>New idea for community gathering places to be at the beaches, connected by a walking/jogging/biking path.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-55</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
<td>Need to create a plan for the community takeover of Mākuʻa Valley in order to be prepared when it does eventually happen.</td>
<td>Revised, but instead added Policy 3.12.2.1 “Preservation and Transition to Civilian Use”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>All of Chapter 4</td>
<td>TSI needs to update all data in this chapter.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that states that all roads within the District should stay within the City Standards so that the City will service them.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Establish rural road standards that the City approves.</td>
<td>Revised. Page 4-1 states “Rural Infrastructure Standards should be developed by the City.” No standards were suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy on water resource inventory.</td>
<td>Not revised in Preliminary Draft, but did add Policy 4.2.4.3 “Diversify Water Supply, Matching Quality with Use,” in PreFinal Draft, which addresses this concern to some degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Need to resolve the issue of saltwater intrusion into the sewer lines.</td>
<td>Not revised because deals with implementation of existing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>4.4.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy on developing alternative energy sources.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy “No new landfills”</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 4.6.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that encourages composting.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 4.6.2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4.6.2</td>
<td>Add a Policy that convenient stations should increase their capacity.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 4.6.2.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Table 4-2</td>
<td>Include charter schools in statistics.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-21</td>
<td>4.7.2.1</td>
<td>Change last sentence from “A second ambulance should be provided” to “Expand second ambulance unit to 24 hours.”</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 4.7.2.5 “Ambulance Service”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>The entire WSCP needs to be implemented better.</td>
<td>Several revisions were made to Chapter 5, including the addition of the Implementation Matrix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Comments on the Wai‘anae SCP, Preliminary Draft (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (“TSI”) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES-1</td>
<td>(no Executive Summary was included in this draft)</td>
<td>Add introductory paragraph that talks about Wai‘anae and its desire to limit new development, “The District of Wai‘anae is characterized by rugged mountains and beautiful welcoming beaches…”</td>
<td>Revised – added to Public Review Draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wai‘anae is supposed to have 3.8 – 4.2% of Oahu’s total population, which it has already exceeded (4.8%). We need a statement that the City Administration and Council should adhere to this policy, and not approve more housing for the District. Wai‘anae already has a disproportionate share of low-income housing.</td>
<td>Revised. Narrative on population added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Vision statement needs some wordsmithing. Should talk about other people living in community, not only children.</td>
<td>Revised. Two sentences now begin with “We,” instead of “Our Children” or “They.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>2.4.5</td>
<td>Add “Nānākuli” back in. It was incorrectly crossed out.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>There is not enough here about economic conditions and the fostering of the economy within the district.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 3</td>
<td>3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 &amp; 3.6</td>
<td>We would like to see a community-based organization manage Waianae’s natural and cultural resources. The NBs could have this role; possibly one of the committees could oversee it. They could seek out expertise.</td>
<td>Revised to say that the creation of such community-based organizations could be a long-term goal. It might be more acceptable to make the short-term goal be for the community to advise on such resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>The population numbers need to be checked and projections need to be added.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>3.1.6</td>
<td>The Mākaha Resort is still operational.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>3.1.7 (b)</td>
<td>Strike out “for either agriculture or”. We know these soils are productive soils.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>3.1.7 (e)</td>
<td>Should include preservation/protection of estuaries also.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Add in the ahupua’a of Koiahi between ‘Ohikilolo and Māku’a.</td>
<td>Revised in narrative. Not added to map since unsure of boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-23</td>
<td>3.6.3</td>
<td>Wai’anae is a special cultural place. It deserves some type of protection. If a Cultural Overlay District is not feasible, then what is?</td>
<td>Revised in E.S. TSI recently developed a plan for North Kohala, where we ran into a similar situation, and we decided to put the same basic idea into the beginning of the Plan, as an overarching statement and theme for the district. We could do the same thing here. This way the City gets the idea, without having to go through a lengthy bureaucratic process of creating a whole new type of district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>We need a policy(s) on affordable housing. We should have our fair share, not more (although we already do have more). They should be affordable for at least 30 years. They should be for Wai’anae residents. New developments should provide infrastructure and public facilities – roads, water, recreation, jobs, parks, etc.</td>
<td>Revised. - Added Policy 3.8.2.5 “Allow Only Affordable Housing Projects that Meet WSCP Guidelines.” - Added Guideline 3.8.3.1 “Follow Wai’anae SCP Affordable Housing Guidelines.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>We need a policy that encourages economic activity in residences.</td>
<td>Revised – added Policy 3.8.2.4 “Support Home-Based Businesses”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-47</td>
<td>3.12.1</td>
<td>Delete last paragraph since the “Ecosystems Management Plan” and the Ukani Po Heiau project are now a source of contention between the Army and the community.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-47</td>
<td>3.12.2.2</td>
<td>Add new (2nd) paragraph, “Therefore, the continued use of these lands for military purposes should be debated, and transition to public use should be given serious consideration.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Let’s define Rural Infrastructure Standards.</td>
<td>Revised. Instead of defining Rural Infrastructure Standards, we added broad statement about how such Standards should be considered to maintain and reinforce a country fee and character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Emphasize the need for an Emergency Bypass Road as a priority. Recommend a Second Access Road.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>4.6.2.3</td>
<td>Composting should be restricted to “Green Waste Composting.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Amend Paragraph 1, Sustainability, of Section 2.2 by adding a new 4th paragraph to read as follows: “It is also recognized that a key element to the sustainability of any community and its people is the ability to maintain economic viability. It cannot be ignored or denied that the Wai’anae Community has ‘lagged’ behind the rest of Oahu in terms of economic development and employment development and employment opportunities for its coastal residents.” The following information… (data &amp; stats)</td>
<td>- Revised Section 2.2 to include new paragraph. Information provided after that paragraph was added to section 3.1. - Section 3.1 was re-titled: Overview of Land Use, Population, Economics, and Environmental Conditions. - A new Section 3.1.3 “Economics” was added. - This economic data was put in Section 3.1 because it seemed like a good fit along side the other data and statistics for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Amend Ahupua’a Concept, by adding a new 3rd paragraph as follows: “It is also recognized that the four ahupua’a have different concerns and needs, and thus, the Wai’anae SCP must be applied with the flexibility to respond to take this into account…”</td>
<td>Revised – this paragraph regarding the differences among the 4 main ahupua’a was added to Section 2.4.1, which includes a more detailed discussion on the various ahupua’a of the District, and how best to do land use planning for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Wai’anae Concept Map should be amended to change the Rural District Boundary to include the Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project area (96-acres).</td>
<td>Not revised – the Wai’anae Concept Map is intended to graphically represent the Wai’anae community’s Vision for the District. It is an idealized concept map, not a land use map that dictates the location of development. - The Land Use Map in Appendix A contains various land use types that function similar to County Zoning, including “Industrial.” In order to allow the Nānākuli Community Baseyard Project, the Land Use Map would need to be changed to include an area in Lualualei that is labeled as such. Thus far, there has been no community consensus on whether or not to make this change on the Land Use Map, so the Public Review Draft includes both (a) the map as is, and (b) the map with a new “Industrial” area. A decision will need to be reached as to which map to include in the finalized Wai’anae SCP (Revised 2009).</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Amend 11th Element to read “Develop community-based businesses and jobs with an emphasis on agriculture, education and culture, including a light industrial park along the mauka-end of Lualualei Naval Road.”</td>
<td>Revised the Vision Element to read “Develop and support community-based businesses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>2.4.11</td>
<td>Amend the 5th paragraph to read: “Other economic opportunities discussed include expansion of retail and commercial centers in the four major ahupua’a and the creation of a light industrial park in the Lualualei/Ma‘ili ahupua’a known as the ‘Nanakuli Community Baseyard Project.’ Similar to the other sectors, it is recommended that locally-owned businesses be given priority, and that they hire residents as much as possible.”</td>
<td>Revised – this suggestion was included, except for the section that is highlighted, because the WSCP should not endorse specific development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-35</td>
<td>3.9.1</td>
<td>Add a new 4th paragraph, “The economic opportunities in the Nanakuli and Lualualei/Ma‘ili ahupua’a are far less than those opportunities available in the Wai‘anae and Makaha ahupua’a. Neither the Nanakuli nor the Lualualei/Ma‘ili ahupua’a have the type of economic diversity and employment opportunities currently enjoyed in Wai‘anae and Makaha. For example, the Lualualei/Ma‘ili ahupua’a does not have: (i) resort/hotel jobs like those at the Makaha Valley Resort, (ii) golf course jobs like those provided at the two golf courses in Makaha Valley, (iii) harbor or boating opportunities as available at the Waianae Boat Harbor, (iv) successful agricultural operations because of the lack of available water and lesser quality soil as compared to the neighboring ahupua’a in Waianae and Makaha, (v)...”</td>
<td>Revised – this paragraph was included in Section 3.9.1 with some minor revisions and additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-36</td>
<td>3.9.2.4</td>
<td>Add new underlined language: “Encourage the establishment of light industrial businesses that provide jobs for local people, and that are generally compatible with the predominantly residential uses of the Rural Community areas along the coast and at the mauka-end of Lualualei Naval Road (adjacent to Navy Base), but not in Makaha Valley.”</td>
<td>Revised – the basic content of the suggested change was included in a different wording, as follows, “Most agree that the most appropriate location for a light industrial park would be in Lualualei.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DPP Comments on the Waiʻanae SCP, Preliminary Draft (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page*</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (TSI) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cov.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Picture has too much contrast and blue dot on mountain background should be edited out; Doc title should be revised to be similar to original where there is a City logo, “Department of Planning and Permitting, City and County of Honolulu” and date of revision; e.g., “Revised _{(month)} 2009”; title of plan should be changed to “Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan”; references to consultant should not be on cover.</td>
<td>Revised. Used other picture. Also, revised title page as per other comments (and “Gospel”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Title page</td>
<td>All policies and guidelines should start with a verb. I didn’t catch all.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Sec. 1</td>
<td>Description of General Plan should follow that found in the Preamble of the GP document which refers to the GP being a statement of long-range social, economic, environmental, and design objectives for the general welfare and prosperity of the people of Oahu; and that it is a statement of broad policies to attain the objectives of the plan, not necessarily policies for the development of Oahu. The reference to Objective C of the GP seems out-of-place as it directs the reader to specific section of the GP as the origin of the plan’s purpose. Instead of citing this objective as the source for the ‘theme’ for Waianae, we should be setting the stage for the need for a SCP which is found in the City Charter. I would refer to the City’s description of its Honolulu land use planning and management system found on p. P-3 of the current plan as the initiating source for the establishment of the Waianae SCP and hold off till later the ‘Country should be kept Country’ theme. That would come as part of the Waianae vision statements. Up front somewhere should be a description of the enabling legislation that directs the 5-Year Review, how this review process conforms to that legislation, a summary of big issues faced in the review process. Will this be in the Preface?</td>
<td>Revised. Content added to Preface to better describe GP and its relationship to the DP/SCPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Top of page</td>
<td>Sustainability paragraph missing</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Objective C</td>
<td>The text in this paragraph needs to be revised to reflect the GP’s current language. See attached Reso 02-205 CD1.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>-------</td>
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<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Chapter 1, para 3 - Thus, the General Plan...Oahu’s population will be 4.8% in 2010 and 4.6% in 2025.</td>
<td>Don’t we have #’s for 2030? (Will be a difficult policy to implement) Add:</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Bottom of page</td>
<td>Distribution is a guideline not target so they tell me. So may be discuss significance or non-significance of overage.</td>
<td>Revised. More narrative added in following paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>A chart showing population growth for Waianae over the last 40 years is desirable to update and substantiate previous analysis. Can be in Tech Report. Any ideas on a graphic to substantiate previous analysis of development trend over the last 40 years? How about aerial photos of Waianae District then and now and some in between years? Time and resources permitting!</td>
<td>Revised narrative to more clearly describe population changes. Population chart included in Chapter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Chapter 1, para 1 – Land development and population...over the past 40 years suggest ...will be difficult policy to implement.</td>
<td>Needs fixing—based on future projections, is expected to hover at 4.6% which is slightly higher than GP policy. Add statement on how much urban development has occurred beyond rural boundary.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Chapter 1, para 1 – Land uses on the mauka side of Farrington...rural uses;</td>
<td>What rural uses? Give examples.</td>
<td>Not revised. “Rural land uses” are discussed more in Chapters 2 &amp; 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>Isn’t sewer system also overloaded too? How about water supply and attendant infrastructure? Does this statement “Important parts of the District’s...” address current conditions adequately?</td>
<td>Revised. Added sewer system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>Change name of plan to “Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009)”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>In the Waianae SCP there’s more vision related material than in the other DPs/SCPs I’ve reviewed. Others have vision and elements of the vision, but you’ve added a “key concepts” section. The key concepts you’ve identified—sustainability, ahupua’a, cultural landscape, community fabric and rural values—are important—and no doubt were greatly influenced by the community.</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Given the importance of the ‘key concepts,’ why not convert the key concepts to vision elements? As written—or as they might be revised—the key concepts are at the same level of generality as the vision elements in other plans I’ve reviewed. So the first vision element in your current draft might remain the same: “Adopt the ahupua’a concept as a framework for land use and open space planning.”</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed. Some aspects were added to the “Vision Elements”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>I’d convert your existing “vision element” statements either to new statements supporting “new” vision elements [i.e. existing concepts] OR to incorporate them under the appropriate land use category in the following sections. Some of them are at the policy level of generality. The protection of cultural landscape statement could be the lead for the landscape concept section. Safety improvements and beautification for Farrington and the emergency bypass road, for example, probably belong as specific land use or transportation policies.</td>
<td>Revised. All “Vision Elements” revised to better fit “Vision” level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Some cutting, pasting and editing could allow you to merge the existing “concept” language with the current “vision element” language.</td>
<td>Revised. See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>Description and purpose of chapters should be up front; i.e, exec summary, preface or other section in beginning of plan.</td>
<td>Revised. Public Review Draft includes Preface and Exec Summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Sec 2</td>
<td>Is this a style supported by Kem? Will this format of chapter contents be for all chapters and all DP/SCP plans? Although desirable, it will add to size. Maybe it can be part of preface/exec summary?</td>
<td>Not revised. Same format throughout WSCP chapters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>[Define the] Key Concepts that this Plan is based upon,</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>[Presents the] Waianae Concept Map that graphically…</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>[Describes] Description of the 12 Vision Elements, and</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>[Summarizes] Summary of the Community…</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>2.1 Vision Statement</td>
<td>Same comment as before.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Chapter 2.1 Vision Statement</td>
<td>[We envision] [o]Our physical environment [as] is pristine, protected from degradation…</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Chapter 2.1.1 Inside Our Vision</td>
<td>Put in appendix / tech report</td>
<td>Not revised. Community adamant about keeping this in Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Para 3, 5th line</td>
<td>The word “‘aina” is not properly displaying. Are you using Word symbols to mimic Hawaiian fonts as agreed to previously? Mine displays as a rectangle then the letters ina. The same word displayed correctly on page 6.</td>
<td>Revised. Fixed problem with fonts.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>Inside Vision</td>
<td>Much of the description of children’s needs can be summarized in one paragraph. More emphasis should be placed on describing how City’s land use management system can achieve this vision. There was only one or 2 lines referencing land use decisions’ effect on the future of Waianae’s residents needs. There is a lack of descriptors that connect the Visions’ desires to the City’s land use management system and how the current land management system can be implemented in a way to achieve those Vision components. Perhaps the plan can elaborate on these mechanisms I’m looking for from a human and environmental health standpoint. For example, the proper control of pollutants from a development proposal as it relates to the residents’ near and long term health impacts. The proposed Vision is related more towards a socio-economic and environmental health goal than a land use policy.</td>
<td>Not revised. These were the community’s words. Description of how City’s land use management system can achieve this vision is included throughout the rest of Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Chapter 2.1.2</td>
<td>This is process not vision statement</td>
<td>Not revised. Community adamant about keeping this in Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian Connection to the Land, para 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Chapter 2.1.2</td>
<td>Tech report</td>
<td>Not revised. Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian Connection to the Land, para 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Hawaiian connection</td>
<td>Since there was no glossary, is it the intent to exclude all glossaries through all of the DP/SCP plans? Also, where are you getting the reference that 62% of the Waianae community identifies themselves as partly Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander? The State Data book references for Year 2000 that the island as a whole had 61% identified as part Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Shouldn’t Waianae’s % be higher than island total?</td>
<td>Not revised. Glossary being handled by DPP for all DP/SCPs. 62% Native Hawaiian comes from US Census, 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2 Key Concepts, para 1</td>
<td>…meetings that were held to first adopt and then to revise the Waianae…</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>The title of the Plan should be consistent throughout the document. Prefer you use “Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009)”.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.1</td>
<td>Are we using this in all DPs or each one is different?</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>What is meant by “...their own District”? Are they not referring to the Waianae District as a whole or are they referring to a part of Waianae they are most familiar with? Do you need to capitalize “District”? Perhaps you should say “Waianae District”?</td>
<td>- Revised. “Key Concepts” removed. - Not revised. “District” is capitalized throughout Plan for consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>Can you cite an example of production of “their own energy”?</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>2. Ahupua’a Concept, 2nd para</td>
<td>Waianae residents want to make sure that the values and lessons of this ancient system and their ancestors are not lost, but are instead remembered and [applied] adopted to their modern-day planning….</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>Cultural Overlay</td>
<td>There needs to be some advantages presented here that support this concept over the existing system as mandated by Feds and the State DLNR. Otherwise, the concept will be forgotten until it resurfaces in Sec 3-7. You want the reader to keep the advantages in mind as they proceed to subsequent pages.</td>
<td>Revised. Removed concept of Cultural Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Bullets</td>
<td>Good themes for pictures for inclusion into Exec Summary to be prepared by other consultants.</td>
<td>Not revised. Did not add pictures to Exec Summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Para 1, Line 1</td>
<td>What process is this line referring to? Revision? Review of land use applications against SCP policies?</td>
<td>Revised. Took “process” out of sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
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<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>There have been reports by DBEDT that Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders (NH&amp;PI) living in the State have been decreasing due to out-migration for more economic opportunities, presumably in California, Nevada, and other places where homes are less costly. On the other hand, there seems to be a large population of homeless in the District. Can you provide some numbers of both out-migration and homelessness in the Waianae District to give the reader a better understanding of population trends. Part of the near term consequences of an SCP with an RCB component is the limitation of growth from outlying areas which could drive up the prices of the limited supply of land within the RCB, slated for accommodating the area’s population growth. The result may be a greater numbers of NH&amp;PI leaving as a result of strong “growth controls”. See the link to article on NH&amp;PI numbers: <a href="http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2005/Aug/12/ln/508120362.html">http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2005/Aug/12/ln/508120362.html</a>. Strong growth controls are a double-edged sword. Although such controls may be successful in limiting growth and offers better protection of natural resources, it may ultimately end up benefiting in-migrants moving into the District as local population who can no longer afford to stay migrate to mainland destinations. So, the question becomes who are we protecting the District’s resources for?</td>
<td>Revised. More population data added to Chapter 3 and Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.5 Rural Values – para 2 - Population growth and land development…that of a stable rural community.</td>
<td>Why is this important?</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed. This phrase is included in section 2.4.2. It is used to discuss a rural community with minimal population growth (“stable” meaning no significant change).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.5 Rural Values – para 2</td>
<td>Population growth and land development…Continued urban and suburban development will consume open agricultural lands and [put still more] add more demand on Waianae’s roads, schools…</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” section removed. Suggested changes made (Final Draft, section 2.4.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.5 Rural Values – para 2</td>
<td>“Population growth and land development… on Waianae’s roads, schools, parks, and other facilities, which are already overcrowded.” Justify</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” section removed. Some issues are justified in Chapter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.5 Rural Values – para 3</td>
<td>Is it just City? Just government?</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” section removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Chapter 2.2.5 Rural Values – para 3</td>
<td>The Vision for the future of the Waianae Community [can be attained if] depends on City policies and programs [vigorously] that support…</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” section removed.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>Re-label Plan name to Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009) and consistently named thru out the Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>2.4 – 12 Vision Elements, #1</td>
<td>Recognize the traditional ahupua’a of the Waianae District and [adopt] adapt the ahupua’a concept as a framework for land use and open space planning</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4 12 Vision Elements</td>
<td>3. [Restrict coastal] Prevent further urban, suburban, [or] and resort development…</td>
<td>Not revised. Not significant difference and community likes “restrict”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4 12 Vision Elements</td>
<td>7. Take next steps in [creating] completing an Emergency Bypass Road.</td>
<td>Revised. Also, this Element revised to “Improve Transportation Systems”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4 12 Vision Elements - #9 Designate Waianae town center as “Country Town”</td>
<td>This is a vision?</td>
<td>Revised. But yes, part of the Vision is for all 4 major ahupua’a to have town centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>2.4 - 12 Vision Elements, # 12</td>
<td>12. Form a Community-Based Organization that [Manages] Advises on Waianae’s Natural and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Revised. This and all similar sections to, “Government Agencies should partner with community-based organizations in order to better manage Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>I’m still not clear on how the ahupua’a concept will benefit our current land use management system. What specific processes of the ahupua’a concept are applicable to the current land use process? Please give examples for planners and regulators. What needs to be done so that the concept can be implemented/integrated w/ current City land management system? Perhaps this concept needs further study as a recommendation our of the SCP review process (next step)?</td>
<td>Revised. Edited wording to make the intent of this Vision Element clearer. Added examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Re-establish Ahupua’a Councils</td>
<td>Maybe just say create new mechanism to get more/better input from Native Hawaiian values and practices.</td>
<td>Not revised. Wai’anae community members have said they wanted to re-establish these councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>2nd para</td>
<td>Clearly then, the concept of the ahupua’a has great… It is thus important to [adopt] adapt the ahupua’a concept into the land use planning process for the Waianae Coast.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.2 – The Preservation Lands ...These lands should be managed by a community-based...</td>
<td>What does that mean? All government-owned lands? Taking private property rights? Who funds them?</td>
<td>Revised. Changed this and all similar sections to “Government Agencies should partner with community-based organizations in order to better manage Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.2 – Coastal Lands...These lands should be managed by a community-based...</td>
<td>Ditto above</td>
<td>Revised. Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Bullet 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>New statement on the use of Native Hawaiian values and management practices may conflict with other non Hawaiian cultural practices.</td>
<td>Revised. Same as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.2 – Rural Community Areas...Within the Rural community areas, there should be...</td>
<td>We should know this. Within the Rural Community areas, there [should be] is acreage for infill. Acreage for infill...</td>
<td>Revised. Changed “should be” to “is”. However, acreage is unknown since RCBs are not defined boundaries, and DPP has not provided this info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.3, para 3</td>
<td>[in] Section 3.11 [of the Revised WSCP, there is ] recommends a plan for such a path... one in each of the major ahupua’ a and [.This Revised Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan supports this limited development makai of Farrington Highway since it] would serve the community’s daily needs.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.5, para 3</td>
<td>A coordinated City/State/Federal and Private landowners program... The [Revised] Waianae Sustainable... (this is not the technical report)</td>
<td>Not revised. Comment unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.5, para 3 (continuation from page 2-15)</td>
<td>The [Revised] Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan [should therefore] designates, [where feasible,] all important perennial... Appropriate State and City agencies [then need to work together to] should initiate a program... (is this a vision statement or a guideline?)</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>2.4.6, 3rd para</td>
<td>Don’t know how this would work.</td>
<td>Revised. Removed concept of Cultural Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>Overlay District</td>
<td>The only difference I can see between the current process and the proposed Overlay District is a complete archaeological survey be done in advance of development/clearing. The State of Hawaii already has regulations to protect sites and they currently have community organizations dedicated to maintaining certain sensitive sites. Perhaps what really needs to be done is to formalize the community management process w/ the BLNR. From there, early assessment by these groups w/ expertise from DLNR/ Bishop Museum and others qualified to do site survey can be undertaken with the permission of landowners.</td>
<td>Revised. Removed concept of Cultural Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.7, para 2 –</td>
<td>awk</td>
<td>Revised. Removed “such”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There have been several times…and other such situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>A map of the roadway sections completed and to be completed should be included in the Plan’s as part of the land use maps.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.7, para 3 and 4</td>
<td>Is this too much detail for vision section and should be in technical report?</td>
<td>Revised. Vision Element changed to “Improve Transportation Systems”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-18</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.9, para 1</td>
<td>Within the Rural Community areas of each … These Centers should contain a concentration of small retail businesses, restaurants, professional offices, [like] medical clinics, [dentists and doctors,] and social services [offices] centers…. This more [efficient] compact? development pattern would provide for a stronger…and potentially alleviate the strong “strip mall” development. (how?)</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-18</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>How about adding a suggestion that narrowing road can be in a form of a landscaped median with left-turn pockets which would have a slowing speed effect but without losing lanes and affecting through-put capacity. I also suggest landscaped barriers in median to discourage jay-walking and to protect against vehicles from crossing over into oncoming traffic.</td>
<td>Revised. Removed suggestion to narrow road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>Why does a small commercial village take 4 years to construct? Maybe remove reference to 2012?</td>
<td>Not revised. This is the estimated completion date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>2.4.10, 1st para</td>
<td>Community Gathering Places of several acres each are needed within each of the major ahupua’a (Nanakuli, Lualualei, … (Maili?)</td>
<td>Revised to “Lualualei/Maili”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>Last Para</td>
<td>Many parks and associated pathways are being closed at night due to security issues. Even w/ lighting, these public facilities are attracting undesirable activities. Be sure to get HPD’s comments on the security of this proposal where it involves night use.</td>
<td>Not revised. HPD’s comments would definitely be needed later in process – if/when pursuing implementation.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>Chapter 2.4.11, para 5</td>
<td>Other economic opportunities discussed include...ahupua’a and the creation of a light industrial park.... <em>(In?)</em></td>
<td>Revised. “In Lualualei”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>2.4.12</td>
<td>Form a Community-Based Organization to Advise on the Management of Waianae’s Natural and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>2.4.1.2</td>
<td>How about an example of such organization. Or, specific functions these groups may be responsible for that is not already covered by existing government agencies or non-profit organizations. How about forming these groups as volunteers since that would involve those with the dedication and interest in preserving the District’s resources. Could be sub-committees of Ahupuaa Councils. In addition, <a href="http://www.conservationpractice.org">www.conservationpractice.org</a> seems to be offline.</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Many of the policy statements in boldface throughout are simply headings [e.g. 3.2.2.2 Project Impacts on Open Space to be Addressed on p. 44]. We need to decide whether to convert all such statements into active policy statements such as “include a detailed analysis of the project’s potential impact on open space and scenic beauty.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Some of the policy sections have guidelines, some don’t. Will guidelines be added to each section?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Table 3-1: Population Trends for Waianae</td>
<td>Different #s on web</td>
<td>Revised. Used population projection numbers from DPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Table 3-2</td>
<td>It would interesting to note what percentage of the island’s Urban District is located in the Waianae District. That could be expanded to compare population number among various rural SCPs and their respective Urban District acreage. I would expect that the DP/SCP districts with the greatest Urban acreage would have the largest population numbers. Perhaps this can go into Tech Report.</td>
<td>Not revised. Interesting idea, perhaps one DPP could pursue since it involves comparing various districts. Also, total acreages need to be updated for State Districts or County Zones (by DPP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Table 3-3</td>
<td>Another interesting note: There almost 2,100 acres in single-family residential zoning and only 73 acres in multi-family zoning. Also, we should include a statistic on how much of the AG zoning is used by DHHL for dwelling use (presumably all single-family dwellings (SFD)). On the surface, the lack of multi-family zoning is not helping in the provision of affordable housing. The reverse should be the trend since potable water is limited and SFD take the most water. Can we encourage more Multi-Family Dwellings especially by DHHL as opposed to SFD?</td>
<td>Not revised. Multi-Family Dwellings and “Clustered Housing” is encouraged in Policy 3.8.3.3.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>Pot. Dev.</td>
<td>What specific information do you need from DPP to prepare the Potential Development map?</td>
<td>Steve Young has the map and data. He has not responded to our requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Bullet 4</td>
<td>Please update info on Makaha Resort. We even had meetings for Makaha SAP there!</td>
<td>Revised. (btw, did not say has closed, said had closed…at that time.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Makaha SAP</td>
<td>Should include preliminary findings from SAP work to date. Let’s plan on sending these out to public together. Ideally, the SAP would offer directions for SCP to incorporate. Please devote a section to Makaha in anticipation of SAP completion as SCP Plan goes to Council. Also, pls include in Plan the Makaha SAP Rural Development Concept Map.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>3.1.6 Makaha Valley, 2nd para on page</td>
<td>Accordingly, [Townscape was contracted] work was started by the City to develop the Makaha Special Area Plan in 2005, and the Plan is scheduled to be completed in 2008.</td>
<td>Revised. Also, this section was moved to section 3.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Please indicate what constitute “good soils” in Lualualei. What USDA SCS Soil Survey categories are these good soils? What is their propensity for cultivation?</td>
<td>Revised. Added, “Soils are from the vertisol series, which is regarded as highly fertile.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>3.1.7 c)</td>
<td>… The balance of about [4.4] 4.5 mgd is currently imported into the District from the much larger Pearl Harbor Aquifer Sector Area.</td>
<td>Revised. Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Until there is more potable water supplies, we should encourage affordable multi-family dwellings and discourage single-family dwellings instead to address water supply. To discourage affordable housing would be contrary to City’s housing policies.</td>
<td>Not revised. No significant growth is encouraged – affordable or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3-9   | Chapter 3.1.7d) to f), Environmental Conditions | Are these conditions or action statements/guidelines? | Revised. Changed to “Environmental Conditions and Implications for Planning”.

3-10 3.1.8, 1st para | The Waianae Watershed Management Plan (WWMP) provides… The City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply (BWS) began developing the WWMP, in collaboration… | Revised. |

3-10 3.1.8, 2nd line | Awkward sentence. Please revise. The SCP plan is not treated as a person w/ reviewing responsibilities. | Revised. |

3-11 3.2.1, 1st para on page | ... They also list [“Significant Stationary Views,” and] “Significant Road Views.” In addition, they are many … | Revised. |

3-11 3.2.1, 2nd line | What is status of view inventory? I would like to see at least one picture of the protected view listed in the Tech Report and a map indicating the camera location and direction of the shot. | Revised. Map and views included in Tech Report. |
### DPP Comments on the Wai‘anae SCP, Preliminary Draft (2008)

<table>
<thead>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>3.2.1, 2nd para on page</td>
<td>The views referenced above are significant to the Waianae residents and should be protected. This means that no development should be allowed that interferes with any of them. <em>(Need to see map and photo of views. Need to be mapped on open space map or separately.)</em></td>
<td>Revised. Discussed in Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Does this also mean no affordable housing too? What is meant by “interfere”? The Tech report should reference or include examples to guide future decision making.</td>
<td>Revised. Discussed in Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>What is meant by “significant” and “large open space”? The Tech report should reference or include examples to guide future decision making.</td>
<td>Not revised. Discussed in Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>3.2.2.6 Management of Open Spaces</td>
<td>Open spaces should be managed by the community-based group that this Plan recommends be established to manage the natural and cultural… Specific to the management of open spaces, the group should appropriately regulate the gathering of various… <em>(Don’t know how this will work.)</em></td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>Para 6</td>
<td>More appropriate would be the management group prepares and recommends regulations to manage natural resources. They can then follow up with initiating legislation for the rules and provisions for enforcement. What would be the nature of this community-based group? Authority? Funding? Or will it mainly be volunteers. The Tech Report should include a strategy on setting up this and other similar groups and how their functions would promote their purpose.</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.3.2.2, 2nd para</td>
<td>The acquisition of land for the expansion and improvement of Pokai Bay Beach Park should be a top priority. The U.S. Army Rest Camp should be programmed… <em>(The beach area or entire camp? Is it fenced off? Suggest beach area return.)</em></td>
<td>Not revised. Community suggests entire camp be returned eventually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.3.2.4</td>
<td>Suggest a better funded and staffed DLNR as an alternative.</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>Para 5</td>
<td>Along with regulatory responsibilities comes enforcement functions. As most communities are aware, resources have been lacking for all facets of enforcement, including homeless occupations of the beach areas. A strategy on budgetary requirement should be included in these proposed community-based groups with regulatory responsibilities.</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>3.3.2.5</td>
<td>Any state permits? Seems to conflict with 3.3.2.4</td>
<td>Revised. “City” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>Last para</td>
<td>“Sand cells” needs a definition. It doesn’t appear to be common knowledge as to what these are.</td>
<td>Revised. Changed “Sand Cells” to “Beaches/Sand.”</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>Chapter 3.4.1, last para</td>
<td>Numerous herbs and plants have long been… as making special items used in hula and lua. Is “lua” defined elsewhere?</td>
<td>Revised. Added definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>Para 6</td>
<td>To be consistent, both “hula” and “lua” needs a definition following the word. Although it is convenient as currently formatted, I still feel a glossary of Hawaiian words and abbreviations would be more useful for the average reader. This document is not only intended for the Hawaiian community readers. And I am ignorant of many Hawaiian words’ meanings.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>Chapter 3.4.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Mountain Forest Lands</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>This paragraphs needs to have names of the other plants used for medicinal and cultural practices. Could be a footnote or expanded upon in the Tech Report? also, eliminate the word “good”.</td>
<td>Revised. Changed “good” to “appropriate”. Medicinal plants not listed. Not our area of expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>“or restrict access…”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>3.4.2.3</td>
<td>[City] and State Permitting Powers <em>(Forest reserve is part of the State Conservation District.)</em></td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>Same comments on enforcement and funding as for previous sections referring to regulatory responsibilities of the community-based management group.</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>3.4.2.4</td>
<td>Does this include Conservation District Use Permit?</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-16</td>
<td>3.4.2.5</td>
<td>Protect[ion of] Rare and Endangered Species</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>What is meant by ‘cultural development”? Citing some examples would be helpful to reader.</td>
<td>Revised. Changed to “cultural practices”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-18</td>
<td>Chapter 3.5.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Streams</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>Chapter 3.5.2.3 Uses Within the Stream Conservation Corridors</td>
<td>Retaining walls ok?</td>
<td>Not revised. Did not ask the community this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>3.5.2.5</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>What places in the ocean have historic and religious significance? Any examples that can be listed?</td>
<td>Not revised. An example is included: “reefs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-19 to 3-20</td>
<td>Background on Arch.</td>
<td>Much of these two pages can be relocated to the Technical Report as background on human settlements in Waianae.</td>
<td>Not revised. Community wants this background included.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>3-22</td>
<td>Chapter 3.6.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Historic and Cultural Sites</td>
<td>Not revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-22</td>
<td>3.6.2.3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Revised. (All similar resource management sections revised as described above.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-23</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>As recommended by the community, if you include scenic resources, the entire Waianae District is a sensitive cultural resource! Perhaps you may want to state so and establish with the communities' input, priorities as to which elements deserve the greatest protection. Also, need to provide definitions for: &quot;uniki, kapukai, and hui wai. Night marchers is an issue w/ Waimanalo Gulch landfill. Was there any mention of this in the protection of view towards mountain areas? Esp the ridgelines?</td>
<td>Revised. Removed concept of Cultural Overlay District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>The format of the discussion on p. 57 is quite different from the other sections. The discussion of agriculture issues and proposed solutions is useful—but the presentation is distracting. Why not discuss the issues in the same format as in the other sections and then lay out the solutions as policies—just like the previous sections?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>3.7.1, 2nd para</td>
<td>… Two of the most prominent reasons for this decline in agricultural activity are lack of land (much of the prime agricultural land is occupied by the U.S. military) and increasing costs… <em>(Has military increased in size. If farms are decreasing, then should be more ag land)</em></td>
<td>Revised. Clarifying narrative added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>Chapter 3.7.1, para 3</td>
<td>…number of wells for xx irrigation purposes, and… <em>(xtra space between “for” and “irrigation”)</em></td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>2nd to last para</td>
<td>URL link created will set the format for all future URLs referenced by SCP/DP. Pls be sure to make link active in the pdf docs or at the minimum test that they connect to the actual web page the link is referring to.</td>
<td>Revised. Moved to Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>Pres. Ag Land</td>
<td>There are no references to IAL here? Is it somewhere else? How about at least an update in this section on current IAL events and milestones. BTW, was'nt consultants to do some kind of assessment of IAL and its impact on the SCP? My notes for our consultant coordination meeting of Aug 9 2007 indicate that the SCP process will be used to define IAL. Will there be some kind of map at least?</td>
<td>Revised. Standard language on IAL added to Appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>Chapter 3.7.1, para 6</td>
<td>The preservation of agricultural lands—both lands currently...critical importance to the Waianae Community [and to the Revised Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan].</td>
<td>Revised. Removed phrase in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>Issues / Taxes:</td>
<td>Taxes: Current taxes on land used for diversified agriculture are high, presenting… (Says who?)</td>
<td>Revised. Sources added to Technical Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>Incentives - #1 Tax Incentives</td>
<td>Haven’t we done this already?</td>
<td>Revised. Section removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>Chapter 3.7.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to the Preservation of Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>Chapter 3.7.2.1 Enforce the Boundary for Important Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>The [Revised] Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Land Use Map…</td>
<td>Revised. All uses of “revised” removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>Last para</td>
<td>Relabel name of SCP to be consistent – “Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009)”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-28</td>
<td>Chapter 3.7.3 3.7.3.1; 3.7.3.2; &amp; 3.7.3.3</td>
<td>Planning? Guidelines for the Preservation of Agricultural Lands (Shorten to bullet-like sentences)</td>
<td>Revised. Changed to Policies because they fit the definition of a Policy more than that of a Guideline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>In terms of housing, an average of 5.76 units per acre does not seem to be high density; more like medium density. I don’t understand why this statistic is relevant or indicative of the ruralness of the Waianae District. Perhaps a more appropriate measure may be the percentage of open space as compared to the total acreage of the built portion of the District which can be compared with other DP/SCP areas. For example, you can look at the built area as the limit of the RCB.</td>
<td>Revised. Changed to “5.76…is relatively high for a ‘rural’ district like Waianae.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page*</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-29 to 3-30</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>These stats are sorely dated as our latest land and housing price increases are not being considered for a current snapshot of housing in Wai‘anae. I suggest you update all of these stats by seeking more current available information. Try the following: single-family sold prices - $416,537 [<a href="http://www.oahure.com/CMA.php?&amp;ListStatus4=SOLD&amp;ClosedDateMin=2007-09-19&amp;Region1=LEEWARD&amp;MyOrderBy=3&amp;MyPropertyType=1">http://www.oahure.com/CMA.php?&amp;ListStatus4=SOLD&amp;ClosedDateMin=2007-09-19&amp;Region1=LEEWARD&amp;MyOrderBy=3&amp;MyPropertyType=1</a>]; condos - $183,000; or stats from [<a href="http://www.oahure.com/CMA.php?&amp;ListStatus4=SOLD&amp;ClosedDateMin=2007-09-19&amp;Region1=LEEWARD&amp;MyOrderBy=3&amp;MyPropertyType=1">http://www.oahure.com/CMA.php?&amp;ListStatus4=SOLD&amp;ClosedDateMin=2007-09-19&amp;Region1=LEEWARD&amp;MyOrderBy=3&amp;MyPropertyType=1</a>]. Also, there are more recent stats on housing and income found in the DHHL’s Regional Plans for Wai‘anae and Nanakuli: <a href="http://hawaii.gov/dhhl/publications/regional-plans/o-ahu-regional-plans/Waianae%20Regional%20Plan%20January%202008.pdf">http://hawaii.gov/dhhl/publications/regional-plans/o-ahu-regional-plans/Waianae%20Regional%20Plan%20January%202008.pdf</a> and <a href="http://hawaii.gov/dhhl/publications/regional-plans/o-ahu-regional-plans/Nanakuli%20Regional%20Plan%202008.pdf">http://hawaii.gov/dhhl/publications/regional-plans/o-ahu-regional-plans/Nanakuli%20Regional%20Plan%202008.pdf</a>. Hope this is helpful.</td>
<td>Revised. Added more recent home values as suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>This as well as all other tables should be numbered. Pls update data per two DHHL housing plans, i.e., Kaupuni village, and others?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-32</td>
<td>“Section on Affordable Housing and homeless”</td>
<td>Use our HUD 2008 data</td>
<td>Revised. Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-32</td>
<td>“Section on Affordable Housing and homeless” para 4</td>
<td>What about the 00’s?</td>
<td>Revised. Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>Chapter 3.8.1, last para</td>
<td>It is likely that there will be many “affordable” housing projects like the Ma‘ili Kai project proposed for development… (Sea Country?)</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>Chapter 3.8.2.1 Residential Acreage</td>
<td>Existing undeveloped lands within boundary. How much is that?</td>
<td>Not revised. DPP has not provided us with that info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>Chapter 3.8.2.2 Coordination with DHHL</td>
<td>Put it the other way around: DHHL holds the aces, not the City. …However, [the City should encourage] DHHL should [to] concentrate home…</td>
<td>Revised. “The City and DHHL should establish an ongoing dialogue…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>Chapter 3.8.2.3 Future housing development should be…by the [Revised] Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan…</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-34</td>
<td>Chapter 3.8.3</td>
<td>What’s the policy on affordable housing (201H’s)?</td>
<td>Revised. Policy and Guideline added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-35</td>
<td>Chapter 3.9.2 [General] Policies Pertaining to Commercial and Industrial Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>3-36</td>
<td>Chapter 3.9.2.3 Prohibit “Big Box” Stores</td>
<td>Hope there’s justification for this in tech report</td>
<td>Not revised. See Tech Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-38</td>
<td>Chapter 3.10.1, last para</td>
<td>The [Revised] Waianae Sustainable Communities plan thus designates the existing commercial...</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.2 [General] Policies Pertaining to Parks and Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.2.1</td>
<td>What’s the guideline?</td>
<td>Not revised. Guideline 3.11.3.1 describes number of parks needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.2.2 No More Golf Courses</td>
<td>Prohibit [Therefore, public agencies should enforce a policy of no] new golf courses within the Waianae District. There is no land available within the Rural Community areas of the Waianae Land Use Map that would be large enough for a golf course. Golf Courses are considered to be incompatible with Agricultural lands or Preservation lands of the Waianae District.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.3 [Planning] Guidelines for Parks and Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.3.1</td>
<td>What’s the guideline? This is a story.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.3.2</td>
<td>Designate [The land between the Waianae High School and Waianae Boat Harbor [should be considered for] as a Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Park...</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-45</td>
<td>Chapter 3.11.3.3</td>
<td>Guideline missing.</td>
<td>Not revised. Not sure what this means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-45</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Why LIMITED MILITARY LAND USE as a title? [p. 77] If the policy intent is to limit, why not justify limitations in the background section and suggest policies that would limit military access and uses?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-47</td>
<td>Chapter 3.12.2.1</td>
<td>In keeping with the WAIANAE CONCEPT MAP, the overall long-range land use [policy] for military lands at Lualualei and at Makua Valley [is that these lands] should be preserved as agricultural/open space and...</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-47</td>
<td>Chapter 3.12.2.2, para 1, last sentence</td>
<td>[In the revision of the Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan, this controversy is recognized.]</td>
<td>Not revised. This seemed like the best way to acknowledge and include community sentiment.</td>
</tr>
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</table>
| 4-1   | Chapter 4, para 3 - bullets | • Implement [T]he latest technology that allows the Waianae Community to be as sustainable, or “green” as possible[, should be implemented whenever possible].  
• Develop [R]ural Infrastructure Standards [should be developed by the City]. The goal of this… | Revised. |
| 4-2   | Chapter 4.1.1, para 6 | Cite ORTP figures/data | Not revised. Not sure what figures/data to cite. |
| 4-4   | Section to “Insert Major Road Maps” | With Emergency road alignment | Revised. |
| 4-4   | Section 4.1.2 | [General] Policies Pertaining to Transportation Systems | Revised. |
| 4-5   | Chapter 4.1.2.4 | [The intent of this project is to] Connect existing roads mauka of Farrington Highway from Nanakuli to Makaha, by providing bypass roads in times of emergency…. Construction of the remaining section, Kaulawaha Road, as of 2008. | Revised. Added “As of 2009”. |
| 4-5   | Chapter 4.1.2.5 and 4.1.2.6 | So is this a guideline or a preference statement? | Revised. Made all Policies action statements (start with verb). |
| 4-7   | Chapter 4.2.1, para 6 | (The amounts $2000 and $11,000 are circled.) Still true? | Revised. Updated. |
| 4-7   | Chapter 4.2.1, para 7 | …Impact fees for new agricultural water users are, however, substantial…. (What? Cite fee rate, document) | Revised. Edited narrative. BWS recommended not citing a fee rate since rate changes often and Plan does not. |
| 4-7   | Chapter 4.2.2 | Projected fee increases? | Not revised. Unclear comment. |
| 4-8   | Chapter 4.2.2.2 | [General] Policies Pertaining to Potable Water Systems | Revised. Policies changed to match those of WWMP. |
| 4-9   | Chapter 4.3.2 | [General] Policies Pertaining to Wastewater Collection and Treatment | Revised. |
| 4-10  | Chapter 4.3.2.2 | Implement Landscaping improvements to the Waianae WWTP [that will] to minimize this facility’s visual and odor? impact on the community [should be implemented]…. | Revised. Landscaping not intended to minimize odor. |
| 4-10  | Chapter 4.3.3 | [Planning] Guidelines for Wastewater Collection and Disposal Systems | Revised. Guideline removed. |
| 4-10  | Chapter 4.3.3.1 | Investigate [T]he feasibility of expanding the City’s reclaimed water program to the Waianae District [should be investigated]…. | Revised. Guideline removed. |
| 4-10  | Chapter 4.3.3.2 | [The City and DHHL should work together to establish a program that will] Develop a strategy to assist Hawaiian Homesteads homeowners to connect… (DHHL?) | Revised. |
| 4-10  | Chapter 4.4.2 | [General] Policies Pertaining to Electrical Power and Communications | Revised. |
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Chapter 4.4.2.2</td>
<td>[The City and State should] [p]rovide incentives for the use of alternative energy sources in the building of new developments.</td>
<td>Not revised. Need to indicate who should carry out the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Chapter 4.4.3</td>
<td>[Planning] Guidelines Pertaining to Electrical Power and Communications</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Chapter 4.4.3.1</td>
<td>Require [A]ll new development proposed for the Waianae District [should] to be powered at least 50% by alternative energy sources.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Chapter 4.5.1</td>
<td>Show map of flood hazard areas?</td>
<td>Not revised. Would be helpful to include, but unsure of reliable source that shows these hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>This section should be updated as it refers to a recent submittal back in 2000. What is status of that project?</td>
<td>Revised. Removed “recent”. Still need a Drainage Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>Chapter 4.5.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Flooding and Drainage</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>Chapter 4.5.2.1</td>
<td>Prepare [A] comprehensive study of local flooding and drainage problems in the Waianae District [should be developed], together with a phased…</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Chapter 4.5.2.2</td>
<td>[There is also a need for the e]stablish[ment] a [well-designed and well-managed] sediment control program…</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Para 3</td>
<td>Font issue w/ word Nanakuli. “a” looks like rectangles.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Chapter 4.6.1, para 2</td>
<td>Correction to the word “Nanakuli” – typo</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Chapter 4.6.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Solid Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>Chapter 4.6.2.1</td>
<td>Prohibit [No] new landfills [should be allowed] on the Waianae Coast (In the valley ok?)</td>
<td>Revised. “Waianae Coast” same as “Waianae District”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Composting</td>
<td>Nanakuli B, located across the road from PVT C&amp;D landfill, is a proposed composting facility for Municipal Solid Waste. Does the new guideline prohibiting new landfills prohibit this proposal as well?</td>
<td>Not revised. Community is adamant about this Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Chapter 4.6.2.3</td>
<td>Quarry [C]omposting [should be encouraged] within the District. (Needs more stuff-who? Residents, business? Where to drop off?)</td>
<td>Revised. But to “Green Waste” not “Quarry” composting. Other details need to be worked out by community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Chapter 4.6.2.4</td>
<td>Increase [T]he capacity of the transfer stations in the District [should be increased], as well as the hours of operation. There should be one in each major ahupua’a. (Whoa)</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-14</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.1 – Satellite City Hall services, bullets</td>
<td>Still valid?</td>
<td>Revised. Updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.2</td>
<td>[General] Policies Pertaining to Civic, Public Safety and Educational Facilities</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.2.1</td>
<td>What's the guideline? ...A second ambulance should be provided. ?</td>
<td>Revised. Made action statement and added policy on 2nd ambulance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.2.2</td>
<td>What's the guideline?</td>
<td>Revised to be more specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.2.4 and 4.7.2.5</td>
<td>Convert to action statements. Why?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.3</td>
<td>[Planning] Guidelines for Civic, Public Safety and Educational Facilities</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19</td>
<td>Chapter 4.7.3.1</td>
<td>[General] Design Standards</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19</td>
<td>4.8.1, 2nd para</td>
<td>Regular health care services are provided by Kaiser Permanente in [Maile] Nanakuli and by the Waianae Coast Comprehensive Health Center.... The nearest hospital is the [Saint Francis West Hospital located in Waipahu] Hawaii Medical Center-West on Fort Weaver Road. ...</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map</td>
<td>Ex. OS, LU, PF</td>
<td>There are problems w/ ex. Maps: All 3 maps use the wrong symbology for the RCB; the OS map uses the wrong symbol for the ahupuaa boundary; name of individual ahupuas as shown on OS map should be labeled (don’t expect consultants to do unless its part of a map amendment e.g., Tropic Land LLC)</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Why is this Plan called the “Wai‘anae SCP”? Shouldn’t it be the “Wai‘anae Coast SCP” or the “Wai‘anae District SCP”?</td>
<td>Not revised. The City &amp; County of Honolulu set the boundaries and the District names. We will have to confer with them about the possibility of making this change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-1</td>
<td>E.S.</td>
<td>“Its people have historically been as rugged…” – change “rugged” to “steadfast.”</td>
<td>Not revised because this suggestion was submitted after PIMs #2 and 3. Therefore, it was not brought to the community, including community members who wrote it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Figure 2-1</td>
<td>Why isn’t the Lualualei ahupua’a labeled as “Mā‘ili”?</td>
<td>Revised. The labels on all maps were changed to “Lualualei/Mā‘ili” to make it more consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The City did a study of important viewplanes, which should be referenced and adhered to.</td>
<td>No revision. That study is referenced on page 3-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>3.5.2.3</td>
<td>Third sentence – add in Mākau, Lualualei, and Nānākuli.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-20</td>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>At end of line 2, add, “City should encourage archaeological surveys of areas not yet surveyed.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-23</td>
<td>3.6.2.6</td>
<td>Remove line 3, since this program no longer exists.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-32</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NUMEROUS comments on the proposed light industrial park – all in meeting notes (PIM #2 and #3); summarized in Chapter III of Technical Report.</td>
<td>Awaiting City decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-42</td>
<td>3.11.2.2</td>
<td>This policy prohibits more golf courses, but what about driving ranges?</td>
<td>Not revised because driving ranges are distinguished as a different use by DPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-43</td>
<td>3.11.2.3</td>
<td>“The Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Park” is a great idea, but it should not be limited to this site. Maybe there should be a “system” of such parks.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>This Plan should be more assertive regarding the return of military land to civilian use.</td>
<td>Not revised because this SCP only has control over certain aspects of the District’s land use, which does not include federal entities, such as the U.S. military.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>At end of paragraph 3, add that the City should encourage analysis of upgrading Kolekole Pass Road as a Second Access route.</td>
<td>Revised, but instead in Policy 4.1.2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>4.2.2.3</td>
<td>In line 3, add “and non-profits engaged in farming on a commercial basis.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>4.4.2.1</td>
<td>“Reduce the Visual Impact of Utility Lines and Poles” should also be improved for safety reasons.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>5.2 Implementation Matrix</td>
<td>Policy 3.3.2.2 – change the “Implementers” – remove “U.S. Army”.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>What about B&amp;Bs? There are several Bills pending at City Council right now. Can we put our stance on B&amp;Bs in this Plan?</td>
<td>No revision because The Bills at the City Council will be decided on before this SCP is finalized. And once finalized, the Bills will take precedence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>How do we prevent any future landfills?</td>
<td>No revision – there is already a Policy (4.6.2.1) that does exactly that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the community have an attorney to make sure our interest is properly represented?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does this Plan have any teeth?</td>
<td>No revision. The best answer is probably yes and no. DPP has said they use it as their “bible” for land use decisions. However, a lot of issues need the community’s support and pressure in order to get them implemented. The community needs to understand and use the SCP, and make sure it is enforced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>City Department of Facility Maintenance (DFM)</td>
<td>The subject draft recommends establishing rural infrastructure standards to allow the Waianae area to maintain its country feel. We do not recommend lowering the existing City and County of Honolulu Standards for proposed City roadways and the associated curb, gutter, sidewalk, street lighting and storm drainage infrastructure. To develop substandard requirements to construct unimproved narrow roadways will create potentially hazardous conditions for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Furthermore, unimproved roadways that lack a positive storm drainage system results in ponding problems along the edge of roadway and possible flooding with abutting private property. The ponding along the edge of roadway will eventually undermine the pavement structure shortening the effective useful life of the roadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>4.7.1</td>
<td>State Department of Education (DOE)</td>
<td>On page 4-16 of the Plan there is reference to a new school being built in Nanakuli. The DOE has no plans to build a school in Nanakuli within the timeframe stated or with the design capacity state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>Table 4-3</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>We would like to recommend a removal of Table 4-3 which lists projects which may have been planned at one time but, with the exception of three projects, were never initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>4.7.1</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>We are concerned with the statement concerning the maximum enrollment sizes of new schools. In June 2008, the BOE adopted design enrollment guidelines which offer a range of school enrollment and acreage sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>4.7.2.3</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>While the DOE supports the shared use of school facilities when there is sufficient time and space for community activities, the educational function of school facilities is primary. The DOE cannot maintain its campuses as public parks to be used after school and on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-18</td>
<td>4.7.2.4</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>In Section 4.7.2.4, the Plan encourages the opening of charter schools. It should be noted that “stand alone” charter schools do not use DOE facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>City Board of Water Supply (BWS)</td>
<td>Pg 4-8 Agricultural Water Rates – regarding updated water rates, please note that water rates are subject to change from year to year and since this is a 5-year plan, specifying a rate is not recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5.2 Implementn Matrix</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>Policy 4.2.2.1 Determine Safe Yield of Aquifers as Related to Storm Flow – add the BWS to the other lead agencies that would collaborate on determining safe yields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>Consider adding a nonpotable water section based on the findings of the Waianae Watershed Management Plan (WWMP) – Public Review Draft. There are several brackish irrigation sources which could be used for agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>Add a water conservation section to reduce water use and extend existing water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>The General Policies Section should be revised to add watershed protection, water conservation, diversification of supplies and expanding water infrastructure policies based on the WWMP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-17 | 4.7.1         | Honolulu Fire Department (HFD) | HFD requires that the following be complied with: 
- Provide a fire apparatus access road for every facility, building, or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into…  
- Provide a water supply, approved by the County, capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection to all premises…  
- Submit civil drawings to the HFD for review and approval. | Not revised – TSI assumes that these requirements will be complied with through DPP’s review of building permit applications. |
<p>| 4-3  | 4.1.1         | City Department of Transportation Services (DTS) | We estimate that the final segments of the Waianae Community Emergency Access Road project will be completed by the end of November 2008. | Revised. |
| 4-4  | 4.1.1         | DTS     | The plan suggested Farrington Highway could be narrowed to reduce the negative impact on the community. According to our Traffic Engineering Division, the narrowing of Farrington Highway in areas would have some benefits, but without an alternative major arterial route, it would likely aggravate congestion. | Revised – removed. |
| 4-4  | 4.1.1         | DTS     | The plan should mention the Waianae Community Transit Center. Phase 1 of the project, consisting of a transit station with bus stops and shelters, is completed. There is also adjacent land available for a future park-and-ride lot. We recommend that the park-and-ride lot be included in the long-range plan. | Revised – added. |
| 4-4  | 4.1.1         | DTS     | There are currently several bus routes and shuttle services in operation in the Waianae Community. Routes C, 40, 40A, 93, and 93A offer regional service, while Routes 401, 402, and 403 operate as a neighborhood shuttle service. Route F11 also runs from Makaha to TheBoat dock at Kalaeloa/Barber’s Point. | Revised – added. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (“TSI”) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>4.1.1.</td>
<td>DTS</td>
<td>The plan should discuss the impact of TheBoat and the Honolulu Rail Transit on the Waianae Community. In the discussion of traffic congestion the plan mentions the need for an enhanced public transportation system. This section should include information about the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project’s plans to run buses along the Waianae coast to connect with a rail station in Kapolei.</td>
<td>Revised – added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>State Department of Transportation (DOT)</td>
<td>No suggested revisions. Letter generally states that the WSCP appropriately recognizes the pressures on Farrington Highway, “which both the City DTS and the State DOT cooperatively address.” “The DOT will also continue to cooperate with the City in the exploration and review of an alternative route to Farrington Highway, particularly if such a route branches off from or connects to another State highway.</td>
<td>No revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>2.4.7</td>
<td>Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO)</td>
<td>Delete “power lines” and replace with “utility lines and poles.”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-17</td>
<td>2.4.7</td>
<td>HECO</td>
<td>Last paragraph, 2nd sentence, delete “these” and replace with “the communication and power”.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>HECO</td>
<td>At the end of the section, insert our Renewable Energy paragraph (attached).</td>
<td>Revised – added most of the language. Only left out the part that sounded more like advertising than facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5.2 Implementn Matrix</td>
<td>HECO</td>
<td>Section 4.4.2.1, please add Hawaiian Telcom in the last column.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (&quot;TSI&quot;) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-42</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
<td>City Department of Design &amp; Construction (DDC)</td>
<td>The Waianae Regional Park is undeveloped and the City wants to return it to the State.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-42</td>
<td>3.11.1</td>
<td>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation (DPR)</td>
<td>There is a need for district park in Waianae.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA)</td>
<td>No suggested revisions. Letter generally states that OHA “supports the seminal ideas that this document is founded upon such as the people of Waianae desiring to ‘maintain their home’s rural character, built upon a Hawaiian cultural foundation…’.”</td>
<td>No revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
<td>No revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
<td>No revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Hawaii, Facilities Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
<td>No revisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page*</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (TSI) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>In the Waianae SCP public draft there’s more vision related material than in the other DPs/SCPs I’ve reviewed. Others have vision and elements of the vision, but you’ve added a “key concepts” section. The key concepts you’ve identified—sustainability, ahupua’a, cultural landscape, community fabric and rural values—are important—and no doubt were greatly influenced by the community.</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” section removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>Given the importance of the ‘key concepts,’ is there a reason for not converting the key concepts to vision elements? As written—or as they might be revised—the key concepts are at the same level of generality as the vision elements in other plans I’ve reviewed. So the first vision element in your current draft might remain the same: “Adopt the ahupua’a concept as a framework for land use and open space planning.”</td>
<td>Revised. “Key Concepts” removed. Some aspects were added to the “Vision Elements”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>I recommend converting your existing “vision element” statements either to new statements supporting “new” vision elements [i.e. using existing concepts] OR to incorporate them under the appropriate land use category in the following sections. Some of them are at the policy level of generality. The protection of cultural landscape statement could be the lead for the landscape concept section. Safety improvements and beautification for Farrington and the emergency bypass road, for example, probably belong as specific land use or transportation policies. If you decide to do this, I’m happy to go through each of them with you and give my suggestions about where they belong.</td>
<td>Revised. All “Vision Elements” revised to better fit “Vision” level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Each of your headings includes an unnecessary verb: “preservation”, “managed”, “limited”, “establish”, “expansion”, etc. Trying to convey the policy intent of each section in the title oversimplifies. Why not just stick with the descriptive content of each section [e.g. Agricultural Lands] and incorporate the multiple management intentions in policies and guidelines?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page*</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Many of the policy statements throughout the land use section are simply headings [e.g. 3.2.2.2 Project Impacts on Open Space to be Addressed on p. 3-10]. I urge you to convert such statements to more explicit policy statements. Regarding this statement, not every project would be subject to an EIS. Hence, a practical question is what projects would be subject to review and what sort of review would be required? You could provide greater specification in the statement OR provide guidelines indicating how you would implement such a policy. If you decide to revise the policy statements to make them more explicit, I’m willing to go through them with you to show you with sorts of statements I think require revision.</td>
<td>Revised. All Policies are now action statements (with a verb).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>There aren’t many guidelines relative to the other plans. I realize that this is partly a matter of taste, but some of the policies could be strengthened with guidelines. What’s the strategy for acquiring coastal properties [3.3.2.2], for example? What else needs to be done to prevent the introduction of alien species [3.3.2.6]?</td>
<td>Not revised. Would need several more meetings with community to create/add Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Implementation Matrix – This is a useful addition. One slight modification to consider: You distinguish between regulatory actions and what you’ve called “proactive.” “Proactive” is not very descriptive. Why not more categories of action such as programs or projects [Pro], incentives [Inc], plans [Pln], research [Rsh] as well as regulations.</td>
<td>Revised to “Implementer” or “Advocate”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No Community or Agency Comments were gathered on WSCP, PreFinal Draft, July 2009.

