AUTHOR  Department of Planning and Permitting.
PUBLISHER  Honolulu: May 2011.
DESCRIPT  139 p.

CONTENTS  This Review Report meets the requirement established by Ordinance 97-49 as amended by Ordinance 00-16 that the 'Ewa Development Plan be evaluated to assess the appropriateness of the plan's regional vision, policies, design principles and guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as its consistency to the general plan, and that development phasing guidelines in the plan be reviewed to assess whether their purpose is being achieved and if phasing priorities should be reviewed.

NOTES:  Volume 2 of the Review Report will not be published, but is available on-line at http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/ or on CD from the Department of Planning and Permitting upon request.

KEYWORDS  Land use + Community development + Public Infrastructure + Regional planning + 'Ewa (O'ahu) + Honolulu.  Dept. of Planning and Permitting.
Table of Contents

VOLUME 1 OF 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .............................................................. ES-1
   The Purpose of the Five Year Review ........................................... ES-2
   Implementation of the Plan Vision .............................................. ES-4
   Major Issues and Changes Resulting From the Review ............... ES-7
   What’s Next .............................................................................. ES-11

1. THE REVIEW PROCESS ................................................................1-1
   1.1 Goals ...................................................................................... 1-1
   1.2 Process and Milestone Events .................................................... 1-1

2. ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS ..........................2-1
   2.1 Findings on the Required Scope of Review ............................... 2-1
   2.2 Findings on Vision Implementation .......................................... 2-2
   2.3 Evaluation of Major Issues....................................................... 2-5
      2.3.1 Transportation Infrastructure Adequacy............................. 2-6
      2.3.2 Schools Permanent Classroom Adequacy .......................... 2-13
      2.3.3 Protection of Open Space and Agricultural Lands ........... 2-15
         2.3.3.1 Agricultural Lands Protection................................. 2-15
         2.3.3.2 Pedestrian and Bike Path Network on Drainage Channels and Utility Corridors .......................... 2-17
      2.3.4 Development Process Management And Mitigation........... 2-19
         2.3.4.1 Housing Affordability............................................. 2-19
         2.3.4.2 Infrastructure Concurrency..................................... 2-21
         2.3.4.3 Placemaking............................................................ 2-27
2.3.5 Jobs And Economic Development ........................................ 2-29
2.3.6 Historic, Cultural, And Natural Resources .......................... 2-33
  2.3.6.1 Historic and Cultural Resources .................................. 2-33
  2.3.6.2 ‘Ewa Plantation Villages ......................................... 2-34
  2.3.6.3 Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites ......... 2-36
  2.3.6.4 World War II Historic Sites ...................................... 2-38
  2.3.6.5 OR&L Historic Train Operations ............................. 2-41
  2.3.6.6 Light Pollution ....................................................... 2-42
2.3.7 Hazards Planning ............................................................ 2-45
  2.3.7.1 Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise ........................... 2-45
  2.3.7.2 Hurricane Shelter Shortage .................................... 2-46

3. RECOMMENDED CHANGES .............................................. 3-1
3.1 Proposed Updates and Revisions to the Plan ........................... 3-1
  3.1.1 Changes Made Throughout the Entire Plan ......................... 3-2
  3.1.2 Substantive Changes by Section or Chapter ....................... 3-3
      Preface and Executive Summary ...................................... 3-4
      Chapter 1 ....................................................................... 3-4
      Chapter 2 ....................................................................... 3-5
      Chapter 3 ....................................................................... 3-11
      Chapter 4 ....................................................................... 3-25
      Chapter 5 ....................................................................... 3-32
3.2 Proposed Improvements to Implementation of
      Plan Vision and Policy .................................................... 3-38
3.3 Proposed Follow-Up Studies and Research .............................. 3-41
APPENDICES

A. Draft Adopting Ordinance for the Final Proposed Revised ‘Ewa Development Plan
B. Proposed Amendment for Kapolei Movie Studio
C. Summary of Comments on the 2008 Public Review Draft/Preliminary Review Findings with DPP Responses

VOLUME 2 OF 2

Not Published; Available on-line at http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/ or on CD upon request

D. Vision Scorecard
E. Scenic View Inventory, 2009
F. January 31, 2004 Orientation Workshop Documentation
G. May 2-4, 2004 Smart Growth Workshops Documentation
H. October 25, 2008 Public Review Draft Workshop Documentation

All ‘Ewa Development Plan Review products, including the Review Report, and the proposed revised ‘Ewa Development Plan, in both the "clean" version proposed to be adopted by reference and in the modified Ramseyer version showing how the proposed revised Plan differs from the adopted 1997 Plan, are available on the Department of Planning and Permitting web site: http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/
List of Tables

Table ES-1: Vision Implementation ................................................................. ES-4
Table ES-2: Summary of Recommendations................................................. ES-8
Table 2-1: Vision Implementation ................................................................. 2-2
Table 2-2: Existing and Planned ‘Ewa Transportation Projects...................... 2-7
Table 2-3: Existing and Planned Public Schools
in the ‘Ewa Development Plan Area............................................................ 2-14

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 2-1: Comparison of Current Parking Lot Street Frontage
with Building Frontage Along Main Street Up to the
Build-To Line .............................................................................................. 2-29
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report describes:

1. The purpose of the Review of the ‘Ewa Development Plan;
2. The Review process;
3. Issues identified and analyzed in the Review; and
4. The findings of the Review, including:
   a. The updates and revisions proposed for the Plan;
   b. Proposed improvements in implementation of the Plan vision and policies; and
   c. Follow-up studies needed to improve implementation of the Plan vision and policies.

The report also includes three published appendices:

A. Draft Adopting Ordinance for the Final Proposed Revised ‘Ewa Development Plan;
B. Review of Proposed Amendment: Kapolei Movie Studio; and

and five on-line appendices:

D. Vision Scorecard;
E. Scenic View Inventory, 2009;
F. January 31, 2004 Orientation Workshop Documentation;
G. May 2-4, 2004 Smart Growth Workshops Documentation; and
THE PURPOSE OF THE FIVE YEAR REVIEW

Background. In 1992, the City Charter was amended to change the definition of Development Plans from "relatively detailed" plans to "conceptual schemes" for implementing General Plan development objectives and policies.

The amendments also established that the purpose of the Development Plans is to provide:
"priorities . . . [for the] coordination of major development activities", and sufficient description of the "desired urban character and the significant natural, scenic and cultural resources" to guide zoning and "public and private sector investment decisions."

Revision Program. In response to the City Charter amendments, the City began comprehensive revisions of the eight Development Plans. The first plan to be revised was the 'Ewa Development Plan (Plan) which was adopted as Ordinance 97-49 in 1997.

Review Requirement. As adopted in 1997, the Plan called for a review every three years, but in 2000, the Council amended the Plan (Ordinance 00-16), extending the review period to five years, making it the same as the review period for all the other plans. (It was felt that a three year period was too short for meaningful evaluation of a long range plan.)

The results of the five year review and any recommended revisions to the Plan are to be sent to the Planning Commission for review and recommendation, and to the City Council for review and appropriate action.

Findings. As specified in the adopting ordinance and in the Plan, we addressed three basic questions in the review. The questions and the conclusions we drew from our review are as follows:
1. Are the Plan vision, implementing land use and infrastructure policies, and implementation methods still appropriate?

   The Plan vision and policies enjoy wide spread support from the community, although there is frustration that key aspects of the vision have not been fully implemented. Implementation of the vision and the policies to provide adequate infrastructure, increase connectivity, and establish vibrant, pedestrian-friendly community centers needs to be improved.

2. Is the purpose of the Plan’s phasing guidelines being achieved?

   The purpose of the phasing guidelines was to continue agricultural activities on areas inside the Community Growth Boundary for a limited period and to slow development of the area between the City of Kapolei and Waipahu. That was what did occur from 1997 to the present. However, the phasing guidelines probably had little to do with that result.

3. Should the phasing priorities in the Plan be revised?

   The existing Plan calls for delaying development of some areas in West Kapolei and East Kapolei until 2016. This phasing or partitioning of land use approvals makes financing regional infrastructure needed to serve West and East Kapolei more difficult and should be deleted from the revised Plan. Concerns about concurrency with key infrastructure capacity can be addressed by adopting conditions of zoning approval that require key infrastructure capacity be provided before residential development permits are issued.