DPP Comments on WSCP, PreFinal Draft, June 2009
Comments gathered during June through November 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (TSI) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Add color City Seal; remove date of cover picture and driftwood in center of beach; too much sky-crop out. <strong>Consider standardized cover design for all DPs/SCP documents including Tech Reports.</strong></td>
<td>Revised. Added City Seal. Standardized cover design for all DPs/SCPs should be decided by DPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised. Entire Preface was revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>This paragraph is a bit misleading in that Central Oahu is also slated for development in the GP to relieve development pressures in the remaining urban fringe and rural areas. It should be clarified accordingly so that the reader is not led to believe that Central Oahu is part of the areas to be relieved of development pressures.</td>
<td>Revised. Entire Preface was revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>Figure P-1</td>
<td>All map text are using the wrong symbol for the okina. Koolau Loa and Koolau Poko are each two separate words. Make DP/SCP boundaries more outstanding as that is the subject of this figure.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3</td>
<td>last paragraph</td>
<td>General Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4</td>
<td>2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Land Use Ordinance General Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-2</td>
<td>Chapter 1, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>General Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-2</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Plan is supposed to have 2035 planning horizon. Shouldn’t it be a 25-year timeline instead of 20 years?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-2</td>
<td>Chapter 2, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3</td>
<td>Vision # 1</td>
<td>The word ahupuaa needs a definition unless it appears w/ definition earlier in doc. Drop &quot;with defined boundaries&quot;. The current phrase implies there are to be boundaries for Pres., Ag, and Coast Lands and is not consistent with our decision to only have the Rural Boundary delineated.</td>
<td>- Not revised. Definition on following page. - Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3</td>
<td>Vision #2 and at p. 2-8, 2-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-3</td>
<td>Chapter 3, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-6</td>
<td>Chapter 4, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3rd paragraph</td>
<td>General Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>6th paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Sec. 2.1.2, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.1</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.2</td>
<td>WSCP Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>4th paragraph</td>
<td>WSCP Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>Figure 2-1</td>
<td>Map is too busy; suggest cut back opacity of contours to 50%. Change symbology for Waianae District boundary as it is too similar to ahupuaa boundary; provide legend for various colors and symbology. Difficult to read areas of “major Concentrations of Arch Site” cuz contours are too prominent (also try increasing line weight perimeter boundary of arch sites); colors and symbology should be consistent with Appendix maps; wrong symbol being used for okina; Rural Boundary should be more prominent than ahupuua boundaries-suggest reducing line weight of ahupuua boundary and increasing line weight for Rural Boundary.</td>
<td>Revised. Cut back opacity of contours to 50%. Changed District Boundary to solid line. Made Arch Site Concentrations darker. Changed symbols to match Land Use Map. Fixed okina. Made Rural Boundary more distinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>5th paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-12</td>
<td>Figure 2-2</td>
<td>Wrong symbol for okina; add linework for delineating Waianae SCP district.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>Para 4, 1st line</td>
<td>Add (referred to as the “Rural Boundary”) after the word ‘line’.</td>
<td>Not revised. This is not the Land Use Map. This is the Vision Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Why is this necessary? It seems we have two tiers of graphics which are intended to be illustrations of the text. What this para should say is both map types are intended to be illustrative as called for by the Charter. Instead we are saying one map is more detailed for guiding land uses than the other? Whatever the decision, both maps should share the same colors and symbology for consistency.</td>
<td>Not revised. The Vision Map describes how the community would like their District to look in the future. The Land Use Map shows what is actually there now and what is allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-15</td>
<td>Sec. 2.4.3, 3rd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>Description that nearly all streams near their origins are perennial and become intermittent as they flow into the valleys are not reflected on all the maps and figures. It appears all stream are perennial on the various maps and figures.</td>
<td>Not revised. Steam vary from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>Sec. 2.4.5, 3rd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-19</td>
<td>Para 5, line 3</td>
<td>“…and Mala Ai ‘Opio Organic Farm (also referred to as MA’O Organic Farm).”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DPP Comments on the Wai'anae SCP, PreFinal Draft (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (TSI) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.1, 2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Chart 3-1 and Para 1</td>
<td>This stat and chart is only in the Waianae SCP. What is the purpose of it? Other SCP areas also have Native Hawaiians right? Should we show similar chart for those SCP areas as well? I’m not sure what the point is. The following stats do not differentiate between Native and Non-Natives so what’s the relevancy?</td>
<td>Not revised. The point is that Waianae has a high percentage of Native Hawaiians (the highest on the island). The community is culturally aware and active. If other SCP areas want to add a similar chart, that is up to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Last Para</td>
<td>This paragraph seems to support the concept that Waianae SCP along Farrington Highway is more urban fringe than rural which is consistent with it appearance and density. Other parts of the SCP also relate to this fact. But there is no guideline or language as what to do about it. Do we continue ignoring this reality or should there be language to address this pattern of growth that seems to be continuing?</td>
<td>Not revised. There is much language within the Plan about the community’s desire to limit growth. Since there is no real way to control population, the density along Farrington Highway will most likely continue to increase. The only other option is sprawl, which the community feels is worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Last Para</td>
<td>A para linking land planning/development to water management is missing. All that was done here was to describe an ongoing planning effort by BWS.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Sec. 3.1.7</td>
<td>Waianae Watershed Management Plan (WWMP) WWMP Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>Para 2</td>
<td>Can there be more descriptive language of the scenic vistas than the subjective “…large scale, bold landscape”?</td>
<td>Not revised. Descriptive language follows that sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>4th paragraph</td>
<td>Coastal View Study Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>Sec. 3.5.2, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-21</td>
<td>Figure 3-1</td>
<td>Wrong symbology for okina; legend symbol “Probable Concentrations of Sites” do not match symbology on map; what are the areas in solid black line polygons which do not show up in legend? Where are the round black dots (Smaller Arch. Site) that show up in legend but not on map?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>Para 3, line 1</td>
<td>“…includes areas of Agricultural lands”. Delete “includes a boundary for”.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-25</td>
<td>Sec. 3.7.2.3</td>
<td>LUO Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-26</td>
<td>Para 1</td>
<td>No mention of meeting facilities, schools and other similar quasi-public uses. Are these intended to be supported or not? Also, these uses are not mentioned in the Residential Section 3.8.2. Again, are these uses supported in Residential areas?</td>
<td>Not revised. See Section 4.7, specifically Policy 4.7.2.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-44</td>
<td>Para 2, line6</td>
<td>What is a shrimp pond? Are they anchialine ponds?</td>
<td>Not revised. Definition not essential to Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Heading (Public Facilities and Infrastructure Policy and Guidelines)</td>
<td>Need extra space after “4”</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>3rd and 4th paragraph</td>
<td>Oahu Regional Transportation Plan ORTP</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>5th paragraph</td>
<td>Lualualei Naval Road/Kunia Road Connector Road Concept Study</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4</td>
<td>Para 2, line 4</td>
<td>The former TheBoat dock as TheBoat is no longer in operation?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Figure 4-1</td>
<td>Wrong okina being used. Why are all other roads except Farrington show up as “Major Roadways”? Maybe re-label as “Major and Minor Roadways”?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Para 4, line 4</td>
<td>Add ‘personal transportation vehicles’ after skateboarders.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Oahu Watershed Management Plan Waianae Watershed Management Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-11</td>
<td>Sec. 4.4.1, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15</td>
<td>Para 2, line 7</td>
<td>I think the reverse is true that many Waianae residents support expansion of Waimanalo Gulch Landfill on the perception that expansion there would preclude expansion of PVT of a new landfill in Waianae for MSW and H-Power ash. Maybe we should delete any description of resident position as that changes and there is not a good source of Waianae residents’ positions</td>
<td>Not revised. Waianae residents have said numerous times that they do not support expansion of Waimanalo Gulch nor any new landfills within their District. Please see meeting notes in Tech Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>Para 4</td>
<td>What are the major ahupuuaas?</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-19</td>
<td>Sec. 4.7.2.2</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-21</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Development Plan</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference Sec</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Townscape (TSI) Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>1st and last paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan WSCP Underline title of publication</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>2nd, 6th and 7th paragraphs</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>4th paragraph</td>
<td>Land Use Ordinance Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>Sec. 5.5, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>Sec. 5.6</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>Sec. 5.7</td>
<td>General Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sec. 5.7.1, 2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sec. 5.7.2</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan General Plan Underline titles</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sec. 5.7.3</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan General Plan Underline titles</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>General Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>Sec. 5.7.4, 1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>1st paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appen</td>
<td>Ag and Pres. Boundaries</td>
<td>Delete references to Ag or Preservation Boundaries. Incorporate language into Ag and Pres. area descriptions/categories.</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>#4, 2nd paragraph</td>
<td>Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Underline title</td>
<td>Revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DPP Comments on the Wai'anae SCP, PreFinal Draft (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Sec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Townscape (TSI) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix Maps</td>
<td>A-1 through A-3</td>
<td>To allow greater legibility, all these maps should be expanded to extent of page less margins. Legend can be relocated to top of page in blank white area. This would allow less crowding of symbologies and afford better legibility of thematic and topographic information. General comments for all 3 map: Reduce opacity of elevation contours to 50%, enlarge line weight for SCP Plan Boundary, map legend symbols should be same scale as displayed on map (match); change all okinas to correct symbol; Rural Boundary symbology appears to merge in certain areas and should be revised to eliminate that behavior; consider revising scale bars to be in miles instead of feet as that would be more appropriate for small scale maps.</td>
<td>Revised.  All maps expanded to full page; Legends relocated; Elevation contours reduced; SCP Boundary line enlarged; Symbols changed to match; Rural Boundary revised to be clearer; Scale bars changed to miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-9</td>
<td>Land Use Map</td>
<td>Outline military areas w/ appropriate line weight (similar to concentration of arch. sites on Map A-10) and darken dots in pattern, make SAP boundary more prominent and make legend symbol to match, change legend symbol for Country Town to match symbol shown on map, change City seal to color.</td>
<td>Revised.  Military areas darkened; Symbols revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10</td>
<td>Open Space Map</td>
<td>Stream symbology is inconsistent – some are solid line whereas others are dashed lines. Dashed streams should reflect intermittent streams (text indicates that stream are perennial at/near origin but become intermittent further makai and map should reflect this. Label ahupua‘as on map and add correct okina to legend text (seems to be merging with “A” in label). Label names for arch site concentrations missing.</td>
<td>Revised.  Streams revised to be consistent; Okinas fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-11</td>
<td>Public Facilities Map</td>
<td>This map would benefit with larger format! There are 4 different colored dashed lines representing Farrington Hwy Beautification, Multi-purpose Beach Path, Bike Lane, and Bike Route, but you can only legibly see 2 (Farrington Hwy Beautification and the Bike Lane). The Bike Route is almost invisible and there are no visible Multi-purpose Beach Paths. In addition, the public use symbols blot out much of the underlying information intended to be displayed in this map. Suggestions: Insets of Waianae and Nanakuli at 2-3X the current scale, change opacity of public use symbols to 65% of current, Bike Lane displayed on one side of hwy. OK. Display of streams unnecessary.</td>
<td>Revised.  The Bike Route does not run along Farrington; it was revised to brown and turquoise dashed line to increase legibility; Unable to change opacity of public use symbols.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page intentionally left blank.

COMMUNITY VALUES:
From Section 2.1 (page 2-1 through 2-4 in 2000 WSCP)

“This overall vision statement has been developed through an understanding of important community values.

Like most Hawaii communities, Wai’anae is diverse. The thoughts shared in the community participation program have therefore been varied and covered a wide spectrum of ideas.

Nevertheless, amidst the differences were certain values that were frequently referred to or expressly stated. While it is not possible for everyone to share all of these values, they seem to be held by many people in the District, regardless of ethnicity, origin, or walk of life. Each frequently expressed value is listed below, followed by a description of what the value entails.

“Ours is a living culture of the land and the sea.”
The mountains and valleys have natural and cultural resources which speak of the culture of Wai’anae. These resources include the remains of precontact Hawaiian settlements, and of plantation towns, farms and ranches. The community is working to restore some of these resources and traditional and cultural practices so that the past can continue in the present and will live in the future. Along the coast, people fish, surf, and gather with families and friends, as have past generations. Open spaces and access to the mountains, the valleys and the sea are an important part of people’s lives.

Wai’anae’s people practice their culture in many ways, and through friendship and marriage its culture has come to cross ethnic lines. Wai’anae’s cultural mix is Hawaiian, Portuguese, Filipino, Japanese, Samoan, Chinese, Caucasian, Vietnamese, Korean, African American, and more.

“Relationships are fundamental to our values and identity.”
In this planning context, a relationship is an association between people and between people and their environment. In Wai’anae, the community has many relationships that are essential to the Wai’anae identity. People value family relationships, and extended families and close kinship are common. Their relationship to the land and the ocean is an essential part of living in Wai’anae. The people’s relationships to their diverse cultures are also vital, and these associations affect how people relate to their physical environment. Wai’anae’s relationship with agriculture is part of the community’s way of life; it is sustenance, open space, and of the land.
“We are a rural community.”
Wai‘anae is “country” to its residents. It is a place that is geographically and socially far from city life and city conveniences. It is a place where development is relatively low density, where there are still many small farms and agricultural activities. For many, Wai‘anae’s rural nature means freedom, the freedom to choose a way of life, to grow one’s own food and to raise animals. In Wai‘anae, the predominant features are still natural, with its blue ocean, its white sand beaches which line the coast, its green valleys and dramatic puu, and its mountain range which embraces the entire community. There are still large stretches of land that have no structures and that are visited only by those who know the land through family and word of mouth.

“We are a community with small town values.”
No matter how fast Wai‘anae has grown, it is still a community with small town values. That means that many of the residents grew up together and many belong to multigeneration local families. They frequently gather with friends and neighbors. They come together to help each other when there is a need. They feel safe because they can depend upon each other. Wai‘anae residents accept newcomers into their families and into their ahupua’a. However, many are concerned that, in the future, more newcomers will change the area’s traditional social values.

“We value economic choices in Wai‘anae.”
For Wai‘anae, economic choices within the region are vital to the community’s well-being. Having jobs in Wai‘anae allows families to spend less time commuting and more time with each other. It reduces traffic and stress. Economic choices also mean more convenience in acquiring necessary goods and services.

“Our elderly have much to teach us.”
People in Wai‘anae have great respect for the elderly. The older people are the community’s link to the past. The elderly help young people and newcomers understand Wai‘anae’s culture and history. They teach others what they’ve learned from previous generations, so that their culture can live on through the children.

“We cherish our children.”
Wai‘anae’s children are the future. The children need to acquire the tools to prosper and carry on values and traditions. The community wants the children to have adequate shelter, a safe environment, a supportive and nurturing community and a good education. They want their children to have a good future, choices in employment and housing within Wai‘anae.”
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROCESS
From Section 2.4 (page 2-5 through 2-8 in 2000 WSCP)

The VISION STATEMENT for the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan emerged through an extensive and intensive COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION PROCESS.

From an early stage in the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan project, the planning team began to develop an overall strategy for a meaningful community participation process. The team received invaluable advice from a well-known member of the Wai'anae community who was at that time the Executive Director of the Wai'anae Coast Community Alternative Development Corporation.

“Public input” or “community input” has become a common “buzzword” in the public planning process: City and State agencies typically take some pains to assure decision-makers that “community input” has been solicited and received. In practice, however, this “input” often consists of one or two “public informational meetings” and/or public hearings in which the agency presents a summary of their plan or program to the public, and then listens to comments and questions for an hour or two. This kind of “community input” thus often has little influence on the actual shape and substance of the plan.

The planning team for the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan was determined to undertake a more meaningful process wherein members of the community could truly participate in the formulation of the plan. The team felt that community “ownership” of the plan was essential. With the assistance and advice of the team’s community advisor, a “three level” strategy for community participation was articulated and implemented:

1. First meet one-on-one with community leaders. Explain the scope of the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan project. Seek the advice and assistance of these leaders.

2. Then meet with many small groups and local community organizations to explain the project and solicit their ideas and concerns. At the same time, conduct a number of one-on-one interviews with local people from various walks of life.

3. Based on steps 1 and 2 above, identify important community groups and organizations and ask them to participate in a series of “Community Advisory Committee” meetings. Use these broadly based community meetings to articulate a deeply grounded VISION STATEMENT for the Wai'anae Coast, and to evolve a Sustainable Communities Plan that builds on this overall Vision.

During the first months of the project, planning team members met with about a dozen well-known community leaders, talked with some twenty community groups and organizations, and interviewed another twenty individuals. Then about thirty groups, organizations, and agencies
were invited to form a Community Advisory Committee and to participate in the development of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan. These organizations and agencies were as follows:

- Aha Leo Kupuna Kaiaulu
- Boys and Girls Club of Wai‘anae
- Hawaii Filipinos of Wai‘anae
- Hoa‘aina o Makaha
- Ho‘omau Ke Ola, Inc.
- Ka‘ala Farms, Inc.
- Makaha Ahupua’a Community Association
- Nani O Wai‘anae
- Na Opio Aloha ‘Aina
- Na Kupuna O Nānākuli Ahupua’a
- Nānākuli Ahupua’a Council
- Nānākuli Hawaiian Homestead Community Association
- ‘Ohana Lualualei Ahupua’a
- Puhawai Farmers Association
- Queen Liliuokalani Children’s Center
- Wai‘anae Ahupua’a Council
- Wai‘anae Coast Coalition
- Wai‘anae Coast Community Alternative Development Corp.
- Wai‘anae Valley Homestead Association
- Wai‘anae Coast Rotary Club
- West Oahu County Farm Bureau
- Wai‘anae Oahu Employment Corporation
- Wai‘anae Kai Homestead Association
- Wai‘anae Coast Neighborhood Board (maximum of 10 members to serve on the CAC)
- Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
- Oahu Hawaiian Homelands Community Board
- U.S. Navy
- U.S. Army

The Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met four times during the course of the planning project. CAC meetings were also open to the general public. In addition, there were two open “public workshops” that involved CAC members and other people from the community. Attendance at these six meetings ranged from 40 to 60 community members. The focus of these six meetings was as follows:

- October 1997 -- the first CAC meeting focused on community problems, issues, and needs.
- February 1998 -- the second CAC meeting focused on a discussion of community values and desires for the future.
- April 1998 -- the third CAC meeting featured a presentation by the planning team of an
“Environmental Concept” for the Wa`ianae Coast, and a preliminary draft “Land Use Plan” for the future.

- May 1998 -- first open public workshop: “information fair” and presentation of progress to date on the Wa`ianae Sustainable Communities Plan.
- October 1998 -- fourth CAC meeting: presentation of the “Public Review Draft” of the Wa`ianae Sustainable Communities Plan.
- May 1999 -- presentation of the “Final Draft” of the Wa`ianae Sustainable Communities Plan to the CAC and other interested community members.

In all, the planning team devoted over 1,000 hours to the various aspects of the community participation process. As a result of this focus on meaningful community participation, the Wa`ianae Sustainable Communities Plan incorporates the overall Vision, the Values, and the desires for the future as expressed by Wa`ianae’s people.”
The State Land Use Classification System currently designates land in the Wai'anae District as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>15,431</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATION</td>
<td>17,871</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,089</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPP, 1997

Lands classified as State Urban are clustered along the coast. The valleys are generally classified “Agriculture,” with the exception of Mākaha Valley, which is “State Urban” to a point mauka of Mākaha Valley Estates, about 3 miles inland from the coast. The steep ridges and valley walls, and the Wai'anae Mountains are in the “Conservation” zone.

The existing City Development Plan Land Use Map for Wai‘anae, which was originally developed in 1982 and has since been amended 21 times, largely reflects the existing development pattern and the State Land Use Districts. The DP Land Use Map categories and acreages as of 1997 are summarized in Table 3-2 below.
## TABLE 3-2

**Existing DP Land Use Map Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Categories</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Vacant Acres 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Apartment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Density Apartment</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>8,777</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Quasi-Public</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>13,036</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.7%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Total less than 100% due to rounding to nearest 0.0.

Source: DPP, 1997

It is interesting to note that, of the eight O’ahu Development Plan/Sustainable Communities Plan areas, Wai‘anae has the second largest acreage of military land (13,036 acres, second only to Central Oahu with 15,865 acres of military land), the largest percentage of military land (34 percent; with the next highest being Central Oahu at 23 percent), and more single-family residential acreage (1,991 acres) than the two rural districts of the North Shore (734 acres of single-family residential) and Ko‘olau Loa (836 acres) combined.
“Issues

The following issues present challenges to the long-term protection of agriculture lands and the development of diversified agriculture:

**Taxes:** Current taxes on land used for diversified agriculture are high, presenting economic challenges to the development of diversified agriculture enterprises, and hence challenges to the development of a diversified agriculture industry.

**Conversion to More Intense Uses:** The cost of maintaining lands in agriculture use, the costs versus revenues involved in developing diversified agriculture enterprises, and the potential for higher economic return if lands are committed to more intense uses such as residential or commercial development all help to create pressures to convert agricultural lands to other uses.

**Lack of Long-Term Leases:** This makes agricultural lessees reluctant to invest in long-term improvements such as infrastructure or needed support facilities, and makes it difficult to obtain financing.

**Water Availability:** Uncertainty about long-term water availability at affordable rates contributes to the economic challenges to diversified agriculture development.

**Use Conflicts:** Development of new communities, residential areas, or institutional facilities such as churches or schools adjacent to or within agricultural areas has resulted in complaints directed at the agriculture activity.

**Lack of Incentives:** There are no strong incentives for protection of agriculture lands or for the development and maintenance of diversified agriculture enterprises.

**Proposed Solutions:** Proposed solutions, many of which must be further researched and developed, fall into two categories: Protection and Incentives. They are:

**Protection**

1. **Community and Agriculture Boundaries.** These boundaries are fixed for the life of the plan; they contain community development and protect agricultural resources.
2. **Land Use Regulations.** Require that all uses on lands designated agriculture be primarily agricultural.

3. **Agriculture Easements.** Acquire easements designed to protect agricultural lands in perpetuity by purchase or other means.

4. **Farmland Trusts.** Place agriculture lands in a long-term “trust” program that ensures their primary use as agriculture.

5. **Development Rights Transfer.** This program could be used to transfer development rights from agriculture lands to “receiver sites” within the Rural Residential area. Transfer of Development Rights could thus be used to protect and conserve agriculture and open space lands.

**Incentives**

1. **Tax Incentives:** Studies should be conducted to identify and develop tax programs or other measures which effectively protect agriculture lands and promote agriculture industry development. They would include:

   a. **Tax Structure Developments:** Revise the tax structure to facilitate and encourage pursuit of diversified agriculture enterprises.

   b. **Tax Incentive Zones or Programs:** Additional tax reductions or credits to promote the initiation and development of new agricultural enterprises.

2. **Agricultural Subdivision:** Develop and implement a way to “subdivide” agriculture lands on paper that would facilitate a lessee’s ability to obtain a mortgage on the land.

3. **Affordable Water:** The creation of affordable water sources and the development of affordable agriculture water rates.

Development and Sustainable Communities Plans should include policy language to encourage and support farmers and agricultural uses by the provision of affordable irrigation water which may include possible assistance by the Agribusiness Development Corporation to develop water facilities, possible use of reclaimed water from wastewater treatment plants where it is feasible, consideration by the City to modify the fee structure for new water services related to water meters and lines, and assistance from other agencies such as the USDA Farm Service Agency.
4. **Right-to-Farm Programs.** Would protect a farmer’s right to farm land if such activity does not physically endanger resources or adjacent uses.”
APPENDIX E - MEETING NOTES

This Appendix contains the Meeting Notes from all of the major meetings and interviews held during the 5-year review process for the Wai'anae SCP, which include the following:

- Notes from the Empower Wai'anae SpeakOut, held in Mā'ili Beach Park
- Individual Stakeholder Interviews
- Public Informational Meeting Notes
- Planning Advisory Committee Meeting Notes
NOTES FROM THE EMPOWER WAI‘ANAŒ SPEAKOUT, HELD IN MÄ‘ILI BEACH PARK

Empower Wai‘anae is a community group whose focus is captured by its name, as they work to “empower” the people from their District. In 2006, the group decided to host an event that would help them to gather input from the numerous homeless living on the region’s beaches. The Empower Wai‘anae members worked with a community planning class from the University of Hawai‘i’s Department of Urban & Regional Planning (UH DURP) to plan and run the event, a “SpeakOut.” SpeakOuts are an alternative way to gather community input, in place of the more typical community meetings. These events generally have several booths, which are focused on various topics. Participants are encouraged to walk from booth to booth to answer questions or participate in some way, such as mapping or ranking various items. The booths are usually run by people who explain what the booth is about, and record participants’ responses.

Because Townscape had a working relationship with some of the leaders of Empower Wai‘anae, as well as the UH planning department, one booth was dedicated to the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan 5-Year Review. Two DURP students and one Townscape staff ran that booth. The booth contained a large sign with the WSCP Vision statement, another with the Community Values, and one large Wai‘anae Concept Map.

After sharing some of the general information about the 2000 Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan, participants were informed about the upcoming update process and asked to share some thoughts about the plan and Wai‘anae in general. A set of questions was prepared that were meant to provide information pertaining to what it means to “keep country, country” (an important point that was voiced in the 2000 plan), and what kind of concepts they would want to see included in a revised Vision statement. The following table summarizes the responses recorded that day. The responses were grouped according to themes and labeled accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- More development uses more water that Waianae doesn’t have. It comes from PHA.</td>
<td>- I Love the Waianae Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stop building</td>
<td>- I Love the beaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renovate our commercial centers</td>
<td>- Country means views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Re-use what is here</td>
<td>- Country means not building higher than two stories, less traffic, open areas, farmland, animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Waianae is becoming not country
- Keep Waianae country
- Country values: Culture, sense of community, families helping each other
- How is it country if you can’t plant your own food, raise your own chickens, and fish?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME/DRUGS</th>
<th>NEW RESIDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There is increasing crime</td>
<td>- New residents are changing the way the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We need to reduce crime</td>
<td>community used to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Get rid of drugs</td>
<td>- Haoles are not respecting local values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We need support for domestic abuse issues</td>
<td>and people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stop vandalism</td>
<td>- I’m worried about outsiders and outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business coming in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There are too many immigrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCEAN USE</th>
<th>LAND USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I love the beaches</td>
<td>- They should use vacant land for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We need controls on ocean use</td>
<td>- Get military to return our land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There should be more sustainable fishing</td>
<td>- More access for cultural activities: taro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerned about Ocean Point Marina coming in</td>
<td>farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with over 1,400 slips, for</td>
<td>- We should use military land for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything from commercial to recreation</td>
<td>- Homelessness unfair because there’s so much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overuse of ocean will have a huge</td>
<td>empty land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative impact on the community</td>
<td>- Becoming less rural because agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative impacts on fishing</td>
<td>lands are being lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need more access to the LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need to limit how many cars a family can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have; More traffic control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>POLITICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No more tents should be on the beach</td>
<td>- Need more State and Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More frequent rubbish pickup</td>
<td>Government involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There should be mandatory recycling</td>
<td>- More control / power to the Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION:</th>
<th>HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Should re-open the railroad</td>
<td>- More affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We need emergency routes into/out of District</td>
<td>- Bring back rent control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We need more housing for homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affordable rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Build more homes not restaurants and hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Homes and infrastructures being built, but not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the people from Waianae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>FAITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Change focus of education to agriculture,</td>
<td>- More BIBLE groups / studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plumbing, repairs, etc.</td>
<td>- More involvement in life groups (Word of Life)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More outreach education</td>
<td>- People need to know about the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teach the values of Waianae in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need more cultural programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better conditions and good teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More job training / education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMICS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SERVICES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excise tax breaks</td>
<td>- More shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More local stores</td>
<td>- More shelters specifically for couples and singles not just families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cheaper prices</td>
<td>- More information on how to access programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Small repair shops</td>
<td>- There's a stigma about those people using those programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Too many commercial chains</td>
<td>- Need to remove stigma especially for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support local business</td>
<td>- Should allow longer time in transitional housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More things for tourists to do</td>
<td>- Take care of homeless and don’t just boot them from the beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need more police on patrol and doing their job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More information about infrastructure and the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Would like more community activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

1. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 1 with Puanani Burgess
2. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 2 with Kamuela Enos
3. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 3 with Patty Kahanamoku Teruya
4. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 4 with William Aila, Melva Aila, and Landis Ornellas
5. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 5 with Cynthia Rezentes
6. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 6 with Councilmember Todd Apo
7. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 7 with Representative Karen Awana
8. Stakeholder Meeting Memorandum No. 8 with Representative Maile Shimabukuro
Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update
STAKEHOLDER MEETING MEMORANDUM NO. 1
To: Project Files
From: Harmonee Williams
Date: March 15, 2007
TSI Team: Bruce Tsuchida, Harmonee Williams
Interviewee: Puanani Burgess

NOTES – MEETING OF MARCH 15, 2007

LEEWARD COAST INITIATIVE

• The Governor’s initiative is focused on business investment and development, along with job creation.

• She participated in the panel/presentation on March 7th. She can send us the PowerPoint, the list of questions generated at the meeting, the Governor’s Press Release, and the list of the outreach team members.

• She’s wondering “How real is this?” There seems to be no timeframe. CBED worked through Joe Lapilio. There was no attention to process. About 60 people attended. Wayne Thom was there, but didn’t add much.

COMPREHENSIVE MAPPING PROJECT

• She would like to map the various networks that exist in Wai‘anae, such as those related to: ‘aina, mental health, youth/families, farms, businesses (160), State Agencies, Hot Spots, etc.

• Can show clusters of activity.

• Put them on transparencies, or computer programs like GIS. Display the maps in the Mall.

• Use them to initiate community dialogues.

WAIANAEC SCP UPDATE PROCESS

• How do we begin?
  o Talk to leadership – in networks? Can get a better community sense, if there are small group meetings.
Need to look at who crosses over between networks.

- The planning process should not be just about info, but about bringing people together. So at the end of the process, we are more together, more respectful, and we know each other in different ways.

- Can community building process be built into the process? If so, how differently would we plan? How different would the process be? How different would the outcome be?

- Maybe have small groups of 8-10, so we have enough diversity, yet it’s a small enough group to be close.

OTHER IDEAS

- Empower Wai‘anae is hosting small film festivals, starting at the end of April – can take them to shelters, other places. Maybe include John Hidel’s video that he did of Wai‘anae values about 30 years ago.

- Education focus? Teach the GIS skills to students (for mapping the networks) and get grants from various organizations (Pua has a friend at the Gates Foundation).

OTHERS TO TALK TO

- Poka – Hale Na‘au Pono
- Joyce O’Brien – WCCHC (Eric’s sister)
- Ho‘oipo DeCambra
- Dana Newman – Ohana Ola (transitional hsg in Lualualei)
- Kamaki Kanahele – Nanakuli DHHL
- Mervina Cash Kaeo –
- Paula Ann Burgess – Ed Center KS
- Corina Luna – V Principal of HS and on Ka’ala Board
NOTES – MEETING OF MARCH 20, 2007

WAI‘ANAES COAST POTENTIAL

- One idea he’s discussed with his brother is opening a Creative Arts Academy, or a Native Arts Center. Maybe have one in Mānoa and one out in Wai‘anae.

- Kids in Wai‘anae have the ability and desire to work with their hands, so maybe something that allowed them to focus on arts or high-tech/computer skills could work. Something like that wouldn’t take a lot of land, and there is already a strong network of artists in the area.

- He’s seen the success of his father’s project, Ka‘ala Farm, and thinks it’s largely due to the fact that it is so tangible and hands-on. And it’s focused on education. Of course, the hard work of his father made it happen, but it’s based on solid foundation of values and opportunities.

- The Governor’s initiative is interesting because it discusses job creation, business investment, economic development, but there’s also talk about innovation and education, which might enable the creation of more high-tech/computer skills/arts centers.

- A good example is Searider Productions - the multimedia education program at Wai‘anae High School. There students get to work on actual projects, get great experience and skills, while helping their clients.
But will the Governor’s Initiative actually accomplish creating something that useful? Doubtful. Wayne Thom and the CBED program (under DBEDT) have no clue.

INTERACTION BETWEEN VARIOUS SECTORS AND PLANNING PROCESSES

- It would be great if the Governor’s Initiative and Hawaii 2050 could collaborate with this County DPP process.
- We really need some group to be the interface between the county and the community, and another (or same) body to be an interface between the state and the community. Maybe something similar to HCRC (Hawaii County Resource Center)?
- Must understand the leverage point/where the power is. Need an assessment of power dynamics.
- So the big question is “Why is the State suddenly giving all of this attention to Wai‘anae?” What are their intentions? Is it prompted by media pressure? Years of the Wai‘anae community organizing? What?
- This could be an opportunity for real change or all a facade (like in the past).
- Even if their intentions are good, one of the real problems is the fast pace of government trying to get something done in a relatively short timeline, often for publicity purposes. Meanwhile, community processes don’t usually go that fast; they’re generally more strategic and comprehensive.
- What about the disconnect between the Plan and community? How many community members know about and understand the Plan? How much of the Plan is reflected/seen in the actual community?
Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update  
STAKEHOLDER MEETING MEMORANDUM NO. 3  

To: Project Files  
From: Harmonee Williams  
Date: March 21, 2007  
TSI Team: Harmonee Williams  
Interviewee: Patty Kahanamoku Teruya  

NOTES – MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2007

LACK OF BUSINESSES AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES

• There are lots of trucking companies in Wai‘anae, most are currently run out of people’s homes. They keep their trucks in the streets, which is a problem. We need an industrial area nearby, like in Kalaeloa.

• More businesses are coming to Kalaeloa and Kapolei, which is nice for Wai‘anae residents. We’d like to see more of that.

• The Mākaha Resort Hotel is not doing well. They’ve talked about creating a training center for culinary and banquet skills. The problem with that is those who get trained cannot find jobs nearby. Ko‘olina doesn’t seem to hire enough people from Wai‘anae.

• The Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center is the largest employer of the area. Tamura’s employs a significant number. But overall, we’re struggling with maintaining stable sources of employment within Wai‘anae.

• One thing that would really help business development in the area is better access:
  o WCEAR is unfinished and just stupid in design (weaving back and forth)
  o The Second Access Road that goes over the mountains and connects to Kunia Road could really help.
  o A road around Kaena Pt. would encourage more people to drive through the area, and spend money here.
The railroad idea could bring people from Koʻolina.

- Once we get people here, there could be more things for them to do and consume – boat tours, locally grown fruits and vegetables (like Kahuku’s shrimp).
- Overall, we need economic development, and we need to get creative with it.

HOMELESS SITUATION

- As for the homeless situation, there have been lots of new shelters put up – but why are all of them being built here? Why not spread them out? All of these people are not from here.
- There have also been developers coming in saying they’re going to put up affordable housing, asking for re-zoning. For example, Hale Wai Vista wanted to build a 60-foot building behind the mall. It got voted down by the NB because it was in a bad location and too tall.
- Other developers have come here and they say they will provide affordable housing, and will keep it a low height, but we are skeptical. In the past, we’ve gotten screwed, we’ve gotten dumped on, and we’re not sure where people are coming from, or if we can trust them.
- We’re not against affordable housing, but we want a guarantee that that is what we will get.

WAI‘ANAE SCP UPDATE PROCESS

- Townscape should come to Neighborhood Board Meeting on April 3rd and announce the process.
  - Would be good to have a date/time/location for next public informational meeting so can invite people.
  - Also good to explain the PAC (including the commitment that is expected and timeline), and invite interested people to contact Harmonee.
- TSI should come to every NB meeting to give update and minutes from our PAC meetings.
- We could announce community meetings in Westside Stories.
- Must make sure to have the meetings in different ahupua‘a, not all in Wai‘anae.
Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update
STAKEHOLDER MEETING MEMORANDUM NO. 4

To: Project Files
From: Harmonee Williams
Date: March 22, 2007
TSI Team: Bruce Tsuchida, Harmonee Williams
Interviewee: William Aila, Melva Aila, Landis Ornellas

NOTES – MEETING OF MARCH 22, 2007

BASELINE ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY OF THE WAI‘ANAE COAST OCEAN

- Being done by Environet, Inc. Apparently, the owners of the company also own 2 dolphin charter boats. Conflict of interest? Should someone say something to DLNR?
- Ocean conflicts should be considered in WSCP Update. DPP is hesitant to get involved because the ocean is under the state’s jurisdiction.

MĀKAHA SPECIAL AREA PLAN

- Helpful because they can use it to say, look it’s written here that x needs to happen (related to the sewer issue).
- We need to incorporate it into the Plan Update.
- Cannot build in Mākaha until new infrastructure is put in place.

INFRASTRUCTURE

- Waianae Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is being used for over-capacity needs from Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant (‘Ewa) and Sand Island.
- WWTP is also getting leachate from Waimanalo Gulch. WWTP is “stink” – can smell it from 1.5 miles away sometimes. (Due to leachate possibly?)
- Second Access Road – Kolekole Pass would be better than Pohakea Pass because would be easier/cheaper. The Army owns this side, and they’re ok with it. The problem is with the Navy, who owns the other side.
• Road around Ka‘ena Point? “Over my dead body,” William Aila.

MUNITIONS
• Still coming to ocean’s surface. Still an unresolved issue.

MILITARY
• Makua Valley – hopefully they will eventually get out. What then? Who will take care of it (or not)?
• Lualualei – they say there’s no more ammunition there.
• Problem is the view the “People of the US” and the “US Military” as two different entities (President). They’re not.
• The 2 big towers in Lualualei are still there, but they also added new infrastructure components.

PARKS
• Kaena State Park (Keawa‘ula Bay) is now closing at 10pm. Neighborhood Board approved.

ZONING
• There are still some areas that are zoned for residential and undeveloped. Can we re-zone them to prevent development?

HOUSING
• Big problem is timeshares (vacation rentals?). Example is that the membership of the Neighborhood Security Watch for Pokai Bay has dwindled because so few people actually live there – all vacationers. No more community.
• Timeshare, Bed & Breakfast, other visitor accommodations – how many? Are they legal?
• We have more than our share of halfway houses, rehab facilities, homeless shelters, etc.
• We need affordable housing. Difficult to make it truly affordable without public land – State or City.
• The Federal Government could help. They’re not dealing with the problems that they caused (allowing in people from other places who don’t know the place or care about it).
AGRICULTURE

- There are only 2 dairies left. Pig farms mostly out. We’re now forced into dependency on outside sources for our food.
- It is cost prohibitive to farm – cost of land, water, etc.
- It’s too bad because there are youth who are interested in farming.
- Now a significant portion of the prime ag land does not meet the requirements for growing organic, or even non-organic vegetables or flowers.
- The Ag Park is a joke – only thing you could raise there are goats.
- Ag lands are being re-zoned.
- We should do a tour of the area, looking specifically at Ag uses (former and current). Possible guides:
  - Uncle Black
  - Fred Cachola
  - Masa Morikawa
NOTES – MEETING OF MARCH 23, 2007

PEOPLE TO TALK TO

• Kimo Keliʻi – Nānākuli representative on NB
• Empower Waiʻanae
• Elected officials (including Mike Kahikina)
• Groups, such as Rotary Club, Lions Club, VFW, Civic Clubs, Homesteads, Waiʻanae Military Community Action Council.
• Homeless shelters, Waiʻanae Community Outreach, St. Johns, Catholic Charities (Mā‘ili), Father Phil Harmon (Kahumana), etc.
• Mikiluna Egg Farm
• Black Hoʻohuli – Nānākuli farmer

ISSUES

• Population growth is a problem in itself; it impacts transportation and the quality of life in general. We’re over the percentage planned for this area by the General Plan (3.8 – 4.2%).
• Illegal vacation rentals – no one to enforce the law.
• Homeless – need State and City to work together. Need the people themselves to decide they want to live differently.
• Governor’s Initiative – no one is sure what will come out of it. We need to get them to collaborate with the other efforts that are being done and have been done. We don’t want to re-do everything for them. Townscape should contact the Office of Planning.
• Parks – there are not enough; we need more.
• Illegal dumping; new dumps. There was that $2.8 million lawsuit about the leachate being too high at Waimanalo Gulch (over 21 feet; normal is 2 feet; safety level was down to 1.3).
• Affordable housing – proposed project: Hale Wai Vista – Keith Ishida; Brian Takeda – R.M. Towill. Look in the OEQC for details – it was in 1 of the last 4 notices.
• Transportation – WCEAR and Second Access Road.
• All infrastructure needs to be looked at.
  o The wires should be buried to prevent them from being knocked down (across road) again.
  o 2001 Lualualei Flood Study – needs to be implemented. What if the ramifications are known, but nothing was implemented? Liable?
• Military – would like to see both Makua and Lualualei operations shut down.
• Munitions clean-up – a report was supposed to come out at the end of this month, but we haven’t heard anything yet.
• Wai’anae Ocean Baseline Study – Environet got contract. Will it result in ORMA rules? Do we need them?
• No development north of Kepuhi Point is still important. We also need to get those slums out of there.
• The growing population in Kapolei/’Ewa is impacting our quality of life because of the traffic. The options to solve this problem are a) better access (2nd access road) or b) more regional jobs.
• Regional Jobs – we need the full spectrum of job opportunities, but they should be jobs that are in-line with the character of the area.
  o Any clean industry would be great.
  o Hawaii cannot continue to rely on tourism only (mono-economy).
  o The military is reducing its presence here.
  o Ag has been reduced because other places are producing goods cheaper. We need diversified ag.
• Education – we have LCC at Wai‘anae, and the UH West Oahu Campus. We need a continuing connection; a social culture where school becomes important and tangible, so people are encouraged to go to school.
NOTES – MEETING OF APRIL 2, 2007

OVERVIEW OF WAI‘ANAE SCP AND THE CURRENT PROCESS

• How far into the ocean does this Plan reach?
  o So far it has not addressed ocean issues, nor water issues in general. We have heard from the community that it doesn’t make sense to separate the land from the water, but this how the system is currently set up. We understand the need to integrate the two, but ocean regulations must come from the State.

• How do we use those rural community areas? By/for the homeless? What about the residential real estate market? If we don’t expand the growth boundary, then the prices will only increase. Of course, that has to be balanced with not expanding too far.
   o Need to look up how much developable acreage is left and do a survey of what areas/buildings are available for re-development.

ISSUES

• Transportation – the State has been looking at expanding Farrington Highway in the Nānākuli area, but I don’t think it will happen. The Second Access Road has been an issue for years, but what’s the purpose – for commuting or emergencies? The Kolekole Pass route doesn’t seem like it would be very useful for commuting, but would probably be ok if purely for emergency use.
• Economics – creating jobs in Waiʻanae would change the character. It would have to be focused on education and health services. The Mākaha Resort has the potential to grow, but the County infrastructure requirements make it too expensive for investors.

• Landfill – the goal is to get it closed. There is the fear of eventually having a blow-out from all of the pressure on its front if we continue to fill it. The permit expires in May ’08, and the City has promised not to expand it. They will have to go in front of the LUC to change that. They are working on a Draft EIS and an Integrated Solid Waste Master Plan (in-house and with R.W. Beck) – due out this fall (deadline keeps getting pushed back). There are viable solutions/alternatives to keeping it open – like using technology to convert waste to energy and shipping it out (like other places do).

• Affordable housing – the State is working on something. Craig Watase is working on a project. Some community group wrote a paper on how they don’t want a concentration of affordable housing here.

• Vacation rental issue – an issue for the entire island/state.
NOTES – MEETING OF APRIL 2, 2007

OVERVIEW OF WAIA'ANAE SCP AND THE CURRENT PROCESS

- It seems like the last SCP was kind of general. I would like to see it be more specific if possible.
- How is this process working with the Hawaii 2050 Sustainability Task force?
  - So far there has been no coordination, but we would like to coordinate as much as possible.

ISSUES

- Transportation – especially a Second Access Road. The Kolekole Pass route seems like it would be too slow and dangerous. Why not use Pohakea Pass?
  - It has been mentioned that there are lots of archeological sites through that area, and there would have to be cooperation from the Navy.
- Maintaining a rural lifestyle is always important to Wai‘anae folks, but it’s getting more and more difficult to do.
- Ag – important to keep Ag lands, and not let people re-zone from Ag to residential, especially when they are right next to each other. Otherwise you get problems from Ag use impacting the neighbors.
- Transitional housing – we keep building more, which is needed, but we have to ask if we want to be known as a community that provides those services, so people come here specifically for that.
- Affordable housing – not sure how to make it truly affordable.
• I would like to see more “mixed-use” – retail on ground level, with residential above, etc.
• Elderly housing – we will definitely be needing more of that.
• Adequate school facilities.
Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update

STAKEHOLDER MEETING MEMORANDUM NO. 8

To: Project Files
From: Harmonee Williams
Date: April 4, 2007
TSI Team: Harmonee Williams
Interviewee: Representative Maile Shimabukuro

NOTES – MEETING OF APRIL 4, 2007

BIG ISSUE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

• She is the Chair of the Housing Committee.
• Any development needs to conform to the SCP, and that needs to be enforced.
• There should be true affordability – homes available at different price levels.
• The UH Center for the Family is a good source of stats on income levels.
• She had a bad experience with Mark Development, who said they were going to build affordable housing, got their permits, and then went back on their word. It still got approved because they said it was grandfathered in.
• California has a “Housing Element Law” that every county must do their share of affordable housing. And they must be affordable in perpetuity. It would be great if Hawaii had a similar law.

INFRASTRUCTURE

• We need more biking and walking paths.
• Less dependency on fossil fuel would be great – more solar infrastructure.
• Close the landfill. Implement curbside recycling.
• Emergency Access Road/Second Access Road would be great, but is it really feasible?
• It would be great to get the military presence reduced.
• Ag lands are important – military occupies most of the good Ag land.
• Restoration of streams is important.

OTHER ITEMS

• It would be great if we had zoning like Haleiwa (they wouldn’t allow a McDonald’s drive-through), so Wai‘anae had a distinctive look. What does Haleiwa have and can Wai‘anae get it? (Special Use District? Design Review Committee?)
• Indigenous Architecture – SB 1917 – would legalize hale and halau for living accommodations. Just need to come up with a building code.
• Nānākuli Housing Corporation – Kapiolani Barber – has some good ideas. Tim Reef – natural builder.
• Growing coconut groves is an idea I have – DLNR said they are legal, we just need a “community partnership” or something like that. Robert Matsunaga (?) at DLNR said he would get back to her, but hasn’t.
• You should talk to Gary Forth about Ag issues/land.
• How is this process working with the Hawaii 2050 Sustainability Task force?
Public Informational Meeting Notes

- Public Informational Meeting #1 – May 3, 2007
- Public Informational Meeting #2 – October 27, 2008
- Public Informational Meeting #3 – November 25, 2008
NOTES – MEETING OF MAY 3, 2007

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
   - Given by Raymond Young, planner with the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Planning and Permitting.
   - The Department is conducting the review of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) which was adopted by City Council in 2000. Townscape, Inc. is the planning consultant.
   - The purpose of the five-year comprehensive review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan’s regional vision, policies, design principles and guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as consistency with the General Plan. The findings of this assessment and any recommendations will be reported to the Planning Commission and City Council.

2. AGENDA AND MEETING RULES WERE PRESENTED

3. PROTECT/PRESERVE WAI‘ANAE
   - The format was a “go-around” in which community members stated their name, where they live, and one resource that they would like to protect or preserve in Wai‘anae. The issues identified included resources in need of protection as well as general land-use problems:
     - The whole coast
     - Agriculture
     - The essence of Wai‘anae
     - There is a major housing problem, especially related to land values
     - Land-Water-Ocean
     - Education
Keep Country, Country
Culture
Scenic sights
Everything – mauka to makai – including the people
No more landfills
Honor the Sustainable Communities Plan; Implement it
Urban zoning in a rural area is not ok
The environment; We need to control growth
Building height limits
Military needs to go; Transportation (we need an alternate route); Elderly housing
Beaches
Land and ocean need protection from over-development
Foundation of Hawaiian values
Wai’anae as the breadbasket of O’ahu
We need to implement plans
Economic choices that are ‘āina-based
8,000 acres owned by Navy in Lualualei Valley should be farmed
Native forests, ahupua’a restoration
Change Urban zoning to Suburban or Rural
Concerned about military control of land
Protect people’s rights to live, work, and play here
Create protected places (e.g., pu‘uhonua)
We need to produce more poi and other products produced locally
Services for kupuna
Communications within the community


- Each member of the audience was given a copy of the Executive Summary of the current Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan. Some of the key concepts that were highlighted include:
  - The Vision Statement, which emphasizes the rural qualities, natural resources, and Hawaiian values found in the Wai‘anae community (Chapter 2)
  - The Wai‘anae Concept map, which articulates many of the key points of the Vision Statement, including:
    - The boundaries of the traditional Ahupua’a within the Wai‘anae Moku
    - The Rural Community Boundary
    - Town centers and Community Gathering Places
    - Protection of important cultural sites and landscapes
5. **THE SCP 5-YEAR REVIEW SCHEDULE**

- The diagram that demonstrates the proposed year-long process is below.
- It proposes that the 3 Public Informational Meetings be held in May, July, and November 2007, and that the Planning Advisory Committee meets approximately 6 times between June and December 2007.
- The Draft Revised WSCP is scheduled to be ready by November, and the Final Revised WSCP by February of 2008.

---

**WAI‘ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

**PROJECT SCHEDULE**

2007


- Begin Updating Community Profile and Meeting with Community Members
- 1st Public Information Meeting, May 3rd
- 2nd Public Information Meeting, July
- Research, Compile Scorecard, Draft SCP Revisions
- Planning Advisory Committee Meets (2)
- Write Draft Revised SCP
- 3rd Public Information Meeting, November
- Planning Advisory Committee Meets (2)
- Write Final Revised SCP

City & County of Honolulu, Department of Planning and Permitting
6. **Planning Advisory Committee Sign-up**

- The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) is the group that will do the bulk of the work in this revision process. Townscape stated that it was looking for people to sign-up for the committee who were committed to the process and willing to do the work necessary. They also said they would like to have a diverse group of people from different ahupua’a, and representing various organizations, so there can be a wide range of perspectives in the discussions.
- 23 people signed up as PAC Members. 3 more said they would like to participate, but may not be able to attend the 1st series of meetings. The list is attached.

7. **Major Land-Related Issues in Wai‘anae**

- The attendees were asked to identify the major land-related issues in Wai‘anae, especially those that this SCP can address. Responses included:
  - We need to keep development in the Farrington Highway corridor, not up the valleys.
  - Cell phone towers are everywhere. The farmers are being bullied by HECO, BWS, and others.
  - Mākaha is zoned urban – what does that mean? How do we prevent it from actually becoming urban?
  - Does zoning stay with the property even if it is sold? Yes.
  - One problem is our need for affordable housing, which has caused the State to bypass the rules in order to allow such housing to be built quickly. Yes, we need affordable housing, but we don’t want a significant amount of population growth. What can we do?
    - Kathy Sokugawa, Chief of the Interim Planning Division for DPP, was in attendance and stated that the Governor’s State of Emergency for the Leeward Coast will sunset this summer. Also, the City Council is the body that approves 201H projects, not DPP (in regards to the Hale Wai Vista project).
  - Landfills and landfill-type projects
  - Streams, natural streambeds, rockslide areas, etc. We need to protect these natural resources, and create man-made features that work with the natural landscape.
  - What is the correlation between population growth and poverty reduction/acceleration?
  - Conservation of historical sites, such as Pu’u Heleakala.
  - Economics – we need more small, local micro-businesses
Military activities have negative economic value and they pollute the land.

Agriculture is dying a fast death. The military is wasting ag land in Lualualei Valley. Farmers need tax incentives.

We need a better community college.

Water should be released back into our streams, especially in Mākaha and Wai‘anae Valleys. There should be in-stream flow standards.

No commercial activities north of Kepuhi Point, including movie filming.

The military has talked about transitioning out, then we could use the land for ag, energy production, etc.

There should be a stronger ocean resource component.

Pass/No-Pass line – what were the criteria in creating it? It is very prejudicial towards Wai‘anae.

Maybe we should just freeze all development for a period of time in order to preserve the rural character and make good development decisions.

DHHL lands are for people on the waiting list and for other uses by Hawaiians – maybe ag.

The Wai‘anae Coast has lots of sunlight – we should use it to produce energy and sell it to HECO.

Mākua Valley – the original agreement was that it would be returned 6 months after World War II ended.

The State should be doing some restoration work on the Wai‘anae Mountain Range. The resources located there are worth billions, and are key to the health of the watersheds.

Cultural learning centers in each ahupua’a.

Ag lands should use a tax incentives structure.

Does this SCP have any relation to the Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan?

What about aquaculture opportunities like at NELHA on the Big Island?

8. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

- The blue on the Wai‘anae Concept map stops close to shore, but our coastal waters are important. These are artificial boundaries.
- We need to restore our lo‘i and produce more poi.
- We need to include some strategies for improving our economics and increasing the number of job opportunities.
- What can we do about development outside of the “Rural Community Boundary?”
This SCP can be used to fight it, but the City zoning takes precedence.

- **How strong is this Plan?**
  - Sokugawa said that DPP uses this WSCP as the “Bible” for land use decisions in Wai‘anae. Examples include recent decisions regarding a proposed Mākaha development and the future of some ag lands in Wai‘anae.
  - This Plan is only effective if the community leaders know about it and use it.
  - It’s better to have this in place than to not, but there are still ways in which it can be overridden, such as 201H exemptions (affordable housing).

- Neighborhood Board members used to get a copy of the Plan when they got elected. DPP should give a copy to those who are newly elected, and provide some training on “how to use the Plan.”

- **How can we get other people involved?**

**9. FOLLOW-UP**

- Can we get a copy of the Plan?
  - Yes – we will get copies to each of the Planning Advisory Committee members. It is currently available online at the DPP website: [WWW.HONOLULUDPP.GOV](http://WWW.HONOLULUDPP.GOV)

- Can we get a copy of the Process Schedule?
  - Yes

- When can we see the updated Community Profile?
  - We hope to have it completed soon, at least by the first PAC meeting in June so we can share it with you then.
# SIGN-IN LIST FOR THE WAI'ANAE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
## PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING - MAY 3, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Walterbea Aldeguer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adrian Silva</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gary Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kukui Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 William Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Melva Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Deonne Carden</td>
<td>Waianae Neighborhood Pl</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Alice Greenwood</td>
<td>Leialii Mana'o'ila (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Venise Lewis</td>
<td>Leialii Mana'o'ila (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bill Akiona</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ruby Maunakea</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kimo Kelii</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kaiawe Makanani</td>
<td>NHHA</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jo Jordan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 George Turner</td>
<td>Kokua Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Don Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Delora Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Rodlyn Brown</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dave Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Raymond Young</td>
<td>DPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Puanani Burgess</td>
<td>WCCADC/ Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cynthia Rezentes</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Polly Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ralph Saito</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Noreen Conlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Fred Dodge</td>
<td>WCCHC, etc.</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Newman</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikake Pelekai</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Mahol</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Phillips</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie Mae L. Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Suiso</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupuaa</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Hatton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawika Nahoopi</td>
<td>Olelo Waianae Community TV</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pua'Ena Burgess</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Loscalzo</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Sylors</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Sylors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poka Laenui</td>
<td>Waianae Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Gay</td>
<td>Leeward Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS
(as of May 3, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gary Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 William Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Melva Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Alice Greenwood</td>
<td>Leialii Manaolana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bill Akiona</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ruby Maunakea</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kimo Kelii</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jo Jordan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 George Turner</td>
<td>Kokua Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rodlyn Brown</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dave Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Puanani Burgess</td>
<td>WCCAD/C Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cynthia Rezentes</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Polly Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ralph Saito</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dana Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Pikake Peleka</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Johnnie Mae L. Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mark Suiso</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupuaa</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Debra Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Denise Sайлорs</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dave Sайлорs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Poka Laenui</td>
<td>Waianae Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
The following people would like to be on the Planning Advisory Committee, but may not be able to attend the 1st series of meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lucy Gay</th>
<th>Leeward Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pua'Ena Burgess</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES – MEETING OF OCTOBER 27, 2008
(Notes revised November 7, 2008)

1. PULE BY VICTOR KILA

2. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
   - Harmonee Williams thanked everyone for coming.
   - Reviewed logistics (apologies for construction in parking lot, location of food & restrooms, permission for photos, we need to adjourn by 8:45 pm because facility closes).
   - Agenda and proposed meeting ground rules were presented and agreed to.
   - Please sign-in and pick up the 2 hand-outs and a copy of the Public Review Draft if you don’t already have one (hand-outs attached).
   - The purpose of tonight’s meeting is to review this Public Review Draft and hear your thoughts and comments on it.

3. OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS
   - The City Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) is conducting the review of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP). The original WSCP was adopted by City Council in 2000. Townscape, Inc. is the planning consultant hired by DPP to coordinate the process.
   - The purpose of the 5-year review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan’s vision, policies, guidelines, implementing actions, and land use map, and then decide what needs to be changed, added, and/or removed. These changes will eventually result in a revised Wai‘anae SCP (2009), which will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for approval and adoption as an ordinance.
The timeline for this process is outlined on the purple hand-out. It shows the dates of meetings, when drafts were submitted, etc. The newest change to this schedule is the deadline for comments on the Public Review Draft. It has been extended to December 15, 2008 (from November 15, 2008), to allow time to incorporate more comments.

So far, what we have found is that there were a significant number of changes needed. We have made many of these, which are in this Public Review Draft.

Three of the main areas that have been identified as needing change include:

- **Implementation** – which is part of the reason we were “on-hold” for 6-7 months, so DPP could look at how to improve consistency among SCPs. We decided to add an “Implementation Matrix” on pages 5-3 to 5-7, which we hope will help improve implementation, since it identifies what agency or group should take the lead.

- **Culturally Appropriate** – we heard from the community the need for this plan to have more cultural history included, and to have more policies based on Native Hawaiian values.

- **Economics** – we have included a new section in Chapter 3 that includes economic data and explains why increased economic opportunities are needed.

There are numerous other changes, but these are some of the main themes that we have tried to keep in mind while revising. We will be discussing some of the others in the next section.

4. **COMMUNITY COMMENTS ON MAJOR PROPOSED CHANGES**

- Please refer to hand-out “Summary of Major Revisions.”

- **Chapter 1** – this is a short chapter, 2 pages. It looks at Wai‘anae’s role within O‘ahu’s overall development pattern. The primary change we made to this chapter was to add in community concerns about Wai‘anae’s population count and projections being low, meaning that Wai‘anae is already above and beyond these projections.

  - Is having a population percentage appropriate? What does it mean, since there’s no limit?
    - This is what we tried to point out here, that a percentage may not be appropriate. It is an issue that, in order to change it, there would need to be an amendment to the General Plan. This is possible, somewhat difficult, but possible.

  - How many SCPs are there in total?
There are 8 such plans, 6 of them are “Sustainable Communities Plans” and 2 are “Development Plans,” where the major development is expected to happen: the ‘Ewa District and the Primary Urban Center.

What about the title of this plan being “The Wai’anae SCP”? Shouldn’t it be “The Wai’anae Coast SCP” or “The Wai’anae District SCP”? It is confusing to people from Nānākuli and other ahupua’a, who are proud of where they’re from, to be considered “Wai’anae.”

The City & County set the boundaries and the District names. We will have to confer with them about the possibility of making this change.

Chapter 2 – Vision – Much of this chapter is new: new Vision statement, replaced “Community Values” with “Key Concepts,” and edited the 10 Vision Elements. Any comments, concerns, questions?

- Why isn’t the Lualualei ahupua’a labeled?
- Which names are more appropriate – the traditional ahupua’a names and boundaries or those used by more recent neighborhoods (e.g. Mā‘ili)?
  - We used Lualualei inter-changeably with Mā‘ili. We can go through the plan to make it more consistent, and put “Lualualei/Mā‘ili” on each map.

Chapter 3 – Land Use Policies & Guidelines – This chapter contains numerous new Policies. (Went through them briefly and asked for comments)

- The City did a study of important viewplanes, which should be referenced and should be adhered to.
  - It is referenced on page 3-9.
- The City should be more assertive regarding the return of military land to civilian use.
  - This SCP only has control over certain aspects of the district’s land use, which does not include federal entities, such as the U.S. Military.
- What is the federal process to return military lands? Would DHHL get it or the State? Probably not the City or the community.
  - The Military would need to go through an extensive process to decide who would get control, but DHHL would be the first to be considered.
The Lualualei bunker area was supposed to be phased out, and all the ammunition moved to West Loch. However, the plan was never funded.

- The plan should explain that Mākua is different now; many more people live closer to Mākua.
- Military lands might be turned over to private developers, but they should be returned to the community people.
- Policy 3.11.2.3 “The Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Park” is a great idea. People started working on this project for the area between the Wai’anae High School and Harbor, but nothing ever came out of it. This is an idea that should be followed up and supported, but not necessarily only for this site.
  - That site definitely needs to be cleaned up (it burned).
  - Maybe there should be a “system” of Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Parks.
- Regarding Policy 3.11.2.2 “Prohibit More Golf Courses,” what about driving ranges? The Nānākuli Homestead has looked into the possibility of creating one, to tap into the nearby golf courses and golfer market.
  - Golf courses and driving ranges are distinguished as different uses by DPP.
- But driving ranges go against our policy of promoting Ag. “You can’t eat golf balls.” Wouldn’t a driving range still need water?
  - Good point. We should’ve distinguished that we are interested in using alternative models of driving ranges, ones that don’t need a lot of water (Japan models, Pearl City range is dry, etc.)
- Would such a range be limited to Hawaiian Home Lands?
  - No.
- Reminder: there is a 9-hole executive golf course grandfathered in, in Mākaha. We can’t do anything about that with this plan.
- Question about DHHL exemptions: Is everything that is built on DHHL lands exempt from all City codes and regulations?
  - Well, they are exempt from zoning. However, if they want their roads and other infrastructure to be maintained by City, they must adhere to the City Codes. Also, building permits are issued by the City.
  - Note: the Princess Kahanu Homestead has DCC&Rs (Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions). Others could do the same to limit/control what is built.
- Back to the driving range question – what if we say they are allowed if they don’t hook up to the City’s potable water system?
- Or we could just leave it alone and let the Neighborhood Boards decide when one is proposed.
  - After more discussion, it was decided to leave “driving ranges” out of the WSCP, and leave any potential future decision up to the appropriate neighborhood board.
  - Would also like to see a policy about such business ventures not being able to hook up to potable water.

- **Proposed light industrial park in Lualualei** – discussed in Section 3.9 and in Appendix A: Land Use Map (2 versions of this map were included in this Public Review Draft, one with a new “Industrial” area and one without)
  - Concern: if we allow this new Industrial area, could we be allowing a new landfill? Waste processing? Other unwanted uses?
  - The Industrial Park is NOT intended to be a landfill. You should look at the Nānākuli Neighborhood Board (NB) Resolution on this proposal. It includes conditions that were established by the NB that say no landfills allowed. It also address other issues such as establishments that sell alcohol, etc.
  - But, the Industrial Park would need re-zoning, which could lead to a landfill at a nearby site. Once one area goes, it could lead to more development nearby.
  - Could we change the Rural Community Boundary on Map B to include the Industrial area?
    - Kathy: you could. This would be a big deal for Wai’anae to change their Rural Boundary, but it could be done.
  - This area is Ag land, although it is not being used for Ag now. It could be.
  - The Nānākuli community strongly supports the recommendation that Map B, which includes the new light industrial area, be accepted.
  - We need this industrial park. Local businesses have had to move to Campbell Industrial Park. We need one nearby so our young folks can learn through hands-on experience.
  - What is the definition of “Light Industrial”?
    - Some examples of “light industrial” uses were given.
    - The official City definition is in the City’s Land Use Ordinance. (Townscape can send to people.)
  - It sounds like there was communication between Townscape and Patty Teruya, yes? Should we know about it?
- Yes. There was a Nānākuli NB Resolution passed that supports the change to the SCP that would include an Industrial area in Lualualei on the Land Use Map. There should have been copies of it distributed here tonight.
  - Harmonee: The reason I didn’t is because it is project specific. It talks about “Tropic Land LLC” and the project known as the “Nānākuli Community Baseyard.” I was trying to keep the discussion limited to the proposed land use, and not talk about the specific project.

- No, the Resolution supports the industrial USE, and it includes a “Unilateral Agreement” with all of the conditions that we would not allow for that site.

- We could use those conditions as an example of what we could put in the SCP.
  - Harmonee: Oh, I see, we could use those conditions from the Unilateral Agreement as an example, or a starting place, which we could change or add to. My fault, I thought you wanted to include the actual Unilateral Agreement, which says “Tropic Land LLC agrees to…”

  o What could “light industrial” include?
    - Vocational education, car repair, etc.
    - Refer to City’s LUO.
    - The Nānākuli NB has listed certain uses that would be prohibited from the Lualualei Light Industrial Park (the exclusions were read to the group – summarized)

  o Suggestion: why don’t we just keep Land Use Map A (without a new industrial area) for now, and then the developer would have to go get community input when the project comes in for its approvals?
    - Developer: DPP has told us that this is how we should proceed – talk to the community while they’re doing their 5-year review, and try to get the SCP amended as part of this community process.

  o Tropic Land has done a significant public input process already. They have worked with the Nānākuli NB and agreed to all of those conditions.

  o Concern: that private business is using these meetings, which are supposed to be part of a “community” process, to subvert the whole process.
This is not a new proposal. If you were concerned about this, you should have come to all of the prior meetings where we’ve been discussing this.

- The Nānākuli community will not have Waianae residents making decisions for our ahupua’a.
- The need for light industrial development was identified way back in 1995.

5. NEXT STEPS

- Sounds like we need another meeting. We will be in contact. Please feel free to contact Townscape with any comments, concerns, or questions.
- Thank you for coming.

FROM THE CITY & COUNTY OF HONOLULU’S LAND USE ORDINANCE (PAGE 60):

I-1 = Limited Industrial District

“The intent of the I-1 limited industrial district is to provide areas for some of the industrial employment and service needs of rural and suburban communities. It is intended to accommodate light manufacturing, including handcrafted goods as well as "high technology industries" such as telecommunications, computer parts manufacturing, and research and development. Uses in this district are limited to those which have few environmental impacts and those which complement the development scale of communities they would serve.”

http://www.co.honolulu.hi.us/refs/roh/21_990.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Akiona, Bill</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apo, Todd</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aquino, Olivia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Awana, Karen</td>
<td>State Leg.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Awiiella, Benavides</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dodge, Fred</td>
<td>WCCHC, etc.</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Doran, Charmaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fee, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fukawa, Janice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearl Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Garth, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gay, Lucy</td>
<td>Leeward Community College</td>
<td>Waianae Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grace, Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Johnson, Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makakilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jordan, Jo</td>
<td>Waianae NB</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Josh, Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kaahaaina, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kakalia, Lima</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kila, Victor</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Laenui, Poka</td>
<td>Waianae Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mahuka, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Makanani, Kaiawe</td>
<td>NHHA</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cynthia Rezentes</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sayers, Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shijo, Masaya</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Shimabukuro, Maile</td>
<td>State Leg.</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sokugawa, Kathy</td>
<td>DPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Teruya, Patty</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Waiamau-Nunuha, Neddie</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Update
Overview of Process Timeline (Revised October 27, 2008)

2007
- March 12, 2007 – WSCP Update process officially begins
- May 3, 2007 – Public Informational Meeting #1 (Kick-off Meeting)
- June 7, 2007 – Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #1
- June 30, 2007 – PAC Meeting #2
- August 11, 2007 – PAC Meeting #3
- September 6, 2007 – PAC Meeting #4
- September 25, 2007 – PAC Meeting #5
- December 19, 2007 – Townscape submits (partial) Preliminary Draft to DPP

2008
- February 2008 – DPP put all SCP Update processes on hold to review and revise formatting (in order to increase consistency among all SCPs and improve implementation).
- August 2008 – DPP re-started all SCP update processes
- September 5, 2008 – Townscape submits Preliminary Draft to DPP and PAC
- September 18, 2008 – PAC Meeting #6
- September 25, 2008 – Comments on Preliminary Draft due to Townscape
- October 1, 2008 – Townscape submits Public Review Draft to ALL
- October 27, 2008 – Public Informational Meeting #2 (get public comments on Public Review Draft)
- December 15, 2008 – Comments on Public Review Draft due to Townscape
- February 1, 2009 – Townscape submits Prefinal Draft to ALL
- Undetermined (2009) – Townscape submits Final Revised WSCP

2009
- Mid-February, 2009 – Public Informational Meeting #3 (to explain approval process by Planning Commission and City Council)
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan 5-Year Review
Date: October 27, 2008
From: Harmonee Williams

SUMMARY OF MAJOR REVISIONS

This memo summarizes the major revisions to the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2000) that have been included in the WSCP (Revised 2009) Public Review Draft. Please send any comments to Townscape by December 15, 2008 (harmonee@townscapeinc.com / 808-772-0316).

Chapter 1 – Wai‘anae’s Role in O‘ahu’s Development Pattern
- Updated policies from General Plan, which was revised in 2002.
- Added community concerns about Wai‘anae’s population count and projections being low, and the use of population distributions. (page 1-2)

Chapter 2 – The Vision for the Future of the Wai‘anae District
- New Vision Statement and sections 2.1.1 & 2.1.2 (pages 2-1 to 2-3)
  - The aim was to make the overall theme of the Plan more based on the values of family, culture, and sustainability. The community is interested in being sustainable in the use of the area’s natural and cultural resources, and to encourage appropriate, community-based economic development within the District.

- “Community Values” (7) – replaced with 5 “Key Concepts”:
  - Sustainability, Ahupua’a Concept, Cultural Landscape, Community Fabric, and Rural Values (pages 2-4 to 2-6)

- The Wai‘anae Concept Map – no major changes
  - Reminder: this is an idealized Vision of the District, NOT a detailed land use map

- 10 Vision Elements (page 2-9)
  - Combined “Evaluate the feasibility of a new roadway that could divert commuter traffic from Farrington Highway” and “Plan and implement safety improvements to Farrington Highway...” and revised to:
    - “Improve transportation systems within the District” (2-16)
  - Added: “Develop and support community-based businesses” (2-18)
o Added: “Facilitate the creation and development of community-based organizations that manage Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources” (2-19)

Chapter 3 – Land Use Policies and Guidelines

- Added new sections: 3.1.2 Population (3-2 to 3-4) & 3.1.3 Economics (3-4 to 3-5)
  - Provide data on the District’s population trends and economic situation

- Sections 3.2 on Open Space, 3.3 on Coastal Lands, 3.4 on Mountain Forest Lands, 3.5 on Streams, and 3.6 on Cultural Resources:
  - All have a new policy that recommends working towards community-based management of these resources.

- Section 3.2 on “Protection of Open Space” has been expanded to “Protection of Open Space and Important Views” (3-8 to 3-11)
  - Policies state that no new developments should impact important public views.

- Section 3.3 on Coastal Lands – new policies (3-13):
  - “No Permits that Negatively Impact Coastal Lands Should be Granted”
  - “Prevent the Introduction of Alien Species”
  - “Beaches/Sand should be Maintained”

- Section 3.4 on Mountain Forest Lands and 3.5 on Streams – no major changes

- Section 3.6 expanded to “Preservation of and Access to Historic and Cultural Resources”
  - Added policies on importance of “access” to such resources.
  - Expanded historical section (3.6.1; pages 3-18 to 3-20)
  - Added several policies to increase protection of cultural sites, including a more thorough survey of area, and more signage for sites. (3-22 to 3-23)

- Section 3.7 Preservation of Agricultural Lands
  - Updated “Overview” section, emphasizing need for support for ag (3-24)

- Section 3.8 Managed Residential Use – added new policies:
  - “Support Home-Based Businesses” (3-30)
  - “Allow only affordable housing projects that meet Wai’anae SCP Guidelines”
    - New Guidelines included (3-30)

- Section 3.9 Limited Commercial and Industrial Uses – added language regarding the possible addition of a light industrial area in Lualualei (3-32; see also Land Use Map in Appendix A).

- Section 3.10 Community Gathering Places – moved their suggested location to the beaches, connected by a walking/jogging/biking path. (3-35)
HAND-OUT #2

- Section 3.11 on Parks – new policy:
  - “Plan for Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Park” (3-43)

- Section 3.12 on Military Lands
  - Long-Range Use Policy expanded to “Preservation and Transition to Civilian Use”

Chapter 4 – Public Facilities and Infrastructure Policies and Guidelines
- Added 2 new General Policies for entire chapter (4-1):
  - “The latest technology that allows the Wai‘anae Community to be as sustainable, or “green” as possible, should be implemented whenever possible.”
  - “Rural Infrastructure Standards should be developed by the City. The goal of this recommendation is to allow the area to maintain its country feel, with features such as narrower roads, and still ensure that the City would maintain them.”

- Section 4.1 on Roads – removed policy for a “Reliever Road” that would basically parallel Farrington Highway, mauka. (4-6 to 4-7)
  - 4.1.2.3 and 4.1.2.5 – emphasized the need for an “Emergency Bypass Road” as a priority, and recommended a “Second Access Road” be considered for the future.

- Section 4.4 Electrical Power and Communications – added new Policy & Guideline:
  - “Encourage the Development of Alternative Energy Sources”
  - “Encourage New Developments to be Powered by Alternative Energy” (50%) (4-11 to 4-12)

- Section 4.6 Solid Waste – added new policies (4-14 to 4-15):
  - “Prohibit New Landfills”
    - (what about expansion?)
  - “Encourage Green Waste Composting”
  - “Increase Capacity of Solid Waste Transfer Stations”

- Section 4.7 and 4.8 – updated (4-15 to 4-23)

Chapter 5 – Implementation
- Added an “Implementation Matrix” (5-3 to 5-7)
  - The objective was to compile all Policies and Guidelines from the Plan in one place, and indicate who is responsible for their implementation.

Appendix A – Maps
- 2 versions of the Land Use Map are included in this Public Review Draft:
  - Land Use Map A – same as original
  - Land Use Map B – includes a new “Industrial” area in Lualualei
    - One of these maps needs to be chosen to be included in the Final SCP.
NOTES – MEETING OF NOVEMBER 25, 2008
(Revised December 8, 2008)

1. **PULE BY VICTOR KILA**

2. **WELCOME AND PURPOSE**
   - Harmonee Williams thanked everyone for coming.
   - Bruce Tsuchida and Williams reviewed the significance of the Waiʻanae SCP, and the 5-year review and update.
   - Agenda and proposed meeting ground rules were presented and agreed to.
   - The purpose of tonight’s meeting is to finish the review of the Waiʻanae SCP Public Review Draft and hear the community’s thoughts and comments on it.
   - To begin the meeting, Townscape will give a brief presentation on the proposed light industrial area – the location, the approval process, and the Nānākuli-Māʻili Neighborhood Board (“NB”) Resolutions in support of the proposed project. We will then listen to and record your comments specific to this issue.

3. **PROPOSED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AREA**
   - Townscape distributed several hand-outs. The first was a map of the proposed light industrial area – an aerial photograph, printed in color on an 8.5”x11” paper, with the major roads shown in white, the property owned by Tropic Land LLC outlined in green, and the proposed project area shaded blue.
   - Williams described the map, including the coastline, major roads, and scale.
• The second hand-out included the definitions of “I-1 limited industrial district” and “I-2 intensive industrial district” from the City & County of Honolulu’s Land Use Ordinance. The proposed industrial area would be applying for I-1. The definition for I-2 was included for comparison (attached).

• The third hand-out described the approval process necessary for the project to happen, including an SCP amendment, a State Land Use Boundary amendment, and a City & County Zone Change (attached).

• The fourth hand-out was the most recent Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board Resolution, passed on October 21, 2008. Williams went through the basic content, which included the NB’s support of the proposed light industrial park, along with their support for the amendment of the Wai‘anae SCP to incorporate this project and other input and ideas of the NB.

4. COMMUNITY COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AREA

• Tsuchida facilitated the “go-around” comments and Williams recorded.

• Tsuchida began by asking if the Chair of the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili NB would like to add anything.

• The Chair stated that discussions about this project started a long time ago. Tropic Land came out to do presentations to the Wai‘anae NB throughout 2007. Once the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili NB was formed, Tropic came to do presentations to them as well. The Nānākuli NB took a position, and passed a resolution in support of the proposed project. Tropic has done lengthy outreach to the entire District, not only Nānākuli. So overall, the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili NB and community support the project coming in.

Go-around started from the back of the room. The following comments were made by community members:

• Regarding the Unilateral Agreement, which is part of the Nānākuli NB resolution, item #10 says that “Nānākuli” will be part of the name of the baseyard. It cannot be part of the name, since the industrial park would not be in Nānākuli; but in Lualualei. Also, I am not objecting to the project. I am objecting to its approval without full analysis – an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) still needs to be completed and made public. I agree that Nānākuli and Mā‘ili should have a greater say in the future of this project, but in the end, we’re all impacted by things like increased traffic.

• I support the program.

• This opportunity is a tremendous chance for graduating high school students and blue-collar workers. It is a chance for the Wai‘anae Coast to increase employment opportunities. Currently, Wai‘anae Comprehensive Health is the largest employer. There is not much else. This would be an opportunity for blue-collar work, like welding, car repair, etc. – this is the kind of work we need out here on the Wai‘anae Coast.
• I support this project. I am a teacher and a farmer. I ask my students about becoming farmers, and they’re not interested. We need to have other opportunities for them.
• I support the project.
• The jobs situation out here is bad. We need businesses and employment opportunities. We have to do something with that land. I support this idea.
• I have a grandson. He has been greatly affected by No Child Left Behind. He has to go to town for training. It would be better if he could go do that training closer. I support this area being used for these kinds of opportunities.
• I’m supporting this project. It’s about time we green, enliven, and improve this place. I want to point out that the Rural Community Boundary should be moved to include this project; make the purple area yellow instead (on the Land Use Map in Appendix A).
• I support this project for my grandchildren. I want them to have opportunities, something to look forward to.
• My husband is an ironworker. We have 5 sons. If they want to grow up and do work like their father, they need a place to do it.
• I support the project because it will offer jobs and economic development. I do think we need more discussion on this though.
• I have 4 questions:
  ○ How many industrial areas are there already along the coast and how well are they used? If some already exist that are not fully used, then what makes us believe that another one will help?
    ▪ There is one behind the wastewater treatment plant, and the other is Pine Ridge.
  ○ Are we talking about Tropic Land’s needs or this community’s needs? Tropic Land has made all kinds of promises to people, but…
  ○ What about future land-owners? Must they do the same?
  ○ Lastly, looking at this gold sheet, it shows all the processes that the developer must go through. Would we be circumventing all of these processes? If so, then I do not support the project.
• I do not support this project circumventing the process. Let it go through the other processes first. We don’t want to set a bad precedence.
• I would not support this because I don’t want to set a bad precedence. I want to know – how many jobs will be created? What would the duration of those jobs be? Other areas can be used for job training. Also, that land is sloped. The run-off will end up in the ocean.
• I am not in support. The EIS should be done first. It could produce a domino effect for the whole area.
• I support the project because on-the-job training is needed. We could license workers so they could make more money. It seems like Tropic Land has worked with the community, and that’s encouraging. We need a place where kids can work on cars.

• If this symbol is placed on the map, it should match up with the boundary of the property. It should be limited to that property only, so we don’t get a strip of industrial uses over there. Putting the symbol on the map is NOT circumventing other processes. Other processes still need to happen. I understand this is difficult for the community because it opens the back of the valleys to new development. I guess it depends on what kind of industrial area we’re looking at – a tech park? Something more like Mapunapuna?

• I think industrial areas belong along the development corridor. They told us what they will NOT do, but what WILL they do? I would like to know what exactly would come from this. If the project will be accessed from Hakimo Road, this is a bad thing.

• I agree with the project, but I think this is the wrong location.

• Whether I vote or not, you guys educated us about the project. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I think about our children, the homeless, the need for job creation, and many other issues. What about the rest of the area? What is to prevent this site from becoming Nānākuli B (landfill)? We need to have a promise that there will never be more landfills, then I’m ok. If that can be clear, and true, then I’m for it, but I need more information.

• I support the project. There are no new issues here. The biggest obstacles are those that we create.

• We need an industrial area. I support this because our children are hands-on. They need to learn the names of tools and how to use them. We need carpenters, plumbers, and on-the-job training. We need things like this that will help our children. I know others from here who have had to move their businesses to Campbell Industrial Park. Also, we now have lots of homeless. I think this will help many of our area’s problems. We also need a park with bathrooms.

• I support this project. I think about the children. My children moved away for more opportunities. I want them to be able to stay.

• I’ve heard good things for and against this project. I’m concerned about heavy truck traffic potential. I would like to see things that are helpful to our community – medical center, another elementary school, etc. I’m against this because I’m not sure what it is.

• I hear this is for the next generation, but where is the sustainability in it? Why limit our community to construction and blue-collar jobs? What about science, medicine, and other learning opportunities? If not now, when?
• This is a community issue. It’s not about Tropic Land. I’m involved in the schools, the Neighborhood Boards, the NB Education Committee, DHHL, and many other committees. I have collected data and facts. You all should do the same. The SCP says we should “encourage light industrial.” So what’s the problem? This new development could have the whole gamut of vocational opportunities. The community should decide what they want here and control it. You can have a voice if you educate yourselves and get involved like I have. I’m not letting Tropic Land decide for me. I’m telling them what I want. “Economic development” means generating revenues to sustain projects. I support this project because I’ve been discussing this with Tropic. They are not going to sell me something I don’t want. I have also been discussing this with other community members, including keiki, opio, makua, and kupuna. I have brought some of them here with me tonight. I want them to speak as well. I want to emphasize that I support the concept of “economic development,” not Tropic Land.

• I am a high school student, and I support a vocational center in Nānākuli, so I don’t have to go away to get training.