Note: The ‘Ewa Development Plan adopted in 1997 is the only plan of the eight development plans and sustainable communities plans which has phasing of development. Areas were assigned to one of three phases:

- Eligible for processing of zone changes starting in 1997;
- Eligible for processing zone changes and other development applications far enough in advance so that housing construction could start in 2006; and
- Eligible for processing zone changes and other development applications far enough in advance so that housing construction could start in 2016.
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN VISION

The 1997 ‘Ewa Development Plan vision has five major elements. The Department’s assessment of the success in implementing each of the vision elements is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space | • Agricultural lands and open space have been protected by the Community Growth Boundary.  
• Lands between Waipahū and the City of Kapolei whose development was to be delayed until 2006 and 2016 have not been developed.  
• New parkland has been acquired and is under development. Transfer to the City of 421 acres at Kalaeloa for a Regional Park and Kalaeloa Neighborhood Park is expected in the near future.  
• The Pearl Harbor Historic Trail Plan calls for establishment of bikeways and historic train use on the OR&L corridor from Rainbow Marina to Nānākuli. Extension of the bikeway from Waipahū to ‘Ewa Plantation Villages is under design by the State. Train operations have been extended from ‘Ewa Plantation Villages closer to Nānākuli, but extension from ‘Ewa Plantation Villages to Waipahū or Rainbow Marina is not feasible due to the presence of energy pipelines buried in the railbed.  
• Use of drainageways and utility corridors as greenways has been difficult to implement due to questions of maintenance responsibilities, coordination, and diffusion of ownership. |
| Develop the Secondary Urban Center around the City of Kapolei | • Significant progress has been made in creating jobs in the City of Kapolei and surrounding resort and industrial areas. The rate of job growth has outpaced that of residential development.  
• Developing the UH West O’ahu Campus is key to continuing the momentum for development of O’ahu’s second city.  
• In 2002, responsibility for redevelopment of Kalaeloa was transferred to the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority (HCDA).  
  o Planning for Kalaeloa was delayed until the Navy decided that a carrier would not be stationed at Pearl Harbor.  
  o HCDA prepared a Kalaeloa Master Plan approved by the Governor in 2006.  
  o Development of Kalaeloa is inhibited by the need to bring infrastructure inherited from the Navy up to State and City standards and by the lack of profit making uses to help pay for needed improvements. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Build Master Planned Communities that Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use and Include Affordable Housing | • Residential development was slowed by economic conditions after 1997, but rebounded sharply, averaging 800 to 900 units/year until recently.  
• Affordable housing units have been required and built in all major developments.  
• Until recently, subdivision layouts have often not supported walking, biking, utility vehicle circulation, connectivity with adjacent areas, or transit use.  
• New Express Buses, a hub-and-spoke system of collector buses, and a temporary Kapolei Transit Center were established.  
• Major east-west and mauka-makai connections are being established with the development of areas on both side of Kualaka‘i Parkway in East Kapolei and in West Kapolei from Maka‘iwa Hills to Kalaeloa Barbers Point Harbor.  
• A proposed Bus Rapid Transit system between ‘Ewa and downtown Honolulu has been abandoned.  
• The final environmental impact study for a fixed guideway transit system to link Kapolei with downtown Honolulu has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration and by the Governor. The contract has been awarded to build the initial segment from East Kapolei to Pearl Highlands which is expected to be completed by 2013. Extension to Ala Moana Shopping Center is expected by 2019.  
• A rapid transit right-of-way has been retained along Kapolei Parkway, Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road), and Farrington Highway.  
• Little progress has been made in establishing town centers and main street areas, often due to regulatory restrictions and lack of market interest.  
• Creating vital pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use, Transit Oriented Development around transit stations in ‘Ewa will be a significant challenge and opportunity in the next few years. The Public Review Draft of the East Kapolei Neighborhood TOD Plan was circulated for comments in April 2010. |
| Protect Natural, Historical and Cultural Resources | • Protection of natural, historical and cultural resources has been included as a condition of land use approvals.  
• Honouliuli Camp and ‘Ewa Field have been identified as significant historic resources which should be protected until they can be surveyed and appropriate protections / mitigations identified. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Development and Provide Adequate Infrastructure</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• State and County infrastructure development has continued, but providing transportation and schools capacity concurrently with residential development remains a critical challenge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key roadway connections within ‘Ewa have been completed. The 2002 ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan identified 13 major projects needed to be completed by 2010 to meet expected growth. Work is either completed or under construction with completion expected in 2011 for eight of the projects. Three projects are partially complete and funding is being sought for completion, one project is under design, and one project is on hold until development of the Kapolei West project is begun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Master Plan has been updated to identify an additional eight priority ‘Ewa roadway and interchange projects needed by 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since 1997, improved express bus service and the Zipper Lane have been added to provide alternatives for the commute to Honolulu, but the quality of the commute for most has not improved. The H-1 Contra-Flow project scheduled to begin in 2010 has been delayed by a law suit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operation of a high-speed commuter ferry, begun in 2007, was not continued due to lack of patronage and substantial cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The high-speed rapid transit system is expected to provide initial hourly capacity by 2020 sufficient to carry 90% of the number of peak hour drivers and passengers that were commuting from ‘Ewa and Wai‘anae in 2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City has fully supported the DOE’s efforts to provide capacity for existing and new developments through requirements on developers to provide their fair share of land and construction costs which if not met, result in denials of permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If permanent classrooms are to be built in time to meet expected demand and relieve existing crowding, State appropriations must be made now for three elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Facility District financing for new developments and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) for redevelopment projects offer a way to finance development of roads and other needed infrastructure concurrently with residential and commercial development. SB693, which would have amended the State Constitution to resolve concerns about TIF constitutionality, was held in committee by the 2011 State Senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR ISSUES AND CHANGES RESULTING FROM THE REVIEW

Major issues identified during the review, from research, interviews, and comments received, included:

- Transportation Infrastructure Adequacy
  - Connectivity and Mobility Within ‘Ewa
  - Commuting Between ‘Ewa and Downtown Honolulu
- Schools Permanent Classroom Adequacy
- Protection of Open Space and Agricultural Lands
  - Agricultural Lands Protection
  - Pedestrian and Bike Path Network on Drainage Channels and Utility Corridors
- Development Process Management and Mitigation
  - Housing Affordability
  - Infrastructure Concurrency
  - Place Making
- Jobs and Economic Development Promotion
- Historic, Cultural, and Natural Resources Protection
  - Historic and Cultural Resources
  - ‘Ewa Plantation Villages
  - Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites
  - World War II Historic Sites
  - OR&L Historic Train Operations
  - Light Pollution
- Hazards Planning
  - Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise
  - Hurricane Shelters

Each of these issues was analyzed to determine both if the Plan needed to be revised to better address the issue and if better implementation of the Plan vision and policies were needed. The recommendations based on that analysis are summarized in Table ES-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Plan Revision Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transportation Infrastructure | • Retain Plan vision and policies calling for adequate capacity and supporting transit use and transit oriented development.  
• Strengthen language regarding connectivity within ‘Ewa, place-making, and provision of alternatives to highway commuting to downtown Honolulu. | • Complete the rapid transit system linking the City of Kapolei with downtown Honolulu as soon as possible.  
• Improve the H-1 HOV lanes so that transit riders and high occupancy vehicles have clear travel time advantages over single occupant automobiles.  
• Use the ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study as the basis for linking together adjacent subdivisions and providing greater connectivity within subdivisions.  
• Develop East Kapolei lands around transit stations because of higher likelihood of transit usage by residents. |
| Schools Permanent Classroom Adequacy | • The adopted Plan vision and policies are valid, and adequate with minor revisions. (Problems are with implementation. State appropriations for permanent classroom capacity are not keeping up with residential development.) | • Continue to enforce Unilateral Agreement conditions that require developers to provide their fair share of land and construction costs for new school capacity.  
• Support increased State funding for permanent classroom capacity to limit the need for DOE to use temporary classrooms, busing, and multi-tracking to meet expected student increases. |
| Protection of Open Space and Agricultural Lands | • The adopted Plan vision and policies are valid, and adequate with minor revisions since over 50,000 acres of agricultural lands are protected from development island-wide as part of the "Keep the Country country" policy of the O'ahu General Plan.  
• Retain the existing Community Growth Boundary which protects 3,000 acres of agricultural land in ‘Ewa and policies and guidelines which call for creation of an open space network within ‘Ewa. | • Study how organizational, economic and regulatory issues could be resolved to realize the vision of using drainageways and utility corridors as greenways linking ‘Ewa together.  
• Design the elevated rapid transit right-of-way to include a public greenway running beneath the elevated transit line. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Plan Revision Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Affordable Housing                        | • Amend the Plan to recognize City inclusionary zoning policy requiring affordable housing in all new residential developments and to support inclusion of granny flats and ohana units in residential developments as a way of increasing affordable rental housing. | **Affordable Housing**
  • Amend the LUO to allow residential use as a permitted use on the second and higher floors for parcels zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business District or B-2 Community Business District.  
  • Study regulatory changes needed to allow more accessory dwelling units in residential developments where appropriate.  
| Infrastructure Concurrency                | **Plan** vision and policies calling for infrastructure concurrency are valid and adequate with minor amendment.  
  • The problem is not with the Plan but with the challenges of implementation, particularly with financing, incentives, and development regulations and standards. | **Infrastructure Concurrency**  
  • Support use of creative financing programs like Community Facility Districts and public-private partnerships as a way to provide infrastructure concurrently with development.  
| Placemaking                               | • Amend the Plan to support place making in the development of new residential areas and new shopping centers. | **Placemaking**  
  • Revise rules and regulations to promote place making and increased connectivity.  
| Jobs and Economic Development             | • The Plan vision and policies for job development in 'Ewa are valid and are being realized.  
  • Amend the Plan to remove references to the Olympic village and major ball field projects on City lands in Kalaeloa since those plans have been abandoned.  
  • Amend the Plan to support plans for shopping centers in East Kapolei, and to note that DHHL has exempted itself from City planning and zoning and plans to develop a regional shopping center in East Kapolei. | • Support full development of the UH West O’ahu campus.  
  • Extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei and Kapolei West which will support job development in Transit Oriented Development areas around transit stations in East Kapolei, in Kalaeloa, and in the City of Kapolei.  
  • Use development of 16 acres of City land in the City of Kapolei to encourage desirable private sector Transit Oriented Development.  
  • Use submittal of the HCDA's Kalaeloa Master Plan to the Council for acceptance as the Special Area Plan as the basis for coordinating State and City infrastructure planning for Kalaeloa. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Plan Revision Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Historic, Cultural, and Natural Resources | • Amend the Plan to clarify that new developers are required under State law to conduct surveys of historic and cultural resources and to get approval for historic and cultural mitigation plans from the SHPD before development will be approved.  
• Amend the Plan to add ‘Ewa Field and Honouliuli Camp as significant historic resources which should be protected until surveys can be completed and a determination made of the appropriate treatment of the historic resources at the two sites.  
• Amend the Plan to recognize Pu’u Makakilo and Pu’u Kapolei as significant historic features and ‘Ewa Beach Midden Site and Ok’okiolele Pond as significant archaeological sites.  
• Amend the Plan to delete the policy calling for extension of historic train operations from the ‘Ewa Plantation Villages to the Waipahū Cultural Garden.  
• Amend the Plan to call for reduction of light pollution’s adverse impact on wildlife and human health and its unnecessary consumption of energy by using, where possible, fully shielded lighting fixtures using lower wattage. | • Update the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan.  
• Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, how to better coordinate City operations, investments, and redevelopment activities for ‘Ewa Villages and to support economic opportunities and revitalization in the Villages.  
• Conduct surveys of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the Ewa Marine Corp Air Field and make a determination of the appropriate treatment of historic resources at the sites.  
• Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, how historic train operations on the OR&L between ‘Ewa Villages, Ko Olina, and Nanakuli, and the development of a train station and railway museum might be coordinated with redevelopment of the historic core of ‘Ewa Villages and establishment of a mill museum.  
• Study light pollution plans and regulations for other jurisdictions and make recommendations for best practices and regulations to minimize light pollution on Oahu.  
• Continue participating in the advisory committee to prepare a proposed statewide intelligent lighting and light pollution law. |
### Table ES-2: Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Plan Revision Recommendations</th>
<th>Recommendations for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hazards Planning    | • Amend the Plan to clarify that the existing policy calling for expansion of shoreline setbacks to 150 feet where possible should be based on historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion.  
• Amend the Plan to require new public projects sited near the shoreline to include an assessment of the risks of sea level rise and potential mitigations in designing and operating the project.  
• Amend the Plan to include policies addressing the shortage of emergency shelters for hurricane conditions. | • Require an assessment of the risks and potential mitigations for sea level rise for all new public projects near the shoreline.  
• Do studies to model the likely impact of sea level rise on coastal erosion and flooding for O‘ahu and provide erosion and flooding hazard mappings and risk assessments.  
• Support State funding of retrofits to existing public shelters to make them capable of withstanding Category 3 hurricanes.  
• Study the feasibility and effectiveness of implementing property tax incentives for private organizations and individual homeowners to equip their homes with hurricane resistant “safe rooms.” |