• I support the light industrial project. My dad is a carpenter. I may be one someday too. I hope to own a business there someday.

• I support the light industrial project, especially if there is a vocational center. I would like to be a student at a trade school.

• I hear good things here, but why put this in this “Vision” – the SCP? Does it include a vocational school? I would gladly wait until there is more information.

• I wonder if there could be a compromise, a win-win. Could the proposed project be moved to another site? And what about water? Where would it come from? Regarding Tropic, I understand they would still need an economic use for their land. Could a solar park be a possible alternative use? Or some other type of renewable energy park?

• Many people are speaking about education, which excites me. But I wonder exactly how will they utilize the land? We want to invite education, invite opportunity. We need to do innovative things, like grow limu and use it for fertilizer, which could help our agricultural situation. We need jobs NOW. We have top-notch people fighting for environment and culture. It you want to teach kids about the environment, then build this and show them how to do it right. Use standards. Make sure the waste is removed properly and logged. Show them how to do that. It is our fault we are where we are, but we can do something about it. We could have one acre of these 96 acres be an environmental park. We can do innovative things.
• I support jobs, training, and economic development, but I do not support moving in haste. Is this Resolution binding? Is Tropic Land driving us? We should drive ourselves. We need to push the Army and Navy to return our land to us, and then use that land. What if we push that area to be released to us instead? Let’s push to return Lualualei Navy Mag, which is a more viable place for industrial use. I’m afraid that if we put this proposed industrial area for Lualualei in the Plan, it will give credence to developers.

• I oppose because there is no EIS. We don’t know the answers to many of our questions yet. We should wait for the EIS.

• I’m not in favor or against, but as a kupuna, I would like to say what I think. The community of Nānākuli has long lived in the dark. Nānākuli is the most economically depressed community. Nānākuli has been taken advantage of by all – the government, Wai‘anae, Mākaha, etc. It might be a good location for Walgreens. This community needs to come together – rise up and hold us together.

• I support the concept. I don’t support circumventing the process. The neighbors should be informed. Developers should reach out more.

• Sokugawa (DPP) – THIS IS the community visioning process. This is where you should be saying “this is what I want.” This is NOT circumventing the process. This IS the process. Instead of asking for more information, this is the time to tell us what you want. What do you see as part of the vision for Wai‘anae?

To explain where we are at I can use a baseball analogy. By you putting this light industrial area in your SCP, you basically put the developers up to bat. Right now they are “on-deck,” waiting to bat. They cannot even get up to bat without this going into the SCP. From here they would then have to go to the State Land Use Commission, the City Council, and DPP. All of those processes have public input components as well. An EIS, the state boundary amendment, rezoning, subdivision – these are the bases that must be reached before the project gets built. The difference between this and baseball, is that there are no double or triple hits. Each based must be earned, one at a time.

As the “bible” for the region, this determines our position on both rezoning and for state land use boundary amendments. If this industrial proposal is not in the SCP, then we (DPP) will have to oppose any petition at the SLUC and any request for rezoning.

So right now you should be asking “what’s lacking?” What else do you want to be included? That’s what you need to decide and put in this SCP.
• Representative from the Wai’anae Business Center – we help micro-businesses, basic start-ups. In our training, what we’re finding is that there are not enough spaces for business people to go to the next level. There’s definitely a need for a light industrial park. Part of this proposal is a business incubator, which would offer support for businesses. We believe there is a need for a light industrial park and a business incubator.

• I’m not for or against. My biggest concern is infrastructure. We need roads. A seaside road is not appropriate for truck traffic. We need to be able to come in and out of the area. We need to look at the community as a whole.

5. OTHER MAJOR PROPOSED REVISIONS

• Williams reviewed the major revisions to Chapters 4 and 5 that have been included in this Public Review Draft.

• Community concern – What about B&B’s?
  o There are currently several Bills pending at City Council that deal with B&Bs. They will be decided on before this SCP is finalized. And once it is finalized, the Bills will take precedence.

• How do we prevent any future landfills?
  o There is already a policy (4.6.2.1) included that does exactly that.

• In Chapter 5, in the Implementation Matrix, Policy 3.3.2.2, change the “implementer” – remove U.S. Army.

• We should also be sure to prohibit “recycling facilities with landfill capacity on site.”

• Policy 4.4.2.1, utility poles should also be improved for safety reasons, not only to reduce the visual impact.

• Does the community have an attorney to make sure our interest is properly represented?
  o No.

• Does this plan have any teeth?
  o Well, the best answer is probably yes and no. DPP has said they use it as their “bible” for land use decisions in Wai’anae. However, a lot of issues need the community’s support and pressure in order to get them implemented. The community needs to understand and use the SCP, and make sure it is enforced.

6. NEXT STEPS

• We will continue to accept comments until December 15, 2008.
• After that, we will finalize the SCP and submit it to DPP in early 2009. DPP will then review it, and submit it to the Planning Commission with their comments. The Planning Commission will then review and submit the SCP to the City Council with their comments. Both processes will have public hearings, so you can all go and voice your opinions. The City Council will then approve the Plan, and it will become ordinance.

• Thank you for coming. We will contact you with further information regarding the process going forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPU'A'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Aipoalani, Hanalei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Akama, William</td>
<td>UH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Akiona, Bill</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Alan, Iona</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Aquino, Olivia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Awana, Karen</td>
<td>State Leg.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Brown, David</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Brown, Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Davenport, Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dodge, Fred</td>
<td>WCCHC, etc.</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Gay, Lucy</td>
<td>Leeward Community College</td>
<td>Waianae Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Gomes, Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Grace, Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Herbert, Haone (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Hopfe, Hanale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Jackson, Kealamakehano</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jordan, Jo</td>
<td>Waianae NB</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Josh, Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kaahaaina, Betty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Kalamae, Dixie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Kaohu, Janelle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Keliiko-Kamai, Kapua</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kia, Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kila, Victor</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Laenui, Poka</td>
<td>Waianae Mental Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lapilio, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Magallanes, Pokii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mahoe, Charlita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Makanani, Kaiawe</td>
<td>NHHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Naaole, Rocky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Naiwi, Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Naiwi, L., Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Patteor, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pomaica, Paul Kaipo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rezentese, Cynthia</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Samson, Tiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Shijo, Masaya</td>
<td>Japan/E-W Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shimabukuro, Maile</td>
<td>State Leg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Silva, Albert</td>
<td>Waianae NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sokugawa, Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Stack, Allen, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Stack, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Teruya, Patty</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Theo, Bauann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tector, Mapuana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Waiamau-Nunuha, Neddie</td>
<td>Nanakuli-Maili NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>West, Donald B., III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Information on Proposed Light Industrial Area

Below are the definitions for I-1 Limited Industrial District and I-2 Intensive Industrial District. The proposed industrial park would be I-1. We have included information on I-2 for comparison. More information can be found at: http://www.co.honolulu.hi.us/refs/roh/21_990.pdf

Excerpt from the City & County of Honolulu’s Land Use Ordinance (page 60):

Sec. 21-3.130 Industrial districts--Purpose and intent.

(d) The intent of the I-1 limited industrial district is to provide areas for some of the industrial employment and service needs of rural and suburban communities. It is intended to accommodate light manufacturing, including handcrafted goods as well as "high technology industries" such as telecommunications, computer parts manufacturing, and research and development. Uses in this district are limited to those which have few environmental impacts and those which complement the development scale of communities they would serve.

(e) The intent of the I-2 intensive industrial district is to set aside areas for the full range of industrial uses necessary to support the city. It is intended for areas with necessary supporting public infrastructure, near major transportation systems and with other locational characteristics necessary to support industrial centers. It shall be located in areas away from residential communities where certain heavy industrial uses would be allowed.
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Process for applicants who seek changes to the Sustainable Communities Plan, State Land Use Boundary, and City & County Zoning:

The applicant can apply for a State Land Use Boundary Amendment or an SCP Amendment first. This applicant has opted to amend the SCP first. This order was recommended by DPP since the SCP Five-Year Review is currently underway.

The order and steps of the process:

1. Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) Amendment
   a. SCP Land Use Map and Policies amendments are being addressed in the current Five-Year Review.
   b. After receiving comments from the public and DPP (Department of Planning and Permitting) on the Public Review Draft, it will be revised, and a Final Draft will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for a Public Hearing and their recommendation.
   c. Subsequently, the Final Draft will be forwarded with the Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council for a Public Hearing and their consideration for adoption. It will eventually go to the Mayor for signature.

2. State Land Use (SLU) Boundary Amendment
   a. At the State Land Use Commission (LUC), an EA or EIS will likely be required prior to processing a petition to amend the SLU boundary. The process at the LUC is a quasi-judicial proceeding requiring for the parties the submittal of position statements, testimony, and exhibits.
   b. The LUC has a one year deadline to take action after accepting the EA/EIS and proper filing of the petition for processing unless extended.
   c. The LUC may require conditions.
3. City & County Zone Change

a. For a Zone Change, the applicant must meet pre-Zone Change application submittal requirements such as making a presentation to the Neighborhood Board, notice to adjacent land owners of the NB presentation, and meet with DPP.

b. Upon submittal of the ZC application, DPP has 10 working days to accept the application for processing.

c. After acceptance, DPP will send the ZC for agency and community review and has 90 days to prepare a report with a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

d. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and forwards their recommendation to the City Council.

e. The Council conducts three readings including a public hearing on the ZC and, if adopted, the ZC is forwarded to the Mayor for signature.

f. The ZC may have conditions.

g. The process may take approximately 9 months from acceptance of the ZC application.

Amending the SCPs/DPs (Sustainable Communities Plans/Development Plans)

Applicants can propose changes through the 5-year review or separately from the 5-year review. If separately, they can propose changes to DPP or through the City Council via adoption of a resolution.

- **If by Council initiation**, prior to adoption of the resolution, DPP will advise Council on the documentation or sufficiency of documentation to accompany the proposal within 30 days. DPP will submit a report within 9 months to the Planning Commission. DPP may request a 60 day extension subject to Council approval. DPP may request subsequent extensions.

- **If the applicant submits to DPP**, DPP has 30 days to review for accepting the application for processing. DPP will inform the applicant whether the request will be processed immediately or in the five year review. If not completed in a year, DPP will report its progress to the Council within one year. If the request is accepted for immediate processing, DPP will notify the public, neighborhood board, affected and/or adjacent property owners, hold an information meeting(s) and submit a report to the Planning Commission.
Planning Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

- PAC Meeting #1 – June 7, 2007
- PAC Meeting #2 – June 30, 2007
- PAC Meeting #3 – August 11, 2007
- PAC Meeting #4 – September 6, 2007
- PAC Meeting #5 – September 25, 2007
- PAC Meeting #6 – September 18, 2008
NOTES – MEETING OF JUNE 7, 2007

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
   - Given by Harmonee Williams of Townscape. Brief review of what the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) is about and used for: it’s the guide for the City and County’s land use decisions in Wai‘anae.
   - The current SCP was adopted as an ordinance in 2000. The SCPs are meant to be reviewed every 5 years. We are currently beginning that comprehensive review process now.
   - The majority of the revisions, updates, and additions to the SCP are meant to come from this Planning Advisory Committee (PAC).
   - 41 people have signed up to be PAC Members so far. Thank you to those of you who have signed up. If others would like to join, that’s fine. We just ask that you are able to commit to attending the majority of the meetings because the discussions will build off of earlier meeting discussions.
   - We’re aiming to have a diverse range of members – from different ahupua’a, jobs, organizations, etc. to bring different perspectives to the discussions.
   - Review of tonight’s agenda and meeting rules.

2. INTRODUCTIONS
   - Go-around format so people could introduce themselves by saying their name, which ahupua’a they live and/or work in, and what perspective they bring to the group.
3. REVIEW OF TIMELINE

- Brief overview of the proposed project schedule, with attention to the work of the PAC. Proposed PAC work consists of:
  - **June/July (2 or 3 mtgs)**
    - Review existing SCP
    - Score its effectiveness (Vision/Values)
    - Discuss possible revisions
  - **August/September (2 or 3 mtgs)**
    - Get into details of Revisions and Updates
    - New Sections/Additions
    - Outline Draft
  - **November/December (2 mtgs)**
    - Review and finalize the Revised SCP

4. REVIEW EXISTING SCP – CHAPTER 2

- Bruce Tsuchida gave a brief description of the last process that he (as President of Townscape) went through in order to write the current SCP. The process took place between 1997 and 2000.
- A community member stated that the last SCP was a great “buck-passer.” He said that the plan was too general, which meant that every agency could look at it and interpret it how they wanted, which often resulted in them passing the responsibility on to another agency. Overall, he felt that it was too open, too undefined to be useful.
- Another community member stated that the SCP was useful in some instances, such as fighting the proposed road around Ka’ena Point and commercial kayaking at Māku’a.
- The discussion continued and resulted in 2 main outcomes:
  1. The recognition that one of the major values in the plan is that it expresses the will of the community. The City & County may not implement all of the desired actions, but once the plan is written, the community can take the lead on getting aspects of it implemented.
  2. The question was asked: can the plan both address a few specific issues in detail (so the buck cannot be passed) AND be broad enough to cover the many issues that it already addresses?
    - Tsuchida said that yes, he believes it can.
The community really needs to use the Plan themselves, not expect the City & County to be proactive in implementing the programs. The City uses the Plan primarily as a guide for making land use decisions.

5. EVALUATION OF SCP VISION ELEMENTS (BREAK-OUT GROUPS)

- The meeting participants were divided into 4 break-out groups and given a hand-out that explained the 10 Vision Elements and what they were being asked. That hand-out can be found on pages 11 and 12 of these notes.
- The main questions were:
  1. Are there any elements that are irrelevant and should not be included?
  2. Are there other big ideas that should be included?
  3. Discuss each Element for effectiveness over the past 7-8 years.
- Each group had a copy of the Wai’anae Concept Map, markers, and a facilitator to lead them through the discussion.
- The participants then re-grouped after about 45 minutes of discussion to share their outcomes.
- A summary of each group’s discussion follows:

**Group 1**

- The time was too limited to cover all of these topics. We need either more time or else fewer issues (more specific) to discuss.
- It might be helpful to break people up into different issues, or we could do break-outs by ahupua‘a.
- Wai’anae needs more affordable housing.
- We need to empower our community in order to get the community to be able to make decisions and implement projects.
- Other topics discussed included:
  - 2nd Access Road
  - Homeless & affordable housing
  - Ahupua‘a – kupuna councils
  - Ag lands – tax breaks
  - Landfill issues
  - Successes & shortcomings of the Plan
  - Separate sections for City, State, and Federal actions
  - “We need to own our own community”
  - Why can’t Wai’anae Mall be a better place for local businesses?
Group 2

- The previous Wai’anae SCP Plan was organized by topic matter, but it was vague and unclear as to which public agency was responsible for what specific actions. Maybe the revised plan should be organized into sections that clearly define which branch of government has jurisdiction and responsibility over specific actions or projects.

- Re-zone some areas for light industrial uses, such as auto mechanics, computer repair, etc. Refer to Group 2’s map for specific areas where light industrial areas might be more feasible and desirable. But we only need one site for light industrial.

- For next meeting, find the definition of light industrial.

- In the light industrial area, we need to form a policy that gives preference for use of area to local small businesses, not big outside companies. Maybe do it under the guise of an economic hub zone. Such zones need to be explored.

- Who initiates the zoning change to light industrial, the state or county?

- Element #2 (4 land use districts) – the boundaries are not clear. We need a map that shows the exact boundaries (hard lines). It would also be helpful to have a City & County as well as a State Land Use map, both by TMK.

- An inventory of cultural sites is needed, so the City & County is made aware, and could create appropriate zoning. Cultural sites should include old plantation era buildings and family graveyards, in addition to Hawaiian sites.

- Elements #7 & 8 should be maintained (no development North of Kepuhi Point and restrict development makai of Farrington Highway).

- Element #6 is too general. We would like to see the word “Restore” inserted into the heading of the element in order to make it more specific (currently reads “Preserve and protect important cultural sites and cultural landscapes”).

- Element #10 (Reliever Highway) is definitely still a priority. It would help us regain control of Farrington Highway. With another access road, it may be possible to reduce the number of lanes that Farrington Highway has, which would make it safer and friendlier for pedestrians.

- Maybe we could create a Special Design District with a Historic Corridor.
Group 3

- We need to accurately define the Ahupua‘a Districts (including Wai‘anae Kai and Wai‘anae Uka) with surveyors. Or else include a disclaimer that the ahupua‘a lines are not accurate.
  - When were City and State GIS layers last ground-truthed?
  - There is currently a conflict with Lualualei and Mā‘ili ahupua‘a boundaries (are they the same ahupua‘a or 2 distinct ones?).

- Cultural sites need to be identified and protected on both private and public lands.
  - Info sources could include kupuna, stone markers, walls, “Sites of O‘ahu,” but need to be sensitive to the fact that some info is not meant for public knowledge.

- There should be legal, hard lines for agricultural and preservation districts.
  - Jurisdiction of lines need to be established (HRS/ROH)
  - Coordinate with other boundaries
  - Additional delineations should include Hawaiian Homelands, Military, cultural.
  - We agree with Group 2 that we need to know our District’s County zoning, and on a map with hard lines, by TMK.

- Town centers need to be more concentrated and business zones more defined.
  - What is the procedure for changing current zoning?
  - We need a more country-style (Wai‘anae plantation) definition of town centers. Maybe a Special District designation like Haleiwa, but with standards specific for Wai‘anae style.
  - Look to North Shore SCP for language
  - Issue of Hale Wai Vista

- There should be gathering places in each ahupua‘a.
  - This has been in the planning stages for 12 years – it’s time to put it into action.
  - Needs more definition.

- The water rights should be based on an ahupua‘a system – used for sustainability.
  - Streams need protection, restoration, de-channelized
  - Water needs to be returned so that it flows properly
  - The water cycle has been broken and affects rain, streamflow, agriculture, etc.
  - Needs to be reconnected to the people and the land
  - ‘Auwai and flumes should be used instead of water meters
There have been many changes in the last 30 years.
We need to have non-native plants removed, and natives replanted.
Stream management protocol needs to be documented
Community should take advantage of government programs and look for appropriate funding sources.
Integrate SCP with Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan.

- We agree with no development North of Kepuhi Point (#7).
- We need to restrict coastal development on the makai side of Farrington Highway (#8).
- Farrington Highway still needs a beautification program (#9).
- We still need a 2nd road into/out of Wai‘anae, but NOT around Ka‘ena Point (#10).

**Group 4**
- The Vision statement needs to be re-written with reference to Hawaiian culture being the host culture (maoli). Something along the lines of “…a Vision of a Community living by values and customs that are firmly embedded in the foundational host (maoli) culture of Hawaii Ne…” (Needs word smithing.)
- The ahupua‘a boundaries need to continue out 2-3 miles into the ocean. It also includes the wind, the air, and the views. Any high-rise development puts the ahupua‘a concept at risk.
- The agricultural boundary lines should be changed to include some of the preservation lands so we can grow more taro, which would mean more healthy living – both through exercise and food. The lines could be tied to rainfall data.
- “Preservation” lands needs either another name or a different definition.
  - These lands should not be excluded from Native Hawaiians. There needs to be a way to ensure preservation AND access for Native Hawaiians.
  - The definition should include Hawaiian values and uses, such as mālama ‘āina.
  - The law that describes customary gathering rights could be included as well.
  - We need traditional management in place – custodial privileges for kupuna, or for the kupuna to decide who.
- The environmental and agricultural sections (page 2-10) needs some revision – the part about the soils not being very good for agriculture is inaccurate. (Gary Maunakea-Forth offered to help re-write the section.)
• The military has control of the land that we’d like to regain control of.
• We need spiritual centers (not just gathering places and/or town centers).
• We need to define “sustainability”.
• Advocates for ownership of businesses.

6. **NEXT STEPS**

• The community may need the time schedule to be more flexible than Townscape’s Process & Schedule diagram shows. We shouldn’t be rushed to get all of our ideas out and organized.
• For future meetings maybe we should organize the small break-out groups by ahupua’a, or interest area.
  o Or maybe we should keep the groups the same so we can build off of what we did before.
  o But if we mix the groups, then we will get to learn from each other.
• Tentative next meeting:
  o Saturday, June 30, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.
  o Try to get the Kamehameha Learning Center in Nānākuli (or another air conditioned space).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPU'A'A</th>
<th>PAC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aki, Georgette</td>
<td>Waianae Community Outreach</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiona, Bill</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage-Lapilio, Nettie</td>
<td>Makaha Resort &amp; Golf Course</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber, Kapiolani</td>
<td>Nanakuli Housing Corporation</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, David</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire, C.L.</td>
<td>Pacific Business Center, UH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope, Agnes</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, Shirley</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace, Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory, Debra</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, Alice</td>
<td>Leialii Manao'Iana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holway, Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauanio, Dana</td>
<td>Pacific Business Center, UH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Jo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahikina, Mike</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
<td>PAC MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kanahele, Kamaki</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kaneaiakala, Alva</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Kapeliela, Kenneth</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kurshals, Maralyn</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Lapilio, Joseph</td>
<td>Waianae Business Center</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mahoe, Harriet</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Malinousky, Donalaia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Maunakea, Ruby</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Maunakea-Forth, Gary</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Maunakea-Forth, Kukui</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Newman, Dana</td>
<td>Concerned Elders &amp; Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Patterson, Pat</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Pelekai, Pikake</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Perry, Johnnie Mae L.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Phillips, Diane</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Pitolo, Laura</td>
<td>Waianae Community Outreach</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Rezentees, Cynthia</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Sacrider, Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
<td>PAC MEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Saito, Ralph</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Saylors, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Saylors, Denise</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Spencer, Iwalani</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HAND-OUT FOR BREAK-OUT GROUPS TO DISCUSS CHAPTER 2

**Goal:** Review each of the 10 Vision Elements and decide:

a. Are there any Elements that are irrelevant or should not be included?

b. Are there other big ideas that should be included?

c. Discuss each Element for effectiveness and any possible change.

The 10 Elements are briefly described below and graphically represented on the map. The suggested changes and additions can be drawn and/or written.

1. **Recognize the traditional Ahupua‘a of the Wai‘anae Coast**
   - Recognize the traditional ahupua‘a land divisions of the Wai‘anae Coast and adapt the ahupua‘a concept as a framework for land use and open space planning.

2. **Establish defined boundaries for preservation, agricultural, coastal, and rural community areas**
   - These 4 land and resource types should be recognized and treated accordingly.
   - Description of each type of land on pages 2-18 and 2-19.

3. **Designate town centers and village centers**
   - For Wai‘anae, Nānākuli, Mā‘ili/Lualualei, and Mākaha – the development of a core, strongly defined commercial and service Center. (page 2-19)

4. **Implement Plans for Community Gathering Places**
   - For Wai‘anae, Nānākuli, Mā‘ili/Lualualei, and Mākaha – and others as needed.
   - Envisioned as “open areas with perhaps a few small buildings where people can gather informally to visit and talk story; have parties and celebrations; stage festivals and special events; teach and learn traditional crafts, music, and dance; buy, sell, and barter homegrown produce and homemade items; and generally renew contact with friends and neighbors.” (page 2-20)

5. **Preserve and restore streams and stream corridors**
   - Appropriate State and City agencies would need to work together to initiate a program that will enhance stream flow and protect the
natural ecology of Waianae’s streams, stream floodplains, and associated plants and animals.

- This program should include a “no dumping” rule within the Stream Conservation Corridor, requirements for siltation basins or other means of controlling urban and agricultural stormwater runoff, and a program for the restoration of natural vegetation within stream floodplain areas.
- A community-based “adopt a stream” program could be an important part of this overall stream conservation program. (page 2-21)

6. **Preserve and protect important cultural sites and cultural landscapes**
   - Page 3-19

7. **Preserve lands north of Kepuhi Point as open space lands**
   - Page 2-22

8. **Restrict coastal development makai of Farrington Highway**
   - Further development encroachment on these coastal lands should not be permitted, with the exception of some very limited redevelopment of small commercial properties in Wai’anae town.

9. ** Beautification of Farrington Highway**
   - To bring the community closer to the beaches and coastline by narrowing roadway width where possible, and adding safety improvements and beautification measures.

10. **Evaluate the feasibility of a reliever highway**
    - Proposed to go over the Wai’anae mountains – to relieve heavy volume on Farrington Hwy. Would provide emergency access. Main problem: expensive to build.
NOTES – MEETING OF JUNE 30, 2007

PULE – BY KAMAKI KANAHELE

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
   - Given by Harmonee Williams of Townscape. Go-around format so people could introduce themselves by saying their name and any organization or interest they represent.

2. PURPOSE, TIMELINE & AGENDA
   - Williams briefly reviewed the proposed timeline for the SCP process. There are 3 series of meetings for the process, each with a distinct purpose:
     o 1\(^{st}\) series – to highlight the areas that need revision
     o 2\(^{nd}\) series – to draft the words of those revisions
     o 3\(^{rd}\) series – to review and edit the Draft Revised Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan.
   - Today’s meeting is the 2\(^{nd}\) meeting in the 1\(^{st}\) series of meetings. Last meeting we examined Chapter 2, which contains the Vision for the Plan. This meeting we will review the findings from Chapter 2 and then closely examine Chapters 3 and 4.

3. ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM THE LAST MEETING (JUNE 7)
   - Last meeting there were several questions regarding zoning, regulatory authority, and what powers this SCP has, or how useful it can be. To help clarify the situation, Bruce Tsuchida gave an overview of how this Plan fits into Hawaii’s and Oahu’s land use planning and regulatory structure.
   - First, the Hawaii State Land Use system has 4 land use zones:
• Conservation, Agriculture, Urban, Rural

The City & County of Honolulu then has a General Plan for the entire island, and a set of plans for each District (Development Plans for the 2 growing Districts, and Sustainable Communities Plans for the other 6, including Wai‘anae.)

Underneath these levels of planning comes zoning, subdivision, special permits, etc. – all of which are meant to conform to the Sustainable (or Development) Plans.

Questions in response to Tsuchida’s presentation:

o So since Wai’anae is a “Sustainable Community,” how can we control things that might affect sustainability, such as population growth?
  ▪ 1st off, according to the SCP, development is supposed to be limited to lands within the Rural Community Boundary. That line cannot move until the SCP is updated (like now).
  ▪ Within that boundary, if a proposed development is relatively small, then it will probably get approved. However, if it is large, then the City will most likely NOT approve it since it doesn’t agree with the General Plan policies nor the SCP policies of maintaining population size.
  ▪ However, some exceptions to that rule include Mākaha Valley and the back of Mā‘ili. Those 2 areas are already zoned for development. The City cannot down-zone unless the owner is willing or else the City offers to pay for the loss of land value that comes with that down-zoning.

o Is there a time limit to zoning? If a lot is zoned for development and it doesn’t happen right away, does the owner lose it?
  ▪ Sometimes – there was an example of that on the Big Island – but not usually.

• What is the difference between Ag and Rural?
  o Ag is for farming. Although an owner of an Ag lot can build a “farm dwelling.”
  o Rural is meant for a country setting where no farming will occur, due to various factors, such as soil conditions.

• Can a community recommend down-zoning in this plan?
  o Yes. You can not mandate it, but can recommend it. The City is currently considering down-zoning for one or more properties in Mākaha Valley.

• Can we say future development should not move ahead without improved/adequate infrastructure?
  o Yes.
- What limitations could be placed on DHHL lands? How do we plan with/for DHHL? Is a partnership possible? How will the City deal with population pressures from DHHL?
  - The City cannot regulate DHHL, but they will enforce the need for infrastructure – this is a point of negotiation.
  - Another point of negotiation is dedication of road and utilities to the City. DHHL must conform to City Standards if they wish to dedicate infrastructure to the City.
- To what extent can we set our own infrastructure standards?
  - Currently, you cannot, but the City is discussing the need for different Rural Standards. This group could outline new standards, which could impact the City’s decisions.
  - Other factors to take into account:
    - We still have the Federal and State laws to comply with, such as the Clean Water Act.
    - The State Office of Planning is looking at redefining Rural Standards.

4. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING’S FINDINGS OF CHAPTER 2
- Last meeting we had 4 break-out groups; each group looked at the current Vision Statement and the 10 Vision Elements. Townscape summarized those comments from the last meeting, and created a draft “Scorecard,” which was handed out (attached at pages 12-13).
- Williams explained that the City Department of Planning & Permitting would like to see a scorecard on how well the plans were implemented, and ways in which they could be implemented better.
- Going through the 10 Vision Elements, most people agreed with the scores that were presented. The 2 main discrepancies were with Elements #8 and #9. The former (#8), “Restrict coastal development makai of Farrington Highway,” should not be scored “high” since there has been some development in that area. Regarding Element #9, “Beautification of Farrington Highway” someone said improvements to the beach parks served to improve Farrington Highway, and so the score should be “low-medium.”
- All other draft scores were ok’d.
- Several people wanted to make sure that the scores did not indicate the level of priority, because many of these elements need to be kept, and implemented. A few comments that came from this discussion will be added to the draft scorecard.
5. **OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS 3 & 4**

- Tsuchida gave a brief overview of what topics each of the chapters covered, and said we would be asking the participants to split up into 3 groups – land use, natural & cultural resources, and infrastructure.

6. **REVIEW OF CHAPTERS 3 & 4 (3 BREAK-OUT GROUPS)**

**Group 1 – Natural and Cultural Resources**

- **In general**
  - The Plan should perpetuate an understanding of cultural values. Cultural understanding is a very important issue. We need to perpetuate it within our family members and in school curricula.
  - We need to be careful what words we choose – they should represent what we’re feeling and give a clear understanding of what we mean.

- **Preservation of Open Space (3.2)**
  - Need to change the definition to include access for gathering and cultural practices.
  - Could we add the ocean as an open space that needs to be protected?
  - We should include a discussion on the cultural significance of open space – as a cultural resource. The view plane is mentioned in oli and mele.
  - Should be accessible for community gathering.
  - Certain areas should be kapu during certain times.
  - Military should return Mākuia. There should be public access. We should create a plan ahead of time, so we’re ready when/if we do get management control of the area.

- **Preservation of Coastal Lands (3.3)**
  - Add Wai’anae Boat Harbor to list on page 3-12; not a beach park, but it is public access to the water.
  - There should be access that allows the perpetuation of Native gathering rights.
    - But should not allow people to lay nets and leave them. They should have to be present.
  - Beach parks are mostly closed at night – that’s ok.
  - Fishing should be allowed for subsistence, but not for over-fishing or commercial (for profit).
  - We must educate people about the pono ways to fish, how much to take, etc.
o DLNR staff needs to be present and be educated. We should look at a partnering situation between DLNR and community members that know the pono way.

o We need a better system – one that is faster than DLNR. If you call them with a problem, it takes a long time before they can respond.

o The community could monitor, or certain organizations, like the Hawaiian Civic Club.

o Specific suggestion: pg 3-13, 2nd paragraph – change to “The coastal lands of the Wai’anae District are important for cultural practices, recreational resources, and scenic resources.” (They should be prioritized in that order.)

- **Preservation of Mountain Forest Lands (3.4)**
  - We need to focus on the lowlands in order to protect the uplands. Reforestation will protect the upland area. Wild grasses keep burning and encroaching.
  - There are native trees that feed us.
  - We need to regulate what can be planted and what cannot. No alien species should be planted.
    - Examples of good trees to plant include Kamani and Hala trees. We should remove the kiawe and other rubbish trees.
    - Do we have to remove the coconuts from the trees out here too?
  - We should extend the forest more into the lowland areas.
  - We need a fire plan.
  - Need to look at the ahupua’a as a whole.
  - Mauka and makai need the same type of protection.
  - Uses of the area should include the use and restoration of kalo lo’i. There should be access for this.
  - There should not be any GMOs planted; maybe create GMO-free zones.

- **Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains (3.5)**
  - A stream in Wai’anae Valley had some rocks moved; same thing in Mākaha. That should not be allowed to any stream.
  - Allow natural flows.
  - Restrict grading of streams and areas around streams.
  - Movement of pōhaku should be forbidden.
  - Establish instream flow standards (3.5.2.4). This should be required as a high priority.
- **Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources (3.6)**
  - We need signs with place name and moʻolelo near cultural sites – both major and minor (there are no “minor” sites).
  - There should not be City regulations on sign size and look. There should be collaboration between the City and the community for what would be appropriate signage.

- **Preservation of Agricultural Lands (3.7)**
  - Need to get info from farmers (Gary Maunakea-Forth).

**Group 2 – Land Use**

- **Residential (3.8)**
  - Affordability issue
  - What about global warming?
    - See Maui Coastal Plan to accommodate coastal erosion.
  - Other sites that need access?
  - Height limit – 25’? Keep it at 30’?
  - “ʻŌhana” housing?
  - Standards need some specifics. Example is the sidewalk along Farrington Highway.
  - Need infrastructure.

- **Farmlands**
  - The younger generation doesn’t want to continue farming.
  - Some “ag” land is not good for ag.
  - Identify prime ag land.
  - “Have to be honest about the quality of the land.”
  - Need to meet with farmers to hear from them.
    - West Oʻahu Farm Bureau
    - Mikilua Farm Bureau

- **Commercial/Industrial/Country Towns (3.9 & 3.10)**
  - No big box stores
  - Special District for Waiʻanae Town
    - Near Kaiser Plant
    - Māʻili “landfill” site
    - Old Co. Landfill Waiʻanae.
• For small Wai‘anae businesses.
  o No new dumps/landfills

• Parks (3.11)
  o More parks – neighborhood parks
  o Nānākuli needs a library.
  o Pu‘u o Hulu Park – see plans
  o Old landfill site?
  o City’s Coastal Views Study?
  o High-rise issue – blocks wind, sun, etc.
  o Land swap issues?
  o No light rail.

• Military Land Use (3.12)
  o Lualualei bunkers still in use
  o No expansion of training lands
  o No widening roads for “Stryker Brigade”
  o Should have farms in Lualualei
  o Ceded land issues

Group 3
• Transportation Systems (4.1)
  o Stay within the City Standards – in other words, roads in
    the district should be up to the City’s Code so that they
    receive service.
  o Nānākuli Homestead Road – the City doesn’t maintain.
  o How do you get a private owner to maintain the road?
  o Police won’t patrol certain areas (ex: Maliona and private
    roads).
  o The City doesn’t service roads that are not to City
    Standards and non-dedicated roads.
  o We need rural standards that the city agrees to.
  o Can the City speed up the contra-flow lane?
  o Encourage City to develop connector roads to provide an
    alternate for Farrington Highway for local traffic (4.1.1)
  o Roads are there, we just have to “take off the gates” – possible
    condemnation.
  o City should connect the roads for 96792 zip code area.
  o 3 possible access roads: Kolekole, Pōhakea, Kaʻena Point.
  o 4.1.2 – We want to provide pedestrian and biking safety
  o Add more turning lanes.
  o 4.1.2.3 – Needs more forceful connection of existing roads.
• **Potable Water Systems (4.2)**
  - Plan doesn’t address non-potable water. We don’t have enough.
  - We need to work with the military to get them to not pump so much water from the aquifers that they are not using.
  - We need a policy that has a strong water resource inventory.

• **Wastewater (4.3)**
  - We have saltwater intrusion into the sewer line. Need to resolve that.
  - Look at water desalinization/ocean thermal. Develop distribution system for local use.
  - Find a way to use gray water at a residential level, how to fit this within State Federal Policy.
  - The treatment plant effluent should be used for gray water.

• **Electrical Power and Communications (4.4)**
  - Add solar generation capabilities and sell back to HECO.
  - Look at alternatives for electricity production.
  - City should look at their properties to site antennas for cell phones.

• **Drainage Systems (4.5)**
  - Look at other methods besides channelization; more eco-friendly.
  - Drainage should enhance estuaries.
  - Add dike revetments to capture water and make more estuary-friendly; prevent run-off.

• **Solid Waste (4.6)**
  - The City should provide “above ground services” in existing rural areas. In some rural areas there is no underground infrastructure in place, however the City
could still provide above-ground services to the community. This could be a rural infrastructure standard.

- We need to reclaim the old Wai‘anae landfill next to the convenience station; create a precedence.
- No new landfills on Wai‘anae Coast
- Encourage composting
- Re-visit the pass/no-pass with regards to landfills.
- Laws against illegal dumping haven’t been enforced.
- We need to increase the capacity of convenience stations. Commercializing them is one option to increase capacity.
- We need recycling centers.
- Recognize and emphasize enforcement.
- Utilize technology to help (cameras, signage, satellites) – could replace use of officers.

- **Civic, Public Safety and Educational Facilities (4.7)**
  - Police, Fire, Emergency Services all need improvement. There should be a long-range plan for an ER. Emergency care needs to be upgraded and self-sustainable.
  - Change “need for 2nd ambulance” to “expand 2nd ambulance unit to 24 hours.”
  - We should utilize the Wai‘anae Health Center.
  - At the very least, police substations should be maintained.
  - We need more laws that result in convictions.
  - Job training programs for health should be a priority.
  - The role of schools in rural communities is more than just education, it’s a community gathering place too.
  - The schools are overcrowded.
  - There should be mention of charter schools and adult education.

- **Also:**
  - Cultural significance of connecting ahupua‘a.
  - We need an assessment of the number of halfway houses currently in the community.
    - A well-run halfway house is an asset to the community, but a poorly run one is a detriment.

### 7. NEXT STEPS

- Tentative next meeting:
  - Saturday, July 28, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.
  - Try to get the same room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
<th>PAC MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiona, Bill</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage-Lapilio, Neddie</td>
<td>Makaha Resort &amp; Golf Course</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awana, Karen</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awo, Alvin</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Raymond</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire, C.L.</td>
<td>Pacific Business Center, UH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope, Agnes</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport, Shirley</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace, Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanohano, Kehau</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hew Len, Kalena</td>
<td>Waianae Kai Homestead Association</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaahaaina, Betty</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanahele, Kamaki</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaneaiakala, Alva</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Alfred</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lapilio, Joseph</td>
<td>Waianae Business Center</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Malinousky, Donalaia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Maunakea, Ruby</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Newman, Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Newman, Debbie</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Patterson, Pat</td>
<td>Concerned Elders &amp; Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Perry, Johnnie Mae L.</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rezentges, Cynthia</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sacrider, Angela</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Saito, Ralph</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sylors, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sylors, Denise</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Suiso, Mark</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupuaa</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Teruya, Patty</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Element</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Facts/Data</td>
<td>Community Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 Recognize the traditional ahupua'a of the Wai'anae Coast | Low | - Ahupua’a lines are not accurate – for example, Wai’anae Kai and Uka should be separated.  
- They should be defined accurately with surveyors, or else include a disclaimer that the ahupua’a lines are not accurate.  
- Are Mā‘ili and Lualualei the same or 2 distinct ahupua’a?  
- The ahupua’a boundaries need to continue 2-3 miles out into ocean.  
- It also includes the wind, the air, and the views. |
| 2 Establish 4 Land Use Types | Medium | - The agricultural boundary lines should be changed to include some of the preservation lands so we can grow more taro. The lines could be tied to rainfall data.  
- “Preservation” lands need a different definition (ensure Native Hawaiian access)  
- Agricultural description (page 2-10) needs some revision (Gary)  
- Re-zone some areas for light industrial uses, such as auto mechanics, computer repair, etc.  
- The boundaries are not clear. We need a map that shows the exact boundaries (should be legal, hard lines).  
- Additional delineations should include Hawaiian Homelands, military, cultural. |
| 3 Establish Town Centers | Low-Medium | - Nānākuli Village Center under construction | - Still need to be established  
- Need to be more concentrated and business zone more defined.  
- Wai’anae Mall should be a better place for local businesses.  
- We need a more country-style (Wai’anae plantation) definition of town centers. Maybe a Special District designation like Haleiwa, but with standards specific for Wai’anae style.  
- Maybe we could create a Special Design District with a Historic Corridor. |
| 4 Develop Community Gathering Places | Low | - We need spiritual centers (not just gathering places)  
- There should be gathering places in each ahupua’a.  
- This has been in the planning stages for 12 years – it’s time to put it into action.  
- Needs more definition. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Facts/Data</th>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 Preserve and restore streams and stream corridors| Low   | - BWS turned off 2 BWS pumps in Mākaha Valley to see if it would increase stream flow | - The water rights should be based on an ahupua’a system – used for sustainability.  
- Streams need protection, restoration, de-channelized  
- Water needs to be returned so that it flows properly  
- The water cycle has been broken and affects rain, streamflow, agriculture, etc.  
- Needs to be reconnected to the people and the land  
- ‘Auwai and flumes should be used instead of water meters  
- There have been many changes in the last 30 years.  
- We need to have non-native plants removed, and natives replanted.  
- Stream management protocol needs to be documented  
- Community should take advantage of government programs and look for appropriate funding sources.  
- Integrate SCP with Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan. |
| 6 Preserve and protect Cultural Sites              | Medium| - Too general – could the word “restore” be inserted into the heading of the element in order to make it more specific?  
- An inventory of cultural sites is needed, so the City & County is made aware, and could create appropriate zoning. Cultural sites should include old plantation era buildings and family graveyards, in addition to Hawaiian sites.  
- Cultural sites need to be identified and protected on both private and public lands. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 7 Preserve Lands north of Kepuhi Point as open space lands | High  | - Should be maintained.  
- Our Lady of Kea’au has a retreat center up there, but it is not new development |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 8 Restrict coastal development makai of Farrington Highway | Low   | - Should be maintained.                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 9 Beautification of Farrington Highway            | Low   | - Some safety measures were implemented                                     | - Should be maintained.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 10 Evaluate the feasibility of a reliever highway  | Low-Medium | - Short feasibility study done in 2001 “(Lualualei Naval Road/Kunia Road Connector Road Concept Study)” | - Definitely still a priority. It would help us regain control of Farrington Highway. With another access road, it may be possible to reduce the number of lanes that Farrington Highway has, which would make it safer and friendlier for pedestrians.  
- We still need a 2nd road into/out of Wai‘anae, but NOT around Ka’ena Point.                                                                                                                                  |
NOTES – MEETING OF AUGUST 11, 2007

PULE – BY KAMAKI KANAHELE

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE

- Harmonee Williams of Townscape reviewed the proposed timeline for the WSCP comprehensive review process. There are 3 series of meetings for the process, each with a distinct purpose:
  - 1st series – to highlight the areas that need revision (June – July)
  - 2nd series – to draft the words of those revisions (August – Sept)
  - 3rd series – to review and edit the Draft Revised Waiʻanae SCP (November – December)
- The first 2 PAC meetings were held in June. The first was on June 7th, when we examined Chapter 2, which includes the Vision Statement and the 10 Vision Elements.
- The 2nd meeting was on June 30th, when we worked in break-out groups, and looked at Chapters 3 & 4 to see which areas might need changes or additions.
- Today’s meeting is the 3rd meeting (the 1st in the 2nd series). The purpose of this meeting is to review Chapter 3, on Land Use, in more detail and to suggest possible revisions and additions.
- The next meeting is proposed to focus on Chapter 4, which deals with Infrastructure.
- Williams reviewed the Agenda and the hand-outs (Attachment A).
- A draft Vision Statement was presented by Puanani Burgess. She and 2 other community members, Hoʻoipo deCambra and Poka Laenui, prepared the statement for the Committee’s review (Attached B). It will be discussed at the next Committee meeting.
2. **CHAPTER 3 – ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Bruce Tsuchida directed the meeting participants to the yellow hand-out entitled “Chapter 3 – Accomplishments.” The purpose of this hand-out is to summarize some of the components of Chapter 3 that have been accomplished since the WSCP was adopted in 2000.
- Townscape created this sheet in response to comments they heard, such as “this Plan is worthless”, “nothing has gotten implemented.”
- One aspect to note is that many of these items were not carried out by the City & County of Honolulu, but instead by various organizations, including community groups.
- So the community should realize that this Plan can be a guide for action, but it doesn’t necessarily mean action by the City.
- If there are other accomplishments that have happened in the community that have not been mentioned here, please let Townscape know.

3. **CHAPTER 3 – COMMUNITY COMMENTS**

- Williams gave a brief summary of the intended process for reviewing Chapter 3, which is to go through the chapter, section by section, discussing each policy and guideline, deciding if it needs revision, and suggesting any new discussion or policy items to be added. The hand-out is a summary of previously heard community comments. It is meant to be a guide, but it should not limit the discussion.
- The tension is to be thorough, but to try to keep moving, in order to get through all 12 sections in the chapter this morning.
- The following community comments are grouped by section, although some of the discussion does not apply specifically to that section. Suggested new language is underlined.

- **3.0 – Overview of Land Use & Population Growth**
  - Add data on zoning changes that were allowed, including where, when, and why allowed.
    - Has there been any intrusion into open space?
  - The big issue here is population. The General Plan states that Wai’anae should contain 3.8 – 4.2% of O‘ahu’s population. This is unreasonable considering Wai’anae’s limited resources, especially without the use of Lualualei Valley, which is primarily controlled by the US Navy. Is it possible to put a discrete cap on the population that Wai’anae is expected to have?
    - Possibly, but this would need an amendment to the General Plan. Part of this review and update process for all of the rural district SCPs is to recommend changes to the General Plan, so we can suggest this.
Wai‘anae is culturally unique. It is not like Koʻolaupoko and other districts. It is definitely not like Kapolei. We don’t want row houses here.

Page 3-1, first paragraph of 3.0 “Before proceeding with detailed policies and guidelines for the Waiʻanae District, it is helpful to summarize the key facts pertaining to existing land use, pre-existing and existing population, especially the Native Hawaiian people, existing State and City designations for land use, and recent population growth trends.”

How can we actually be sustainable? What does “sustainability” mean? How do we make better use of our resources?

One participant stated that the Rocky Mountain Institute has lots of information on sustainability and technology to support it. There was a long discussion on sustainability, and a suggestion to define what it means to Waiʻanae, particularly for this “Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan.”

We need to use a “Precautionary Approach” – whereby we do things on a trial basis. If they don’t work out, we can stop them.

We need to know the facts – what is already pre-zoned and a report from DPP on all development plans for our area.

Boundaries should be created and fixed on where development is allowed to occur.

- The Rural Community Boundary is meant to do just that (next section 3.1)

Possible policy or guidelines to add (on hand-out):

- Zoning should be downgraded if not developed after a certain period of time.
- Development should require improvements to infrastructure.
- Unilateral Agreement should include definition of responsibilities.

We need a clear definition of who is responsible for infrastructure.

There should be time limits on the validity of zoning.

To limit development, infrastructure should be in place before development can happen (“concurrency” – like the legislation pass on the Big Island).

“Infrastructure” should include libraries, off-grid systems, recycling, schools, playgrounds, food production, water, the land that supports us, the ecosystems that surround us, etc.

We also need to define who is responsible for various infrastructure systems. The Plan should help us to define infrastructure needs.

The Rocky Mountain Institute has lots of technological concepts we could use.

This is all linked to sustainability. So is the kapu system. Let things rest and recuperate, so they can continue to produce and flourish.
We need a deeper definition of “infrastructure” to support a sustainable community. It should include cultural centers, land, water, streams – the entire environment.

We need a new perspective on waste management. We need to look at innovative concepts to deal with the landfill issue.

This is an island – therefore, it’s got limited resources.

We need to think 22nd Century. How can we apply a new way of thinking to this Plan? Like innovative wastewater technology – using recycled water. One good example is the new Boys & Girls Club facility. It will be a LEED building that will be utilizing new technologies and growing a native species garden.

Seattle’s “Zero Waste Policy” is another great example.

- We should look more at these ideas when we get to Chapter 4 on Infrastructure.

Page 3-2, the last sentence of 3.0.1, “To many of Waianae’s residents, this landscape is one of unique grandeur and beauty.” That sentence should also emphasize the cultural importance. Community member Poka Laenui drafted possible language to add here (Attachment C).

This language was read and people generally agreed with it. There was a suggestion that maybe it should go in Chapter 2, as part of the Vision and Values section. Overall, the plan needs to include this type of explanation between Native Hawaiians, Waianae community, their lands, and these policies.

Developers can’t just come in here and do what they want without community support. They need to establish a trust-based relationship with the community.

What about the traditional Moku boundaries?

- It may complicate planning if we try to include input from Central O’ahu communities.
- Ok, but we should at least include a map that shows the original boundaries and explain why this is important.

Last policy suggestion (on hand-out):

- The sections in the Chapter that deal with management of natural and cultural resources (3.2 through 3.6) should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

- This is ok, but we don’t want to be exclusive, and limit to only Hawaiians. There can be non-Hawaiians involved as well.

- 3.1 – Boundary Definitions

Possible change (on hand-out):

- Preservation Boundary – change the definition to include access for cultural purposes.

General agreement.
• **3.2 – Preservation of Open Space**
  - The Coastal View Study should be followed regarding view planes.
  - We need to preserve wilderness and wildness, not just open space and nice views.
  - 3.2.2.3 Add “There should be a special use of these areas for Native Hawaiian practices while not excluding the use by the general population. This special use shall be treated as a priority for Native Hawaiian practices in the active management of these lands.”
  - We need to use all tools available to protect open space, including easements via a land trust. We need a local group to provide land stewardship.

• **3.3 – Preservation of Coastal Lands**
  - Possible changes (from hand-out) generally accepted. Discussion follows:
    - There is some debate as to how to manage sand cells in various locations. But it was agreed that in general sand cells should be maintained.
    - 3.3.2.1 Should be clarified to not include or limit future improvements to the Wai‘anae Boat Harbor.
  - Change the name of Nānākuli Beach Park to Kalaniana‘ole Beach Park.
  - After the last sentence on page 3-13, add “The US Army Rest Camp should be destined for eventual return to the general public so that there would be no discrimination among the public’s use between military and civilian population, to the beach.”
  - Possible policies to add:
    - Land use permits should not be granted to any uses of the district’s coastal lands that may degrade the natural ecology, scenic beauty, cultural practices, and increase user conflicts on the beach or in nearshore waters.
    - Permits should be coordinated with DLNR study.
    - Farrington Highway should be re-aligned around Mākaha Beach Park, so people don’t have to cross the highway to get to the restrooms, canoe hale, etc.
    - Contact Henry Kennedy at DOT
    - Every effort should be made to prevent the introduction of marine alien species.
  - Townscape plans to coordinate with the company who is doing the current Wai‘anae Ocean Baseline Study, Tetratech.
3.4 – Preservation of Mountain Forest Lands
  - 3.4.1 Change the 4th paragraph to read “Preservation, restoration, and Native Hawaiian cultural uses of these mountain forest lands and forest resources are of great importance to the Native Hawaiian people, to the Wai‘anae community, and to the people of O‘ahu.”
  - 3.4.2.2 Reforestation Program. Examples of good native trees to plant also includes: Kamani, Ulu, Ohi‘a’ai, Hala, Lama, Kawila, Iliahi, Koae‘a (should be Hala bush, not tree).
  - There should be reforestation up to the firebreak road, and restoration above it.
  - Forest resources are of great cultural, historical, and medicinal importance. They are tied to religious beliefs.
    - We need a kumu to help write about this aspect – about how Hawaiians go to the forests to gather the things they need for hula and lua. Vicky Holt Takamine is one possibility.
    - These herbs and medicines have important cultural stories. They need to be protected and re-planted. There needs to be an understanding of how this links to health and wellness.
    - All of this needs to be incorporated into the Plan.
  - We need: to eradicate invasive species; practices to discourage wildfires; control of pigs and goats.
  - Add Critical Area Habitats – Section 106.
  - Identify critical areas for kalo. We need a policy for re-establishing kalo (not sure what section it goes in); could also be linked to infrastructure idea.
  - Need to do something about the odor problem at the WWTP!
  - 3.4.2.3 City Permitting Powers – “Land use permits should not be granted to any uses of the District’s forest lands that may degrade the natural ecology, scenic beauty, and access to the Native Hawaiian’s practices on these lands.”

3.5 – Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains
  - 3.5.1 Second sentence change to “The streams traditionally provided precious fresh water for drinking, production of special marine life for human and ocean life development, a source of cultural and spiritual development, and agriculture, as well as…”
  - Possible policies to add:
    - Floodplains and estuaries should be protected in order to retain storm water.
  - This Plan should be linked to the Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan.
  - We need to re-look at the drainage channels. Could we use new designs that are more pervious?
  - What about grading permits? What are the rules?
• They are in the NPDES book (has dead fish on the cover).
  o There is also the problem of the flooding coming from the Navy property.
  o Why is water being pumped from Wai‘anae mountains to Wahiawa?
  o Why is water priced so high so that some people can’t afford it?
  o Some farmers used to have their own wells, but their water rights were taken away.
  o We need to include a map with all of the streams labeled.
  o What about restoring brackish wells?
  o Have the resorts stopped the water from flowing? Is that why the trees are dying along the road in Makaha?

• 3.6 – Preservation of Historic & Cultural Resources
  o Possible changes:
    ▪ 3.6.2.1 Second sentence “These important cultural landscapes should be preserved and protected for the benefit of the Native Hawaiian population, the Wai‘anae community, and future generations.”
    ▪ 3.6.2.2 Second and third sentences “Urban, military-controlled, or agricultural development projects should not be permitted to degrade or destroy important historical or cultural sites. ‘Important historical and cultural sites’ should be determined by the State Historic Preservation Division, the Native Hawaiian and larger Wai‘anae community.” (this language was agreed to instead of what’s on hand-out)
    ▪ 3.6.3.1 Second sentence “These programs should include provisions for Native Hawaiian access and for community access to important sites for the observance of cultural practices, and involvement of members of the Native Hawaiian and larger community in the protection and preservation program.
    ▪ 3.6.3.2 Third line “…and protect these important sites and provide for Native Hawaiian and larger community access. The program for Native Hawaiian and larger community access to important sites in Makua Valley…”
    ▪ Fourth sentence “Similar Native Hawaiian and larger community access and forest management programs…”
  o Need to find a balance between allowing access and protecting the sites.
  o Consider setbacks and restrictions to preserve viewplanes to cultural sites.
  o Need protection of seasonal native birds.
DPP should require archeological studies before construction begins, before permits are issued.

4. NEXT STEPS
   - We need to have another meeting to finish Chapter 3 before we go on to Chapter 4.
   - Next meeting:
     - Thursday, September 6th, 6:30 – 9pm
     - Possible locations: St. Philips Church or Hale Na‘au Pono

Attachments

Attachment A – Hand-outs
Attachment B – Draft Vision Statement
Attachment C – Draft Language for 3.0.1 or Chapter 2 (Vision & Values)
   Submitted by Poka Laenui
Attachment D – List of Attendees
CHAPTER 3 – ACCOMPLISHMENTS
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan PAC Meeting #3 – August 11, 2007

3.4 – Mountain Lands
Restoration of indigenous forest plants and animals
- Ka‘ala Kïpuka is a 7.5 acre parcel at Ka‘ala Cultural Learning Center, purchased with help of Trust for Public Land in 2003. Ka‘ala began transforming the Kïpuka forest from alien species to a native dry forest in 2006.
- U.S. Army Ecosystem Restoration Program
  - Ungulate control (over 1,000 goats have been removed from Mäkua)
  - Constructed firebreaks in Kaluakauila and Lower Ohikilolo
- Wai‘anae Forest Partnership is doing restoration of forest areas
- DLNR Wai‘anae Wildfire Management Plan – started but not implemented

3.5 – Streams
Uses within Stream Conservation Corridors should be restricted to natural resources conservation uses and program. No dumping, littering, grading, etc.
- DFM has been maintaining channels and ENV has been doing “Adopt-a-Block” program at Nänäkuli (storm drain stenciling, stream & beach clean-ups, some plantings, etc.)
- BWS is working with Mohala I Ka Wai to restore flow in Mäkaha Stream

3.8 – Residential Land Use
Develop a Special Area Plan for Mäkaha Valley
- Public Review Draft completed in March 2007
Height of Residential Structures has been held to 30 foot max
- Yes, but Hale Wai Vista is still pending

3.10 – Country Towns, Commercial Centers, Gathering Places
Establish phased development of commercial centers and gathering places
- Nänäkuli Village Center – Phase I construction has begun
- Mäkaha Shopping Center re-opened
- Mohala I Ka Wai has preliminary plans for Mäkaha Cultural Center

3.12 Military
Cooperative programs for the protection of cultural and natural resources on military lands
- Army and community groups agreed on access for cultural purposes
CHAPTER 3 – PRELIMINARY COMMENTS
Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan PAC Meeting #3 – August 11, 2007

This hand-out summarizes Wai’anae Community comments on Chapter 3.
(Townscape notes are in italics)

- Townscape will update data throughout the SCP

3.0 – Overview of Land Use & Population Growth (pages 3-1 to 3-7)
(Currently there are no policies or guidelines in this section)

- Possible discussion items to add:
  - Add data and discussion on number of zoning changes that were allowed, where, when, and why allowed.

- Possible policy or guidelines to add:
  - Zoning should be downgraded if not developed after a certain period of time.
  - Development should require improvements to infrastructure. Responsibility of developer vs. responsibility of county should be defined.
  - Unilateral Agreements (associated with undeveloped projects) should include definition of responsibilities.
  - The sections in this Chapter that deal with natural and cultural resource management (3.2 Open Space, 3.3 Coastal Lands, 3.4 Mountain Forest Lands, 3.5 Streams, & 3.6 Cultural Resources) should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

3.1 – Boundary Definitions (pages 3-7 to 3-12)
(Currently there are no policies or guidelines in this section)

- Possible changes:
  - Preservation Boundary – change the definition to include access for cultural purposes (page 2-18 and page 3-9)

3.2 – Preservation of Open Space (policies on pages 3-11 and 3-12)

- Possible items to add:
  - Discuss the cultural significance of open space (as a cultural resource)

- Possible policy to add:
  - Open space should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

3.3 Preservation of Coastal Lands (policies on pages 3-13 to 3-14)

- Possible changes:
  - Add Wai’anae Boat Harbor to list and name the list “Coastal Access Areas”
Add a sentence that reads “Sand cells should be managed in a sustainable manner and impacts from armoring should be considered.”

Change 2nd paragraph on page 3-13 to stress the importance of coastal lands as cultural resources first, then scenic and recreational resources 2nd and 3rd. Possible wording:
“The coastal lands of the Wai’anae District are important cultural resources first and foremost. Generations of Wai’anae residents have utilized this shoreline for fishing, gathering, and accessing the ocean. In addition, they provide scenic and recreational assets for residents and visitors alike. They must be preserved and protected for the benefit of present and future generations.”

3.3.2.1 At end of 2nd paragraph add “including the acquisition of the Wai’anae Kai Military Reservation Beach (or the Pilila’au Recreation Center).”

- Possible policy items to add:
  o Land use permits should not be granted to any uses of the district’s coastal lands that may degrade the natural ecology, scenic beauty, and increase user conflicts on the beach or in nearshore waters.”
  o Coastal lands should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.
  o What activities/uses are allowed and what are not (e.g. laying nets and leaving them should be prohibited).

3.4 Preservation of Mountain Forest Lands (policies and guidelines on page 3-15)

- Possible changes:
  o 3.4.1 Change 4th paragraph to read “Preservation, restoration, and Native Hawaiian cultural uses of these mountain forest lands and forest resources are of great importance to the Wai’anae community and to the people of O‘ahu.”
  o 3.4.2.2 Forest Reforestation Program. Should include:
    ▪ Examples of good native trees to plant: Kamani, Ulu, Ohi’a’ai (Mountain Apple), and Hala trees
    ▪ Need to remove kiawe and other alien species
    ▪ Possible groups who could take the lead on this reforestation.

- Possible policy items to add:
  o The health and preservation of the lowlands are crucial to the protection of the uplands areas. Therefore, lowlands need appropriate reforestation:
    ▪ No alien species should be allowed beyond a designated boundary
    ▪ Below the firebreak roads, agro-forestry food crops and raw materials are allowable, if appropriate
    ▪ Create GMO-free zones
  o Develop and implement a community-based wildfire management plan.
o Mountain Forest Lands should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

---

3.5 Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains (policies on pages 3-18 and 3-19)

- Possible changes:
  o 3.5.2.3 “Uses and activities within these Stream Conservation Corridors should be restricted to…” add “the cultivation of kalo, and controlled diversion of stream waters for agricultural purposes.”
  o 3.5.3.3 & 3.5.2.4 Need movement on and enforcement of Establish Stream Conservation Corridors and establishment of Minimum In-Stream Flow Standards ▪ Maybe work with BWS to take the lead on establishing in-stream flow standards for all perennial streams in Wai‘anae.

- Possible policy items to add:
  o Streams should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

---

3.6 Historic and Cultural Resources (policies and guidelines on pages 3-22 and 3-23)

- Possible changes:
  o 3.6.2.2 Change 2nd sentence to “Urban, military-controlled, or agricultural development projects should not be permitted to degrade or destroy important historical or cultural sites.”
  o 3rd sentence: “‘Important historical and cultural sites’ should be determined by the State Historic Preservation District, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and the Wai‘anae community.”
  o 3.6.3.1 Change 2nd line to “…found on all city-owned land within the District…” All of these sites should have signs that tell the name, mo‘olelo, rules, etc.
  o 3.6.3.2 In 3rd line add “and protect all Hawaiian Cultural sites and provide for community access.” All of these sites should have signs that tell the name, mo‘olelo, rules, etc.
  o Figure 3-2 (page 3-24): update map to include inventory of cultural sites for Mākua

- Possible policy items to add:
  o Important cultural sites should have signs (include name, mo‘olelo, rules, etc.).
  o All Environmental Impact Statements should require a cultural impact statement that is done by a certified cultural expert.
  o Historical & Cultural Resources should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group.

---

3.7 Preservation of Agricultural Lands (policies and guidelines on pages 3-29 and 3-30)
- *Townscape has plans to meet with MA‘O Farm in September to discuss this section. Are there other farmers we should talk to?*

### 3.8 Residential Land Use (policies and guidelines on pages 3-36 to 3-38)

- **Possible changes:**
  - 3.8.3.1 Maybe change maximum height of residential structures from 30 ft to 25 ft. Add a statement that just because HHFDC gets an exemption to the maximum height limit (if they do for the Hale Wai Vista project), it shouldn’t set an example for others.

- **Possible policy items to add:**
  - The need for affordable housing
  - ‘Ohana Housing concept
  - Unilateral Agreement responsibilities; identify parties or successors to the agreements

### 3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses (policies and guidelines on pages 3-40 and 3-41)

- **Possible policy items to add:**
  - “Prohibit big box stores”
  - Create a Special District for Wai‘anae Town Center
  - Recommend the building of a light industrial park (150-200 acres)

### 3.10 Towns, Commercial Centers, Gathering Places (policies and guidelines on pages 3-42 to 3-47)

- New idea for community gathering places (brief presentation by community member)

### 3.11 Parks (policies and guidelines on pages 3-52 and 3-53)

- Need implementation of policies in this section already

### 3.12 Military Land Use (policies on page 3-55)

- **Possible changes:**
  - Re-write section to reflect present situation including towers at Lualualei, ordnance dumped offshore, and cumulative impacts on Wai‘anae community.

- **Possible policy items to add:**
  - Create a Plan for the transition back to civilian control.

Also
* Can Townscape talk to the military to find out their plans?
Attachment B – Draft Vision Statement

THE VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF THE WAI’ANAE DISTRICT

IS THAT OUR MO’OMO’O (CHILDREN INCLUDING THOSE YET UNBORN) WILL BE ABLE TO HAVE ALL OF THEIR NEEDS MET.

To fulfill this vision, we are called upon to keep in the forefront of our planning, the children of our future. All decisions made which impact the Wai’anae society, must be made with the children in the forefront of our minds, including:

A child must have a safe and healthy physical environment in which to be raised; we must maintain our environment in a pristine condition as possible. It therefore behooves us to protect the physical environment from degradation which would deprive our children of the use and enjoyment of her elements: the kai (salt waters), wai (fresh waters), ea (air, sky and heavens), ‘aina (land, soil), and all of the animate and inanimate aspects of nature which make up this physical environment. Our children must have access to our mountains, valleys and sea. Activities that threaten our environmental conditions or interfere with such access must be treated with the greatest caution, and if approved due to special circumstances, must have deadlines for which the activities will be discontinued and reversed in order to return the environmental conditions and accessibility to its earlier state.

Interlaced within a child’s physical environment is a social environment containing cultures, religions, history, family life, educational experiences, health and healthy living conditions. Our children must be raised within a culture of caring which expresses respect for all peoples, encourages opportunities for love, compassion, kindness, and inclusiveness. Our children must be raised in environments of peace and righteousness - in pono. These environments include the child’s needs for healthy relationships within family, neighborhoods, and wider ahupua’a.

Opportunities for our children to have religious or spiritual guidance and the ability to identify their own chosen religious or spiritual followings (if any) without undue pressure from peers, institutions, or family members should be available to every child.

Our children should be raised with a clear understanding of their history, the legacy of the native Hawaiian people and of the Hawaiian nation. They must be given the opportunity to compare people’s histories, to explore their own visions of their futures, to challenge authority, and to question “conventional wisdom.”

Our children must be raised in an environment of strong, kind, and loving families, and larger circles of support in an extended lei of guiding children by an extended ‘ohana.
Our children must be given educational opportunities compatible with their ways or styles of learning. Their educational experiences should include literacy and oracy. It must include science and art, poetry and politics, physical and mental development, character building, and responsibility. Every child’s educational challenge should be met with vigor and determination. Education must support a full lifetime of learning. Education should be a community practice and not merely one or another bureaucratic function of a society.

Our children should have immediate access to health and food resources: medicine and food from our environment to meet their physical as well as spiritual, emotional, and psychological needs. They are to have knowledge of their own conditions, and have experience and opportunity in using a variety of medical and sustenance methods to meet their needs.

All changes to the physical environment planned by the society must be done within this framework of the community vision.
Attachment C – Draft Language for 3.0.1 or Chapter 2 (Vision & Values)
Submitted by Poka Laenui

In the Native Hawaiian tradition, as shared by many indigenous peoples throughout the
world, and by increasing number of migrant populations as they become more
understanding and aware of native thought, the earth is the foundation of her people. It is
the seat of spirituality, the fountain from which indigenous cultures and languages
flourish. The earth is the first historian, the keeper of events and the cradle for the bones
of indigenous ancestors. It provides food, medicine, shelter and clothing. It is the source
of the people’s independence. It is our mother.

Given the special significance the land and surrounding sea plays for the native Hawaiian
people, and the strong commitment of the Wai’anae community to pay special regard for
this significance in the planning for a sustainable Wai’anae community envisioned into
the future, there is hereby created a special "Development" Criteria for protection and
preservation of specifically Native Hawaiian kuleana. This kuleana would include the
protection of cultural, spiritual, and social "kipuka" where ever found in their various
manifestations. This would include:

  a) Long traditional use by Native Hawaiians (for example, fishing, temporarily
residing, enjoying recreation, conducting cultural practices (uniki, kapu kai, hiu wai, etc.)
at Makua beach);

  b) Observations of historic/cultural/political significance (for example, resurrection or
reenactment of the Makahiki activities);

  c) Protected access rights, and specific delineation of said rights to resources for
religious, cultural, sustenance, and traditional economic purposes, along with appropriate
protection and preservation of certain delineated areas such that these resources will be
protected for the future generations of Native Hawaiians to enjoy. The assertion of a
system of "kapu" if necessary, against the general community for accessing certain
resources, is created. For example, if Limu Kohu is found to be wanting in the general
community, and this is regarded by the Native Hawaiians as a necessary medication for
certain illnesses, this ocean vegetation could be regarded as off-limits to the general
population, or to the population for a period of time, or for a particular area, or for a
particular purpose. Any land or ocean activity which would have a negative effect to this
limu would be prohibited.

  d) Special regard for traditional social and cultural patterns of Native Hawaiian living
and hubs of Native Hawaiian interaction in their living styles and practices. Such living
styles should be shown to have been rooted in Native Hawaiian lifestyle and not merely
an economically formed pattern of living. Large families, households, and compounds
among related and associated family members bound together by familial, rather than economic, relationship, should be permitted.

e) Sensitivity and respect for the appreciation of the Native Hawaiian understanding of the land and the sea and of all life forms which live within these domains as having a kinship with the Native Hawaiian people. As a result, there is a close and abiding reverence to land and sea, a sense of ancestry which maintains a continuity to the people living on the land today and into the generations of the future *(Mo’omo’o)*.

There are probably many more aspects of this Native Hawaiian "kipuka" which should be established as additional criteria for consideration in the development of land use which protects and preserves for our Mo’omo’o this special place in which we live. These criteria should be applied across all of the boundaries of land uses in this plan.

Justification for the establishment of these special criteria can be found in many places, including the ILO Convention on the protection of Indigenous Peoples (Convention 169), the draft U.N. Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the World Council of Indigenous People's Statement of Indigenous Peoples Rights.

The present plan already contains some element or recognition of the importance of the Native Hawaiian population, especially in its comments of the various ahupa’a having great cultural importance to the native Hawaiian community.
## ATTACHMENT D – Sign-In List for the Wai'anae SCP Comprehensive Review Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #3 – August 11, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Akama, William</td>
<td>Leeward Community College at Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Akiona, Bill</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Burgess, Puanani</td>
<td>WCCADC/Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Davenport, Shirley</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 DeCambra, Ho'oipo</td>
<td>Legal Services for Children</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dodge, Fred</td>
<td>KFI</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gay, Lucy</td>
<td>Office of the Assoc. VP for Commty Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Grace, Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Greenwood, Alice</td>
<td>Leialii Manaolana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hanohano, Kehau</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Hew Len, Kalena</td>
<td>Waianae Kai Homestead Association</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Hutton, Don</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kahikina, Mike</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kanahele, Kamaki</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kaneaiakala, Alva</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Keliikoa-Kamai, Kapua</td>
<td>WVHHCA &amp; Hokkon</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Laenui, Poka</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Malinousky, Donalaia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Rezentes, Cynthia</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Saito, Ralph</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Saylors, Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Saylors, Denise</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei-Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shimabukuro, Maile</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Suiso, Mark</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupuaa</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Tapuro, Lani</td>
<td>Leialii Manao Lani</td>
<td>Waianae/Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES – MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2007

PULE – BY AUNTIE AGNES COPE

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE

- Harmonee Williams of Townscape gave a brief welcome and overview of the meeting agenda. The purpose of the meeting is to finish the review of Chapter 3 – Land Use.
- The previous meeting we covered Sections 3.0 through 3.6. This meeting is intended to cover Sections 3.7 through 3.12. The next meeting will be on Chapter 4 – Infrastructure.
- Townscape has begun compiling a list of other people we should talk to for information on this update. Please add to it as we go through the Chapter. (This list is included in these notes as Item 4.)

2. CHAPTER 3 – BRIEF REVIEW OF LAST MEETING ON CHAPTER 3 (SECTIONS 3.0 TO 3.6)

Additional suggestions for these Sections include:

- **3.5 – Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains**
  - **3.5.2 Add:**
    - Retain rainfall especially in upper sections to reduce flooding in lower areas
    - Capture runoff without increasing flood exposure
    - Re-establish estuaries

- **3.6 – Preservation of Historic & Cultural Resources**
  - **Page 3-21:** change word “exploit” to “gather”.
- Actually, this section needs much more information on the cultural history and setting of Wai‘anae. There should be a separate paragraph(s) on the spiritual aspect and significance of the area.
  - Kamaki offered to write something on this topic.
- Place name of Wai‘anae Valley = Pu‘ea?
  - Pu‘ea refers to the back of the valley, not the entire thing.
  - We can add this if someone knows the exact info and can present it to TSI.
- Page 3-21: Name “Poka‘i” should be changed to “Malaea”; also change “countries” to “districts”.
- 3.6.3.2: There was a suggestion to remove Army as example of pro-active and cooperative action to protect and preserve sites. This led to a larger discussion on the history of these lands, pre-military, and who the original “land-owners” were. It was decided that the entire paragraph should be re-written, and it should include the mid-90s court case involving Mālama O Mākua.
  - Walterbea agreed to help gather and summarize this info.
- We need to change the definition of preservation to include access (throughout the SCP, as discussed in previous mtgs).
- The Cultural Resources Map on page 3-24 is incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading. Can we insert a new one?
  - We can try to find out if more recent/accurate information is available or if a new map has been created by DLNR or SHPD. However, our budget does not include hiring someone to do this.
- This map just shows a handful of sites, when in reality the entire Wai‘anae District is full of sites – it’s a cultural (or archeological) landscape.
- Maybe we should include a date on the map and a disclaimer that includes something about how this map was created by DLNR in 1999 (find out actual year) and it only represents what was known at that time, and those sites that were known by those conducting the study. In addition, it is only as accurate as the tools that were used at that time, and by those using those tools. There are many more sites within the district, and this map should not be the final authority on what should be considered an important cultural site, and its exact location.
- It is recommended that a new cultural assessment be conducted and a new Cultural Resources Map be created that incorporates local knowledge and utilizes the most up-to-date mapping technology. (Add this as a policy suggestion as well.)
3. CHAPTER 3 – DISCUSSION ON SECTIONS 3.7 TO 3.12

- Williams then closed the discussion on Sections 3.0 to 3.6 in order to move on to the second half of Chapter 3. Anyone with additional thoughts on any of the chapters is welcomed to call or email Townscape with those.

- In the ensuing discussion, a few points were made that refer to the entire SCP, not specific chapters. They are mentioned here:
  - All photos in SCP should have captions.
  - Any policy that may also be covered elsewhere, such as in the Land Use Ordinance, should be referenced and/or cited.

- **3.7 – Preservation of Agricultural Lands**
  - Townscape has plans to meet with Gary and Kukui Maunakea-Forth of MA'O Farms to discuss what needs to be added/updated in the overview of Ag section (3.7.1). We will also talk to them about proposed solutions and policies. Is there anyone else we should talk to?
    - Several names were suggested. They are included in the “Other People/Agencies for Townscape to Talk to” list (Item 4 of these notes).
  - **Page 3-26:** Under “Issues” add:
    - Illegal dumping (including hazardous waste material)
    - Availability of non-Potable water
  - Discussion on “Easements”
    - Is there a way to prevent right-of-way easements through farm land? (i.e., HECO putting power lines through a field)
    - Instead of “Agricultural Easement,” don’t we want land restricted to Ag use only?
      - That’s what is meant by an easement in this context.
    - We need to have this definition included in the Plan so it is clear what we mean, and everyone understands.
    - We should include Land Trusts as a method of protection, and Ag Easements are related to this, so it could all be presented and explained together (Cynthia is a good reference on this topic if needed.)
  - Make sure to emphasize the importance of Ag to Wai‘anae.
  - Agricultural lands should increase over the next 5 years.

- **3.8 – Residential Land Use**
  - **3.8.3.1:** Suggestion was given to possibly change the maximum height limit of residential structures from 30 feet to 25 feet. Townscape should also check the Zoning Criteria, in the Land Use Ordinance – it may already say 25 feet.
Affordable Housing

- What is “affordable?” For whom? We need to use the median income of the Wai‘anae District, not of the state.
- “Low-income housing” has a bad reputation, and in some cases, it is true. How can we create low-income housing that doesn’t fulfill its reputation?
- If we build “affordable housing” in Wai‘anae, people from outside the district will buy it and move here. We need a way to limit new affordable housing to residents. We’re the ones who need it and really want to live here, in our home.
- No more development should be allowed in Wai‘anae until we can guarantee that it will be for our residents.
- Who are the “people of Wai‘anae”? How do we define ourselves? Wai‘anae has struggled through much adversity. We have struggled to create a community fabric that is the foundation of what this place is about. We need to continue that struggle and create a place that is strongly rooted in our values; a place that has such a strong sense of identity that newcomers should feel the need to adapt. And we need that struggle to be identified and documented here. Puanani can help with the proper wording.
- Wai‘anae people are an agricultural, fishing, culture-practicing people, mauka to makai. We need to show our solid cultural base, our integrity, and make this a district of special people that is recognized by government. There is a Supreme Court case about this. Maybe this could be a way to get government backing and participation.
- Wai‘anae does self-police itself in many ways. We need a way to extend this to have minimum characteristics or requirements for new residents. We can extend our aloha, or we can do the opposite if people do not respect our community.
- Many more ideas were expressed on these themes, and it was agreed that something needs to be written for the SCP that explains this. Poka and Lucy agreed to help work on this.

A suggestion was emailed to Townscape on possible language regarding a policy on ½ -way houses (see hand-out at end of notes).

Group discussion led to the conclusion that although the community is definitely concerned about sex offenders and individuals with a violent criminal history living together and near schools, there is already a Federal and/or State Law(s) that dictates policy on this. That needs to be researched and used as a SCP guideline or policy. (The Neighborhood Board already decided this.)
• **3.9 – Commercial and Industrial Uses**
  o **Possible policies to add:**
    - Prohibit Big Box Stores
    - Recommend the building of a **light industrial park** (150-200 acres)
      - This is another example of something that we want in order to help Wai‘anae people and our economy. If an industrial park is built here, and it offers cheap rent, then people from all over the island could utilize and benefit from it. How can we limit it to Wai‘anae residents?
      - If it was on DHHL land we could set limits. Maybe we should look into creating a partnership with them on this type of project.
      - We should encourage partnerships of all kinds for this project idea.

• **3.10 – Country Towns, Rural Community Commercial Centers and Gathering Places**
  o Ralph Saito gave a brief presentation on an idea to create gathering places at the beach parks in each of the 4 major ahupua’a. The concept then extends to include a walking/jogging/biking path that connects all of these gathering places, and the community. The path would be wide enough for Police Cushmans to utilize for patrolling the area. It could also be lit with photovoltaic-powered lights, have safety phones along the path, and water fountains.
  o The benefits of this concept include connecting the community, allowing people to utilize the beaches and feel safe doing so, providing a venue for exercise and possible sporting events, allowing people to get around the district by bike in a safe way, and many others.
  o **Ralph will help write up this idea for the Plan.**
  o This led to a discussion of the plans for the land between the Wai‘anae High School and the Wai‘anae Boat Harbor (more details documented under the notes for Section 3.11 on Parks). Information for this project to be shared between Ralph, Rodlyn, and Alva, and the write-up to be worked on with Townscape.
  o Will this idea be affected by the SCP policy of no new development makai of Farrington Highway?
    - There should be a way around it since small structures for gathering places should be all that are needed.
3.11 – Parks and Recreational Areas
  o There needs to be implementation of the policies already in this section. The 2000 SCP says that we need more parks, yet they have not been built. It should be a simple matter of the Parks Department following their own standards of a certain number of parks and park acreage per size of population (standards shown on Page 3-51).
  o Regarding these standards, what seems to be most needed is sports fields. For example there are only 2 football fields in the whole district. Maybe we could say something like “Wai‘anae needs X number of recreational fields by X date.”
  o There also needs to be proper maintenance of parks, especially beach park comfort stations.
  o There needs to be a provision for permitted camping – both for County and State Parks.
  o 3.11.2.2: Does this policy for “No More Golf Courses” include no new driving ranges?
    - It shouldn’t since the proposed driving range would be an addition to a currently existing golf course.
  o There has been discussion on plans for a Hawaiian Cultural Park on the land between the Wai‘anae High School and the Wai‘anae Boat Harbor. It incorporates the old shrimp farm located here, opportunities for school kids (especially those in the Special Education program), and other opportunities for marine activities. These ideas could be put into the Plan – need info from Ralph, Rodlyn, and Alva.

3.12 – Military Land Use
  o We need to re-write this whole section.
  o There needs to be a discussion on the original “land-owners” of this land that is now owned by the military – a true history.
  o We need to write a full Transition Plan for when, not if, the military leaves. We don’t want that land to go under State control. We want it to go back to the original land-owners – the people of Wai‘anae.
  o We need to know what the military is currently using the land for, and what their plans are for giving up that land.
  o Kamaki is involved in a court case involving the US Navy and DHHL.
  o William Aila will write something for this section (with possible help from Kamaki).
4. OTHER PEOPLE/AGENCIES FOR TOWNSCAPE TO TALK TO

- **Agencies**
  - DOT – Department of Transportation
  - DOBOR – Dept of Boating and Ocean Recreation
  - DOFAW – Dept of Fish and Wildlife
  - DOA – Dept of Agriculture
  - DTS – Dept of Transportation Services
  - BWS – Board of Water Supply
  - ENV – Dept of Environmental Services (deals with solid waste and wastewater) [not confirmed]
  - DPR – Dept of Parks and Rec
  - DDC – Dept of Design and Construction
  - DBEDT – Dept of Business and Economic Devlpmt (separate mtg)
  - State Parks (separate mtg)

- **Farmers & Ag-related Organizations**
  - Gary Maunakea-Forth (MA’O)
  - Vicki Domingo (grows exotic vegetables)
  - ‘Ohana Farmers – Kimo Keli‘i
  - Hoa ‘Äina O Mäkaha Farms – Gigi Cocoquio
  - Mikilua Farm Bureau – Phyllis Shimabukuro
  - West O’ahu Farm Bureau
  - Produce Wholesalers that buy Wai’anae products
  - Local Slaughter House
  - NRCS Field Office in Aiea (Chad Kacir)

- **Kumu Hula** (Vicki Holt Takamine was suggested)

- **Military**
  - US Army
  - US Navy

5. NEXT STEPS

- Townscape will meet with most of the agencies listed above on September 17th. If you have any specific questions for us to ask, please call or email us before then.

- Next meeting on Chapter 4, Infrastructure:
  - Tuesday, September 25th, 6:30 – 9pm
  - Possible locations: St. Philips Church or Hale Na’au Pono

Attachments

**Attachment A – Hand-outs**
**Attachment B – List of Attendees**
Attachment A – Hand-outs

The 1st hand-out was a copy of the notes from the August 11th PAC meeting. This was primarily for reference, and is not included here.

The 2nd hand-out included suggested additions and changes to Sections 3.0 to 3.6 (below).

The 3rd hand-out was a summary of community comments on Sections 3.7 to 3.12, which were used as an outline for the group discussion (it follows the 2nd hand-out).

ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY COMMENTS ON SECTIONS 3.0 TO 3.6 SINCE AUGUST 11, 2007

- 3.5 – Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains
  - 3.5.2 Add:
    - Retain rainfall especially in upper sections to reduce flooding in lower areas
    - Capture runoff without increasing flood exposure
    - Re-establish estuaries

- 3.6 – Preservation of Historic & Cultural Resources
  - Possible changes:
    - Page 3-21: change word “exploit” to “use”, “gather”, or “collect”
    - Place name of Wai’anae Valley = Pu’ea?
    - Name Poka‘I should be changed to Malaea?
    - Page 3-23: Remove Army as example of pro-active and cooperative action to protect and preserve sites
SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COMMENTS FROM SECTIONS 3.7 TO 3.12

3.7 Preservation of Agricultural Lands (policies and guidelines on pages 3-29 and 3-30)
- Townscape has plans to meet with MA’O Farm in September to discuss this section. Are there other farmers we should talk to?

3.8 Residential Land Use (policies and guidelines on pages 3-36 to 3-38)
- Possible changes:
  o 3.8.3.1 Maybe change maximum height of residential structures from 30 ft to 25 ft. Add a statement that just because HHFDC gets an exemption to the maximum height limit (if they do for the Hale Wai Vista project), it shouldn’t set an example for others.

- Possible policy items to add:
  o The need for affordable housing
  o ‘Ohana Housing concept
  o Unilateral Agreement responsibilities; identify parties or successors to the agreements

3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses (policies and guidelines on pages 3-40 and 3-41)
- Possible policy items to add:
  o “Prohibit big box stores”
  o Create a Special District for Wai’anae Town Center
  o Recommend the building of a light industrial park (150-200 acres)

3.10 Towns, Commercial Centers, Gathering Places (policies and guidelines on pages 3-42 to 3-47)
- New idea for community gathering places (brief presentation by community member)

3.11 Parks (policies and guidelines on pages 3-52 and 3-53)
- Need implementation of policies in this section already
3.12 Military Land Use (policies on page 3-55)

- **Possible changes:**
  - Re-write section to reflect present situation including towers at Lualualei, ordnance dumped offshore, and cumulative impacts on Wai’anae community.

- **Possible policy items to add:**
  - Create a Plan for the transition back to civilian control.

Also
* Can Townscape talk to the military to find out their plans?
### ATTACHMENT B – List of Attendees for the Wai'anae SCP Comprehensive Review Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #4 – September 6, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Aki, Georgette</td>
<td>Waianae Community Outreach</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Awana, Karen</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Brown, David</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Brown, Rodlyn</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Burgess, Puanani</td>
<td>WCCADC/Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  Cope, Agnes</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  Davenport, Shirley</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  Gay, Lucy</td>
<td>Office of the Assoc. VP for Commty Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  Hanohano, Kehau</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  Kanahele, Kamaki</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Kaneaiakala, Alva</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16  Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  Keliikoa-Kamai, Kapua</td>
<td>WVHHCA &amp; Hokkon</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18  Laenui , Poka</td>
<td>Waianae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Makanani, Kaiawe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Manabu, James</td>
<td>Concerned parent &amp; grandparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maunakea, Ruby</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Patterson, Pat</td>
<td>Concerned Elders &amp; Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rezentes, Cynthia</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Saito, Ralph</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 5
Location: Hale Na‘au Pono
Date: October 8, 2007
From: Harmonee Williams
TSI Team: Sherri Hiraoka & Harmonee Williams
Attachment A – Meeting Hand-out
Attachment B – List of Attendees

NOTES – MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2007

PULE – BY KAMAKI KANAHELE

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
   - Harmonee Williams of Townscape gave a brief welcome and overview of the meeting agenda. The purpose of the meeting is to review Chapter 4 – Infrastructure.
   - This is the last Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting that is scheduled for in-depth review of the SCP. After this meeting, Townscape will begin writing a preliminary draft of the Revised Wai‘anae SCP. The next PAC meeting will be to review and revise that preliminary draft.
   - There are 3 hand-outs:
     - The 1st is a summary of community comments on Chapter 4 issues from past meetings.
     - The 2nd is a summary of Townscape’s meetings with various City and State agencies held on September 17th. When appropriate, Williams referenced these notes.
     - The 3rd is a draft Scorecard.
   - Regarding the draft Scorecard (“SCP Performance Measures”):
     - DPP included the process of developing the Scorecard in the SCP Update so that the community could point out what worked well, what didn’t, and then revise accordingly. It was meant to be a starting place.
     - This Committee discussed an earlier version of the Scorecard, but it was never finalized.
     - Townscape asked the PAC members to take a look at this draft and if time allows, we can discuss at the end of the meeting. If not, please call or email any comments to Townscape.
2. **CHAPTER 4 – INFRASTRUCTURE**

- **4.0 – Infrastructure Overview**
  - All of Wai’anae is a cultural landscape. Our natural and cultural resources were our original infrastructure. New infrastructure (i.e., water lines, roads, etc.) should take our cultural infrastructure into consideration, and go around it whenever possible.
  - All new infrastructure should be in place before ground is even broken for new development.
  - We need to set standards for rural infrastructure, and make sure it takes cultural infrastructure into account. We should set guidelines for the City in their decision-making, including the order of our infrastructure priorities.
  - Currently, any excavation requires consultation with SHPD. It should also include consultation with the Burial Council and the community, regarding mo‘olelo, place names, and local knowledge.
  - We need complete surveys of the area.

- **4.1 – Transportation Systems**
  - Perhaps the organization of this section should be by types of transportation, such as roads, railroads, and boats.
  - **Farrington Highway**
    - Would be safer if the current laws were enforced. For example, shouldn’t all trucks be forced to travel in the right lane?
    - Another idea is to add deceleration and acceleration lanes, and bus pull-outs. These additions may create some bends in the highway, which would also serve as traffic calming features.
  - **Bypass road**
    - Much needed – for emergencies/evacuations, for commuting, for truck traffic, to make Farrington safer, etc.;
    - it might invite more people to move here if the commute wasn’t so bad (catalyst for more development);
    - should we include a light industrial area near the Lualualei end if the proposed bypass road, so we could truck goods directly over the Wai’anae mountain range, without the trucks entering our residential areas or using Farrington?
    - Unsettled debate on need for a light industrial area – does it stay with our main guiding principles of being a rural, agricultural community – and where should it go?
- Generally, people are in favor of both the bypass road and light industrial area, but we don’t need to decide on a specific location. (Bypass Road could go through Pōhakea or Kolekole, but not around Ka‘ena.)
- Some specific concerns include: cultural sites, coordination with DHHL, and is this the right use of “Preservation” and “Ag” lands (per SCP)?
- Is Ag land in that part of Lualualei any good? Yes, just need to find the right crop.
  o **Less Roads**
    - We could use more shipping/water routes and become less dependent on roads. Our community is in a great position to utilize the ocean and coastline.
    - We should be focusing on making ourselves a self-sustaining community that doesn’t need to travel in and out; since we produce our own food and other goods; we don’t get all of our goods delivered.
    - Couldn’t we expand our agriculture to the point where we would want to export? Light industrial businesses could support Ag (vacuum cooling, packaging, processing, etc.)
    - Guiding principle for entire SCP: Ag lands should not shrink.

- **4.2 – Potable Water Systems**
  - Add a policy about reducing “impact fees” to farmers.
  - This section should refer to the Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan (Townscape, 2007), and re-state the policy recommendations put forth in that document.

- **4.3 – Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems**
  - Williams reported that regarding the odor from the Wai‘anae WTP, Environmental Services (ENV) stated that they suspect the problem to be the collection system. It was created to handle a larger capacity than it is currently receiving, and so the relatively low volumes of sewerage may be turning septic and causing the odor. They are currently working on an island-wide Odor Mitigation Masterplan.
  - The community said that the odors are a relatively new problem, so that answer doesn’t really make sense. They would like to see and comment on a public review draft of the Odor Mitigation Masterplan when it becomes available.
  - ENV needs to do odor testing before and after leachate gets dumped into the WWTP as well.
  - DHHL needs to help residents connect to the sewer system. It’s a public health issue because some of the septic systems are leaking.
Actually, it needs to be a collaborative effort with the City.
We need to direct the City to development a pay structure for loans/payback for those who take the initiative to do so.
  - Do new developments have to have their own wastewater systems?
    Why are septic tanks or cesspools still allowable?

**4.4 – Electrical Power & Communications**
  - It would be great if we could create our own energy, but how would we distribute it?
  - We definitely want to encourage the use of alternative energy sources. Let’s add a policy that says “All new developments need to be powered at least 50% by alternative energy.”
    - That would bring CDBG funds.
  - We need better lighting on main roads, especially Farrington Highway.
  - Why are photovoltaics so expensive?
  - We should be creative and think outside the box when looking at “best practices”. What about using the WWTP as a source of energy? Or other “wild” ideas.
  - Our policy suggestions should recommend the latest technology that allows us to be as sustainable/green as possible.

**4.5 – Drainage Systems**
  - This section should also refer to the Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan (Townscape, 2007), and re-state the policy recommendations put forth in that document.

**4.6 – Solid Waste Handling & Disposal**
  - No new landfills on the Wai‘anae Coast is a must. We also need to be clear that we don’t want anything called a “recycling facility” or some other name that is really just a cover-up for another landfill.
  - We would like a real recycling center.
  - We should include a brief history of the environmental injustices to our area.
  - Convenience stations:
    - We need at least one more, maybe one in each valley
    - Better pick-up service
    - Increase in number, hours of operation, and/or capacity
  - Rural standards should include above-ground services
  - Maybe we could reclaim the old Wai‘anae landfill site for a park like Kaka‘ako (if no public health risks). Actually, it would be better to have a park somewhere else, but we just want to be sure that it is never re-opened as a landfill.
4.7 – Civic, Public Safety & Education Facilities
   - Ambulance service – yes, we need to expand to having a 2nd ambulance unit in operation 24 hours/day. It would be nice to have an ambulance take Wai‘anae residents to places other than Pali Momi, Kaiser, and Hawaii Medical Center West.
   - Encourage emergency center in WCCHC to be open 24 hours. WCCHC needs an endowment to provide that. It would be great to have an expansion of services to create a 1st rate center all around.
   - We need more vocational schools.
   - Public schools need smaller class sizes (helpful if more, smaller schools), and to encourage teacher retention.
   - Encourage charter and immersion schools.

4.8 – Health Care Facilities
   - Encourage expansion of WCCHC.

Other
   - Encourage local cemetery, morgue, crematorium (put in Chapter 3).

3. OTHER PEOPLE/AGENCIES FOR TOWNSCAPE TO TALK TO

   Agencies
   - DOBOR – Dept of Boating and Ocean Recreation
   - DPR – Dept of Parks and Rec
   - DBEDT – Dept of Business and Economic Devlpmt (separate mtg)
   - State Parks (separate mtg)

   Farmers & Ag-related Organizations
   - Gary Maunakea-Forth (MA’O)
   - Vicki Domingo (grows exotic vegetables)
   - ‘Ohana Farmers – Kimo Keli‘i
   - Hoa ‘Āina O Mākaha Farms – Gigi Cocoquio
   - Mikilua Farm Bureau – Phyllis Shimabukuro
   - West O‘ahu Farm Bureau
   - Produce Wholesalers that buy Wai‘anae products
   - Local Slaughter House
   - NRCS Field Office in Aiea (Chad Kacir)

   Kumu Hula (Vicki Holt Takamine was suggested)

   Military
   - US Army
   - US Navy
4. NEXT STEPS

- Townscape will work on draft of Revised WSCP. Those who offered to write suggestions for the draft, please submit to Townscape ASAP.
- Townscape will meet with as many of the individuals and agencies listed as possible.
- Next meeting will probably be in November.

Attachments
Attachment A – Hand-outs
Attachment B – List of Attendees
4.0 – Overview of Infrastructure (there is currently no overview or intro to this section)

- We need a deeper definition of “infrastructure” to support a sustainable community. It should include cultural centers, land, water, streams – the entire environment.
- “Infrastructure” should include libraries, off-grid systems, recycling, schools, playgrounds, food production, water, the land that supports us, the ecosystems that surround us, etc.
- We also need to define who is responsible for various infrastructure systems. The Plan should help us to define infrastructure needs. We need a clear definition of who is responsible for infrastructure.
- We need to think 22nd Century. How can we apply a new way of thinking to this Plan? Like innovative technologies. One good example is the new Boys & Girls Club facility. It will be a LEED building.
- The Rocky Mountain Institute has lots of technological concepts we could use.
- We may need to add Sections for these newly defined infrastructure systems, and also some for those not currently delineated, such as cemeteries.
- We may also want to look at possible legislative actions, such as the “Zero Waste Strategy” example (attached).

4.1 – Transportation Systems (pages 4-1 to 4-7)

- **General comments:**
  - Stay within the City Standards – in other words, roads in the district should be up to the City’s Standards so that they receive service.
  - We need rural standards that the city agrees to.
  - Need more creative use of transportation.
  - Zipper lane should come closer to Wai’anae (as close as Honokai Hale).