A listing of specific changes proposed for the Plan and specific recommendations for improving implementation of the Plan is provided in Chapter 3.

**WHAT'S NEXT**

A draft adopting ordinance with a "clean" version of the proposed revised ‘Ewa Development Plan as an attached exhibit has been transmitted to the Planning Commission for their review and decision making. (A marked up version in a modified Ramseyer format with shadings, strikeouts, and underlines identifying proposed changes has also been published to help reviewers understand exactly how the proposed Plan differs from the adopted Plan.)

This Review Report accompanies the transmittal of the adopting ordinance and proposed Plan to provide documentation of the process followed in the review and the background for the recommendations for revision of the Plan and for improvement of implementation of the Plan vision and policies.
Public Information and Outreach. The Department will present the findings of the Review and the recommended revisions to the Plan and proposed improvements to implementation to the public before the Planning Commission holds a public hearing on the proposed revised Plan and the Review Report recommendations. The Department will ask to make short summary presentations to the ‘Ewa Neighborhood Board No. 23 and the Makakilo/Kapolei/Honokai Hale Neighborhood Board No. 34, and will hold a public information meeting in ‘Ewa to present the Review findings and recommendations, to answer questions, and to receive comments and suggestions.

Copies of this Review Report, the draft adopting ordinance and proposed revised Plan, and a modified Ramseyer version of the proposed revised Plan identifying changes from the adopted Plan will be posted on the Department of Planning and Permitting webpage (http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/), and circulated to Federal, State, and City agencies and key libraries, including the two State libraries in ‘Ewa.

Copies of the proposed Plan and the Review Report will also be available for pickup at the Department’s office on the seventh floor of the Fasi Municipal Building, at the two Neighborhood Board presentations, and at the Department’s public information meeting in ‘Ewa.

After the Department public information meeting, there will be time for the two Boards to meet and approve testimony before the Planning Commission holds its public hearing.

Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will hold one or more public hearings on the proposed Plan revision. Members of the public are welcome to provide written testimony to the Planning Commission and/or attend the public hearing and provide oral testimony.

After the public hearing or hearings are closed, the Planning Commission will determine what recommendations they want to make on the proposed revision, and then will transmit those recommendations by letter to the City Council along with the draft adopting ordinance with proposed revised Plan, and the Review Report for the Council's review and action.
City Council. After the Planning Commission recommendations, draft ordinance with proposed revised Plan, and the Review Report are received by the City Council, a bill to adopt the proposed revised Plan will be placed on the full Council agenda for the first of three votes that the bill must pass in order for the Plan revisions to be adopted. After the first vote (called First Reading), the bill will be assigned to a Council Committee which will hear testimony on the bill, consider any proposed amendments, and vote to determine if the bill should go to the full Council for a public hearing and a second vote.

If the bill passes the second vote by the full Council (Second Reading), it will go back to the Council Committee for a second review. The Committee will once again hear testimony, consider any amendments, and vote to decide if the bill should go back to the full Council for the final vote.

Mayor. If the Committee approves sending the bill back to the full Council and the Council approves the bill on the Third Reading, the bill goes to the Mayor who can sign it, return it to Council without signature, or veto the bill. If the Mayor signs the bill or returns it without signature, it is approved. If he vetoes it, it can still be adopted if six members of the Council vote to override the Mayor's veto.

Role of the Public. Members of the public are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to provide written and/or oral testimony to both the Planning Commission and the City Council as they review the proposed Plan revisions and recommendations for implementation improvement.

- Contact the Planning Commission at 768-8007 for information regarding the public hearing. The Commission requests that an original and fifteen (15) copies of written testimony be filed at least forty-eight (48) hours before the public hearing. Persons can sign up at the public hearing to provide oral testimony.
- Contact the City Clerk at 768-3822 or visit the City Council website at http://www1.honolulu.gov/council/geninfo.htm for the status of bills and the Council and committee meetings agenda.
Members of the public can contact the Council members directly to express their views on the proposed Plan revisions and can provide written and/or oral testimony to the full Council or to the Council Committee whenever the bill is on the agenda. Written testimony may be submitted by e-mail or faxed. Persons wanting to provide oral testimony are asked to sign up after the agenda is posted, and can do so on-line, by fax, or prior to the meeting.
1. THE REVIEW PROCESS

1.1 GOALS

The Department's goals for the review were to:

1. Evaluate the ‘Ewa Development Plan and recommend appropriate revisions and implementing actions;
2. Involve the community in the review;
3. Establish the model for the pending five year reviews of the other seven plans; and
4. Submit a Report and revised Plan to Council as soon as possible, given limitations on staffing and funding.

1.2 PROCESS AND MILESTONE EVENTS

Work on the Review began in 2002, but significant progress did not occur until the summer of 2003, following the adoption of the Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan. During the latter half of 2003, a briefing package and overview presentation were prepared, and interviews begun with community leaders, land owners, developers, and others with major interests in ‘Ewa's development.

On January 31, 2004, an Orientation Workshop was held at Kapolei Hale. The workshop was well attended with representatives from the two Neighborhood Boards, developers, land owners, professionals, and area political leaders in attendance.

The workshop opened with a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the ‘Ewa Development Review Program and was followed with a Question and Answer session with all of the participants. After a short break, the participants broke into four Issue Groups...
(Transportation, Schools, Development Process, Economic and Jobs Development) to discuss what information they needed to understand and help plan for the issue, identify questions and concerns that they had about the issue, and provide suggestions for how the issue could be addressed.

Handouts provided at the Workshop included

1. **Workshop Agenda**
2. **Draft Briefing Package**
   a. Overview of the Review Program and
   b. Vision Scorecard: historical and projected indicators of progress in implementing the **Plan** Vision
3. **Phasing of ‘Ewa Development**: Most current estimates of residential project capacity and timing of development, updating Table 2.2.
4. **‘Ewa Development Plan Issues: Analysis of Concerns Raised at ‘Ewa Neighborhood Boards**
5. **‘Ewa Development Plan: Vision and Policies Digest**: a digest of the **Plan**'s vision, land use & infrastructure policies, and implementation methods.

Copies of the Workshop Handouts, the PowerPoint Presentation, notes from the Question and Answer session that followed the presentation, and a listing of Comments and Suggestions from the four Issue Groups are available in Appendix D.

**Community Interviews.** Since the Fall of 2003, Department staff have held a series of interviews and small group meetings with Neighborhood Board members, residents, land owners, developers, and public agencies to collect their evaluations of the **‘Ewa Development Plan** and its implementation and ask for recommendations for ways either the **Plan** or its implementation might be improved.

**Smart Growth Team.** Beginning in February 2004, at the invitation of the City and County, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Smart Growth Program, the University of Hawai‘i Sea Grant Program and School of Architecture, the Urban Land Institute, Hawai‘i and the Campbell Estate sponsored a series of workshops and meetings to evaluate how the **‘Ewa Development Plan** and the **City of Kapolei Urban Design Plan** might better incorporate "Smart Growth Principles."
A team of nationally renowned architects, planners, developers, urban economists, transportation planners and other professionals was recruited to lead the sessions and to provide a report recommending ways to improve the plans and implementing measures (Land Use Ordinance, Subdivision Regulations, etc.)