- **4.1.2**
  - We want to provide pedestrian and biking safety
  - **4.1.2.3 and 4.1.2.4 Emergency, Reliever, and Second Access Roads**
    - Idea proposed to open the Lualualei Homestead Road and Kolekole Pass for short-term solution to emergency access needs. Long-term, Wai’anae needs a Second Access Road for everyday commuting.
    - Another idea is to connect existing roads within District to create a Reliever Road (although this is the basic idea behind the Wai’anae Coast Emergency Access Route; it may never be completed).
4.2 – Potable Water Systems (pages 4-7 to 4-9)

1. Plan doesn’t address non-potable water. We don’t have enough.
2. We need to work with the military to get them to not pump so much water from the aquifers that they are not using.
3. We need a policy that has a strong water resource inventory.
4. There needs to be a discussion of uses of surface water.
5. Integrate this Section with Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan

4.3 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems (pages 4-9 to 4-12)

1. There needs to be a discussion of the city’s failure to maintain the sewer system and prevent saltwater intrusion, and the possibility of repairs so that wastewater could be re-used.
2. Find a way to use gray water at a residential level, how to fit this within State/Federal Policy.
3. The treatment plant effluent should be used for recycled water.
4. We need to do something about the odor problem at the WWTP. Most of the island’s other WTPs don’t smell that bad.

4.4 Electrical Power and Communications (page 4-12)

1. We want to encourage the use of solar alternatives, as well as other alternative energy sources, at both the micro and macro level. Add solar generation capabilities and sell back to HECO.
2. City should look at their properties to site antennas for cell phones.

4.5 Drainage Systems (pages 4-13 to 4-15)

1. We would like to see the incremental replacement of concrete channels with a more eco-friendly method.
2. Drainage should enhance estuaries.
3. Add dike revetments to capture water and make more estuary-friendly; prevent run-off.

4.6 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal (pages 4-15 to 4-16)

1. **No new landfills** on Wai‘anae Coast!
2. We may also want to look at possible legislative actions, such as the “Zero Waste Strategy” example (attached).
3. Should have a discussion of how the **pass/no pass line** impacts solid waste issues and the validity of the concerns that led to the creation of the line and how it disproportionately negatively impacts the Wai‘anae Coast.

4. The City should provide “**above ground services**” in existing rural areas. In some rural areas there is no underground infrastructure in place; however the City could still provide above-ground services to the community. This could be a **rural infrastructure standard**.

5. We need to reclaim the **old Wai‘anae landfill** next to the convenience station; create a precedence.

6. We need to increase the capacity of **convenience stations**. Commercializing them is one option to increase capacity.

7. We need **recycling centers**.

8. Encourage **composting**

9. Laws against illegal dumping haven’t been enforced. Recognize and emphasize **enforcement**.
   a. Utilize technology to help (cameras, signage, and satellites) – could replace use of officers.

---

### 4.7 Civic, Public Safety and Education Facilities (pages 4-16 to 4-23)

1. Police, Fire, Emergency Services all need improvement. There should be a long-range plan for an ER. Emergency care needs to be upgraded and self-sustainable.

2. We want a commitment to keep the **Wai‘anae substation** in Wai‘anae.

3. **Change “need for 2nd ambulance” to “expand 2nd ambulance unit to 24 hours.”**

4. Job training programs should be a priority.

5. The role of schools in rural communities is more than just education, it’s a community gathering place too.

6. The schools are overcrowded.

7. There should be mention of charter schools and adult education.

---

4.7.2.2

- **The Site Selection Criteria** must include a section on adverse factors such as a site near a chicken or pig farm, or half-way house.

---

### 4.8 Health Care Facilities (pages 4-23 to 4-26)

1. We should utilize the Wai‘anae Health Center.

2. Job training programs for health should be a priority.
## ATTACHMENT B – List of Attendees for the Wai'anae SCP Comprehensive Review Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #5 – September 25, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Brown, Rodlyn</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Cope, Agnes</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Gay, Lucy</td>
<td>Office of the Assoc. VP for Commtt Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Grace, Polly</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Greenwood, Alice</td>
<td>Leialii’i Manaolana</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Hew Len, Kalena</td>
<td>Wai’anae Kai Homestead Association</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kanahele, Kamaki</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Laenui, Poka</td>
<td>Wai’anae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Makanani, Kaiawe</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Patterson, Pat</td>
<td>Concerned Elders &amp; Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Saito, Ralph</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 6
Location: Ohana Ola O Kahumana
Date: September 22, 2008
From: Harmonee Williams
TSI Team: Bruce Tsuchida & Harmonee Williams

Attachment A – List of Attendees
Attachment B – Meeting Hand-outs

NOTES – MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 18, 2008

PULE – BY KIMO KELII

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
   • Harmonee Williams of Townscape gave a brief welcome and overview of the meeting agenda. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Preliminary Draft, and to answer some questions so Townscape can complete the Public Review Draft by October 1, 2008.
   • There were 3 hand-outs (attached):
     o Overview of Process Timeline
     o Memo: Summary of Proposed Wai‘anae SCP Revisions
     o A summary of information on the light industrial park proposed by Tropic Land LLC.
   • Williams then reviewed the Process Timeline. There were no major concerns, so the meeting then moved to reviewing the Preliminary Draft (copies of which were mailed to most participants and hard copies were also available).
   • Williams explained that hand-out #2 summarized the major changes and highlighted those areas that still needed clarification on in order to finish the Public Review Draft. It was suggested that this hand-out be used as the guide for the discussion, and hand-out #3 be referenced for the discussion of Section 3.9 on Commercial and Industrial Uses. PAC agreed.
   • Williams introduced Kathy Sokugawa, the Director of the Interim Planning Division of DPP (City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting).
     o PAC member question for Sokugawa: The City has only used the SCPs when they want to. Will this be the case again?
Sokugawa: Well, all of the City agencies and departments are supposed to read all of the SCPs and follow them as much as possible. In a perfect world, they would do so. Unfortunately, I can only control my department.

- Other PAC member concern: There is currently a Bed & Breakfast Ordinance being heard that would remove the prohibition on new B&Bs. This shouldn’t be allowed. It will raise our already high rent prices.

2. CHAPTER 1 – WAI’ANAÉ’S ROLE IN O’AHU’S DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

- Concern: Wai’anae is supposed to have 3.8 – 4.2% of O’ahu’s total population, which it has already exceeded (4.8%). We need a statement that the City Administration and Council should adhere to this policy, and not approve more housing for the District. We already have a disproportionate share of low-income housing. Either they need to enforce the General Plan (GP), or the GP needs to be revisited.
  - Townscape comment: part of the process of updating the SCPs is recommendations to update the GP. We can recommend this section of the GP be revised.
- Also, what if the total population of O’ahu keeps increasing? What if it’s eventually 1.5 million? 4% of 1.5 million is 60,000. What about Wai’anae’s real carrying capacity? We’re already using more water than we have, and importing the rest. What about roads? Jobs? Some balance is needed.
- Why are other rural districts mentioned in our plan?
  - Only in that the GP is supposed to set forth policies that emphasize agricultural and rural land uses for those districts too.

3. CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF THE WAI’ANAÉ DISTRICT

- Vision Statement – needs some word-smithing. Should have some balance – talk about other people living in community, not only children. And balance future needs with needs of current residents – so we can live, work, play here now.
- The Vision Statement should be the “essence” of the plan. Should talk a bit more about rural land use and ag.
- The longer “Inside Our Vision” section should stay in SCP, at least in an appendix. It’s important that City staff understand us. Tension: culturally-based material vs. City-based (structured for City staff to reference easily/quickly). The overall Vision has not been implemented well.
- PAC question: Are these SCP policies selectively enforced?
  - Answer: It varies.
- Key issue – the SCP does not address already approved projects.
- Question: Who in Government will champion “sustainability”?
• Townscape: Could the “Key Concepts” be combined with “Vision Elements” in order to make this chapter more succinct?
  o No, we need all of these parts – they’re all essential to the overall explanation of who we are and what we want.

• We need to re-visit the population numbers. The Plan under-estimates these numbers. They don’t take into account recently built developments.

• What about lands that are already zoned for development, but not yet built?

• Also, new developments are not addressing other uses and facilities needed for sustainability, such as parks, healthcare, schools, etc.

• What about the 1200-1600 homeless who live here? Are they counted?
  o Overall, Townscape needs to take another look at population numbers, and try to calculate a more complete population estimate, including looking at households with numerous people living there.

• Townscape: This draft shows the deletion of “Community Values” and addition of “Key Concepts” – is this acceptable?
  o Ok in main SCP, but Community Values should be kept somewhere; either in an appendix or Technical Report.

• Sentence at beginning of “Key Concepts” needs revising:
  o “Like most Hawaii communities, Wai’anae is diverse.” We are diverse, yes, but, there are unique cultural values here that are very important and should be recognized. Newcomers to Wai’anae should adapt to our ways, not vice versa.

• We need to consider who the readers/users of the SCP are: DPP, City Council, other City Departments. It’s used for land use decisions. Therefore, it should be as clear as possible for them. All Departments should read the SCP!

4. CHAPTER 3 – LAND USE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

• Page 3-3 – the population numbers should be checked (as discussed previously).

• Pages 3-4 and 3-5 – the total acreages for State and County zoning are different. The numbers should be checked.

• Potential Development – be sure to include DHHL projects (and include in map).

• Page 3-8 – the Makaha Resort is still operational.

• Page 3-8 and 3-9 – Potable water numbers are not updated. What about a small desalination plant or getting fresh water from ocean depths?

• Page 3-9, section “e” – should include preservation/protection of estuaries also, such as Ma’ili Canal.
- Townscape: Regarding the idea of creating a community-based organization to manage Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources (section 2.4.11 and several policies in Chapter 3), this seems like more of a long-term goal. Would it be acceptable to make this the long-term goal, and make the short-term goal for the community to advise on resource management?
  - A number of groups are needed to accomplish this, but it is do-able.
  - The Neighborhood Boards could have this role, possibly one of the committees could oversee it. They could seek out the necessary expertise.
  - Cultural resources and natural resources are one and the same. There needs to be more flexibility in the Plan so that local groups have the ability to be effective in protecting their cultural sites. This is what is already happening anyways, organically. It should be supported.
  - Overall, ok, but need to include this last point (bullet above).
- Townscape: Another issue is the “Cultural Overlay District,” which we brought up last year. The City has pointed out that the creation and implementation of a new type of district would be an intensive undertaking. They would like to see either much more detail in how it would work and how it would be created, or else changed. Comments?
  - Wai’anae is a “stubborn” place, a place unto itself. It is a special cultural place, from the mountains to the ocean, the entire moku. It deserves some type of protection. What is feasible?
  - Tsuchida: In our recently developed plan for North Kohala, we ran into a similar situation, and we decided to put the same basic idea into the beginning of the Plan, as an overarching statement and theme for the district. We could do something similar here. This way the City gets the idea, without having to go through a lengthy bureaucratic process of creating a whole new type of district.
    - PAC: General consensus.
- Section 3.8 Residential Land Use – What about affordable housing?
  - What about rural infrastructure standards?
    - City is working on developing these.
  - What about home-based businesses? We may need some special provision to all home occupations. This would help with our sustainability goal.
  - Townscape: What types of policies would you like the City to see regarding future proposed affordable housing projects?
    - Suggestion: Wai’anae should have 3.8% to 4.2% of O’ahu’s “affordable units,” our fair share, not more.
- They should be affordable for at least 30 years.
- We need a real definition for “affordable homes” and “affordable units.” It should be based on Wai’anae’s median income, not O’ahu’s.
- Also, future developments need to address more than just the housing units. They need to provide infrastructure and facilities – water, roads, recreation, jobs, churches, parks, etc.
  - Also, need to include new affordable housing developments (Rezentes gave Townscape updated information).

- Section 3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses – is there broad support for a light industrial park in the area proposed for one in Lualualei? (SCP does not take position on specific projects, but on type of land use.)
  - We need jobs. That area already has industrial uses anyways. Maybe that whole corridor should be zoned for industrial use.
  - There are traffic issues – heavy trucks and increased traffic to district would need to be addressed. This area was good ag land. What about the unknown impacts (EIS not yet completed)? What else would this zoning allow (strip clubs, bars, etc.)?
  - There has been community discussion on this. Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board (NB) has formally supported. Waianae NB has not taken a formal position to support or oppose.
  - No consensus. Decision: the Public Review Draft will include both the map as is, and a new map with appropriate changes, along with narrative. Discussion will continue at Public Informational Meeting at end of October.

- Section 3.12 – Military Land Use
  - Page 3-47, Policy 3.12.2.2, 2nd paragraph:
    - “Therefore, the continued use of these lands for military purposes should be debated, and transition to public use should be given serious consideration.”
    - Suggestion: Change “given serious consideration” to “pursued.”

5. CHAPTER 4 – INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES
- Page 4-14, Policy 4.6.2.3 Composting:
  - Should be restricted to “Green Waste Composting.”

6. NEXT STEPS
• Comments on Preliminary Draft due to Townscape by Thursday, September 25th.
• Public Review Draft should be ready on October 1.
• Public Information Meeting – October 27, 28, or 29. Need to check with Councilman Apo’s schedule.

ATTACHMENT A – List of Attendees for the Wai’anae SCP Comprehensive Review Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #6 – September 18, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aila, Melva</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aila, William</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Aldeguer, Walterbea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Awana, Karen</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Burgess, Barbie-Lei</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gomes, Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Grace, Polly</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Greenwood, Alice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hauanio, Dana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Kaneaiakala, Alva</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kelii, Kimo</td>
<td>Nanakuli Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Keliikoa-Kamai, Kapua</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Langihara, Arick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Maunakea, Ruby</td>
<td>Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Neuman, Debbie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Newman, Dana</td>
<td>Ohana Ola o Kahumana</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Patterson, Pat</td>
<td>Concerned Elders &amp; Habitat for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rezentes, Cynthia</td>
<td>Many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Suiso, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overview of Process Timeline

2007
- March 12, 2007 – WSCP Update process officially begins
- May 3, 2007 – Public Informational Meeting #1 (Kick-off Meeting)
- June 7, 2007 – Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #1
- June 30, 2007 – PAC Meeting #2
- August 11, 2007 – PAC Meeting #3
- September 6, 2007 – PAC Meeting #4
- September 25, 2007 – PAC Meeting #5
- December 19, 2007 – Townscape submits (partial) Preliminary Draft to DPP

2008
- February 2008 – DPP put all SCP Update processes on hold to review and revise formatting (in order to increase consistency among all SCPs and improve implementation).
- August 2008 – DPP re-started all SCP update processes
- September 5, 2008 – Townscape submits Preliminary Draft to DPP and PAC
- September 18, 2008 – PAC Meeting #6
- September 25, 2008 – Comments on Preliminary Draft due to Townscape
- October 1, 2008 – Townscape submits Public Review Draft to ALL
- November 1-8, 2008 – Public Informational Meeting #2 (get public comments on Public Review Draft)
- November 15, 2008 – Comments on Public Review Draft due to Townscape
- December 1, 2008 – Townscape submits Prefinal Draft to ALL
- December 15, 2008 – Comments on Prefinal Draft due to Townscape
- December 30, 2008 – Townscape submits Final Revised WSCP

2009
- Mid-January, 2009 – Public Informational Meeting #3 (to explain approval process by Planning Commission and City Council)

Contact: Harmonee Williams
harmonee@townscapeinc.com
808-553-3897 (o)
808-772-0316 (c)
Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan Update
Planning Advisory Committee Meeting #6
September 18, 2008

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED WAIʻANAE SCP REVISIONS
For Revised Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan Preliminary Draft, September 5, 2008

Chapter 1 – Waiʻanae’s Role in Oʻahu’s Development Pattern
- No major changes

Chapter 2 – The Vision for the Future of the Waiʻanae District
- **2.1 Vision Statement (new)**
  - DPP comments: Focus is on children. What about other parts of community, such as youth, young adults, adults, and seniors’ needs? Vision may want to include maintaining rural areas, supporting ag, and low density, low-rise character of Waiʻanae (i.e., land use values).

- **2.1.1 Inside Our Vision & 2.1.2 Native Hawaiian Connection to the Land (new)**
  - DPP comment: Put this section (2.1.1) in Technical Report or Appendix?

- **2.2 “Community Values” (7) – replaced with “Key Concepts” (5)**
  - Sustainability
  - Ahupuaʻa Concept
  - Cultural Landscape
  - Community Fabric
  - Rural Values
  - DPP comments: Could these be combined with Vision Elements? Also, is it possible to be more concrete on what it would mean to adopt (or adapt) the ahupuaʻa concept for land use planning and have each ahupuaʻa be more sustainable and self-sufficient (free flowing streams, access for gathering)?
  - Townscape comment: Perhaps we need to clarify that these concepts are more about values – residents’ relationships with the land, their resources, and each other. The values then guide the more concrete Policies and Guidelines in following chapters.

- **2.3 The Waiʻanae Concept Map**
  - No major changes
• **2.5 12 Vision Elements** (there were previously 10)
  
  o #1. Recognize the traditional *ahupua’a* of the Wai’anae District and **adapt adopt** the *ahupua’a* concept as a framework for land use and open space planning

  o #2. Establish **Delineate** the 4 major land and resource use types with defined boundaries: Preservation Lands, Coastal Lands, Agricultural Lands, and Rural Community Areas

  o #3. Restrict coastal urban, suburban, or resort development *makai* of Farrington Highway

  o #4. Preserve all lands north of Kepuhi Point as open space lands

  o #5. Preserve and restore **important all** streams and stream corridors

  o #6. Preserve and restore **important all** cultural sites and establish cultural landscapes recognition and protection in the form of a Cultural Overlay District

  o #7. Evaluate the feasibility of a new roadway that could divert commuter traffic from Farrington Highway **Take next steps in creating an Emergency Bypass Road**

  o #8. Plan and implement safety improvements and beautification programs for Farrington Highway to bring the community closer to the beaches and coastline

  o #9. Designate Wai’anae Town Center as a “Country Town,” and the community centers of Nanakuli, Ma‘ili, and Makaha as “Village Centers”

  o #10. Plan and Develop Community Gathering Places for Wai’anae, Nanakuli, Ma‘ili, and Makaha, and other subcommunities of the District, as needed and connect them by a biking/jogging path along the coast

  o #11. Develop community-based businesses and jobs with an emphasis on agriculture, education, and culture (new)

  o #12. Form a community-based organization to manage Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources (new)

    ▪ **DPP comment**: *What about DLNR? Could this group “advise on the management of Wai’anae’s natural and cultural resources for short-term” and take over in the long-run, when have the capacity needed?*

    ▪ Also refers to Policies in Chapter 3 (Sections 3.2 through 3.6).
Chapter 3 – Land Use Policies and Guidelines

- **3.1 Overview of Land Use, Population, and Environmental Conditions**
  - New: 3.1.2 Population, 3.1.5 Potential Developments, 3.1.7 Environmental Conditions

- **3.2 Preservation of Open Space and Important Views**

- **3.6 Preservation of and Access to Historic and Cultural Resources**
  - Added Policy regarding the need for Signage (3.6.2.4)
  - Need another Policy regarding Access?
  - 3.6.3.1 regarding “Cultural Overlay District” (refer to Vision Element #6)

- **3.8 Managed Residential Land Use**
  - Preliminary Draft – did not have all data updated/added regarding homeless and affordable housing. Will be included in Public Review Draft.
  - What Policies/Guidelines want to add regarding this topic (if any)?

- **3.9 Limited Commercial and Industrial Uses**
  - Tropic Land LLC’s proposed Light Industrial Park (hand-outs)

- **3.10 Establish Country Towns, Rural Community Commercial Centers, and Gathering Places**
  - 3.10.3.5 Biking/Jogging Path (refer to Vision Element #10)

- **3.11 Expansion of Parks and Recreational Areas**
  - Preliminary Draft did not have info on homeless in parks, City’s response to “clean up” beaches. Will be included in Public Review Draft.
  - What Policies/Guidelines want to add regarding this topic (if any)?

- **3.12 Limited Military Land Use**
  - 3.12.2.1 Long-Range Use Policy: Preservation and Transition to Civilian Use
  - 3.12.2.2 Recognition of Military Use in the Interim (Before Transition to Public Use)

Chapter 4 – Infrastructure

- Introduction to Chapter includes discussion on Wai‘anae’s “original infrastructure” – the landscape and cultural resources – that needs to be recognized and preserved.
- New General Policies for entire chapter.

- **4.1 Transportation Systems**
  - Removed policy for a “Reliever Road” that would basically parallel Farrington Highway, mauka.
  - 4.1.2.3 emphasizes the need for an “Emergency Bypass Road” as a priority.
  - 4.1.2.5 recommends a “Second Access Road.”
• **4.2 Potable Water Systems**
  o Updated info from Wai‘anae Watershed Management Plan will be included in Public Review Draft.

• **4.4 Electrical Power and Communications**
  o 4.4.2.2 Encourage the Development of Alternative Energy Sources

• **4.6 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal**
  o 4.6.2.1 No New Landfills

**Chapter 5 – Implementation**
• This chapter could be revised to include an:
  o “Implementation Table” that lists all proposed projects, what agency should take the lead, and an approximate timeframe and
  o “Priority Projects,” such as:
    ▪ Safety improvements and beautification programs for Farrington Highway
    ▪ Expansion and upgrade of parks
    ▪ Construction of affordable housing projects
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APPENDIX F – WORKING PAPERS

This Appendix contains the Working Papers that Townscape submitted to DPP:

- **Working Paper #1**: “Preliminary Discussion of Possible WSCP Revisions”
- **Working Paper #2**: “Public Informational Meeting #1 Discussion and Results”
- **Working Paper #3**: “Formation, Purpose, and Make-up of the Planning Advisory Committee”
- **Working Paper #4**: “Draft Scorecard and Expanded Discussion of Possible Revisions”
- **Working Paper #5**: Public Informational Meeting #2 Discussion and Results”
- **Working Paper #6**: Public Informational Meeting #3 Discussion and Results”
“Preliminary Discussion of Possible WSCP Revisions”

In March 2007, Townscape began reviewing the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (adopted by the Honolulu City Council in May 2000) for possible revisions. Because Townscape has worked with the Wai‘anae community for over a decade on a wide range of projects, including the current SCP, we began with a relatively good understanding of the major issues that the community is currently facing, and with a working relationship with a core group of community leaders.

Our initial tasks were to talk with residents and community leaders about their major land use concerns, and to attend community meetings to listen to the topics that were raised. Townscape also participated in the Empower Wai‘anae SpeakOut, held in Mā‘ili Beach Park in November of 2006 (notes from the SpeakOut are attached). The information gathered from these sources has guided us to specific issues that the updated Plan may need to address. While some of these issues are already addressed to some degree in the current SCP, some are not. This paper presents the methodology we have used to initiate the review, and gives a brief overview of the priority topics that we believe need to be addressed in this update.

Between March 21st and April 27th, we met with the following community leaders:

1. Puanani Burgess, Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Alternative Development Corp.
2. Patty Teruya, Chair, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board
3. Cynthia Rezentes, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (past Chair)
4. William Aila, Harbor Master, Wai‘anae Harbor
5. Melva Aila
6. Landis Ornellas, Capital Investments Corp.
7. Eric Enos, Programs Director, Ka‘ala Farm
8. Kamuela Enos, HACBED
9. Todd Apo, City Councilman for the Wai‘anae District
10. Karen Awana, House Representative for the Nānākuli area
11. Maile Shimabukuro, House Representative for the Wai‘anae area

The notes from these interviews are attached. While numerous issues surfaced during these initial meetings, there are seven that have emerged as priority topics that this Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review may need to address:

1. Homelessness/Affordable Housing
2. Population Growth (Rural Values and Qualities)
3. Infrastructure (Second Access Road)
4. Military Impacts (Land Use and Ordnance in Ocean)
5. Agriculture
6. Parks
7. Jobs/Unemployment

Many of these issues are overlapping. For example, there should be a direct correlation between the unemployment rate and the number of homeless in the area, as well as between the size of the population and the need for improved and increased capacity of infrastructure and parks. However, our interactions with the community have led us to believe that these seven topics are individually important, and can be addressed in distinct ways.

The following is a brief description of each issue, if and how the current SCP addresses it, and possible planning strategies to address these issues.
1. Homelessness/Affordable Housing

Problem: In the past few years, the Wai‘anae Coast has seen a dramatic increase in the number of homeless people living on the beaches in tents. Various studies have estimated that there were between 1,000 and 4,000 people living on the beaches in 2006 (Star Bulletin, February 2007). Homeless shelters have recently opened in Wai‘anae and in Kalaeloa to temporarily accommodate these people. While there are numerous factors that have led to the current situation, one of the most commonly cited reasons is the skyrocketing prices of homes – both for rent and for purchase – which has forced people to live with extended family or friends, or take up residence on the beach (Wai‘anae SpeakOut, 2006).

Another issue that has recently been raised is an attitude of “them” versus “us,” whereby some residents look at the homeless people as separate from the general community. Residents concerned with this attitude believe that it needs to be addressed first and foremost.

In addition, many of the people who are currently homeless also have other problems to deal with, such as drug addictions, prison records, or a lack of employable skills, which prevents them from obtaining a job and being able to pay rent. Various support services are needed, such as shelters and drug rehab programs. However, many people are beginning to ask if such services should all be located in Wai‘anae. Their basic question is, “Since the rest of the island has these same problems, shouldn’t the responsibility be more evenly distributed?”

WSCP 2000: Does not address homelessness and related issues.

Possible Solutions: There is no simple solution to solving homelessness. However, the availability of affordable housing is something that could help those people who currently have jobs, but simply cannot afford the housing that is available. That being said, there still remains the question how to create affordable housing and who will do it.

Some possible strategies for the Wai‘anae community to consider include:

- The creation of a non-profit entity that focuses on affordable housing
- Requesting the City & County of Honolulu and/or the State government to donate land upon which affordable housing can be built
- Funding of housing-related infrastructure by the State

Lastly, there are some excellent programs currently operating in Wai‘anae that address these needs. It is essential that there is financial support for the continuation of these programs and the opening of new ones. Perhaps new facilities should be located in other areas of the island to create a more even distribution of facilities for the homeless.
2. Population

Problem: The population of the Wai‘anae District is growing faster than the growth targets set forth in the O‘ahu General Plan (1989) and the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2000). Both of these documents say that Wai‘anae’s proportional share of O‘ahu’s 2010 population should be between 3.8% and 4.2%. The General Plan also contains “Population Objective C Policy 4,” which says that the Wai‘anae population should be 4% of the total population by 2025. As of 2000, Wai‘anae was home to 42,259 people, or 4.8% of O‘ahu’s total population of 876,156, with trends indicating a continued increase.

The following table summarizes the population changes in Wai‘anae over the past 2 decades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wai‘anae Population</th>
<th>% of O‘ahu Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>31,487</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>37,411</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42,259</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Planning and Permitting, Annual Report 2005.

This issue of increasing population is one that affects nearly every aspect of the Wai‘anae community. Primarily, it impacts the rural character of the area, which Wai‘anae residents have continually identified as a priority for them to maintain. In addition, an expanding population puts added stress on infrastructure, such as sewer and water lines, as well as increased traffic on Farrington Highway, the only major route in and out of Wai‘anae.

With this in mind, residents are questioning the value of building more homes and other buildings in their District, even those that are needed, such as affordable homes, homeless shelters, rehab programs, and half-way houses.

WSCP 2000: States that: “These growth and development trends are likely to continue unless the City implements a strong ‘growth control’ plan for the District. Continued urban and suburban development will consume agricultural lands and put still more stress on Wai‘anae’s roads, schools, parks, and other facilities, which are already overcrowded. The country values and lifestyle that are of such great importance to the Wai‘anae community will be further eroded and undermined.”

“The Vision for the future of the Wai‘anae Community CAN be attained if City policies and programs vigorously support the preservation of country lifestyles, the rural landscape, and the natural and cultural resources of this District.” (pg. 2-5)

Possible Solutions:
- Limit the building of new housing units in the District to only affordable housing units, which are made available to Wai‘anae residents on a priority basis.
- New homeless shelters, rehab programs and halfway houses should be dispersed around the island.
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3. Infrastructure

Problem: The biggest infrastructure concern for most Wai‘anae residents is transportation and traffic. Many of the people living in the District must commute to downtown Honolulu for work, and the only route in and out of Wai‘anae is Farrington Highway. This route is also used for a significant proportion of travel within the District, so it is often congested. The average work commute time for people living within the District is about 41.9 minutes, compared to 26 minutes for the state. (Note: most people who commute to downtown report an average commute time of well over an hour; also, this number was taken from the 2000 U.S. Census, and has most likely increased since then).

In addition to being congested, Farrington Highway also has a high frequency of accidents, both between vehicles and between vehicles and pedestrians. Any major obstruction to the roadway can completely block access in and out of the area. Thus, many residents have long been asking for a “Second Access Road.”

The main routes that have been proposed for this road would cut over the Wai‘anae Mountain Range to Kunia Road in the ‘Ewa District. There are two main passes that have been considered – the Kolekole Pass and Pöhākea Pass. Both are owned by the U.S. military, and would require considerable cooperation from the Navy and the Army, as well as millions of dollars in federal funding, along with local sources. This Second Access Road project is currently listed on the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2030 (ORTP 2030) Long-Range Plan Project List (2016 to 2030), with an estimated capital cost of $423 million (in 2005 $).

WSCP 2000: The idea of a Second Access Road is included in the 2000 Plan, along with recommendations for a feasibility study. However, the SCP also brings up the important related issue of such a reliever road serving as an “urban growth generator”. Alternatively, the Plan proposed an enhanced public transportation system for the District. (pg. 4-3)

Possible Solutions: The City and County sponsored a feasibility study, which was completed in 2001. The study began by stating that the Kolekole Pass should not be considered, because of the high wind conditions and the required cooperation with the U.S. Navy. Instead, the study looked at a road connecting Wai‘anae to Kunia Road through the Pöhākea Pass. The study estimated the cost to be somewhere between $219 and $257 million, depending on specifications of the tunnel that would need to be built.

To implement this idea, several more steps would need to be taken, including:

- Consultation meetings with major affected landowners (the Navy and James Campbell Company)
- Evaluation of alternative tunnel configurations
- Geologic exploration
- Cultural impact assessment
- EIS clearance
The study estimates the completion of these items would take between $10 and $15 million, and approximately 3 to 5 years. It is further anticipated that a 3 to 4 year design and construction period would then be required.

**4. Military Land Use and Ordnance in Ocean**

**Problem:** The U.S. military owns a significant amount of land in the Wai‘anae District. Much of it is prime agricultural land that cannot be used as such. Specifically, Lualualei Valley contains the U.S. Naval Magazine Pearl Harbor, which contains 7,498 acres that the Navy uses for the storage of various kinds of ordnance. The Navy also owns another 1,729 acres in Lualualei – the Naval Radio Transmitter Facility Lualualei – which transmits high and low frequency radio signals that are used for the navigation of Navy vessels throughout the Pacific.

The U.S. Army uses 4,130 acres of Mäkua Valley for training programs. The Army’s Makua lands consist of 170 acres of fee land, 782 acres of land leased from the State of Hawaii, and 3,237 acres of ceded lands also leased from the State. These leases expire in the Year 2029. The community would like to regain access to the important cultural sites located within this ahupua’a.

In addition, Wai‘anae residents have long been finding ordnance in the ocean just off their coast (one area is known by locals as Ordnance Reef), as well as washed up on their shores. In May 2006, the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration conducted a survey of an ordnance site off Wai‘anae, the results of which were released in April 2007. Its basic finding was that overall trace metals in sediments are very low and there is little evidence of contamination of the area from discarded munitions (Weekly, April 11, 2007).

Many Wai‘anae residents disagree with the findings of the report. Some say that the methodologies employed by the study were flawed. There have been numerous meetings and discussions about what to do about the situation, and how to get the military to implement a clean up program. The Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board recently passed a motion to “demand the military clean up the reef, shore and ocean starting June 1, 2007 in Wai‘anae.”

**WSCP 2000:** The current Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan’s General Policies Pertaining to Military Lands states: “In keeping with the Wai‘anae Concept, the City’s overall long-range land use policy for the military lands at Lualualei and at Mäkua Valley is that these lands should be preserved as agricultural/open space and mountain preservation areas.” (pg. 3.55)

**Possible Solutions:** Eventual transition of ownership of these lands back to the State or the City and County would be the ideal outcome for the Wai‘anae community. However, current events in the U.S. Congress do not indicate such a transfer is likely in the near future. A new report to Congress stated that a return to company-size live-fire training at Mäkua Valley — prohibited by court order for the past three years — is "absolutely critical" to the Army's training strategy and requirements in Hawai‘i (Honolulu Advertiser, April 20, 2007).
Similarly, although numerous Wai‘anae residents are calling for a cleanup of the munitions in the ocean, an Army representative recently said that the study shows there is no immediate threat to the public or the environment, and that no cleanup is imminent (Weekly, April 11, 2007).

In order to get the Neighborhood Board motion implemented, there would have to be some skillful negotiating that resulted in major shifts in the Army’s current stance.

5. Agriculture

Problem: The preservation of agricultural lands – both those lands currently in agricultural use as well as fallow land that has agricultural use potential – is of critical importance to the Wai‘anae community and its rural lifestyle. Historically, the District has been known as one of the largest and most important centers for commercial livestock production in the State. There have also been numerous dairies, piggeries, egg operations, chicken farms, and small truck farms that produce fresh fruits, vegetables, and herbs. While there are still some farms in operation, the overall total level of operation has decreased substantially. The continued protection and availability of agricultural lands for commercial farms, family farms, part-time farmers, and rural homesteads with backyard gardens is essential if the Wai‘anae community is to have a chance at preserving its agricultural lifestyle.

Although the existing SCP Land Use Plan designates 8,777 acres as “Agricultural”, less than 20% of that land is actually being used for active agriculture and ag/residential lots. Most of the unused agricultural lands are lands with poor (some contaminated) soils and/or steep slopes. A significant portion consists of fallow grasslands.

Some of the specific issues facing the protection of agricultural lands include: high taxes, economic pressures to convert ag lands to other uses, the uncertainty of water availability, use conflicts, a lack of incentives for protection of ag lands, and a lack of land with farmable and uncontaminated soils.

WSCP 2000: The 2000 Plan proposes numerous solutions, such as:

- Community and Agriculture Boundaries
- Land Use Regulations
- Agriculture Easements
- Farmland Trusts
- Development Rights Transfer
- Tax Incentives
- Agricultural Subdivisions
- Affordable Water

Possible Solutions: The solutions proposed in the 2000 SCP could be implemented.
6. Parks

**Problem:** There are not enough active recreational parks for the children who live in the Waiʻanae District. Numerous parents have complained that they have to drive to school playgrounds or other parks outside of the District in order to get their kids to a place where they can play.

The District is well below the City’s community-based park standards. The standards for the various types of parks are:

- **Neighborhood Parks (4 to 6 acres):** one per 5,000 population  
  Service Area ½ Mile
- **Community Parks (10 acres):** one per 10,000 population  
  Service Area 1 Mile
- **District Parks (20 acres):** one per 25,000 population  
  Service Area 2 Miles

According to the current SCP, by type of parks, Waiʻanae District has a shortfall of one Community Park and seven or eight Neighborhood Parks. It should also be noted that two of the three existing Community Parks are substandard in size: Māʻili Community Park at 3.68 acres, and Mākaha Community Park at 4.32 acres. The City’s planned development of Māʻili Kai Community Park will fulfill the need for a fourth community park in the District.

**WSCP 2000:** This plan clearly points out the shortfall of parks and the need for more. Section 3.11.2.1 is entitled “Development of Adequate Public Parks is a Top Priority.” It goes on to say that “At least the minimum number and size of community-based parks should be developed by the year 2020. The development of the Waiʻanae Regional Park should also be a high priority. Thereafter, the City should assess the need for additional parks and recreational facilities, and, where there is an identified need about the minimum standards, these additional facilities should be provided.”

“This shortfall should be addressed through an incremental park development program. Generally, there should be two neighborhood parks for each of the main settlement areas of the District: Nānākuli, Māʻili/Lualualei, Waiʻanae, and Mākaha.” (pg. 3-52)

**Possible Solutions:** The solutions proposed in the 2000 Plan should be implemented. There should be a priority placed on the creation and implementation of an incremental park development program.
7. Jobs/Unemployment

Problem: The Wai‘anae District has one of the highest levels of unemployment in the state at 8.73%, compared to the statewide level of 3.8% (U.S. Census, 2000). The issue of unemployment has two components that are related, but distinct. First, there is the fact that many residents lack skills and qualifications for jobs. The second component is the lack of jobs available within the Wai‘anae District.

WSCP 2000: The following General Policies are contained in the current SCP:
- Encourage the Continuation of Existing Commercial Establishments
- Encourage Commercial Businesses that Serve the Community
- Encourage Light Industrial Businesses
- No Heavy Industry (pg. 3-40 and 3-41)

Possible Solutions: The most obvious solution to the issue of the lack of skills, is that there needs to be more training opportunities available in the Wai‘anae area. The following is a list of some programs that are currently growing to serve this need, and should be supported:
- Leeward Community College at Wai‘anae has plans to expand, both in size and in courses offered.
- The Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center is already the largest employer in the District. WCCHC is currently in the process of expanding their health career training opportunities, which include high school programs and university programs, both undergraduate and graduate.

Another idea that has been proposed is to build a teacher-training facility in the District. A Senate bill that would have provided $750,000 to pay for the educational center died in committee in mid-March, but proponents of the idea are looking for alternative ways to get funding.

The issue of increasing the number of job opportunities in Wai‘anae has been discussed for decades, with no easy answer. Recently, the Governor’s office has looked at various economic development projects, such as:
- Community Development Financial Institution that would give loans to small business owners
- Grants and loans to non-profit, cultural, or economic community groups
- Training program for text digitization
- Training program for small “handyman” businesses
- Marketing center for products outside the area
- Incentives for farmers and businesses
- Support for various agricultural activities (DBEDT, 2007)
“PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING #1 DISCUSSION AND RESULTS”

The first Public Informational Meeting for the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review was held on May 3, 2007 at 7 pm at the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Community Center. This paper presents an overview of the work that Townscape did to prepare for the meeting, the proceedings of the meeting itself, and the outcomes and follow-up work that is planned.

A. MEETING PREPARATION

Initially, a meeting date was selected after consulting with several community members about what dates would not conflict with other major meetings in Wai‘anae. The Wai‘anae Neighborhood Community Center was selected to hold the event due to its well-known location and well-suited size.

In order to announce the event, an advertisement was placed on the Honolulu Advertiser’s “myAdvertiser.com” website. This site has a link for 16 of the communities on O‘ahu, including Wai‘anae, where this announcement was placed. This announcement was also placed in the Westside Stories, the community newspaper for the residents of the Leeward Coast. The announcement is located at the end of this document as Attachment A.

In addition to advertising, Townscape announced the meeting at the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board meetings in April and May. Lastly, Wai‘anae community members who have participated in past Townscape projects were contacted by email and phone the week before the meeting. The Townscape project manager sent out approximately 50 email messages and made approximately 40 phone calls urging community people to attend the meeting.

B. THE MEETING

The meeting began shortly after 7pm. There were 42 attendees, including 2 staff from the City & County of Honolulu’s Department of Planning and Permitting, Raymond Young and Kathy Sokugawa. The sign-in list can be found at Attachment B. The meeting was recorded by ‘Ôlelo Community Television.
The meeting agenda consisted of:

- Pule -

1. **Welcome and Purpose**
2. **Agenda and Meeting Rules**
3. **Protect/Preserve Wai‘anae**
5. **The SCP 5-Year Review Schedule**
6. **Major Land-Related Issues in Wai‘anae**
7. **Planning Advisory Committee Sign-Up**
8. **Next Steps**

An overview of each agenda item follows:

The pule was given by Pikake Pelekai, the President of the Wai‘anae Valley Homestead Association.

1. The “Welcome and Purpose” was given by Raymond Young, from the City & County of Honolulu’s Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP):
   
   - The Department is conducting the review of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) which was adopted by City Council in 2000. Townscape, Inc. is the planning consultant.
   
   - The purpose of the five-year comprehensive review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan’s regional vision, policies, design principles and guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as consistency with the General Plan. The findings of this assessment and any recommendations will be reported to the Planning Commission and City Council.
   
   - The specific objectives of the review were also mentioned. (They can be found in the “Five-Year Review of Sustainable Communities Plans Scope of Work, Budget and Schedule.”)

2. Harmonee Williams of Townscape briefly reviewed the Agenda and Meeting Ground Rules. The Proposed Ground Rules can be found at Attachment C.

3. Item #3 on the Agenda consisted of a “go-around” in which the audience stated their name, where they live, and one resource that they would like to protect or preserve in Wai‘anae. People gave a wide variety of responses, from the coast, to agricultural lands, to culture, to economic choices. A list of the items mentioned during that activity is
4. Bruce Tsuchida, President of Townscape, presented an overview of the current Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (WSCP). Mr. Tsuchida is familiar with the WSCP since he was the primary planner for that process in 1999 and 2000. The audience was given a hand-out of the WSCP Executive Summary, so they could follow along as some of the key points were reviewed and explained. A copy of the Executive Summary and the Wai‘anae Concept Map is located at Attachment E.

5. Harmonee Williams explained the proposed timeline for the approximate year-long WSCP review and update process, which she will be overseeing. The diagram that visually presents the schedule is Attachment F.

The timeline begins in March 2007, when the contract was executed. The work of the consultant between March and early May was to update the Community Profile and meet with community members (the details of which can be found in Working Paper #1). This initial Public Informational Meeting was the first of three such meetings. The other two are planned for July and November, but the exact dates will depend on how the update process progresses.

Ms. Williams explained that Townscape will be asking for volunteers from various sectors of the community to serve on the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC). The PAC is expected to do the bulk of the work, and will convene approximately 6 times in the next 6 to 8 months. The meetings will be broken into three “series” of meetings (2 to 3 meetings per series). The first series is proposed for June and July, when the current SCP will be reviewed and examined in detail. The committee will help to evaluate, or “score” the SCP as part of the development of the “Scorecard,” and to identify what issues are not addressed in the current SCP. The second series, scheduled for August to September, is for the group to discuss and resolve details of revisions, updates, and additions to the SCP. The product of these meetings is the Draft Revised WSCP, targeted to be ready by November. The third and final series of PAC meetings is proposed for November and December, to finalize the Revised SCP. The Final Revised WSCP is scheduled to be completed by February 2008. However, it should be noted that all of the dates are subject to change, dependent on community members’ and the consultant’s schedules and rate of progress.

6. The community members in attendance were then asked to sign-up for the WSCP Planning Advisory Committee. Townscape stated that it was looking for people to sign-up for the committee who were committed to the process and willing to do the work necessary. We also said we would like to have a diverse group of people, from different ahupua’a, and representing various organizations, so there could be a wide range of perspectives in the discussions.

Twenty-three (23) people signed up as PAC Members. Two more said they would like to participate, but may not be able to attend the first series of meetings. The list is attached located at Attachment D.
as Attachment G. (Note: during the meeting, Townscape decided to switch agenda items #6 and #7, which is why they are explained in that order here.)

7. The meeting attendees were asked to identify the major land-related issues in Wai‘anae, especially those that this SCP can address. Similar to agenda item #3, there was a wide variety of responses, but this time people were given the opportunity to expand on their topics. In addition, some of the community members asked questions, which both Townscape and DPP staff responded to. The list of the items mentioned during that activity is located at Attachment H.

8. Lastly, the meeting closed with a few questions and comments from the community, which are summarized in Attachment I. The first Planning Advisory Committee meeting was tentatively set for Wednesday, June 6th. The questions that called for follow-up are listed here:

- Can we get a copy of the Plan?
  - Yes – we will get copies to each of the Planning Advisory Committee members. It is currently available online at the DPP website: WWW.HONOLULUDPP.ORG
- Can we get a copy of the Project Schedule?
  - Yes – we can email it with the meeting notes.
- When can we see the updated Community Profile?
  - We hope to have it completed soon, at least by the first PAC meeting in June so we can share it with you then.

C. FOLLOW-UP

The primary actions following the Public Informational Meeting were to type up the notes from the meeting and distribute them. We sent them to all of the meeting participants as well as those who contacted Townscape to say that they had missed the meeting, but would like to participate. The notes included the DPP website and the “Project Schedule” diagram, as requested.

The next step will be to plan the first Planning Advisory Committee meeting. After looking at the affiliations of the 23 people who signed up to be on the Committee, Townscape will determine what sectors of the community are not represented, and look for people with those characteristics to join.
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Attachment A: Advertisement Placed in myAdvertiser.com and Westside Stories

Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan 5-Year Update Begins

On Thursday, May 3, Townscape will hold a Public Information Meeting to initiate the 5-year comprehensive review of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) by the City Department of Planning and Permitting. The meeting will be held at the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Community Center, 85-670 Farrington Highway, from 7 pm to 9 pm.

The purpose of this review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan’s regional vision, policies, design principles and guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as consistency with the General Plan. The findings of this assessment and any recommendations will be reported to the Planning Commission and the City Council. The current Wai‘anae SCP was adopted by the City and County of Honolulu in 2000.

Please come out Thursday evening to share your concerns about the future development of and planning in Wai‘anae. For more information contact Harmonee Williams at Townscape, Inc. at 536-6999, ext. 8.
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## Attachment B: Sign-in List for the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Walterbea Aldeguer</td>
<td>Maili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adrian Silva</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gary Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kukui Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 William Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Melva Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Deonne Carden</td>
<td>Waianae Neighborhood Pl</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Alice Greenwood</td>
<td>Leialii Manao'ilana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Venise Lewis</td>
<td>Leialii Manao'ilana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bill Akiona</td>
<td>Ke Ola Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ruby Maunakea</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Kimo Kelii</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kaiawe Makanani</td>
<td>NHHA</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jo Jordan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 George Turner</td>
<td>Kokua Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Don Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Delora Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Rodlyn Brown</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dave Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Raymond Young</td>
<td>DPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Puanani Burgess</td>
<td>WCCADC/ Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Cynthia Rezentzes</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Polly Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Ralph Saito</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Noreen Conlin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Fred Dodge</td>
<td>WCCHC, etc.</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikake Pelekai</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Mahol</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Phillips</td>
<td>Waianae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnnie Mae L. Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Suiso</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupuaa</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Hatton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawika Nahoopi</td>
<td>Olelo Waianae Community TV</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pua'Ena Burgess</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Loscalzo</td>
<td>Empower Waianae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Sylors</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Sylors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poka Laenui</td>
<td>Waianae Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Gay</td>
<td>Leeward Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Sokugawa</td>
<td>DPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C: Proposed Ground Rules for Public Informational Meeting #1

- Let each speaker share their thoughts without interruptions
- Treat each other with respect
- Let’s focus on solutions
- End the meeting on time
This page intentionally left blank.
Attachment D: Issues Identified by Community Members during Agenda Item #3 ("Protect/Preserve Wai‘anae")

- The whole coast
- Agriculture
- The essence of Wai‘anae
- There is a major housing problem, especially related to land values
- Land-Water-Ocean
- Education
- Keep Country, Country
- Culture
- Scenic sights
- Everything – mauka to makai – including the people
- No more landfills
- Honor the Sustainable Communities Plan; Implement it
- Urban zoning in a rural area is not ok
- The environment; We need to control growth
- Building height limits
- Military needs to go; Transportation (we need an alternate route); Elderly housing
- Beaches
- Land and ocean need protection from over-development
- Foundation of Hawaiian values
- Wai‘anae as the breadbasket of O‘ahu
- We need to implement plans
- Economic choices that are ‘āina-based
- 8,000 acres owned by Navy in Lualualei Valley should be farmed
- Native forests, ahupua’a restoration
- Change Urban zoning to Suburban or Rural
- Concerned about military control of land
- Protect people’s rights to live, work, and play here
- Create protected places (e.g., pu‘uhonua)
- We need to produce more poi and other products produced locally
- Services for kupuna
- Communications within the community
“FORMATION, PURPOSE, AND MAKE-UP OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE”

The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) for the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) Comprehensive Review is the group that will give the most substantive input to guide the revisions, updates, and additions to the current SCP. This paper presents an overview of how Townscape approached the process of forming this Committee, a brief description of the PAC Members, and the proposed work that will be done over the next 6 months (June through December 2007).

A. FORMATION

Initially, Townscape began this planning process by meeting with several community leaders with whom we have a working relationship from past planning efforts. We asked them the best way to approach the larger Wai‘anae community, in order to get input from a wide range of perspectives, as well as from those who are most familiar with and affected by land use issues in the District. The list of those people that we met with and their affiliations is located at Attachment A.

After talking with 11 such leaders, we set a date for the first Public Informational Meeting and invited them to participate, along with the people and organizations they had suggested. We also made announcements at the April and May Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board Meetings, and placed public notices in the Westside Stories and on the myAdvertiser.com website.

At the May 3rd Public Informational Meeting, we announced that we were looking for people to join the Planning Advisory Committee who were committed to the process and willing to do the work necessary. We also said we would like to have a diverse group of people, from different ahupua’a, and representing various organizations, so there could be a wide range of perspectives in the discussions. Twenty-five people signed up at this time. The list is at Attachment B.

From that point our next step was to look closely at the list and think about what important
stakeholder groups were not represented. We made a list of possible categories that could be filled. That list included: youth, farmers, certain ethnic groups, educators, and businesses.

We then called a few of our community contacts and asked them for recommendations of people who might represent these “under-represented” groups. From their suggestions, we made 8 more phone calls, and were able to recruit 7 of those people. Most of them (including the one who did not sign-up to be a member of the PAC) gave several other recommendations, with whom we followed up. Overall, this networking led to 16 additional members, for a total of 41. The current list of PAC Members is at Attachment C.

Although this number (41) is relatively high, we do not expect all of the members to attend every meeting. Instead, we anticipate that the Committee will have a somewhat flexible membership, and that some new members may join during the process. While the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) planned for a more structured PAC membership and formal invitation process, Townscape believes that the Wai‘anae community needs this type of flexible and inclusive PAC format. To begin with, the Wai‘anae community is a relatively tight-knit group that is actively involved in various community planning projects. Accordingly, many of them are skilled planners themselves and they feel a real sense of ownership over this SCP Update process. Because of this, they would most likely prefer to select their own membership, instead of having it chosen by DPP. In addition, many of the most respected community members are involved in a number of organizations and projects. Although they may not be able to attend every meeting, they still may have important contributions and insights when they can attend, and should not be excluded.

There are a few concerns with this type of flexible structure, but we believe they can be handled. One such concern is “late hits,” or people coming into the process once it is already underway, and re-opening an issue that the group already discussed and came to a decision on. We intend to do our best to inform any “newcomers” of what has already been covered by building an informational packet of meeting minutes and related material that will be handed out at the beginning of each meeting. We will ask them to study the packet before engaging in substantive discussion on the issues that are on that day’s agenda. This approach won’t always work smoothly, but we are relatively confident that order can be maintained – both through our facilitation of the PAC meetings, as well as from community “self-policing.”

The issue of the Waianae PAC structure being different from the other SCP districts is addressed by the Memorandum of Understanding (draft) that can be read at Attachment D.
B. MAKE-UP

As recommended by the scope of the SCP Comprehensive Review, the Wai‘anae Planning Advisory Committee is composed of “knowledgeable community leaders that represent a broad range of interests and affiliations.” Several of the people who signed-up to be members are involved in numerous organizations and businesses. As well, many of the organizations they belong to can be placed in more than one category. It should be noted that although these PAC members are affiliated with the organizations and businesses listed below, they do not necessarily represent the views of the entire entity.

There are representatives from the following:

- **Community and Environmental Organizations:**
  - Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board
  - Empower Wai‘anae
  - Mākaha Ahupua‘a Community Association
  - Wai‘anae Ahupua‘a Community Association
  - Mohala I Ka Wai
  - Nānāikapono Hawaiian Civic Club
  - Nānākuli Hawaiian Homestead Community Association
  - Wai‘anae Valley Hawaiian Homestead Community Association
  - Princess Kahanu Estates Hawaiian Homes Association

- **Non-profit Businesses and Organizations:**
  - Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center
  - Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Mental Health Center (Hale Na‘au Pono)
  - Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Alternative Development Corp.
  - Legal Services for Children
  - Boys & Girls Club
  - Nānākuli Housing Corporation
  - Kokua Legal Services, Inc.
  - HACBED (Hawai‘i Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development)

- **Businesses:**
  - Wai‘anae Business Center
  - Leeward Petroleum
  - Mākaha Resort & Golf Course
- Educational and/or Cultural Organizations:
  - Leeward Community College
  - Ka’ala Cultural Learning Center
  - MA’O Organic Farm
  - Nānāikapono Elementary School

- Others
  - Ke Ola ‘Āina
  - AARP
  - Homeless (Leialii Manao‘lana; Paiʻolu Kaiāulu))
  - Youth

In addition, we looked to see if there was a reasonably balanced representation from people living within the four major ahupuaʻa in the District. The breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ahupuaʻa:</th>
<th>Nānākuli</th>
<th>Lualualei/Māʻili</th>
<th>Waiʻanae</th>
<th>Mākaha</th>
<th>Not Designated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


C. PURPOSE & PROPOSED WORKPLAN

The purpose of the Planning Advisory Committee is to give substantive input that will guide the update process of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review. The way in which the process will gather this input is primarily through the discussions and interactive activities led by Townscape at the PAC meetings.

The PAC meetings are scheduled to be held approximately once a month between June and December of 2007. The Proposed Project Schedule Diagram can be found at Attachment E. The meetings are broken into 3 series of 2 meetings. The tentative topics to be covered at each series of meetings are as follows:

1. June-July
   a. Review existing SCP
   b. Score its effectiveness (Vision/Values)
   c. Discuss possible revisions, updates, and additions

2. August-September
   a. Discuss and resolve details of revisions and updates
   b. Discuss and decide on the addition of new policies and guidelines
   c. Outline Draft Revised SCP

3. November-December
   a. Review and finalize the Revised SCP

The first PAC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 7th at 7 pm at St. Philips Episcopal Church in Mā‘ili. This meeting and the July meeting (not yet scheduled) are intended to get the committee organized, then to review the SCP Update process and evaluate or “score” the existing SCP. It is also meant to begin discussions on possible revisions, updates, and additions. The outcome or work product from this series of meetings will be a working paper that summarizes the draft “Scorecard” for the SCP and expands on the draft summary of possible revisions (Working Paper #1).

The second series of meetings, proposed for August and September, is intended to discuss and resolve the details of the revisions, updates, and additions of new sections to the SCP. The outcome from these meetings will be the information necessary to write the Draft Revised SCP, which Townscape will prepare in September and October.

The purpose of the third and final series of meetings, scheduled for November and December, is to review and finalize the Revised SCP. Townscape will use the information gathered during these meetings to write the Prefinal Revised SCP, which will then be submitted to DPP for
technical review.
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Attachment A: Community Leaders Initially Interviewed

1. Puanani Burgess, Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Alternative Development Corp.
2. Patty Teruya, Chair, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board
3. Cynthia Rezentes, Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (past Chair)
4. William Aila, Harbor Master, Wai‘anae Harbor
5. Melva Aila
6. Landis Ornellas, Capital Investments Corp.
7. Eric Enos, Programs Director, Ka‘ala Farm
8. Kamuela Enos, HACBED
9. Todd Apo, City Councilman for the Wai‘anae District
10. Karen Awana, House Representative for the Nānākuli area
11. Maile Shimabukuro, House Representative for the Wai‘anae area
**Attachment B: People that Signed-up to be Planning Advisory Committee Members at the May 3rd Public Informational Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPU'A'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gary Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 William Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Melva Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Alice Greenwood</td>
<td>Leialii'i Manao'lana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bill Akiona</td>
<td>Ke Ola 'Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ruby Maunakea</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kimo Kelii</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jo Jordan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 George Turner</td>
<td>Kokua Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rodlyn Brown</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dave Brown</td>
<td>Wai'anae Ahupua'a Community Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Puanani Burgess</td>
<td>WCCADC/ Empower Wai'anae</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cynthia Rezentes</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Polly Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ralph Saito</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dana Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Pikake Pelekai</td>
<td>Wai'anae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Johnnie Mae L. Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mark Suiso</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupua'a Community Assoc</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Debra Gregory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Denise Saylors</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dave Saylors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Poka Laenui</td>
<td>Wai'anae Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Lucy Gay</td>
<td>Office of the Associate Vice President for Community Colleges</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pua'Ena Burgess</td>
<td>Empower Wai'anae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C: People that have Signed-up to be Planning Advisory Committee Members as of June 1, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>AHUPUA'A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bill Akiona</td>
<td>Ke Ola 'Aina</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Melva Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 William Aila</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Neddie Armitage-Lapilio</td>
<td>Makaha Resort &amp; Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kapiolani Barber</td>
<td>Nanakuli Housing Corporation</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dave Brown</td>
<td>Wai'anae Ahupua'a Community Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rodlyn Brown</td>
<td>AARP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Myron Brumaghim</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Elementary</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mauna Ala Burgess</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pua'Ena Burgess</td>
<td>Empower Wai'anae</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Puanani Burgess</td>
<td>WCCADC/ Empower Wai'anae</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Shirley Davenport</td>
<td>Wai'anae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ho'opi DeCambra</td>
<td>Legal Services for Children</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eric Enos</td>
<td>Ka'ala Farm</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kamuela Enos</td>
<td>HACBED</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Lucy Gay</td>
<td>Office of the Associate Vice President for Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Polly Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Alice Greenwood</td>
<td>Leialii Manao'ilana (Maili Homeless)</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Debra Gregory</td>
<td>Hawai'i</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jo Jordan</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mike Kahikina</td>
<td>Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Kamaki Kanahele</td>
<td>Nanakuli Homestead Association</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Alva Kanaiakala</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Kimo Kelii</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board, Nanakuli Homestead, etc.</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Maralyn Kurshals</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>AHUPUA'A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Poka Laenui</td>
<td>Wai'anae Coast Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Joseph Lapilio</td>
<td>Wai'anae Business Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Ruby Maunakea</td>
<td>Nanaikapono Hawaiian Civic Club</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Gary Maunakea-Forth</td>
<td>MA'O Farms</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Dana Newman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Lori Nordlum</td>
<td>Princess Kahanu Estates</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Joyce O'Brien</td>
<td>Wai'anae Coast Comprehensive Health Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Pikake Pelekai</td>
<td>Wai'anae Valley Homestead Assoc</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Johnnie Mae L. Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Cynthia Rezentes</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Ralph Saito</td>
<td>Leeward Petroleum</td>
<td>Waianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Dave Saylors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Denise Saylors</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Lualualei/Maili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Mark Suiso</td>
<td>Makaha Ahupua'a Community Assoc</td>
<td>Makaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Patty Teruya</td>
<td>Neighborhood Board</td>
<td>Nanakuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 George Turner</td>
<td>Kokua Legal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D: Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Planning and Permitting, PlanPacific, and Townscape, Inc. to Allow the Waiʻanae PAC to have a Unique Format (Draft)

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This is a MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING dated ________________, 2007 between PLANPACIFIC, INC. and the CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU.

The contract titled Sustainable Communities Plans 5-Year Update, as amended on February 21, 2007 between the two parties above provides for, in First Amended Exhibit A, Section I.B 3., a task to organize and facilitate a Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) for each of the four Sustainable Communities Plans (i.e., Koolauloa, Koolauloa, North Shore and Waiʻanae) to be updated pursuant to the contract. PlanPacific, Inc. has retained a sub-contractor, Townscape, Inc., to assist in the preparation of the update of the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan.

The City and County of Honolulu, in consultation with contractor PlanPacific, Inc. and its sub-contractor Townscape, Inc., agrees to a more informal approach to the formation of the PAC for the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan to recognize the public participation practices that have been shown to be effective in that community. Accordingly, First Amended Exhibit A, Section I.B.3. is adjusted and replaced as follows:

“3. Organize and facilitate, with guidance from the CITY, the four (4) PACs, which shall be comprised of representatives from the community, other City and State agencies, and other key stakeholders. The CONSULTANT shall:

a. Recommend members of the PACs and the means by which PAC members will be engaged in the Project, e.g., group meetings, structured interviews, telephone discussions, and e-mail exchanges.

b. Prepare material of distribution to invited PAC members, including description of Project purpose and schedule, role of and responsibilities of the PAC, working principles for the PAC. Submit invitation letter and material to the CITY for review and approval prior to distribution.

c. Notwithstanding the two above subparts, the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan PAC shall allow for the intermittent inclusion and participation of interested community representatives, agencies, and other key stakeholders.

Product: Working Paper documenting the composition and purpose of the PAC.”

All other provisions of Contract No. C-60116 shall remain in effect.

Signed:

John P. Whalen, President
PlanPacific, Inc.  CONTRACTOR

Bruce Tsuchida, President
Townscape, Inc.  SUB-CONTRACTOR

Henry Eng, Director
Department of Planning and Permitting  CITY
Attachment E: Proposed Project Schedule Diagram
“DRAFT SCORECARD AND EXPANDED DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS”

This Working Paper #4 presents a draft “Scorecard” for the current Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (WSCP). Its purpose is to summarize how effective the WSCP has been since its adoption in 2000. The paper then expands on the discussion of possible revisions that was begun in Working Paper #1, “Preliminary Discussion of Possible WSCP Revisions,” submitted to the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) on April 30, 2007.

The information in this paper was gathered primarily through 2 recent Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, held on June 7th and June 30th. Due to the fact that Wai‘anae has a flexible PAC, the names of the meeting participants for each meeting are listed in Attachments A & C. The actual meeting notes are attached at Attachments B & D.

A. SCORECARD

As stated above, the purpose of the Scorecard is to evaluate the effectiveness of the WSCP from its adoption in 2000 to the present. The format used here is a modification of that proposed by DPP. Please refer to the draft Scorecard, which is attached at the end of the document due to its large paper size.

The first column consists of 4 “Goals,” which were proposed by DPP:

1. Protect natural, scenic and cultural resources
2. Provide infrastructure to improve safety and access
3. Preserve rural character of neighborhoods
4. Provide economic choices in Wai‘anae

For the next column, “Outcomes,” we used each of the 10 WSCP Vision Elements to help determine whether or not each of the Goals was reached. One example is Vision Element #1.e. “Preserve and restore streams and stream corridors” as an Outcome for reaching Goal #1 “Protect natural, scenic and cultural resources.”
The “Indicators” column consists of facts and data that indicate whether or not the Outcome was reached. More information will be added to the draft Scorecard as it becomes available from DPP and other research conducted by Townscape. Eventually a “Score” will be placed in each of these sections that will rank how well that particular Vision Element was implemented.

One significant change to DPP’s Scorecard is the addition of the column entitled “Community Comments.” The purpose of this column is to summarize what the community said when asked about the implementation of the various Vision Elements. The comments include discussion on the effectiveness of the implementation of the Indicators, as well as the need for revisions to the WSCP.

Overall, the preliminary data seems to indicate that the current WSCP was most effective in controlling land use according to the Plan. For example, there have been no new developments North of Kepuhi Point, and very few makai of Farrington Highway (Outcomes/Vision Elements 1.c. and 1.d.). On the other hand, the data collected thus far indicates that less was achieved from those Outcomes that required pro-active steps to be taken by the City & County or other public agencies. Some of these examples include Safety Improvements and Beautification of Farrington Highway and Establishing Town Centers for the 4 major ahupua’a (Outcomes/Vision Elements 2.b. and 3.a.). In general, that is one of the biggest concerns the community has expressed in regards to the review of this WSCP – the lack of implementation. Thus, Townscape is keeping this in mind as we continue with this comprehensive review process, to see how implementation might be improved upon.

B. EXPANDED DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE REVISIONS

Townscape’s objective in revising the WSCP is to base the revision on input from the Wai‘anae community, particularly that of the PAC. To accomplish this input gathering, Townscape is following the proposed project schedule, which includes 3 series of PAC meetings. The purpose of these 3 series of meetings is as follows:

1. June-July  
   a. Review existing SCP  
   b. Score its effectiveness (Vision/Values)  
   c. Discuss possible revisions, updates, and additions

2. August-September  
   a. Discuss and resolve details of revisions and updates  
   b. Discuss and decide on the addition of new policies and guidelines  
   c. Outline Draft Revised SCP
3. **November-December**  
   a. Review and finalize the Revised SCP

We are currently at the end of the 1st series of PAC meetings, having held meetings on June 7th and June 30th. Accordingly, we have thus far focused on identifying possible revisions, updates, and additions. The purpose of the next series of (2 to 3) meetings will be to work out the specific details. Thus, this Working Paper presents the outcomes of these meetings, which includes proposed new topics to be added and points out which sections need revisions. These recommendations are presented by chapter, in brief, relatively general statements. The details of the discussions can be found in the meeting notes, which are attached at **Attachments B & D**.

The review also includes research by Townscape to update the information presented in the Plan, which is outlined here as well.

**Executive Summary of the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan**

Although the Executive Summary basically summarizes the rest of the document, it also serves to highlight the most important aspects of the WSCP. According to the information gathered through the first 2 PAC meetings, the following topics should be included in the Executive Summary:

- Affordable housing
- Community management of natural and cultural resources
- The need for increased enforcement of rules and implementation of the WSCP policies

**Chapter 1 - Waiʻanae’s Role in Oʻahu’s Development Patterns**

This brief (2-page) chapter examines the growth management policies presented in Oʻahu’s General Plan, and those that are most relevant to Waiʻanae. There have been no major changes to the General Plan since the revised 1992 edition. Therefore, no major revisions are suggested to this chapter.

**Chapter 2 – The Vision for the Future of the Waiʻanae District**

The main components of this chapter that were identified for revisions include the Vision Statement, the Vision Elements, and the Waiʻanae Concept map. Also included in this chapter are Community Values, an explanation of the Community Participation Process used for the development of the original WSCP, an overview of the Ahupuaʻa/Ecosystem Concept, and Environmental Criteria for Land Use Planning. Townscape felt that due to the nature of these sections being essentially background information, it was advisable to leave them as they are unless PAC members had specific concerns. One Committee member did suggest some changes...
to the Environmental Criteria section, specifically regarding agriculture (2.6.a and 2.6.b). Those suggestions will be fleshed out in the next round of meetings.

The first PAC meeting, held on June 7\textsuperscript{th}, focused specifically on the Vision Statement, the 10 Vision Elements, and the Wai’anae Concept map for possible revisions of the WSCP. The 40 meeting participants broke into 4 working groups to discuss possible revisions. The general outcomes of their discussions are as follows:

1. The Vision Statement should be re-written. Some preliminary ideas include:
   - Incorporate more of a Hawaiian cultural perspective
   - Identify the host culture

2. The 10 Vision Elements should be maintained, but a few of them should be revised (the following ideas are followed by the number and letter of the Vision Element it refers to as it is listed on the draft Scorecard):
   - Revise the definition of “Preservation Lands” to include access for cultural purposes (1.b.)
   - In addition to “protect” and “preserve,” cultural sites should also be “restored” (1.f.)
   - Community Gathering Places should be Spiritual Centers (3.b.)
   - Maybe add the need for affordable housing as a priority (new)

3. The Wai‘anae Concept Map is still relevant, but it needs a few revisions:
   - The ahupua‘a lines need to be revised for accuracy and they should extend 2-3 miles into the ocean
   - The Agricultural land use boundary should be changed to include more of the mauka Preservation lands for the cultivation of taro

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

The proposed updates, revisions, and additions for Chapter 3 are outlined here by sections:

**3.0 Overview of Land Use and Population Growth** contains data regarding Wai‘anae’s land use that Townscape needs to update.

**3.1 Boundary Definitions** describes the boundary definitions for the 4 major types of land uses within the region. The primary revision recommended here is to update the definition of the Preservation Boundary to include access for cultural purposes.

**3.2 Preservation of Open Space**
• Add a discussion of the cultural significance of open space (as a cultural resource)
• Open space should be managed by a community-based Native Hawaiian group that understands and allows for gathering, but only certain things at certain times.

3.3 Preservation of Coastal Lands
• Add Wai‘anae Harbor to list of beach parks on page 3-12 and maybe name the list “Coastal Access Areas”
• Add a section on management of coastal resources. It should explain what is allowed and what is not (e.g. laying nets and leaving them should be prohibited).
• Add a section on enforcement of these management guidelines
• 2nd paragraph on page 3-13 should be re-worded to stress the importance of coastal lands as cultural resources first, then scenic and recreational resources second and third.

3.4 Preservation of Mountain Forest Lands
• Add a section about the importance of protecting the lowlands
• Create a list of what species can be planted (should be natives only) and which species cannot (no invasive/alien species)
• Include the need for a wildfire management plan

3.5 Preservation of Streams and Stream Floodplains
• Need enforcement for the guidelines that are in this section

3.6 Preservation of Historic and Cultural Resources
• Add a section about the specific need for signage near cultural sites (names, mo‘olelo, rules)

3.7 Preservation of Agricultural Lands
Townscape needs to meet with some Wai‘anae farmers to get more information on this section, but the general feeling of the PAC was that agriculture is very important to the Wai‘anae District. This section needs to include some innovative ideas to support farmers and ways of getting them implemented.

3.8 Residential Land Use
• Townscape needs to update housing data
• Need to address affordability of housing
• Height of residential structures could possibly be changed from 30 feet to 25 ft.
• Add ‘Ohana housing concept

3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses
• Prohibit big box stores
• Maybe create Special District for Wai‘anae Town Center
• Add the recommendation of building a light industrial park of 150-200 acres
• No new landfills

3.10 Country Towns, Rural Community Commercial Centers and Gathering Places
No major revisions recommended yet.

3.11 Parks and Recreational Areas
• Need to get the policy recommendation of adding more parks implemented

3.12 Military Land Use
• Need to create a plan for the community take over of Mākua Valley in order to be prepared when it does eventually happen

Chapter 4 – Public Facilities and Infrastructure Policies and Guidelines
Chapter 4 deals with the infrastructure policies and guidelines. Townscape needs to update the data presented throughout this chapter.

4.1 Transportation Systems
• Add a section on how all roads in the District should stay within the City standards so that the City will service them
• Establish rural road standards that the City agrees to
• Get the idea of a second access road implemented
• Add a section on extending the zipper lane closer to Wai‘anae

4.2 Potable Water Systems
• Add a section on non-potable water systems
• Add a section that discusses the need to coordinate with the military to get them to pump less water since they don’t use all that they are pumping
• Add a policy on water resource inventory

4.3 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems
• Need to resolve the issue of saltwater intrusion into the sewer lines
• Add a section on looking into the possibility of a water desalinization plant and the use of ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC)
• Implement the ideas for re-using gray water

4.4 Electrical Power and Communications
• Add a section on developing alternative energy sources
- Add a section on increasing cell phone towers/antennas

**4.5 Drainage Systems**
- Add a recommendation to look at other methods to deal with drainage/flooding problems besides channelization
- Add a recommendation to build dike revetments to capture run-off and make the area more estuary-friendly

**4.6 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal**
- No new landfills on the Wai‘anae Coast
- Recommend new rural infrastructure standards
- Add a section encouraging composting
- Enforce fines for illegal dumping
- Increase the capacity of convenience stations

**4.7 Civic, Public Safety and Educational Facilities**
- Nānākuli needs a library
- Change “A second ambulance should be provided” (page 4-21) to “Expand second ambulance unit to 24 hours.”
- Add section on the need for job training programs for health
- Include charter schools and adult education in school statistics

**4.8 Healthcare Facilities**
No major revisions recommended yet.

**Chapter 5 – Implementation**
No major revisions have been recommended for this chapter yet. However, Townscape heard numerous comments from the Wai‘anae community that this was the area that needs the most emphasis. This will be examined more.

**C. NEXT STEPS**

After the last PAC meeting on June 30th, Townscape distributed the meeting notes (Attachment A) to the participants and asked them to prepare for the next series of PAC meetings by doing some “homework.” The homework was to review the current WSCP and write down any suggested changes or additions that were not already recorded in the notes, and email (or mail) them to Harmonee Williams by July 20th. Townscape’s plan is to collect all of these suggestions, combine them with those listed above, and present them at the next series of meetings; the first
of which is scheduled for August 11, 2007.

We intend to use that list of suggested revisions and additions as the outline for the meeting discussions. We expect this process to take at least 2 meetings, possibly 3. Then the outcome of those meetings should be the basis for the draft Revised WSCP, which will then be presented at a Public Informational Meeting.
WORKING PAPER #5:
“PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING #2 – DISCUSSION AND RESULTS”

The second Public Informational Meeting for the Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review was held on October 27, 2008 at 7pm at the Kamehameha School’s Community Learning Center at Nānākuli. This paper presents an overview of the work that Townscape did to prepare for the meeting, the proceedings of the meeting itself, and the outcomes and follow-up work that is planned.

A. MEETING PREPARATION

Initially, a meeting date was selected after consulting with several community members about what dates would not conflict with other major meetings or events in the Waiʻanae District. The KS Community Learning Center at Nānākuli was selected to hold the event. This facility is relatively new and comfortably holds at least 50 people. Unfortunately, the evening of the meeting, the parking lot was under construction, which made entering and finding parking somewhat difficult.

In order to announce the event, Townscape sent out two separate email notifications to all Waiʻanae residents who have been involved in this process before (65 email addresses). The email asked people to attend the meeting, and to spread the word to any other individuals who might be interested. Copies of those emails are included as Attachment A. Phone calls were made to those participants who do not use email regularly (5 phone calls). In addition, an announcement was sent to the Honolulu Advertiser and the Star Bulletin. However, the announcements were not received before the newspapers’ calendar deadlines, and so were not posted.

Lastly, Townscape announced the upcoming Waiʻanae SCP meeting at the Nānākuli-Māʻili Neighborhood Board meeting on October 21st. The Chair of the Waiʻanae Neighborhood Board was asked to announce the WSCP meeting at their regular monthly meeting on October 7th, which Townscape was unable to attend.
B. THE MEETING

The meeting began promptly at 7pm. There were 32 attendees that signed in. However, an unofficial count consisted of over 40 attendees, so it was likely that at least eight people did not sign in. This total included one staff from the City & County of Honolulu’s Department of Planning and Permitting, Division Chief, Kathy Sokugawa. Also present were Council Member Todd Apo, Wai’anae Representative Maile Shimabukuro, and Nānākuli Representative Karen Awana. The sign-in list can be found in the Meeting Notes, Attachment C.

The meeting agenda consisted of:

- Pule -

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE
2. OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCESS
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & PROPOSED CHANGES TO WAI’ANAE SCP
   - IMPLEMENTATION
   - CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE
   - ECONOMICS
4. COMMUNITY COMMENTS ON MAJOR PROPOSED CHANGES
5. NEXT STEPS

An overview of each agenda item follows:

- The Pule was given by Victor Kila, member of the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board.

1. The “Welcome and Purpose” was given by Harmonee Williams, from Townscape:
   - Williams thanked everyone for coming and reviewed the logistics: apologies for the construction in the parking lot; location of food and restrooms; permission for photos to be taken during the meeting; we need to adjourn by 8:45pm because the facility closes.
   - Williams briefly reviewed the Agenda and proposed meeting Ground Rules, which were agreed to. The “Proposed Ground Rules” can be found at Attachment B.
   - Everyone was asked to sign-in and pick up the two hand-outs, along with a copy of the Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2009) Public Review Draft, although most participants already had one, which Townscape mailed out October 3rd. The hand-outs are included in the Meeting Notes (Attachment C).
• The main **purpose** of this meeting was to review the Public Review Draft and hear community thoughts and comments on it.

2. Williams then presented an **overview of this 5-year review process**:

   • The Department is conducting the review of the Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP), which was adopted by City Council in 2000. Townscape, Inc. is the planning consultant.

   • The purpose of the five-year comprehensive review is to assess the appropriateness of the plan’s vision, policies, guidelines, implementing actions, and land use map, and then decide what needs to be changed, added, and/or removed. These changes will eventually result in a revised Wai’anae SCP (2009), which will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for approval and adoption as an ordinance.

   • The timeline for this process is outlined on the first hand-out, **“Overview of Process Timeline”**. It shows the dates of all past community meetings and Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, when the various drafts were submitted, and other details. The newest change to this schedule is the deadline for comments on the Public Review Draft. It has been extended to December 15, 2008 (from November 15, 2008) to allow time to incorporate more comments.

3. **Summary of Findings & Proposed Changes to Wai’anae SCP:**

   • So far, what Townscape has found is that there were a significant number of changes needed. Many of these have already been made, and can be found in this Public Review Draft. Three of the main areas that have been identified as needing change include:

     i. **Implementation** – this is part of the reason we were “on-hold” for approximately six months, so DPP could look at how to improve consistency among the SCPs. We decided to add an “Implementation Matrix” on pages 5-3 through 5-7, which will hopefully improve implementation, since it summarizes all projects/programs within the SCP, and identifies what agency or group should take the lead.

     ii. **Culturally Appropriate** – we heard from the community the need for this plan to have more cultural history included, and to have more policies based on Native Hawaiian values. This has been incorporated into both the overview sections of the plan (e.g., Chapter 2 – Vision), as well as in the form of more specific Policies and Guidelines.
iii. **Economics** – we have heard many comments on the need for the plan to do more to explain and improve the economic situation within the District. We have included a new section in Chapter 3 that presents economic data on the District and explains why increased economic opportunities are so needed. There are several new Policies intended to improve the economic situation as well, which we will see as we go through each section.

- There are numerous other changes, but these are some of the main themes that Townscape has tried to keep in mind while revising. We will be discussing some of the others in the next section of the agenda.

4. **Community Comments on Major Proposed Changes:**

- Williams asked the group to refer to the hand-out entitled “**Summary of Major Revisions**” (in Attachment C). She went through the revisions for each chapter, and then asked for comments on that section (although the meeting ended before Chapters 4 and 5 were discussed).

- The community comments are included in the Meeting Notes, which are included as Attachment C.

- Overall, the revisions in the Public Review Draft were generally accepted. A few topics that need follow-up include the following:
  
  o Should the name of the plan be changed to “The Wai’anae Coast SCP” or “The Wai’anae District SCP”?
  
  o The plan should explain that Mākuʻa is different now; many more people live closer to that ahupuaʻa, which makes its use by the military highly inappropriate and dangerous.
  
  o The “Hawaiian Cultural and Educational Park” is a good idea, but not necessarily only for the site mentioned in the Public Review Draft (page 3-43; Policy 3.11.2.3). Maybe there should be a “system” of such parks.
  
  o The community would like to see a policy about new business ventures (such as driving ranges) not being able to hook up to County potable water.

- The most controversial issue of the meeting was the proposed change to the Land Use Map, to include a new area for “**Industrial**” use in Lualualei Valley. There were basically two “sides” of the debate:

  o **A. Those in favor of the new industrial area**, who stated that it is needed because of the economic situation in the District, and especially in Nānākuli and Māʻili/Lualualei. In addition:

    - It was pointed out that those two ahupuaʻa have even less employment opportunities than Waiʻanae and Mākaha.
    - There have already been numerous community meetings, where
residents have come out in support of the light industrial project proposed for the area.

- The Chair and Vice Chair of the Nānākuli-Māʻili Neighborhood Board were in attendance and stated that the residents of those two ahupuaʻa have shown their support for the proposed industrial use, and their Board has passed two resolutions to show this support (Attachment D).

- There is a real need for this type of industrial area, since local businesses have had to locate in Campbell Industrial Park. It can provide hands-on experience/opportunities for youth.

- Another issue brought up was that residents of Waiʻanae and Mākaha should not decide what happens in Nānākuli and Māʻili/Lualualei, and vice versa.

- The proposed developer has already signed a Unilateral Agreement with all of the conditions that would not be allowed for the site (including no landfill, golf course, alcohol establishments, etc.). Members of the NB suggested that these conditions could be included in the Waiʻanae SCP to prohibit any owner from these other uses as well.

  B. Those NOT in support of a new industrial area. Their perspectives and concerns include:

- This community has long said that we want a rural District, one that supports agriculture first and foremost. This is what our SCP is all about.

- What other uses could this area have (landfill, waste processing, alcohol establishments, other unwanted uses)? What is the definition of “light industrial”? What is allowed?

- What effect will this have on nearby sites? Once this one area allows industrial uses, it could open other sites to such uses.

- A private business is using these meetings, which are supposed to be part of a “community” process, to subvert the process.

- Is it possible to leave the Land Use Map as is for now, and then have the developer apply for the needed changes/amendments later (when more info is available)?

  - In the end, no consensus was reached. The issue was “tabled” until the next meeting.

  - Another issue not yet resolved is whether the addition of such an Industrial area would need only a purple “Industrial” bubble on the Land Use Map, or
whether the Rural Community Boundary would also need to be amended to include this area. Sokugawa commented that the latter could be done, but it would be a big deal since the Wai‘anae community has been adamant about not changing or extending the Rural Community Boundary in the past.

5. Next Steps:

- Townscape thanked everyone for coming, and said they would be in contact with the details of a follow-up meeting.
- The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50pm.

C. FOLLOW-UP

The primary actions following the second Public Informational Meeting were to type up the notes from the meeting and distribute them. They were sent to all of the meeting participants as well as those who were on the invitational email list.

The next step was to contact the Chairs of both Neighborhood Boards, and ask them which dates would work best for them, for the next Public Informational Meeting, from the possibilities of November 21, 22, 24, or 25. Townscape thought it best to have the follow-up meeting relatively soon after this meeting, so as not to lose momentum, and also to avoid the end of the year holiday season.

Townscape will continue to work with community members and DPP staff to set the next meeting. We are also working on gathering and distributing all relevant information to community members before the next meeting, in order to answer their questions and concerns about the proposed industrial area, and any other concerns. Primarily, this consists of the definitions of the various industrial districts, as defined by the City and County of Honolulu’s Land Use Ordinance, and the various processes involved in getting the changes/amendments necessary for such an industrial area to happen (SCP Land Use Map amendment, State Land Use District amendment, City & County zoning change).
Attachments:

A. Emails Announcing Public Informational Meeting #2 for the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan Update

B. Proposed Ground Rules for Public Informational Meeting #2

C. Meeting Notes for Public Informational Meeting #2
   • The Notes contain the Sign-In Sheet and the Hand-outs.

   • This Resolution contains 3 “Exhibits,” which are:
     1. The Neighborhood Board Resolution passed on July 15, 2008;
     2. The Neighborhood Board Resolution passed on September 16, 2008; and
Aloha All-  
There will be a meeting regarding the Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009) Public Review Draft on **Monday, October 27th from 7pm to 9pm at the Kamehameha School’s Community Learning Center at Nanakuli**.

Please come to hear about the changes to the Waianae SCP proposed in this revised version, and to voice your opinions. We will be taking comments on this Public Review Draft at the meeting, and after until November 15th.

This is a Public Informational Meeting. Please invite any and all interested Waianae residents. Any questions, please call me on my cell (808-772-0316).

thanks and hope to see you all on the 27th,
Harmonee

Harmonee Williams  
**Townscape, Inc.**  
Environmental & Community Planning  
900 Fort Street Mall, Suite 1160  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  
Phone: (808) 536-6999, ext. 8  
Fax: (808) 524-4998  
Email: harmonee@townscapeinc.com
Aloha Everyone,

Just a reminder that there is a **Community-wide Public Meeting next Monday, October 27th, 7pm to 9pm, at the Kamehameha School's Community Learning Center at Nanakuli** (89-101 Farrington Highway - the former Nanaikapono Elementary School site, makai side of Farrington Highway). Refreshments will be served.

Please come and invite everyone!

We will be there to hear from you. So please come and share your thoughts on the **Public Review Draft, October 1, 2008** of the "Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (Revised 2009)".

The draft can still be accessed online at the Townscape and the DPP websites: 

or

[http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/](http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/) (click on "Wai'anae SCP")

Both sites have the full Public Review Draft and a tracked changes version (if you'd like to see what changed from the original SCP).

Please email or call me with any questions at 772-0316.

thanks and hope to see you Monday,

Harmonee

---

Harmonee Williams  
Townscape, Inc.  
Environmental & Community Planning  
900 Fort Street Mall, Suite 1160  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  
Phone: (808) 536-6999, ext. 8  
Fax: (808) 524-4998  
Email: harmonee@townscapeinc.com

(see following page)
RESOLUTION

SUPPORTING THE AMENDMENT OF THE WAI’ANAЕ SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN TO INCORPORATE THE INPUT AND IDEAS OF THE NANAKULI-MAILI NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD #36, INCLUDING ITS SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIGHT-INDUSTRIAL PARK IN LUALUALEI VALLEY, NANAKULI, OAHU.

WHEREAS, on or about March 12, 2007, the Department of Planning and Permitting of the City and County of Honolulu ("DPP") began the official process to update and revise the existing Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan ("WSCP") which was adopted in December 2000;

WHEREAS, as a part of DPP’s 5-year review process (see Section 24-9.10 of the Revised Ordinances of Honolulu), DPP is in the process of evaluating and re-assessing the appropriateness of the WSCP’s regional vision, policies, design principles and guidelines and implementing actions;

WHEREAS, DPP contracted the services of Townscape, Inc. ("Townscape") to lead the “community participation processes” as DPP’s planning consultant;

WHEREAS, Townscape began the community participation process in April 2007, and a planning advisory committee (“PAC”) was established and its members were selected by June 2007;

WHEREAS, also as a part of the community participation process, Townscape attended several meetings of the Wai’anae Neighborhood Board meetings;

WHEREAS, the Neighborhood Commission established the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36 (“Nanakuli NB”) in February 2008, and its members were elected and seated in March 2008;

WHEREAS, since the Nanakuli NB was formed and its members seated after the commencement of the community participation process, and since Townscape has not had the opportunity to attend any of Nanakuli NB’s meetings, the Nanakuli NB has not been able to make any meaningful input or comment to the community participation process to revise the WSCP;

WHEREAS, on or about July 15, 2008, the Nanakuli NB unanimously supported the development of a light-industrial park in Lualualei Valley, specifically that project known as the Nanakuli Community Baseyard, and which unanimous support is evidenced by the adoption of that certain Resolution dated July 15, 2008 ("7/15/08 Resolution") and that certain letter of Mr. Victor Kila dated July 21, 2008 ("Kila Letter") (copies of the 7/15/08 Resolution and Kila Letter are attached hereto as Exhibit "A");
WHEREAS, the 7/15/08 Resolution specifically recognizes the Nanakuli NB's desire to have the WSCP amended to support the development of the Nanakuli Community Baseyard Project in Lualualei Valley;

WHEREAS, although copies of the 7/15/08 Resolution and Kila Letter were delivered to Townscape, the September 5, 2008 version of Townscape's WSCP Public Review Draft did not reflect the Nanakuli NB's position to have a light-industrial park developed in Lualualei Valley;

WHEREAS, the Nanakuli NB took further action to adopt at its general meeting held on September 16, 2008, a Resolution to specifically support an amendment to the WSCP to include the designation of the proposed Nanakuli Community Baseyard Project in Lualualei Valley ("9/16/08 Resolution");

WHEREAS, at the most recent PAC meeting which was held on September 18, 2008, Board Member Kimo Keli'i "pressed" to have heard the need for input and participation from the Nanakuli NB in the community participation process and delivered to Townscape the 9/16/08 Resolution, together with a cover letter signed by all 9 members of the Nanakuli NB (a copy of the 9/16/08 Resolution and the accompanying cover letter are attached hereto as Exhibit "B");

WHEREAS, since the September 18 PAC Meeting, Townscape has accepted the further comments from Nanakuli NB members and has incorporated some, but not all, of the input into the current revised draft of Townscape's WSCP Public Review Draft which is dated October 1, 2008 ("10/1/08 Draft");

WHEREAS, since Townscape has announced its intention to develop a further revised WSCP Public Review Draft by November 2008 and to submit to DPP its proposed Final Revised WSCP by mid-December 2008, it is crucial that the Nanakuli NB continue to make known to Townscape its ideas, suggestions and proposals regarding any further amendment of the WSCP and to continue to oversee the implementation of the Nanakuli NB's ideas and suggestions into the Final Revised WSCP;

WHEREAS, Townscape has scheduled future PAC meetings and is scheduled to attend Nanakuli NB's general meeting which is scheduled for October 21, 2008; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board #36 hereby supports the amendment of the WSCP to incorporate the input and ideas of the Nanakuli NB (some of which have been already included in the 10/1/08 Draft), and including the new and additional input and comments to the 10/1/08 Draft which are set forth in Exhibit "C" which is attached hereto and incorporated herein;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36 hereby re-states it support for the development of the Nanakuli Community Basyard Project, and states its support to amend the WSCP to provide for the development of a light-industrial park in Lualualei Valley, Nanakuli, Oahu, and which is identified on Map B of the 10/1/08 Draft;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36, except for the specific amendments previously requested by the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board and the additional changes requested in Exhibit "C," hereby reserves judgment and makes no comment regarding other aspects of the 10/1/08 Draft; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu, the Director of the Department of Planning and Permitting of the City and County of Honolulu, the Chairperson of the Honolulu Planning Commission and the Chairperson of the Honolulu City Council.

INTRODUCED AND SUPPORTED BY THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE NANAKULI-MAILI NEIGHBORHOOD # 36:

[Signatures]

The Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36 adopted this Resolution at its meeting which was held on October 21, 2008.

Patty K. Teruya
Chairperson 10-21-08
RESOLUTION

SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONCEPT OF THE PROPOSED NANAKULI COMMUNITY BASEYARD PROJECT, A LIGHT-INDUSTRIAL PARK IN LUALUALEI VALLEY, NANAKULI, OAHU.

WHEREAS, a new 96-acre light industrial park is being proposed for development on a portion of TMK No. 8-7-9: 02 in Lualualei Valley, Nanakuli, Oahu (herein called "Industrial Park Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Industrial Park Project will be a center for many new employment in the construction trades, automotive repair, trucking, warehousing and other light-industrial businesses and that the type of employment created in this proposed project are quality jobs that pay well and are also the type of jobs that are being sought after by many Leeward Coast residents; and

WHEREAS, the Industrial Park Project is being planned to included an "incubator" facility for new or developing businesses in the Leeward Coast; and

WHEREAS, Tropic Land, LLC, the owner and developer of the Industrial Park Project, made a public presentation regarding the Industrial Park Project to the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board #36 (herein "Neighborhood Board") on June 24, 2008; and

WHEREAS, in its recent presentation to the Planning and Zoning Committee, Tropic Land has made commitment with several unilateral agreements regarding the development of the Industrial Park Project which are attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "A," and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Committee has received an informational booklet describing the project with more than 590 signatures/letters of support for the Industrial Park Project from many Leeward Coast residents and community groups; and

WHEREAS, in order for this project to become a reality for the residents of the Leeward Coast, various governmental approvals (herein collectively "Government Permitting Process") are required, which may include (i) an amendment of the VVa’i’anae Sustainable Communities Plan, (ii) the rezoning of the 96-acre site from P-2 (general preservation district) to I-1 (limited industrial district), (iii) a State Land Use Boundary amendment to reclassify the 96-acre site from Agricultural to Urban use, and (iv) an amendment of the Leeward Coast Enterprise Zone to include the 96-acre site; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Committee, upon the unanimous vote of its members at the Committee’s meeting held on June 24, 2008, adopted a motion to support the Industrial Park Project and recommend the action of the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board #36 to support the Industrial Park Project at the Board’s upcoming meeting on July 15, 2008; and
WHEREAS, the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board No. 36 recognizes the need for a project in the Leeward Coast, which has traditionally "lagged" behind the rest of Oahu in terms of economic development and employment opportunities for its coastal residents; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board No. 36 supports the development of the Industrial Park Project; and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board No. 36 hereby supports and encourages the approvals of the various governmental agencies that will be reviewing the Industrial Park Project in the Government Permitting Process; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu, the Director of the Department of Planning and Permitting of the City and County of Honolulu, the Chairperson of the Honolulu Planning Commission, the Chairperson of the Honolulu City Council, the Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Executive Director of the Office of Planning of the State of Hawaii, the Chairperson of the State Land Use Commission, and the Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development of the State of Hawaii.

INTRODUCED AND SUPPORTED BY:

NANAKULI-MAILI NB#36

[Signatures]

The Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36, hereby certifies that this Resolution was adopted by the Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board # 36 at its meeting held on July 15, 2008.

1-15-08
Tropic Land LLC agrees to the Unilateral Agreement and Promise to the Community along the Leeward Coast.

1. An MSW/composting/construction debris landfill will not be built on any Tropic’s land LLC located in Nanakuli, Oahu.

2. A golf course will not be built on Tropic’s land, LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu.

3. Any future housing development will not be built on Tropic’s land.

4. Strip clubs, hostess bars, night clubs, or any alcohol establishments stores and pornography stores will not be allowed on Tropic’s land, LLC, Nanakuli Oahu.

5. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will do an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) covering traffic, infrastructure and other pertinent issues. To be presented to the community and board members.

6. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will go green on energy consumption.

7. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will be sensitive to cultural practices and places and will work with Nanakuli or Leeward Coast residents cultural monitors.

8. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will contribute $1,000,000 for the a community benefits program which will be used to benefit the Nanakuli and Maili communities.

9. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will apply for Enterprise Zone designation for the project.

10. Tropic LLC, Nanakuli, Oahu will find an appropriate permanent name for the project site, acceptable to the community and offer community involvement on names for the site. To add the word “Nanakuli”, in naming the site.

The Planning and Zoning Committee has requested of Tropic Land the additional language to these promises which are indicated by the underlined text.
July 21, 2008

Kahu Victor Allen Kila  
Pacific Faith Fellowship Church  
Ma‘ili Commercial Center  
87-1784 Farrington Highway, Unit 8  
Wai‘anae, Hawaii 96792  

RE: Support of Tropic Land LLC proposed Light Industrial Project – Lualualei, O‘ahu

Aloha Chair Teruya:

As you know I was on a religious mission in Jamaica and have recently returned home. Being away, I was unable to attend the Nanakuli-Ma‘ili NB#36 regular meeting on July 15, 2008. I understand that Tropic Land LLC did a presentation to the full board and the board introduced a Resolution and an exhibit agreement was supported unanimously of a vote 8 aye; 0 opposition.

As a member of the Planning & Zoning Committee which met on June 24, 2008, I was in attendance and voted with a motion to support this project and send to the full board meeting. This support recommendation did come from the P&Z Committee meeting.

This letter is to clarify my position and for the record as a member of the Nanakuli-Ma‘ili NB#36, and as the (9) ninth member of the board, I would like to state that my vote is to support this project and my vote be noted in the records through this process.

I’m very aware of this project and that Tropic Land LLC will continue to work with the board with updates but, this project will benefit our community with many opportunities.

Chair Teruya, I’m asking to be included in the support of Tropic Land LLC project and state my vote as “aye”, as a member of the board I did not want my vote to be excluded.

Thank you and Aloha,

[Signature]

Ms. Victor Allen Kila, NB#36 member  
Committee Chair, Health & Public Safety

Cc: Neighborhood Commission Office  
P&Z Committee Chair, Eli
Townscape Inc.
900 Fort Street Mall, Suite 1160
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attn: Ms. Harmonee Williams

RE: Revised Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have received and reviewed the Revised Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2009) Preliminary Draft dated September 5, 2008.

However, based upon our review, it has come to our attention that the preliminary draft makes no mention of a proposed 96 acre light industrial park project in Lualualei Valley, that is supported by our Board and community.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of our formal support Resolution adopted and signed by all 8 Board members in attendance at our meeting held on July 15, 2008, supporting the proposed project and its inclusion in the Amendment to the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan. Also enclosed is a copy of a letter dated July 21, 2008, signed by Mr. Victor Kila, the ninth Board member.
who was unable to attend the meeting, also confirming his support of the resolution and the project.

It is also our understanding that you had previously been provided with a Community Support Report for the proposed light industrial project, that contains approx. 590 petition signatures and support letters evidencing the widespread community support for the proposed 96 acre light industrial park project.