**May 2-4, 2004 Smart Growth Workshops.** A series of well attended workshops involving community members, landowners, builders and developers were held in Kapolei at Kapolei Hale and the Campbell Building.

The national consultant team presented Smart Growth principles drawn from the team's national work, offered details on mixed-use projects in Atlanta, Portland, and Colorado which had successfully implemented Smart Growth principles; and led discussions of the ‘Ewa Development Plan and the Kapolei Urban Design Plan.

After the May workshops, the team returned twice for meetings and consultations, and prepared a draft report, ‘Ewa Smart Growth Design Code Working Draft (July 19, 2004) with recommendations for revisions to the Land Use Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations.

The team made the following recommendations for improving the ‘Ewa Development Plan and its implementation:

- Improve connections
  - Between regional destinations and activities
  - Between neighborhoods and communities
- Focus on place making in villages and neighborhoods
- Mix housing types in neighborhoods
- Get the new stuff right now or the chance to get it right will have passed
- Improve implementation and finance tools and policies

Documentation of the Smart Growth Workshops is provided in Appendix E.

**Public Review Draft Plan/Preliminary Plan Review Findings.** The Public Review Draft of the revised ‘Ewa Development Plan and a summary of key findings from the
Plan Review was completed and sent out to members of the public and Federal, State, and City agencies for review and comment in October 2008.

**Neighborhood Board Presentation.** A presentation on the draft Plan and the preliminary findings was made to the Makakilo/Kapolei/Honokai Hale Neighborhood Board No. 34 on October 22, 2008. Copies of the Public Review Draft Plan were also distributed to the public at the Board presentation. (A presentation could not be scheduled for the ‘Ewa Neighborhood Board No. 23 prior to the October Workshop because a candidate's forum was scheduled for their October meeting.)

**Workshop II: Public Review Draft Plan and Preliminary Review Findings.** A public workshop to collect comments, questions, and suggestions on the Public Review Draft Plan was held on Saturday, October 25, 2008 at the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands Hale Kalaniana'ole Meeting Room in East Kapolei. The meeting was well attended with representation from the community, land owners, developers, professionals and political leaders.

The workshop began with a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the Plan Review process, and a report on preliminary findings from the Plan Review and proposed changes to the Plan. Following the presentation, participants were asked to fill out comment cards concerning the proposed changes to the Plan and to implementation, and then to share those comments with the group.

Handouts provided at the Workshop included:

1. Workshop Agenda
2. Overview of Plan Review Results and Proposed Changes to the Plan
3. Proposed Substantive Changes to the Plan
5. Overview of Projections to 2030
6. ‘Ewa DP Five Year Review Status Report (October 2008)
Copies of the Workshop handouts, the PowerPoint Presentation, and comments received are available in Appendix F. A copy of the **Public Review Draft ‘Ewa Development Plan** is available on the Department's Web page at:

**Final Proposed Revised Plan.** The deadline for providing comments on the Public Review Draft and the preliminary Review Findings was extended twice. The initial deadline of November 15, 2008 was extended to January 31, 2009 at the request of Council Chair Apo. After consultation with Chair Apo, the Director agreed to extend the deadline for comments to March 15, 2009, in response to the request of the ‘Ewa Neighborhood Board No. 23.

Over 60 letters and e-mails were received and reviewed to determine whether a revision of the **Plan** was warranted or improvement to implementation needed. Appendix I provides a summary of the hundreds of comments and suggestions received and details the Department's response to the comments and suggestions.
2. ISSUES IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter provides findings on the items that are required by law to be covered in the review of the ‘Ewa Development Plan, on the success in implementing the Plan vision and policies; and on how well the Plan and its implementation addresses critical issues.

2.1 FINDINGS ON THE REQUIRED SCOPE OF REVIEW

1. Is the Plan vision, and its land use and infrastructure policies and implementing methods still appropriate? The Plan vision and policies enjoy widespread support from the community. Implementation methods need to be improved to ensure the implementation of the vision and the policies regarding adequate infrastructure, connectivity, and community centers.

2. Is the purpose of the Plan’s phasing guidelines being achieved? The purpose of the phasing guidelines, which was to protect agricultural areas inside the Community Growth Boundary for a limited period and to slow development of the area between the City of Kapolei and Waipahu was achieved. However, the phasing requirements probably had little to do with that result.

3. Should the phasing priorities in the Plan be revised? They should be eliminated to allow in-fill development of areas in West Kapolei and to make possible master planning, sizing, and financing infrastructure to meet the needs of the East Kapolei area as it develops in the next ten years.
2.2 FINDINGS ON VISION IMPLEMENTATION

The 1997 ‘Ewa Development Plan vision has five major elements. Our assessment of the success in implementing each of the vision elements is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Element</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agricultural lands and open space have been protected by the Community Growth Boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lands between Waipahū and the City of Kapolei whose development was to be delayed until 2006 and 2016 have not been developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New parkland has been acquired and is under development. Transfer to the City of 421 acres at Kalaeloa for a Regional Park and Kalaeloa Neighborhood Park is expected in the near future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Pearl Harbor Historic Trail Plan calls for establishment of bikeways and historic train use on the OR&amp;L corridor from Rainbow Marina to Nānākuli. Extension of the bikeway from Waipahū to ‘Ewa Plantation Villages is under design by the State. Train operations have been extended from ‘Ewa Plantation Villages closer to Nānākuli, but extension from ‘Ewa Plantation Villages to Waipahū or Rainbow Marina is not feasible due to the presence of energy pipelines buried in the railbed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of drainageways and utility corridors as greenways has been difficult to implement due to questions of maintenance responsibilities, coordination, and diffusion of ownership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the Secondary Urban Center around the City of Kapolei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant progress has been made in creating jobs in the City of Kapolei and surrounding resort and industrial areas. The rate of job growth has outpaced residential development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing the UH West O‘ahu Campus is key to continuing the momentum for development of O‘ahu’s second city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In 2002, responsibility for redevelopment of Kalaeloa was transferred to the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority (HCDA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Planning for Kalaeloa was delayed until the Navy decided that a carrier would not be stationed at Pearl Harbor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o HCDA prepared a Kalaeloa Master Plan approved by the Governor in 2006.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Development of Kalaeloa is inhibited by the need to bring infrastructure inherited from the Navy up to State and City standards and by the lack of profit making uses to help pay for needed improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 2.1: VISION IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build Master Planned Communities that Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use and Include Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential development was slowed by economic conditions after 1997, but rebounded sharply, averaging 800 to 900 units/year until recently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable housing units have been required and built in all major residential developments in ‘Ewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Until recently, subdivision layouts have often not supported walking, biking, utility vehicle circulation, connectivity with adjacent areas, or transit use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Express Buses, a hub-and-spoke system of collector buses, and a temporary Kapolei Transit Center were established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Major east-west and mauka-makai connections are being established with the development of areas on both side of Kualaka‘i Parkway in East Kapolei and in West Kapolei from Makaiwa Hills to Kalaeloa Barbers Point Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A proposed Bus Rapid Transit system between ‘Ewa and downtown Honolulu has been abandoned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The final environmental impact study for a fixed guideway transit system to link Kapolei with downtown Honolulu has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration and by the Governor. The contract has been awarded to build the initial segment from East Kapolei to Pearl Highlands which is expected to be completed by 2013. Extension to Ala Moana Shopping Center is expected by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A rapid transit right-of-way has been retained along Kapolei Parkway, Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road), and Farrington Highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little progress has been made in establishing mixed use town centers and main street areas, often due to regulatory restrictions and the difficulty of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating vital pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use, Transit Oriented Development around transit stations in ‘Ewa will be a significant challenge and opportunity in the next few years. The Public Review Draft of the <strong>East Kapolei Neighborhood TOD Plan</strong> was circulated for comments in April 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Natural, Historical and Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>• Protection of natural, historical and cultural resources has been included as a condition of land use approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Honouliuli Camp and ‘Ewa Field have been identified as significant historic resources which should be protected until they can be surveyed and appropriate protections / mitigations identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2.1: VISION IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Development and Provide Adequate Infrastructure</th>
<th>Evaluation of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• State and County infrastructure development has continued, but providing transportation and schools capacity concurrently with residential development remains a critical challenge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key roadway connections within 'Ewa have been completed. The 'Ewa Highway Master Plan identified 13 major projects needed to be completed by 2010 to meet expected growth. Work is either completed or under construction with completion expected in 2011 for eight of the projects. Three projects are partially complete and funding is being sought for completion, one project is under design, and one project is on hold until development of the Kapolei West project is begun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Master Plan has been updated to identify an additional eight priority 'Ewa roadway and interchange projects needed by 2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since 1997, improved express bus service and the Zipper Lane have been added to provide alternatives for the commute to Honolulu, but the quality of the commute for most has not improved. The H-1 Contra-Flow project scheduled to begin in 2010 has been delayed by a law suit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operation of a high-speed commuter ferry, begun in 2007, was not continued due to lack of patronage and substantial cost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The high-speed rapid transit system is expected to provide initial hourly capacity by 2020 sufficient to carry 90% of the number of peak hour drivers and passengers that were commuting from 'Ewa and Wai'anae in 2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The City has fully supported the DOE's efforts to provide capacity for existing and new developments through requirements on developers to provide their fair share of land and construction costs which if not met, result in denials of permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If permanent classrooms are to be built in time to meet expected demand and relieve existing crowding, State appropriations must be made now for three elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Facility District financing for new developments and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) for redevelopment projects offer a way to finance development of roads and other needed infrastructure concurrently with residential and commercial development. SB693 (2011) which would amend the State Constitution to resolve concerns about TIF constitutionality, was held in committee by the 2011 State Senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the Vision Scorecard in Appendix C for more details.
2.3 EVALUATION OF MAJOR ISSUES