We hereby request that the following language be added to the next Public Review Draft of the Revised Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2009), that is scheduled to be issued in early October, 2008. We propose that the following language be added to Section 2.4.11 (new language in bold):

“Other economic opportunities discussed include expansion of retail and commercial centers in the four major ahupua‘a and the creation of a light industrial park in the Lualualei/Ma‘ili ahupua‘a known as the Nanakuli Community Baseyard Project. Similar to the other sectors, it is recommended that locally-owned businesses be given priority, and that they hire residents as much as possible.

The Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board #36 at its formal meeting held on July 15, 2008, formally issued a support Resolution unanimously supported by all of its Board members, supporting the development of a proposed new 96 acre light industrial park known as
the Nanakuli Community Baseyard project, located in Lualualei Valley. The resolution issued by the Nanakuli-Maili neighborhood board supports an amendment to the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan, that would include the designation of the proposed project for the development of a light industrial park in Lualualei Valley. The proposed project has also received widespread community support along with endorsements from several business organizations located in the Leeward Coast.”

Thank you for your consideration and kokua on this matter that is important to the economic future of our community.

Issued this ___ day of September, 2008:

NANAKULI-MAILI NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD #36

[Signatures]

[Handwritten text]
The 10/1/08 Draft includes the following language in the third paragraph on page 2-11:

"It is recognized that the four ahupua'a have different concerns and needs, and thus, the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan must be flexible enough to take this into account. For example, the current land use and economic opportunities in Makaha Valley are very different from the circumstances in the Lualualei/Ma'ili and Nanakuli ahupua'a. As such, the land use policies and guidelines must allow for variance between the differing ahupua'a."

We believe that all ahupua'a along the Waianae Coast probably are in agreement with the concept in the above language; however, implementing the concept that we are all in agreement with must still be addressed.

The Nanakuli NB suggests that all further work on Townscape’s Public Review Draft of the WSCP should progress with the understanding and agreement with the concept that greater weight be given to each ahupua'a's opinion when it comes to land use decisions made in their own ahupua'a. Although everyone should be able to voice their opinions, shouldn't there be greater weight given to the opinions of the residents in the ahupua'a involved?

This is especially true with respect to the drawing of the Wai'anae Concept Map in Section 2.3 and working out the details in Chapter 5, Implementation, both of which have not been prepared and circulated for review and comment. The Nanakuli NB strongly believes that the Nanakuli-Ma'ili communities should be given greater consideration and weight when deciding issues in the Lualualei/Ma'ili and Nanakuli ahupua'a. Likewise, we understand that that it is only fair and reasonable that the opinions of the Nanakuli-Ma'ili communities will have less weight when involving land use issues in the Wai'anae and Makaha ahupua'a.

The Nanakuli NB has already expressed its position to support the identification of the industrial park project in the Lualualei/Ma'ili ahupua'a as identified on Map B of the Wai'anae Concept Map in Section 2.3, and we hereby make no further comment and reserve our judgment with respect to the proposed land uses identified on the Wai'anae Concept Map for the other three ahupua'a.
The third Public Informational Meeting for the Wai`anae Sustainable Communities Plan Comprehensive Review was held on November 25, 2008 at 7pm at St. Philips Church in Mā`ili. This paper presents an overview of the work that Townscape did to prepare for the meeting, the proceedings of the meeting itself, and the outcomes and follow-up work that is planned.

A. MEETING PREPARATION

At the end of the second Public Informational Meeting, held on October 27th, Townscape announced that they would hold another meeting within a few weeks, in order to follow-up what was not finished. Townscape wanted to select a date that was relatively soon after that meeting, in order to not lose momentum, and one that was not too close to the end of the year holidays. Four meeting dates were proposed to the Wai`anae and Nānākuli-Mā`ili Neighborhood Board Chairs, November 21, 22, 24 and 25, asking what date would work best for them, and not conflict with other major meetings or events in the District. When November 25th was selected, Townscape was concerned that the date might be too close to Thanksgiving (2 days before), but both Neighborhood Board Chairs approved the date. St. Philips Church was selected to hold the event because it had been used for other meetings in this process, it’s relatively centrally located within the District, and it comfortably holds at least 50 people.

Once the specific date was decided upon, Townscape sent out three separate email notifications to all Wai`anae residents who have been involved in this process before (70 email addresses). The emails asked people to attend the meeting, and to spread the word to any other individuals who might be interested. In addition, the first email included information on the proposed light industrial area, as was promised at the October 27th meeting. Copies of those email messages are included as Attachment A. Phone calls were made to those participants who do not use email regularly (5 phone calls). In addition, an announcement was sent to the Honolulu Advertiser and the Star Bulletin.
B. THE MEETING

The meeting began promptly at 7pm. There were 47 attendees that signed in, and most likely a few who did not, putting the total attendance at over 50. This total included one staff from the City & County of Honolulu’s Department of Planning and Permitting, Division Chief, Kathy Sokugawa. Also present were Wai’anae Representative Maile Shimabukuro and Nānākuli Representative Karen Awana. The sign-in list can be found in the Meeting Notes, in Attachment C.

The meeting agenda consisted of:

-- Pule --

1. WELCOME AND PURPOSE

2. PROPOSED CHANGE TO SCP LAND USE MAP: TO ADD A LIGHT INDUSTRIAL AREA
   - BRIEF PRESENTATION
   - COMMUNITY COMMENTS

3. COMMUNITY COMMENTS ON OTHER MAJOR PROPOSED SCP REVISIONS

4. NEXT STEPS

An overview of each agenda item follows:

- The Pule was given by Victor Kila, member of the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board.

1. The “Welcome and Purpose” was given by Harmonee Williams, from Townscape:
   - Williams thanked everyone for coming.
   - Bruce Tsuchida and Williams reviewed the significance of the Wai‘anae SCP and the 5-year review and update.
   - Williams briefly reviewed the Agenda and proposed meeting Ground Rules, which were agreed to. The “Proposed Ground Rules” can be found at Attachment B.
   - The purpose of this meeting was to finish the review of the Public Review Draft and hear community thoughts and comments on it.
• Included in that review was a brief presentation on the proposed light industrial area and a “go-around” format to hear everyone’s comments on the proposed SCP amendment.

2. Presentation on Proposed Light Industrial Area:

• Townscape distributed several hand-outs, which are attached to the meeting notes, and reviewed their content and significance:
  i. Map of area – aerial photograph, printed in color, with major roads shown in white, property owned by Tropic Land LLC outlined in green, and the proposed project area shaded blue. (This hand-out was not attached to meeting notes because it made the file too large to email.)
  ii. Definitions of “I-1 limited industrial district” and “I-2 intensive industrial district” from the City & County of Honolulu’s Land Use Ordinance.
  iii. Description of the approval processes necessary for the project to happen.
  iv. The most recent Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board Resolution, passed on October 21, 2008, which supports the proposed light industrial park and the amendment of the Wai‘anae SCP to incorporate this project and other ideas of the NB. (This hand-out was not attached to meeting notes because it was emailed to everyone before the meeting, and it is 11 pages in length.)

3. Community Comments on Proposed Light Industrial Area:

• Tsuchida facilitated the “go-around” format and Williams recorded.
• The community comments are included in the Meeting Notes, which are in Attachment C.
• Overall, there were numerous comments both in support of and opposed to the proposed project and SCP amendment. Many people mentioned the need for more information on exactly what this project would mean.
• Some of the most common reasons community members supported the SCP amendment that would allow the light industrial project:
  o Job creation and economic development;
  o Wai‘anae children need these kinds of opportunities: blue-collar jobs and vocational training;
  o There is a significant need for this type of business space in this District.
• Some of the most common reasons community members opposed the SCP amendment that would allow the light industrial project:
  o There is not enough information (an EIS should be done first);
  o Allowing this change in our SCP could set a bad precedence for developers;
  o Allowing this SCP amendment and this project could open up our valleys for more development (domino effect).
• Townscape thanked everyone for sharing their thoughts, and said that all of this information would be passed along to DPP for their review.
4. Community Comments on Other Major Proposed SCP Revisions

- Williams reviewed the major revisions to Chapters 4 and 5 that were included in this Public Review Draft and asked for comments or concerns.
- Community members had a few questions, concerns, and suggestions, which are included in the Meeting Notes in Attachment C.

5. Next Steps:

- Townscape told everyone that they will continue to accept comments on the Public Review Draft until December 15, 2008.
- They also reviewed the process going forward:
  - Townscape will finalize and submit Wai‘anae SCP (Revised 2009) in early 2009.
  - DPP will review and submit to the Planning Commission with comments.
  - Planning Commission will review and submit to City Council with comments.
  - City Council will review and adopt as ordinance.
  - There is the opportunity for public testimony at the Planning Commission and the City Council.
- Townscape will keep everyone informed of this process.
- The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:20 pm.

C. FOLLOW-UP

The primary actions following the third Public Informational Meeting were to type up the notes from the meeting and distribute them. They were sent to all of the meeting participants as well as those who were on the invitational email list. Townscape asked anyone who had corrections or additions to the Meeting Notes to please get them in by December 5, 2008.

At this point in the process, Townscape will be accepting comments on the Public Review Draft until December 15, 2008. We will then work with DPP staff to finalize the Wai‘anae SCP (Revised 2009). The target date for submission of the final draft is February 1, 2009. In addition, Townscape is currently working on the creation of the Technical Report that goes along with the revised SCP, and describes the revision process.
Attachments:

A. Emails Announcing Public Informational Meeting #3 for the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan 5-Year Review

B. Proposed Ground Rules for Public Informational Meeting #3

C. Meeting Notes for Public Informational Meeting #3
   - Contain Sign-In Sheet and Hand-outs, except for map of the proposed light industrial area and the Nānākuli-Mā‘ili Neighborhood Board Resolution of October 21, 2008. The map is not included because it is only useful in color, and the Resolution because it was already included in Working Paper #5 and consists of 11 pages.
ATTACHMENT A: Emails Announcing Public Informational Meeting #3 for the Wai’anae Sustainable Communities Plan Update

EMAIL #1
SENT: THU 11/6/2008 3:26 PM

Aloha All-
The update for the Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update includes the following:

- We will be holding the next community meeting Tuesday, November 25th, from 7pm to 9pm. I am still in the process of reserving a room, and will let you know as soon as it is confirmed. (the 24th is the back-up date, just in case.) Sorry for the mtg being so close to Thanksgiving, but we didn’t want to wait too long to follow-up on the last meeting.

- We will be discussing the proposed light industrial area in Lualualei again. More info on that topic is attached, and more will be provided at the mtg. We also want to be sure to have some time to discuss other concerns with the Public Review Draft, so we will try again to reach consensus, and then move on to cover other topics.
  **Please email or call me with any specific topics you would like to see on the agenda.

Attachments:
1. The Nanakuli-Maili Neighborhood Board Resolution passed on October 21st, which was discussed at our last meeting in September.
2. Some basic info on industrial districts.
3. Revised notes from the last meeting (thank you to those of you who sent in additions/corrections).

Aloha for now,
Harmonee
772-0316 (c)

*Note: This information is not included here since items #1 and #3 were included in Working Paper #5, and item #2 is included in Attachment C, as part of the Meeting Notes for PIM #3.
Aloha-
The next Public Informational Meeting for the Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan Update will be **Tuesday, November 25th, at 7pm at St. Philips Church in Maili/Lualualei.** The address is 87-227 St. Johns Rd. From Farrington Hwy, turn mauka onto St. John's Road. The church is 0.3 miles up the road, on the right side. Parking is available in the lot in front of the church or on the side of the road.

Please come and invite everyone who is interested! The purpose of this meeting will be to gather community input on the Oct .1, 2008 Public Review Draft of the revised Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (2009). This is basically a "part 2" to what was not covered or decided upon at the last meeting on Oct. 27th.

The Public Review Draft can be still accessed at the following links:

- [http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/](http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/) (click on "Wai'anae SCP")

Any questions or concerns, please email or call me at 772-0316 (c). Please note that I will be away from this afternoon (Wed, 12th) through Sunday, Nov. 16th. (I'll be on Kahoolawe, so will have NO phone or email access until Monday.)

thanks, and hope to see you all then,
Harmonee
(also, sorry to schedule the mtg so close to Thanksgiving, but we wanted to follow-up the last mtg while the issues were still fresh in people's minds, and didnt want to schedule too close to end of year holidays.)
This is a reminder that the Waianae SCP Community Meeting will be held tomorrow night. This will be the 2nd and final meeting for the public to comment on the Public Review Draft.

Meeting details
Date: Tuesday, Nov. 25th, 2008
Time: 7 - 9 pm
Place: St. Philips Church
   87-227 St, Johns Rd, Waianae, HI 96792
   (0.3 miles mauka of Farrington Hwy)

Agenda attached.

Please call or email with any questions.
thanks,
Harmonee
772-0316
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November 13, 2007

Mr. Henry Eng, Director
Department of Planning and Permitting
City and County of Honolulu
680 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Attn: Mr. Randy Hara

Dear Mr. Eng:

Re: Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP), Five Year Review Amendment Application
   Tax Map Key: 8-7-09: 02 and 8-7-10: 06 and 10

As part of your department’s five-year review of the Waianae SCP, we are requesting a change to the Land Use Map, specifically the redesignation of 192.6 acres located in Lualualei Valley from Golf Course use to Industrial and Preservation use. We are seeking this change to allow the development of a light industrial park to be located off of Lualualei Naval Access Road between Pineridge Farms and the military installation.

We consulted members of your staff about potential uses of the property during a pre-application meeting on July 23, 2007 with Kathy Sokugawa, Randy Hara, and Matthew Higashida. The Waianae Neighborhood Board was consulted during an initial meeting on September 4, 2007, followed by a meeting with the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Committee on October 10. Another P&Z meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2007.

The following are enclosed with this request:
- Completed DPP Master Application Form
- Written statement with maps (2 copies)
- Check for $600 (filing fee)

Your consideration is appreciated. Please contact me if you need any additional information.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

Anoki B. Yanagihara
Project Coordinator

Cc: Michael H. Nekoba
PLANNING DIVISION MASTER APPLICATION FORM

Additional data, drawings/plans, and fee requirements are listed on a separate sheet titled 'Instructions for Filing'. PLEASE ASK FOR THESE INSTRUCTIONS.

All specified materials described in the 'Instructions for Filing' and required fees must accompany this form. Incomplete applications will delay processing. You are encouraged to consult with Planning Division staff in completing the application. Please call the appropriate phone number given in the 'Instructions for Filing'.

Please print legibly or type the required information.

PERMIT/APPROVAL REQUESTED (Check one or more as appropriate):

☐ GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

☐ STATE LAND USE BOUNDARY AMENDMENT (<15 acres)
From ____________________________
To ____________________________

☐ DEVELOPMENT PLAN (DP)/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLAN (SCP) AMENDMENT
Indicate DP/SCP area: Waianae

☐ SPECIAL USE PERMIT

☐ ZONING DISTRICT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT, ADMINISTRATIVE
From ____________________________
To ____________________________

☐ ZONE CHANGE

☐ AMEND UNILATERAL AGREEMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. __________________________

☐ PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE MAP REVISION (Indicate Map Symbol Request):

☐ CY (Corporation Yard) ☐ DSP (Desalination Plant)

☐ D (Drainage Way [Open Channel]) ☐ EG (Energy Generation) ☐ ET (Electrical Transmission)

☐ FS (Fire Station) ☐ GB (Government Building)

☐ GC (Golf Course) ☐ P (Park) ☐ PS (Police Station) ☐ PKG (Parking Facility/Transit Center)

☐ RES (Water Reservoir) ☐ DPS (Sewage Pump Station)

☐ STP (Sewage Treatment Plant) ☐ SW (Solid Waste Facility) ☐ TC (Transit Corridor)

☐ TR (Military & Collector Roadway) ☐ W (Public Utility)

(Tax Map Key: 8-7-009: Parcel 002; 8-7-10: Parcels 6 and 10)

Street Address/Location of Property: Iualualei Naval Access Road, Iualualei, Nanakuli

APPLICATION/SUBJECT AREA (Acres/sq. ft.): 192.6 acres

The proposed project is located __ INSIDE __ OUTSIDE THE:

☐ Urban Growth Boundary

☐ Urban Community Boundary

☐ Rural Community Boundary

DEVELOPMENT PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN ZONING DISTRICT(S): Preservation STATE LAND USE DISTRICT: Agricultural

RECORDED FEE OWNER:

Name & Title, if any: Tropic Land LLC

Organization

Mailing Address: 1001 Bishop St., ASB Tower Suite 2690, Honolulu, HI 96813

Phone Number: 808-538-3785

Signature

PRESENCE USE(S) OF PROPERTY/BUILDING:

Vacant Land - subject to existing

Unilateral Agreement dated September 24, 1996

PROJECT NAME (If any): Nanakuli Community Baseyard

REQUEST/PROPOSAL (Briefly describe the nature of the request, proposed activity or project):

- Request to amend the Waianae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) to include the subject property within the rural community boundary and change the land use designation from golf course use to industrial/preservation use.

APPLICANT:

Name: Tropic Land LLC

Organization

Mailing Address: 1001 Bishop St., ASB Tower Suite 2690, Honolulu, HI 96813

Phone Number: 808-538-3785

Signature

AUTHORIZED AGENT/CONTACT PERSON:

Name: Arick B. Yanagihara

Organization

Mailing Address: 1001 Bishop St., ASB Tower Suite 2690, Honolulu, HI 96813

Phone Number: 808-457-1172

Signature
Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP), Five Year Review Amendment Application
(11/13/07)

1. Background

a. Location of property affected by the amendment

This SCP application involves three parcels located in the Lualualei Valley, mauka of Farrington Highway and south of U.S. Naval Magazine Lualualei. The properties are approximately 2.5 miles north of Nānākuli town and 7.5 miles from Wai'anae town. They are owned by Tropic Land LLC and identified as follows (see Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMK</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-7-9: 02</td>
<td>236.154</td>
<td>East of Lualualei Naval Access Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-10: 06</td>
<td>21.138</td>
<td>West side of Lualualei Naval Access Road, straddling Hakimo Road and Lualualei Naval Access Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-7-10: 10</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>Off of Hakimo Road; west side of Lualualei Naval Access Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>260.047</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TMK 8-7-9: 02 comprises approximately 90 percent of the amendment area and is located on the east side of Lualualei Naval Access Road. Two parcels totaling approximately 23.9 acres (8-7-10: 06 and 10), are located on the west side of Lualualei Naval Access Road.

**Amendment Area.** The total acreage owned by Tropic Land LLC is slightly larger than 260 acres; however, 67.439 acres are located within the State Conservation District and excluded from this amendment application. Therefore, the amendment area measures approximately 192.6 acres.

**Access.** At present, formal access to the property is via Hakimo Road. An easement from the Navy links the properties across Lualualei Naval Access Road. The City and County of Honolulu is in discussions with the Navy to acquire Lualualei Naval Access Road, at which time it will be a public right-of-way. In the interim, Tropic Land LLC plans to obtain an easement to use Lualualei Naval Access Road as a direct route from Farrington Highway.
b. Surrounding land uses and structures

Existing Uses. The site is vacant and covered mostly with grasses, haole koa bushes, and isolated kiawe trees. Ulehawa Stream, an intermittent stream, crosses the site along a course that is generally parallel to Lualualei Naval Access Road.

Level portions of the site were used for sugar cane production, but production ceased in the early 1900s. Since then, the property has remained largely vacant and unused. A truck farm operated on 15 acres for a brief period in the 1980s, closing voluntarily in 1988.

There is limited use of the property at the present time. Grasses are mowed periodically for fire control purpose and used for silage. The entire site is subject to an existing Unilateral Agreement (UA) related to the development of a golf course. In compliance with a UA condition to provide a 30-foot wide landscaped buffer on the east side of Lualualei Naval Access Road, trees were planted in a linear strip fronting the roadway in the summer of 2007.

Surrounding Uses. Land uses in the Lualualei Valley are generally divided into four zones. The lower valley or makai zone is characterized by a mix of residential and commercial uses that developed along Farrington Highway. The upper valley is occupied by the U.S. military, including the Naval Magazine which connects over the ridge to Schofield Barracks on the central O‘ahu plateau.

The western zone is dominated by numerous lots that are arrayed along the mauka-makai oriented Hakimo Road. Lualualei Naval Access Road is the mauka-makai transportation spine for the eastern zone of the valley. Unlike Hakimo Road, the parcels on Lualualei Naval Access Road are larger and much fewer in number. This corridor has a distinctly industrial character, conveyed by the presence of the PVT landfill for construction and demolition debris and the former cement plant, now operated as a waste processing facility by Pineridge Farms. The amendment area lies just beyond Pineridge, and abuts the Naval installation. The foothills of Pu‘u Haleakala Ridge form the site’s eastern and southern boundaries.

The two western parcels form an “L” shape with one leg straddling Lualualei Naval Access Road and Hakimo Road, and the other leg located parallel with Lualualei Naval Road. The western area is surrounded to the north, west, and south by privately owned lots. Lualualei Naval Access Road lies to the east.
c. Proximity to significant public facilities and utilities

Roadways. The amendment area is bisected by Lualualei Naval Access Road. This two-lane roadway is currently under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy; however, it is planned for turn over to the City and County of Honolulu in the near term.

The amendment area is approximately two miles from Farrington Highway, which is classified as a principal arterial. The highway is owned by the State of Hawai'i, Department of Transportation (HDOT), and is on the National Highway System, which means that it receives federal aid. Where Farrington Highway intersects with Lualualei Naval Access Road, it is a four lane, undivided highway. The highway runs parallel with the coastline and serves both regional and local transportation needs. The intersection of Lualualei Naval Road and Farrington Highway is fully signalized.

The amendment area is located approximately 4,000 feet from the intersection of Lualualei Naval Access Road and Pa'a'kea Road. The latter is one segment of a proposed City and County emergency access route.

Water. The Board of Water Supply’s Pu‘u-o-hulu system services the properties along Hakimo Road. The water storage facility located closest to the amendment area is Pu‘u-o-hulu Reservoir which has a capacity of 1.5 million gallons. Domestic water is serviced through a 20-inch transmission line and 8-inch distribution lines along Hakimo Road.

Wastewater Facilities. The amendment area is not served by the City and County’s wastewater collection and disposal system. Residential areas between the amendment area and the junction of Waiolu Street and Hakimo Road are serviced by cesspools. As a general policy, the City has no plans to install public sewers within the Agricultural District.

Solid Waste. The amendment area is approximately 5,500 feet from the PVT Land Company waste disposal site. Although the PVT facility is privately owned, it is the only authorized location on O‘ahu that accepts construction and demolition debris material.

Schools. The campuses of Nānākuli Elementary School and Nānākuli Intermediate and High School are located in the valley to the east of the amendment area. The Lualualei and Nānākuli valleys are separated by a ridge of the Wai‘anae mountain range and connected by Farrington Highway.

Fire. The closest fire station, located in Nānākuli valley, is approximately 3.4 miles from the amendment site. The Nānākuli Station houses an engine unit and a tanker unit. Back-up fire service is provided from the Wai‘anae Fire Station, approximately 8 miles away.

Police. The amendment area falls within the service area of District 8 which stretches from 'Ewa Beach to Ka‘ena. The District 8 headquarters are located in Kapolei. There is
a substation in Wai‘anae which serves as a base for personnel patrolling the Wai‘anae Coast.

Emergency Health. The primary health care facility on the Wai‘anae Coast is the Wai‘anae Comprehensive Health Center in Mā‘ili. This facility provides 24-hour emergency services. Additional round the clock emergency health services are provided by Hawai‘i Medical Center West, located in ‘Ewa Beach, with 102 beds for acute and critical care.

d. Proximity to Urban Community/Rural Community/Preservation/Special Area Plan/Special District or any other similar boundary

Rural Community Boundary. In the Lualualei Valley area, the rural community boundary generally runs parallel with the coastline and Farrington Highway. The boundary line intersects Lualualei Naval Access Road at a point approximately 1,800 feet mauka of Farrington Highway. The project area lies approximately 8,750 feet farther mauka of the rural community boundary.

Preservation Boundaries. As part of the zone change approval on September 24, 1996, the amendment area was rezoned from AG-1 and AG-2 to P-2, which allows golf course development.

e. Chronological history of the area affected by the amendment, including a discussion of any previous land use approvals

The landowner prior to Tropic Land LLC was Kabushiki Kaisha Oban, (referred to as “Oban”) a Japanese corporation.

- April 1991: Environmental Impact Statement for a proposed golf course on the properties was completed and filed.
- November 1993, January 1991: A formal Archaeological Inventory Survey of the property was prepared by Cultural Surveys Hawai‘i in January 1991 and a revised Survey was prepared in November 1993. The report was subsequently approved by the State of Hawai‘i Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). Eight archaeological sites were identified, of which seven are considered “no longer significant.” There is one significant site that is situated upslope and outside the area proposed for development.
- September 24, 1996: In support of its proposed development of an 18-hole golf course and accessory uses, Oban sought and obtained approval for a conditional zoning change for approximately 188 acres out of a total of 254 acres from AG-1 Restricted Agricultural District and AG-2 General Agricultural District to P-2 General Preservation District. The zoning change was approved with conditions and recorded as Document 2337653 on September 24, 1996.
- December 22, 2005: The property was acquired from Oban by Tropic Land LLC.

- September 4, 2007: Preliminary presentation made to Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board (NB) to present information about the property and to solicit recommendations for future use of the property. The Wai‘anae NB recommended that a more formal presentation be made to the Planning and Zoning Committee.

- October 10, 2007: Presentation made to Wai‘anae NB Planning and Zoning Committee. Requested and discussed recommendations for proposed uses of the property. Several suggestions were made, but the consensus of community recommendations was for a light industrial park.

- Follow-up presentation to the Wai‘anae NB Planning and Zoning Committee on November 15, 2007.

Consultations with DPP

- July 23, 2007: Pre-application meeting with Kathy Sokugawa, Randy Hara, and Matthew Higashida of DPP, and Harmonee Williams of Townscape to discuss potential uses of the property and applicable governmental permitting processes.

2. Amendment Proposal

Provide a detailed description of the proposed SCP amendment, including the following:

a. Ramseyer version of the SCP text to be amended, if applicable

Not applicable

b. Revisions of any affected SCP Exhibit or Map

Currently, the amendment area is designated for Golf Course use (see Figure 3a). This application requests a change in land use designation to accommodate the proposed light industrial park development. Approximately 96 acres are proposed for Industrial use (see Figure 3b). The remaining acreage will remain in Preservation use.
3. **Basis for Proposed Amendment**

a. **Public issue, need or problem addressed by the amendment**

This amendment addresses a deficiency in industrial land in the Wai’anae District. The sustainability of a community, its ability to support a range of economic activities and workplaces congruent with the livelihood of many of its residents, requires a broad distribution of land use types. Given the occupational and business profile of the district, the light industrial park will provide opportunities for blue-collar trade and craft employers to locate within the community.

b. **Consistency with the General Plan**

*City and County of Honolulu General Plan: Objectives and Policies, 1992*

The amendment is consistent with the following objectives and policies from the current General Plan.

**II. Economic Activity**

**Objective A**  To promote employment opportunities that will enable all the people of O‘ahu to attain a decent standard of living.

- **Policy 1**  Encourage the growth and diversification of O‘ahu’s economic base.

- **Policy 2**  Encourage the development of small businesses and larger industries which will contribute to the economic and social well-being of O‘ahu residents.

- **Policy 3**  Encourage the development in appropriate locations on O‘ahu of trade, communications, and other industries of a nonpolluting nature.

**Discussion:** The amendment will provide an inventory of industrial space on the Wai‘anae Coast, which does not have a similar facility. The proposed project will be attractive to a mix of light industrial businesses and provide open yard space for storing materials, trucks, and heavy equipment.

**Objective C**  To maintain the viability of agriculture on O‘ahu.

- **Policy 1**  Assist the agricultural industry to ensure the continuation of agriculture as an important source of income and employment.

- **Policy 5**  Maintain agricultural land along the Windward, North Shore, and Wai‘anae coasts for truck farming, flower growing, aquaculture, livestock production, and other types of diversified agriculture.
Discussion: The importance of agricultural production is recognized; however, the amendment area has clayey and rocky soils that are poorly suited for diversified agricultural. It is situated between industrial uses and the military installation in a location that has not experienced economically viable agricultural activity for decades.

Objective G To bring about orderly economic growth on O'ahu.

Policy 2 Permit the moderate growth of business centers in the urban-fringe areas.

Policy 3 Maintain sufficient land in appropriately located commercial and industrial areas to help ensure a favorable business climate on O'ahu.

Discussion: The region has demonstrated an ability to nurture small businesses involved in trucking, distribution, light manufacturing, construction trades, repair and related services. The proposed industrial park is intended to meet their current and future demand for industrial space with an affordable product.

III. Natural Environment

Objective A To protect and preserve the natural environment.

Policy 1 Protect O'ahu's natural environment, especially the shoreline, valleys, and ridges, from incompatible development.

Policy 4 Require development projects to give due consideration to natural features such as slope, flood and erosion hazards, water-recharge areas, distinctive land forms, and existing vegetation.

Policy 6 Design surface drainage and flood-control systems in a manner which will help preserve their natural settings.

Discussion: The preliminary site plan (see Figure 6) shows a development pattern that is compatible with the topography of the site. The light industrial park is confined to areas with flatter slopes. The development footprint is smaller than the golf course previously proposed for the site, and will leave a larger expanse of the foothills undeveloped. Surface drainage, flood and erosion hazards, and rockfall hazards will be addressed in detail in the environmental assessment.

VII. Physical Development and Urban Design

Objective A To coordinate changes in the physical environment of O'ahu to ensure that all new developments are timely, well-designed, and appropriate for the areas in which they will be located.
Policy 2 Coordinate the location of timing of new development with the availability of adequate water supply, sewage treatment, drainage, transportation, and public safety facilities.

Policy 3 Phase the construction of new developments so that they do not require more regional supporting services than are available.

Policy 7 Locate new industries and new commercial areas so that they will be well related to their markets and suppliers, and to residential areas and transportation facilities.

Discussion: The proposed development will be designed to minimize impacts on public utility systems and services. The industrial park will need to be connected to the City’s water system, but demand is expected to be lower than the previous plan for a golf course and clubhouse. City water lines are provided to the property’s boundaries. Wells located on site may be able to supply non-potable water for landscape irrigation, sanitation, and some industrial purposes. An independent wastewater system will be developed on site. Safety systems will be provided on site and complement ongoing security provided by the adjacent military installation and local police.

Objective D To maintain those development characteristics in the urban fringe and rural areas which make them desirable places to live.

Policy 1 Develop and maintain urban-fringe areas as predominantly residential areas characterized by generally low rise, low density development which may include significant levels of retail and service commercial uses as well as satellite institutional and public uses geared to serving the needs of households.

Policy 4 Maintain rural areas as areas which are intended to provide environments supportive of lifestyle choices which are dependent on the availability of land suitable for small to moderate size agricultural pursuits, a relatively open and scenic setting, and/or a small town, country atmosphere consisting of communities which are small in size, very low density and low rise in character, and may contain a mixture of uses.

Discussion: The proposed industrial park is located off the main highway, where it will not detract from either the scenic views of the coast or the ambiance of small commercial villages in nearby Nānākuli and Māʻili. The industrial park is also favorably situated from a transportation standpoint. Lualualei Naval Access Road was designed and constructed for truck transport. Compared to other mauka-makai roadways in the district, there is a low volume of residential traffic on Lualualei Naval Access Road and the uses adjoining the road are similarly industrial in nature. In terms of the regional roadway network, the location has ease of access to the freeway
and being near the gateway to the Wai‘anae District would minimize truck traffic farther up the coast.

c.  Consistency with existing SCP vision

Department of Planning and Permitting, City and County of Honolulu, Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan, July 2000

2.1 Vision Statement

The vision for the future of Wai‘anae is a vision of a community living by values and customs that are firmly embedded in the rural landscape, the coastal shorelands, the ocean waters, the forested mountains, the diversity of cultures, the warmth of family and friends, and the Wai‘anae traditions of independence, country living, and aloha. (p. 2-1)

Discussion: The proposed amendment seeks to establish an employment center in the Wai‘anae District. The proposal will amplify the district’s sense of independence, specifically economic independence and expand local employment opportunities. For some district residents, this key element of the vision is not yet fully realized, as the Wai‘anae Coast historically has experienced disproportionately high rates of unemployment and underemployment. There are ongoing efforts in the local schools and by non-profit organizations to encourage young people to strive for economic independence. At the same time, there are many on the Wai‘anae Coast who have successfully created small businesses, for example, in contracting, services, and trucking. The proposed development offers a potential venue for these businesses to operate within the community.

2.2 Community Values

“”We value economic choices in Wai‘anae”

For Wai‘anae, economic choices within the region are vital to the community’s well-being. Having jobs in Wai‘anae allows families to spend less time commuting and more time with each other. It reduces traffic and stress. Economic choices also mean more convenience in acquiring necessary goods and services. (p. 2-3)

Discussion: The proposed light industrial park and baseyard is a job-producing and economy sustaining land use. The industrial park has the potential to become an employment center offering well-paid jobs that are within convenient commuting distance of Wai‘anae Coast communities.

2.3 Wai‘anae District: Rural Values and Qualities

Population growth and land development in the Wai‘anae District over the past 40+ years have been more typical of a suburbanizing urban fringe community
than that of a stable rural community. ... Continued urban and suburban development will consume agricultural lands and put still more stress on Wai‘anae’s roads, schools, parks, and other facilities, which are already overcrowded.

Discussion: Although the amendment area is undeveloped, it is not necessarily suited for commercial agriculture. Because of the clayey soils with poor drainage, the site is unable to sustain commercial agricultural operations, particularly in light of alternative areas available that have better growing conditions. The Wai‘anae SCP itself recognizes that the highly expansive clay soils on the lower slopes of the ridges are not good for agriculture (p. 2-10).

The proposed industrial park will not generate a need for public facilities, such as schools and parks. Truck traffic is expected to increase in the vicinity of the industrial park, but roads will be used more efficiently. The industrial park site is located close to the freeway and is likely reduce the volume of trips made further up the coast. Industrial park employees who live in the Wai‘anae District will not have to commute to more distant locations, such as Hālawa, Kalihi, or Airport/Māpunapuna.

There are important natural and cultural resources in the Wai‘anae District that should be protected and managed. The proposed development will not have an adverse affect on these resources.

d. Impact on the SCP vision, policies, principles, guidelines, and implementing actions (implement, clarify, or change?)

3.1.1 Rural Community Boundary

The rural community boundary is established to define, protect, and contain communities in areas which the General Plan designates “rural” and which exhibit the physical characteristics of rural lifestyles. The purpose of this boundary is to provide adequate lands for facilities needed to support established communities, to protect such communities from more intense land uses and patterns of development associated with more urban areas and to protect areas outside the boundary for agriculture or other resource or open space values. Where appropriate, this boundary also contains open space elements, the preservation of which is essential to the character of the rural community being defined. They may include lands designated “park,” “agriculture,” “preservation,” or areas with development-related hazards such as steep slopes or unstable soils.

Rural communities defined by this boundary consist of smaller, more dispersed, less intensively developed residential communities and towns, and minor industrial areas that are smaller than those of urban or urban fringe areas.
Development character is generally low-density, low-rise, small scale, and reflective of a "country" setting. Within residential areas, the landscaping and front yards which provide the foregrounds to their respective residences are the principal visual elements. In commercial areas, the pedestrian environment and associated amenities predominate, and storefronts on both sides of the street are simultaneously perceivable. Buildings are oriented principally toward the street, relate readily to a human scale, and are organized to encourage interaction between the public and private domains. (p. 3-7 and 3-8)

Discussion: The rural community boundary is a line that generally encompasses the built environment along the Farrington Highway corridor. The boundary provides for a limited amount of infill residential and commercial development. Except for a small number of isolated farm lots that are already surrounded by housing development, no other agricultural lands are to be included within the developed areas.

3.2.2.3 Limits on Urban Development

Future urban and suburban development in the Wai'anae District should be limited to the Rural Community areas, and should not be allowed to intrude into the Coastal area, the Agricultural area, or the Preservation area. (p. 3-11)

Discussion: As it is currently laid out, the rural community boundary circumscribes a fairly narrow set of land uses; namely, small-scale retail and service businesses and residences that create a compact physical form. "Small-scale" and "compact" are important characteristics for country towns and village centers (p. 2-19). Zones of "human-scale" interaction suggest a walkable, pedestrian scale. Elsewhere, the SCP endorses clustering to "alleviate the strong 'strip commercial' development pattern that presently exists along Farrington Highway." (p. 2-20)

To promote compact development, the rural community boundary excludes agricultural land, which is a land-extensive type of use. The SCP allows for minor industrial areas within the rural community boundary, but industrial areas generally require more space, and allow buildings with larger footprints than would be found in a country town or village. Even a small industrial park, at a scale that is financially viable, would have to be land extensive. Therefore, a location along Farrington Highway or in the residential areas surrounding the highway would not be appropriate.

The problem encountered is that the SCP requires non-agricultural development to occur within the rural community boundary. This stricture creates a situation in which industrial development is limited to inappropriate locations with inadequate separation from incompatible uses.
3.9 Commercial and Industrial Uses

3.9.1 Overview of Commercial and Industrial Uses

In keeping with the overall theme of ‘rural Wai’anae,’ the General Plan does not foresee significant growth in commercial or industrial land use for the area. The projected growth in population may create a need for more support retail commercial and industrial acreage, although recent trends indicate a shifting of shopping habits away from local stores to the larger commercial centers in the ‘Ewa District. Some local leaders have voiced the need for more local industrial parks. The potential size, financing, and tenant mix of any such industrial parks, however, have not been thought out in any detail.

Local small businesses and light industrial operations are an important source of jobs for Wai’anae’s people. A healthy level of small local businesses is essential for the local economy and also lessens the volume of commuter traffic that causes severe congestion on Farrington Highway during morning peak traffic periods. (p. 3-39)

3.9.2.3 Encourage Light Industrial Businesses

Encourage the establishment of light industrial businesses that provide jobs for local people, and that are generally compatible with the predominantly residential uses of the Rural Community areas along the coast, but not in Makaha Valley. Light industrial uses should be allowed only in the Rural Community areas. Such areas such as the Wai’anae Small Boat Harbor may provide opportunities for ocean-related light industrial and research uses. (p. 3-40)

3.9.2.4 No Heavy Industry

Heavy industrial uses should not be permitted in the Wai’anae District. Such uses should be sited in the Campbell Industrial Park in ‘Ewa. (p. 3-41)

3.9.3 Planning Guidelines for Commercial and Industrial Uses

[No planning and/or design guidelines are provided for industrial uses.]

Discussion: As part of its internal planning process, Tropic Land LLC has consulted informally with members of the Wai’anae community and with the Wai’anae Neighborhood Board. There has been clear and consistent support for a light industrial park and baseyard that will provide a locally accessible, convenient, and affordable place for some types of Wai’anae businesses. Anecdotal information indicates that Campbell Industrial Park is transforming into a higher intensity manufacturing and distribution center with concomitant increases in the unit cost of industrial land. A detailed supply and demand study for industrial space in the Nānākuli area is being prepared.
It is the landowner’s intent to seek a zone change to the I-1 district for approximately 96 acres of the parcel on the east side of Lualualei Naval Access Road. As defined by the Honolulu Land Use Ordinance, I-1 is a limited industrial district and would be compatible with the rural milieu and lifestyle of the Wai'anae District. The proposed industrial development is expected to have few environmental impacts and uses are intended to complement the development scale of the communities they would serve. Land uses permitted within the industrial park will be further specified in the project’s covenants, conditions, and restrictions.

3.11.2 No More Golf Courses

There is no land available within the Rural Community areas of the Wai’anae Land Use Map that would be large enough for a golf course. Golf courses are considered to be incompatible with Agricultural lands or Preservation lands of the Wai’anae District. Therefore, public agencies should enforce a policy of no new golf courses within the Wai’anae District. (p. 3-52)

Discussion: As part of the permitting process for the light industrial park, Tropic Land LLC will amend the existing Unilateral Agreement which entitles golf course development on the property. Economic and land use conditions have changed since 1996, when the agreement was executed, and a golf course is not the most feasible use.

e. Other reasons in support of the proposed amendment

The Hawai‘i Enterprise Zone (EZ) Partnership Program was established by the State Legislature to help stimulate business activity and employment in areas where they are most needed or most appropriate. Each county can select up to six zones that satisfy statutory income or unemployment criteria, and each zone designation is valid for a period of 20 years. Qualified businesses that locate within a designated enterprise zone can receive tax and other incentives. Since 1994, 21 zones have been created statewide, including one on the Leeward Coast. On O‘ahu, 132 firms were enrolled in the EZ program in 2006, the last year for which data have been reported. On the Leeward Coast, however, there were zero participants.

The economic development impact of the EZ program has been significant. In 2006 alone, participating firms produced a combined total of 830 new jobs. Since job creation occurred in areas targeted by unemployment or income criteria, the benefits of the EZ program are all the more noteworthy.

The enterprise zones on O‘ahu are typically oriented around new or established employment centers. For example, Zone 1 includes the former O‘ahu Sugar Mill site in Waipahu, Campbell Industrial Park, and all of Kapolei. Zone 2 includes the Millili Tech

1 State of Hawai‘i, Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism. 2006. “Enterprise Zones Partnership, Report to the Governor for Calendar Years, 2003-2006.” See Appendix B: Firms Enrolled by County, Zone, and Type.
Park and parts of Wahiawā. Zone 3 includes the former Wailaua Sugar Mill site. Zone 4 is in urban Honolulu from the airport through Kalihi to the Kaka'ako redevelopment area. Zone 5 is the Leeward Coast, but in contrast to the other zones, does not have a well-defined place to incubate and grow new businesses, provide training activities, and promote other types of economic development activities.

The western portion of the amendment area (23 acres) is already located within the existing Leeward Coast Enterprise Zone. The eastern portion of the amendment area, including the area proposed for the light industrial park, is in a census tract that is eligible for EZ designation. As the proposed industrial park site moves forward in the entitlement process, Tropic Land will seek to expand the EZ boundary to encompass the industrial park.

4. Project Specific Information

If the amendment is required for a specific project to proceed, provide:

a. Brief project description

Tropic Land LLC proposes to develop an industrial park that would occupy approximately 96 acres on TMK 8-7-9: 02, on the east side of Lualualei Naval Access Road (see Figure 6, Site Plan). The industrial park would consist of approximately 35 lots, averaging two acres each. The project would have a single secured entry off of Lualualei Naval Access Road and a secondary access for fire and emergency purposes. The existing linear tree farm will remain as a 30-foot landscaped setback along the Lualualei Road frontage. The north and south property lines have 15-foot setbacks. An additional strip of land, approximately 100 feet wide and mauka of the industrial lots, will be used for drainage improvements and rockfall hazard mitigation.

The project will be structured under a condominium form of ownership with individual lots and common ownership of internal roads and infrastructure. Tropic Land LLC is planning to seek an I-1 zone for the area that is planned for industrial use. The remainder of TMK 8-7-9: 02 will remain in the preservation zone.

Future uses of the two parcels on the west side of Lualualei Naval Access Road (TMK: 8-7-10: 6 and 10) are being studied. In October 2007, Tropic Land was contacted by the State of Hawai‘i, Housing Finance and Development Corporation (HFDC) and urged to consider the development of affordable housing. HFDC’s correspondence indicated that the parcels off of Hakimo Road “may be very suitable” for such use and “would help alleviate the current housing shortage in Hawai‘i.” Tropic Land is also pursuing opportunities to use a portion of the west side property to conduct training in heavy equipment handling and crane operations, commercial truck driving, and/or heavy vehicle maintenance. And, although golf course use has been dismissed, outdoor recreation opportunities are being considered, including a possible driving range, as suggested during a meeting with the Wai‘anae Neighborhood Board’s Planning and Zoning Committee.
b. Development timetable

The anticipated opening is approximately 18 months from receipt of government approvals.

c. Estimated project cost

The preliminary cost of the light industrial park, based on the conceptual site plan, is estimated at $29 million.

5. Maps

For amendments affecting the long range land use patterns or the urban community or rural community boundaries, the application must use the applicable SCP Land Use map as a base map.

Maps included with the application should be no larger than 11 x 17" in size showing the proposed change(s) in relation to the existing land use patterns, boundaries and other features shown on the base map. Other maps may be included as supporting documentation. For amendments specific to an area, please provide:

a. Location Map (8.5” x 11”)
   Figure 1, Location Map
   Figure 2, Aerial Photo of Amendment Area

b. Appropriate SCP Map (with amendment area identified)
   Figure 3a, Existing Wai’anae SCP, Land Use Map
   Figure 3b, Proposed Wai’anae SCP, Land Use Map

c. Public Infrastructure Map (8.5” x 11”)
   Figure 4, Public Infrastructure Map

d. Zoning Map
   Figure 5, Zoning Map
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APPENDIX H
DHHL Residential Community and Kamehameha Schools Learning Center
April 30, 2010

Mr. David Tanoue, Director
Department of Planning and Permitting
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813


Dear Mr. Tanoue:

On behalf our clients, the State of Hawai‘i, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) and Kamehameha Schools (KS), we would like to thank you for providing us with the opportunity to provide our comments on the Public Review Draft of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (Draft WSCP) dated October 1, 2008.

This letter related to our consistency with, and recommended amendments to the Draft WSCP focuses specifically on the DHHL Residential Community and KS Learning Community on the Stone Family Lands project (herein referred to as the DHHL Residential Community and KS Learning Community) on approximately 306 acres of land in lower Mākaha Valley. Also proposed as part of this project are off-site infrastructure improvements to support the project.

Although the DHHL is not subject to County zoning or other land use controls, changes to the Draft WSCP are being requested on behalf of the DHHL in effort to plan and work collaboratively with the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) and other agencies on this project. As a means for further dialogue on this and other planning efforts, such as the DHHL’s O‘ahu Island Plan, the DHHL will seek the input and collaboration from your department at appropriate times during the planning process.

We have prepared an analysis of the project’s compliance with the Draft WSCP and the information is included in the attached “Analysis of Consistency and Proposed Amendments to the Public Review Draft of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan (2009) for the State of Hawai‘i, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Residential Community and Kamehameha Schools Learning Community on the Stone Family Lands” document. The document clearly identifies how the project is in compliance with the Draft WSCP document. The analysis describes how the project’s vision statement generated jointly by DHHL and KS for the project closely aligns with the vision statement of the Draft WSCP.
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It also identifies how the project will provide and enhance affordable housing, education, employment, recreation, and cultural opportunities to the community, as well as provide the necessary infrastructure improvements to accommodate the project.

Based on our analysis, we believe that the KS portion of the project as represented in the Open Space, Land Use and Public Facilities maps within the Draft WSCP as Rural Community (Yellow) is a permitted use. The site is zoned R-20 and is a permitted use with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit-Minor. As such, no revisions are requested to these maps for the KS portion of the project.

For the DHHL lands, in order to assure that the WSCP properly portray our project, we are requesting amendments to the Open Space, Land Use and Public Facilities Map for a color change for the proposed residential areas within the DHHL Residential Community from Golf Course (Dark Green) to Rural Community (Yellow). The area designated as “Special District” and described as cultural landscape can remain as Preservation (Light Green) and Agriculture (Green).

In addition to the above map changes, there are more specific comments and recommended modifications to the various sections of the Draft WSCP.

On behalf of our clients, DHHL and KS, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Public Review Draft of the Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan and look forward to working with your department in the future as we move forward in implementing this exciting project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 521-5631.

Sincerely,

PBR HAWAII & Associates, Inc.

[Signature]

Grant T. Murakami, AICP, LEED AP
Principal

Enclosures:

Cc: Kathy Sokugawa/Department of Planning and Permitting
Kamuela-Cobb Adams/State of Hawai‘i, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
Walter Thoennes/Kamehameha Schools
Randy Fujiki/The Resort Group
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