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

- Transportation Infrastructure Adequacy
  - Connectivity and Mobility Within ‘Ewa
  - Commuting Between ‘Ewa and Downtown Honolulu
- Schools Permanent Classroom Adequacy
- Protection of Open Space and Agricultural Lands
  - Agricultural Lands Protection
  - Pedestrian and Bike Path Network on Drainage Channels and Utility Corridors
- Development Process Management and Mitigation
  - Housing Affordability
  - Infrastructure Concurrency
  - Place Making
- Jobs and Economic Development
- Historic, Cultural, and Natural Resources
  - Historic and Cultural Resources
  - ‘Ewa Plantation Villages
  - Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites
  - World War II Historic Sites
  - OR&L Historic Train Operations
  - Light Pollution
- Hazards Planning
  - Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise
  - Hurricane Shelters

The relation of these issues to the ‘Ewa Development Plan vision, policies, guidelines and implementation methods was analyzed to determine whether the Plan needed to be revised to better address the issue or whether the problem was one of improving implementation to better realize the Plan vision. The analysis of each of the issues is summarized below.
2.3.1 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ADEQUACY

Issue Analysis
- It is useful to analyze transportation issues in ‘Ewa from two perspectives:
  - Connectivity and mobility within ‘Ewa; and
  - Commuting between ‘Ewa and Downtown Honolulu.

Connectivity And Mobility Within ‘Ewa
- Roadway connectivity and mobility problems within ‘Ewa are primarily due to the
  over loading placed on major arterials because of the lack of alternative arterial,
  collector, and sub-collector roadways, and existing subdivision roadway layouts
  that funnel all traffic onto the major arterials.
- Roadway connectivity is improving with major alternative east-west and mauka-
  makai connections recently completed. (See Table 2.2 below.) The early 2010
  opening of Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) and Kapolei Parkway brought
  some long awaited relief to the severe peak hour congestion on Fort Weaver
  Road for ‘Ewa Beach, ‘Ewa by Gentry and Ocean Pointe residents.
- The ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan (EHMP) was adopted in 2002, identifying 15
  key ‘Ewa transportation improvements needed by 2010 to meet expected growth
  by providing additional mauka-makai and East-West roadways and freeway
  connection capacity. Ten of the projects either are already completed or under
  construction with completion expected by 2011, and three are partially complete
  with funding being sought for their completion.
- At the same time, the City Council adopted the ‘Ewa Highway Impact Fee
  program which established an impact fee on all building permits issued for new
  developments in ‘Ewa and Royal Kunia and dedicated the funds from the fee to
  help offset some of the cost of building the transportation projects identified in the
  EHMP.
## TABLE 2-2
EXISTING AND PLANNED ‘EWA TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>‘Ewa DP</th>
<th>‘Ewa HMP</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Status as of April 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East-West Road, DHHL East Kapolei</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Under construction. Completion in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Road, Ho'opili</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Pending entitlements and development of Ho'opili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Road, UH WO East Kapolei</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>State/Private</td>
<td>Pending development of UH WOC private residential and commercial properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrington Highway Widening, Golf Course Road to Fort Weaver Road</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City seeking funding. ORTP2035 20C:2011-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrington Highway Widening, Hakimo to Kualaeo Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State seeking funding. ORTP2035 54S:2021-2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Barrette Road Widening, Roosevelt Avenue to Saratoga Avenue</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>ORTP2035 56C:2011-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Weaver Road Widening, H-1 to Farrington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Completed 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Weaver Road Widening, Farrington to ‘A’awa Drive</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Completed 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Weaver Road Widening, ‘A’awa Drive to Geiger Road</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Completed 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Weaver Road Widening, Geiger Road to North Road</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State DOT has no plans to continue widening to North Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1 Median HOV Lane, Makakilo to Waiawa Int.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Zipper lane from Waieke Stream to near Honolulu International Airport completed 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hānū’a Street Extension to Farrington Highway</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>State/Private</td>
<td>State seeking funding. ORTP2035 16S:2011 to 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu High Capacity Transit Corridor Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>FEIS accepted by Federal Transit Authority and by Governor. First segment planned completion by 2013, Kapolei to Ala Moana by 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualaeo East-West Spine Road, Geiger to Kualaeo Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>ORTP2035 57S:2021-2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualaeo Boulevard Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private (KPD) / City</td>
<td>KPD completed Phase I in 2009. City began Phase II in 2011. Phase III start by KPD yet to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamākila Boulevard Extension to Roosevelt Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/Private</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamākila Boulevard Extension from Roosevelt Avenue to Saratoga Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City/Private</td>
<td>ORTP2035 55C:2021-2035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2-2
EXISTING AND PLANNED 'EWA TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>'Ewa DP1</th>
<th>'Ewa HMP2</th>
<th>Agency2</th>
<th>Status as of April 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, Ali'i Nui Drive to Kala'eo Ave.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010, 2020</td>
<td>Private (KPD)</td>
<td>Partially completed Kala'eo to Kapolei Commons. Remainder pending development of Kapolei West. <strong>ORTP2035 18C:2011-2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, DHHL</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, Kualaka'i Establishment Road to Renton Road</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Completed 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, Renton Road to Puuapao St.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Completed 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, Ocean Pointe boundary to Puuapao Street</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Private (Gentry)</td>
<td>Completed 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Parkway, Gentry 'Ewa Makai boundary to Paipipi Road</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Private (Haseko)</td>
<td>Completed 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualaka'i Parkway, H-1 to Kapolei Parkway</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>3 lanes completed 2010. Seeking funds to widen to 6 lanes. <strong>ORTP2035 22S: 2011 to 2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualaka'i Parkway Extension to Keoneula Blvd.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State seeking funding. <strong>ORTP2035 23S: 2011 to 2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualaka'i Parkway Interchange, H-1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Completed 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunia Road Widening, Farrington to Anonui Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State seeking funding. <strong>ORTP2035 71S (Illustrative)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaiwa Hills Interchange</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Pending development of Makaiwa Hills project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makakilo Drive Extension</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>FEA/FONSI. Design to begin in 2011. Seeking funding for acquisition and construction. <strong>ORTP2035 35C:2011-2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makakilo Interchange, H-1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>State/ Private</td>
<td>Phase I completed. Phase II to be completed 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makakilo Mauka Frontage Road</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Seeking funding. <strong>ORTP2035 58S:2021-2035</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pali'ai Interchange, H-1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>State/ Private</td>
<td>Under design. Seeking funding for construction. <strong>ORTP2035 16S:2011-2020</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Discontinued as of June 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

- Project identified in the *Ewa Development Plan* (1997) as needed to meet projected 'Ewa development needs.
- Identifies lead governmental agency and projects with significant private participation.
- DHHL = Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
- FEA/FONSI = Final Environmental Assessment accepted with Finding of No Significant Impact
- FEIS = Final Environmental Impact Statement accepted
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle
- KPD = Kapolei Property Development, Inc.
- **ORTP2035 = O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035** (April 2011). Project identification number and implementation period are shown. Illustrative projects are not included in the ORTP2035 but could be added by amendment if additional funding becomes available.
- UH WO = University of Hawai'i West O'ahu
An update of the EHMP has been completed which identifies eight roadway and intersection projects needed to meet growth in ‘Ewa traffic by 2020\(^1\).

For many years, developers in ‘Ewa were allowed to build "pod" communities with only one way in and out. The City, starting in 2004, began requiring developers of new subdivisions to provide greater connectivity both within their subdivisions and between their subdivisions and adjacent projects. At a minimum, at least two ways in and out of the subdivision are required, ending the pattern of "pod" subdivisions with only one way in and out.

The ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study (March 2009) provides a conceptual plan for a network of convenient routes throughout ‘Ewa and is intended to be used as a reference document when reviewing roadway master plans, particularly with respect to future street and bikeway locations. It bridges the gap between the major arterials listed in the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan and the street standards for subdivisions, identifying "missing links" needed to provided connectivity throughout ‘Ewa.

Increased connectivity and support for establishment of town centers and Main Street areas in each community is needed to create healthy, sustainable communities, friendly to pedestrians, bikers, and transit users.

**Commuting between ‘Ewa and Downtown Honolulu**

- Commuting between ‘Ewa and Downtown Honolulu is characterized by lack of choice of alternative modes or routes, high levels of congestion, and uncertainty.

- On a regular basis, the average commute from ‘Ewa to downtown Honolulu is 75 minutes with 20% of commuters spending almost 90 minutes\(^2\). In addition, because of the lack of alternatives, traffic accidents and emergency conditions can drastically affect the length of the commute. Congested conditions for single occupant autos traveling between ‘Ewa and Honolulu on H-1 during peak hours are not likely to significantly improve, even with major roadway improvements.

---

\(^1\) City and County of Honolulu, *‘Ewa Transportation Impact Fee Program Update: Final ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan For Year 2020*, by Fehr & Peers (March 2011).

The alternatives to single occupant use of the automobile on the H-1 freeway are use of the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane either in an auto with at least two occupants or as a rider in an Express Bus. Neither of these options provide significant time advantage over the single occupant auto, and all options can be significantly delayed by accidents.

The congestion is not just on the H-1 freeway, but extends into the Downtown Honolulu street system, much of which is at capacity with existing peak loads. The inability for Downtown Honolulu streets to accept significant additional peak traffic limits the potential benefit of increased H-1 capacity.

City policy adopted in 2002 is to meet the demand for peak-hour transportation between the Leeward side and downtown Honolulu by:

- Increased use of transit; and
- Management of transportation demand to encourage less single occupant auto commuting.³

There have been a number of projects since 1997 which have attempted to improve the commute by increasing capacity or providing alternatives, including the construction in 1998 of the Zipper Lane for bus and HOV use and its extension in 2005 to connect with the Nimitz highway contraflow lane; and the establishment of expanded Express and Hub and Spoke Bus Service.

The City operated a high-speed commuter ferry system between Kalaeloa Barbers Point Harbor and Aloha Tower from September 2007 to June 2009 to provide an alternative to automobile use. It was decided not to continue operating the ferry system due to low level of patronage and substantial cost. It was felt that a higher level of patronage would be possible if a terminus in the ‘Ewa Beach area could be obtained.

Completion of the first increment of the elevated fixed guide way transit system (from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center) will provide an effective alternative to commuting by auto for a significant numbers of commuters by 2020.

³ City and County of Honolulu, Central O’ahu Sustainable Communities Plan (December 2002), p. 4-13.
• The rapid transit system will have the capacity to carry 8,650 passengers per hour\(^4\). (This capacity could be increased by adding more cars to each train and by reducing the time between trains.)

• In contrast, automobiles traveling on the freeway in 1998 carried an average of 1.28 persons per car\(^5\). At that occupancy rate, it would take 6,758 automobiles per hour on the freeway to provide the same capacity as the rapid transit system. For comparison, in 2005, during the morning peak hour, the estimated number of cars going toward downtown Honolulu crossing the screenline at H-1, Farrington, and Fort Weaver Road was 7,460.\(^6\)

• Not only will the rapid transit system provide ample capacity for ‘Ewa commuters, it will also complete the trip from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center in 42 minutes\(^7\) which will be significantly faster than the equivalent commute by auto on the freeway, and will be much more reliable since it will travel on its own separate guide way, and will not be subject to the delays that accidents cause on the freeway.

  o Job creation in ‘Ewa has outpaced residential development, providing an alternative to commuting from ‘Ewa to Honolulu. The number of non-construction jobs grew from 16,400 in 2000 to an estimated 33,300 in 2007, an increase of over 100%. In contrast, the number of housing units in ‘Ewa grew from 20,800 to 27,900 during the same period, a percentage increase of 34%.\(^8\)

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

  o Retain the existing Plan’s strong policy language calling for adequate capacity to meet existing and planned demand and supporting transit use and transit oriented development.

  o Make the Plan’s language calling for increased connectivity and place making stronger and more specific. (For additional details, see this Review Report’s pp. 3-5 and 3-6 [Plan Ch. 2 changes E, G], pp. 3-19 through 21 [Plan Ch. 3 changes AL, AM, AO, AS], pp. 3-26 and 3-27 [Plan Ch. 4 changes G, H], and pp. 3-35 through 37 [Plan Ch. 5 changes E,J,K].)

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 2-30.
\(^5\) Ibid., p. 3-9.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 3-21.
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 3-36.
\(^8\) Department of Planning and Permitting, unpublished estimates (September 2009).
Add City Transportation Improvement Priorities approved in 2002 to the Plan to clarify how peak hour transportation needs will be met. (See p. 3-26 [Plan Ch. 4 change F].)

Update language on the location of the transit corridor to reflect Council decisions to route the corridor through Kalaeloa, and add language requiring retention of a transit corridor right-of-way through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei to the Plan, to support future extension of the elevated rapid transit system from East Kapolei through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei and Kapolei Commons. (See p. 3-7 [Plan Ch. 2 change I] and p. 3-26 [Plan Ch. 4 change E].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Complete construction of the first increment of the elevated rapid transit system as soon as possible.
- Extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei/Kapolei Commons as soon as possible after completion of the first increment in order to support development of the City of Kapolei as O'ahu's Second City by giving it a Transit Oriented Development core with a rapid transit connection to the rest of O'ahu's major employment centers.
- Improve the functioning of the H-1 HOV lanes so that riders in transit and high occupancy vehicles have a clear advantage in travel time over single occupant automobile commuters.
- Adopt updated impact fees to support building of needed additional east-west and mauka-makai connector roadways within 'Ewa, as identified in the updated 'Ewa Highway Master Plan.
- Use the 'Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study as the starting point for subdivision applications and urban design reviews discussions establishing or extending roadways in new and existing communities.
- Develop the East Kapolei lands within walking distance (1/2 mile to ¼ mile) from the transit stations since East Kapolei residents within walking distance of transit stations are much more likely to use transit than residents farther from the stations, thereby causing less roadway traffic congestion than new development elsewhere in 'Ewa or Central O'ahu.
2.3.2 SCHOOLS PERMANENT CLASSROOM ADEQUACY

Issue Analysis

- The Department of Education (DOE) has been able to provide classroom space for all students through use of temporary classrooms, busing students, and multi-tracking when permanent school room capacity was not adequate. Recently, the DOE announced it will not build any new multi-tracking schools.

- However, parents generally prefer that their children go to the public school closest to their home, be housed in a permanent classroom building, and not be on a multi-track schedule.

- State legislative appropriations in the past have often been less than the DOE needed to meet costs of renovation, mandated upgrades for ADA and other requirements, and new school construction costs.

- The DOE estimates that nine new elementary, three new intermediate/middle, and two new high schools will be needed by 2035 to meet the projected ʻEwa growth in school age children. See Table 2.3.

- The recession has provided a slowdown in the pace of residential development, but because of budget difficulties for the State, new schools construction in ʻEwa may also be delayed.

- The DOE reported in 2010 that because critical appropriations for ʻEwa schools and land releases were not made in 2010, they cannot promise that they will be able to build all the permanent school room capacity needed to keep up with development. Funding is needed immediately for three new elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school to keep up with projected development.

- The DOE has the ability either through Unilateral Agreements adopted as part of zoning approval or as part of Act 245 (2007) school impact fee districts, to require developer fair share contributions for the land and a portion of the construction cost for schools needed to house students from new developments.

- The DOE is studying whether a school impact fee district should be created for ʻEwa.
Table 2-3
EXISTING AND PLANNED PUBLIC SCHOOLS
IN THE 'EWA DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>FY 2011 Enrollment</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Site Reserved</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ewa Beach Elementary</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ewa Elementary</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holomua Elementary</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iroquois Point Elementary</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka'imiloa Elementary</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keone'ula Elementary</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōhākea Elementary</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kapolei Complex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers Point Elementary</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Elementary</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makakilo Elementary</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka Lani Elementary</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,231</td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei II Elementary (Mehana)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei UH WOC I, II, III</td>
<td>400 to 750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei DHHL</td>
<td>400 to 750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei Ho'opili I, II, III</td>
<td>1,200 to 2,250</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maka'iwa Hills</td>
<td>400 to 750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei West</td>
<td>400 to 750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko Olina</td>
<td>400 to 750</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,600 to 6,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate/Middle School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ewa Makai Middle (Campbell Complex)</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ilima Intermediate (Campbell Complex)</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei Middle (Kapolei Complex)</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei Middle (DHHL)</td>
<td>500 to 1,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei Middle (Ho'opili)</td>
<td>500 to 1,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Kapolei Middle (Maka'iwa Hills)</td>
<td>500 to 1,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,500 to 3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell High</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei High</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,746</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei High I (HHFDC land)</td>
<td>800 to 1,600</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Kapolei High II (Ho'opili)</td>
<td>800 to 1,600</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,600 to 3,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. Received appropriation for added design and construction funds in FY2012-2013.
2. No legislative appropriation
3. Includes a UH WOC lab school.
X Site Reserved
NA Not Applicable
N.D. Not Determined
Source: State Department of Education Facilities Development Branch, 2011
Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

- Retain the existing Plan's strong policy language calling for adequate capacity to meet existing and planned demand for public schools, and supporting the DOE in its efforts to obtain "fair share" contributions from developers to help build the school capacity needed for the students from their developments.

- Update the Plan to reflect the City's support for the DOE collection of its fair share contribution either through school impact fee districts or through Unilateral Agreement (UA) conditions enforcement. (See p. 3-31 [Plan Ch. 4 change X].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Continue to enforce UA conditions that require DOE to certify developer compliance with fair share provisions before the City will approve development permits.

- Support DOE and community efforts to obtain funding for permanent school capacity from the State Legislature.

2.3.3 PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACE AND AGRICULTURAL LANDS

2.3.3.1 Agricultural Lands Protection

Issue Analysis

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

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

- The ‘Ewa Development Plan Community Growth Boundary adopted in 1997 protects over 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land above the H-1 Freeway and around the West Loch of Pearl Harbor.

- The Boundary does include within the urban area some East Kapolei lands which are currently being farmed. However, those lands are part of the ‘Ewa urban fringe area which has been planned for low rise residential community development since 1977.

- Concerns about loss of open space and agricultural land are sincere, but do not recognize how much O'ahu agricultural land is currently protected against development:
  - 53,000 acres of agricultural lands are protected by the Community Growth Boundary in ‘Ewa, Central O’ahu and the North Shore DP/SCP areas.
  - Hundreds of acres of additional ag lands are protected in other DP/SCP areas, especially in Wa‘ianae, near Kahuku, in Wai‘ahole/Waikâne, and in Waimânalo.

- The City's consultant has identified 30,000 acres of agricultural lands on O'ahu that are not being farmed currently and could be farmed if somebody wanted to start farming.9

- For those concerned about O‘ahu’s reliance on agricultural imports, the City’s consultant has also estimated that all the fruits and vegetables that can be grown successfully in Hawai‘i, but are now being imported, could be grown on 23,000 acres.9

- Farm lands in East Kapolei, which the existing Plan says should be retained in farming until 2016, are still being farmed. Given the approvals needed for development of East Kapolei, these lands are unlikely to be developed before 2016. However, development of these lands after 2016 was approved in the existing Plan because they are located between Waipahū and the Villages of Kapolei and would be well served by the same infrastructure investments that serve the rest of ‘Ewa.

---

9 Department of Planning and Permitting, O‘ahu Agriculture: Situation, Outlook and Issues, by Plasch Econ Pacific LLC(December 2009), p. 27 and 32.
Approval by the City Council of the elevated fixed guideway alignment to East Kapolei reflects the existing ‘Ewa Development Plan vision to provide rapid transit to serve development of the University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu Campus and residential communities on the lands around it in East Kapolei.

The East Kapolei lands within walking distance (1/2 mile to ¼ mile) from the transit stations are the best lands to develop in ‘Ewa or Central O‘ahu if you want to minimize traffic congestion because residents who live that close to stations are much more likely to use transit than residents who would have to drive or ride the bus to get to the transit station.

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Retain the existing Community Growth Boundary which protects ag lands above the H-1 Freeway from residential development (The Community Growth Boundary was called the Urban Growth Boundary in the 1997 Plan.)
- Retain the current land use plan which calls for development of East Kapolei as a collection of master planned communities because:
  - East Kapolei is an in-fill development area between the Villages of Kapolei and Waipahu which can take advantage of existing and planned infrastructure, including Kualaka‘i Parkway, the Kroc Center, the UH West O‘ahu Campus, and the elevated rapid transit system.
  - As a part of zoning approvals and permits, East Kapolei can be required to be designed and developed to take maximum advantage of the new transit system which is planned to be running to downtown Honolulu by 2019.

### 2.3.3.2 Pedestrian and Bike Path Network on Drainage Channels and Utility Corridors

**Issue Analysis**

- There has been limited progress in establishing the pedestrian and bike paths running on grassed drainageways and utility corridors as part of the open space network.
  - There is no one City or State agency responsible for creating the pedestrian and bike path network by linking together roadway paths, drainageways, and utility corridors.
• Most drainageways have not been dedicated to the City, with the result that a pedestrian and bike path system running on the drainageways would involve coordinating with a wide variety of private and public owners.
• The agency responsible for maintaining City drainage systems views grassed channels, landscaping, and pedestrian and bike paths as causing problems and adding maintenance costs.
• The agency responsible for providing City outdoor recreation facilities does not have the staff or funding to take on additional responsibilities, given the needs of traditional parks, ball fields and courts.
• A Unilateral Agreement condition requiring "a grass-lined drainage system with trees along a bicycle path, open for public use, within or abutting the drainage system" was adopted as part of the zone change approval for the Mehana at Kapolei project.¹⁰
• In several other major projects approved for zone changes, pedestrian and bike paths were provided either on the street network or as separate systems, but the routes were not designed to use the drainageways.
• Access from bordering residential areas to the drainage systems is often blocked by fencing, with the result that drainage channels provide a habitat for anti-social behavior and are used as a site to dump trash and abandoned equipment.
• As proposed in the Public Review Draft East Kapolei Neighborhood TOD Plan, the elevated rapid transit system offers the opportunity to create a pedestrian and bike path running below the elevated rail on a landscaped median.¹¹

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

o Retain language in the Plan supporting creation of an open space network within the Community Growth Boundary, linked by greenways along roadways, utility corridors, and drainage ways.

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

o Resolve lack of agency support for creation and maintenance of the open space network.

¹⁰ Ordinance 04-46 [Bill 73, 2004).
• Study whether a public-private regional open space and greenway ‘ohana should be established to advocate for creation of the network, raise funds to support the network, and coordinate development, operation, and maintenance of the open space network.

• Study whether public access easements could be used to give private owners tax incentives to allow establishment of public pedestrian and bike paths on utility corridors and drainage ways.
  o Design the elevated rapid transit right-of-way to include a public greenway running beneath the elevated transit line.

2.3.4 DEVELOPMENT PROCESS MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION

• Concerns were raised that the existing development process is resulting in a shortfall in affordable housing, failure to develop roads and schools concurrently with residential development, and is not creating vital, accessible, pedestrian oriented community centers in new master planned communities as called for by the ‘Ewa Development Plan vision and policies.

2.3.4.1 Housing Affordability

Issue Analysis

• Housing affordability is a continuing problem on O‘ahu.
  • In 2009, there were an estimated 3,650 homeless persons on O‘ahu on average during the year;\textsuperscript{12}
  • In 2006, 20% of the 303,000 households on O‘ahu were at risk of becoming homeless;\textsuperscript{13}
  • In 2006, over 30% of all households paid more than 30% of their income for housing;\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} City & County of Honolulu, \textit{FY 2011 – 2015 Consolidated Plan} (July 2009), p. 1
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, p. 32.
• Fifteen percent of all households were either living in crowded housing in 2006 or sharing a home with other families only because they could not afford to buy or rent a home for themselves\textsuperscript{15}, and \\
• Sixty percent of the single family homes sold in Honolulu in 2006 were not affordable to 75% of the households wanting a single family home\textsuperscript{16}; \\

  o The SMS, Inc. \textit{Hawai'i Housing Policy Study, 2006} estimate is that an average of 2,000 housing units affordable to households who earn no more than 80% of the median income (low-income households) and 900 units affordable to households who earn between 81% and 120% of median income (low-moderate income households) are needed annually on O'ahu to address problems of crowding, doubling up, and affordability, and to provide homes for new households\textsuperscript{17}.

  o Honolulu has a long established inclusionary zoning policy requiring that 30% of the units in new residential developments with 10 or more units be affordable to low and low-moderate income households, either as sales units or rental units.

  • The requirement is established by Council as a condition of zone change approvals.

  • Islandwide annual production of new homes in major residential projects between 1990 and 2009 ranged between 4,500 and 1,400 homes, with a median annual production of 2,400 homes\textsuperscript{18}.

  • A comparison of the volume of new homes built annually in major projects since 1990 with the SMS estimate that 2,900 units are needed annually to meet the needs of low and low-moderate income households makes it clear that inclusionary zoning, while producing a significant number of affordable homes, \textit{cannot, by itself}, come close to meeting the total affordable housing need, particularly for low-income households.

  • Since the inclusionary program was established in the 1980s, through June 2009, over 6,500 of the 16,400 units built in major residential projects in 'Ewa have been affordable units\textsuperscript{19}.

\textsuperscript{15} SMS, Inc., \textit{Hawai'i Housing Policy Study, 2006} (February 2007), p. 44
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{18} Department of Planning and Permitting, \textit{Annual Report on the Status of Land Use on O'ahu}.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}
Development of units affordable for low income households on sites within walking distance of stations on the elevated rapid transit system makes those units more affordable since the occupants will be able to save money by using transit and sharply reducing or eliminating use of automobiles.

Affordable housing for special needs and smaller households could also be provided more easily if it was easier to develop "granny flats" or accessory apartment units in residential developments or to include residential units above the first floor on parcels zoned for business uses.

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Add language stating the existing City policy that requires 30% of housing units in new residential developments to be affordable to low and low-middle income households. (See p. 3-19 [Plan Ch. 3 change AK].)

- Add language supporting inclusion of granny flats and ‘ohana units in residential developments as a way of increasing the supply of affordable housing for seniors, students, young families, and low income households. (See p. 3-6 [Plan Ch. 2 change F].)

**Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation**

- Amend the Land Use Ordinance to allow residential use as a permitted use on the second floor and above for parcels zoned B-1 or B-2 as a way of supporting placemaking and increasing the supply of affordable and appropriate housing for seniors and low-income households.

- Study how the Land Use Ordinance and other development regulations and standards might be amended to allow inclusion of granny flats, ‘ohana units, and other accessory residential units in residential developments where appropriate.

2.3.4.2 Infrastructure Concurrency

**Issue Analysis**

- Complaints that critical infrastructure is not being built concurrently with residential developments revolve around problems with transportation capacity and with a lack of permanent classrooms which the DOE meets with temporary classrooms, multi-track scheduling, or busing.
There are not "concurrency" issues with most other infrastructure because City subdivision and building permit processes do not allow development to proceed if the developer cannot show that adequate capacity can be provided. For example, if the Board of Water Supply does not say adequate water is available for fire and home use, subdivision approvals and building permits will not be approved.

Transportation Capacity Concurrency

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

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

Gaps in the 'Ewa roadway network will exist if developers must build most of the missing roadway network using conventional project infrastructure financing.

- As each new phase of a project begins, the developer will borrow enough money to build just the portion of the roadway network serving that phase because it would be too risky to borrow the funds for the entire project, since the cash flow needed to repay the financing might be inadequate if the market went bad. For example, the extension of Kapolei Parkway to connect with Ali'i Nui Drive in Ko Olina has been completed to Kapolei Commons but will not be completed until the Kapolei West project begins development.

- A Community Facility District which is a special assessment district financed by a special property tax on all the owners within the district can be used to fund key public infrastructure improvements and facilities like the spine roadway system so that they all can be built at the beginning of the project instead of incrementally. (Long-term, fixed-rate, tax-exempt bonds secured by the land within the district are used to raise the needed funds; the bonds are paid off over thirty years by the special property tax.)
The ‘Ewa Highway Impact Fee Program, adopted by Ord. 02-52, established an impact fee collected on each building permit for residential or non-residential construction in ‘Ewa, Royal Kunia, and Village Park to provide additional funding resources for roadway and traffic improvements for the ‘Ewa region.  

- The fee was set at a level estimated to cover 20 percent of the total cost of 13 major roadway and interchange projects identified in the ordinance.
- Impact fees are deposited in a special trust fund which is to be used exclusively to fund only State or City "highway or traffic improvements" which are part of the 13 projects identified by the ordinance.
- As of September 2011, total fees collected since 2002 by the Department of Planning and Permitting and transferred to the Department of Budget and Fiscal Services for deposit in the fund equaled $15.7 million.
- Developers or landowners who elect to construct all or a portion of one of the 13 projects can receive a credit against the impact fee based on how much of the roadway or interchange project they built.
- As of May 2011, total credits awarded to developers, landowners, and governmental agencies for roadway and traffic improvements they made were over $45 million. (For comparison, the 2002 estimates of costs for the 13 projects was almost $194 million.)
- However, because the impact fees are collected when permits are issued for residential and non-residential building, the funds are not available to finance building backbone infrastructure concurrently with or in advance of the residential and non-residential building.

---

20 Ordinance 02-52, A Bill for an Ordinance Relating to Impact Fees for Traffic and Roadway Improvements in ‘Ewa, Section 1. Purpose.
22 Revised Ordinances of Honolulu (ROH), Chapter 33A Impact Fees for Traffic and Roadway Improvements in ‘Ewa, Sec. 33A-1.7(d).
23 Department of Planning and Permitting, “‘Ewa Highway Master Plan Impact Fees Assessed For Building Permits Issued Between 10/30/02 and 09/06/2011,” internal records summary, Sep. 6, 2011.
24 ROH, Ch. 33A, Sec. 33A-1.10.
25 State and City agencies can be issued credits based on State and City ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan project expenditures which are then used to offset impact fee charges on building permits for State and City ‘Ewa projects like the Villages of Kapolei affordable housing projects or the expansion of the H-Power plant.
26 ROH, Ch. 33A, Table 33A-1.2 ‘Ewa Region Highway Improvement Program Estimated Cost of Improvements.
• In addition, because the fees were calculated to cover only a portion of the total cost of the 13 major backbone projects, additional financing beyond that collected in fees is needed to build the backbone infrastructure.

• Also, because the impact fees are based on cost estimates made in 2001 and have not been adjusted to reflect inflation in construction costs of the roadway and traffic improvement projects, their impact as a source of funding for ‘Ewa roadways and traffic improvements has been steadily reduced by inflation.27

• When multiple developers are responsible for completing segments of the network, gaps will also arise because of differences in the developers’ timetables.

• For example, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has begun work on the portion of the East Kapolei East-West Road that will serve Phase II of its East Kapolei project.

• However, completion of the East-West Road through the University of Hawai’i West O’ahu residential lands on the Wai’anae side of Kualaka’i Parkway will have to wait until a developer is selected for those lands and is ready to begin development, and completion of the Road through the Ho’opili project will have to wait until State Land Use Commission approval and City Council approval for urban development has been obtained.

• Because the entire East-West Road through UH West O’ahu, DHHL, and Ho’opili will not be open until all three developments complete their work, existing roadways and intersections will be more congested than they would be if the East-West Road could be built so that it would be in place at the beginning of residential development of the area.

• Gaps in the ‘Ewa roadway network are also likely if connections across Kalaeloa cannot be completed in a timely manner.

• The Hawai’i Community Development Authority (HCDA) is responsible for planning and directing the development of the Kalaeloa area. As indicated in Chapter 4 of both the approved and the proposed revised ‘Ewa Development Plan, improvements and extensions of several Kalaeloa roads are planned to provide key east-west and mauka-makai connections for ‘Ewa.

• Many of the existing roads in Kalaeloa are not up to State or City standards.
• Because most of the lands in Kalaeloa were transferred from the Navy to public agencies and non-profit organizations, there are very limited sources for financing the needed improvements, upgrades, and extensions.
• HCDA has proposed use of a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District as a way of obtaining long-term financing for needed infrastructure in Kalaeloa. The core idea of a TIF District is that if building needed infrastructure will increase the value of the property and property tax revenues in the District, then the cost of that infrastructure can be paid for by borrowing against the expected increase in property tax revenues. The base amount of property taxes that is being received without the infrastructure investment is established, and any increment over the base amount for a fixed period of time (usually from 15 to 30 years) goes to pay off the TIF bonds.
• The City's Bond Counsel has advised that there "may be a Constitutional cloud on the City's authority to issue TIF bonds." Senate Bill 693, which would amend the State Constitution to resolve concerns about TIF constitutionality, was held in committee by the 2011 State Senate.

• Problems providing regional and island-wide transportation capacity have also led to lack of concurrency.
  • Unexpected delays in completing the Kualaka’i Parkway meant that hundreds of homes were built along the Fort Weaver corridor without any significant alternative connection to use to get to the H-1 Freeway.
  • At a larger scale, the on again, off again planning for providing a rapid transit system to serve ‘Ewa and Central O’ahu has resulted in transportation capacity lagging behind residential development approvals.
    ▪ Starting in the 1970s, environmental assessments prepared for Council use in deciding whether to approve large residential communities in both ‘Ewa and Central O’ahu assumed that significant capacity for the daily commute would be provided by a rapid transit system running on the corridor between downtown Honolulu and Central O’ahu and ‘Ewa as was

---

28 Letter from City and County of Honolulu Department of Budget and Fiscal Services to The Honorable Jon Riki Karamatsu, Chair and Members of the Committee on Judiciary, Hawai‘i State House of Representatives, “H.B. No. 1205: Proposing Amendments to Article VII, Section 12 and 13, of the Constitution of the State of Hawai‘i Relating to Tax Increment Financing,” January 22, 2010.
called for in the General Plan and included in the island-wide transportation plans.

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

**Permanent Classroom Capacity Concurrency**

- Permanent classroom capacity has lagged behind residential development because there has been a persistent shortfall in State appropriations for the Department of Education (DOE) capital improvement program.
  - Funds are needed by the DOE for ongoing repair and maintenance of existing facilities, periodic rehabilitation of older facilities, construction of new facilities at existing schools, and meeting the need for new schools.
  - In 2009, DOE estimated that the amount needed to meet the Department’s infrastructure development, repair and maintenance needs was $575 million per year.  
    - The average funding the DOE received from Fiscal Year 2005 through Fiscal Year 2009 was $278 million.
    - Even with $14 million per year provided by developers and homeowners as part of fair share impact fees, the average shortfall in funding is $283 million.

- Failure to provide appropriations in the 2010 and 2011 Legislative sessions for new schools needed in ‘Ewa means that existing classroom shortfalls will not be addressed and school construction will continue to lag behind residential construction. The DOE has identified three elementary schools, a middle school, and a high school which are needed in the next six years to relieve existing crowding and meet enrollment growth, but received no appropriations for the projects.

---

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

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

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Support creative financing programs like Community Facilities Districts and public-private partnerships as a way of financing critical roadways and transit support infrastructure so that infrastructure is built as new residential, retail and office development is built.
- Study the possibility of using Community Facilities District funding to build permanent classroom capacity in anticipation of legislative appropriations to cover the cost of the new classrooms.

2.3.4.3 Placemaking

Issue Analysis

- The existing ‘Ewa Development Plan vision is that residential growth in ‘Ewa should occur in master planned communities with distinct identities which are designed to encourage walking and biking and reduce the use of automobiles. The Plan vision emphasizes that the developments are to be communities, not just sprawling suburban residential projects.
- The assessment of the Smart Growth Team who visited Honolulu in 2004 to meet with community stakeholders and hold a series of workshops was that the City needs to focus on placemaking in villages and neighborhoods in ‘Ewa because the current development practices are producing "a 'place-less' suburban development pattern lacking urban amenities" and "neighborhood-serving commercial districts" and characterized by "small automobile-oriented commercial sites ... at occasional major intersections throughout the area."

---

The Team saw the need to encourage "a close-knit, mixed-use pattern" of land uses in "key locations—such as Village Centers, downtown Kapolei, and other sites along current and proposed transit routes." To make these places successful, the Team recommended adoption of standards, "either through an update of the Subdivision Regulations or through design guidelines, [to] support a vibrant pedestrian environment."

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Add language supporting place making in new master planned developments by requiring identification of a Neighborhood Center or "Main Street" area and use of pedestrian friendly design for that center. (See p. 3-5 [Plan Ch. 2 change E], p. 3-19 [Plan Ch. 3 change AL], p. 3-21 [Plan Ch. 3 change AS], and p. 3-36 [Plan Ch. 5 change J].)

**Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation**

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

---

33 *Ibid*, p. 2
2.3.5 JOBS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Issue Analysis

- Jobs development has significantly outpaced the rate of residential development in 'Ewa. The number of non-construction jobs in 'Ewa more than doubled between 2000 and 2007 while the number of housing units increased only by 34%.\(^ {35} \)

- Significant projects are moving forward, including:
  - The State Family Court Judicial Complex which opened in 2010;
  - The Disney Hotel at Ko Olina which is expected to open in 2011;
  - The elevated rapid transit system which is expected to break ground in 2011, begin operations connecting East Kapolei to Pearl Highlands by 2013, and be running from Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center by 2019; and

\(^ {35} \) Department of Planning and Permitting estimates (September 2009).
• The Hoakalei Resort/Marina which is expected to be developed over the next four years.
  o Significant job centers face major challenges
• UH West O‘ahu College (UHWO)
  ▪ The University of Hawaii acquired 500 acres on the Wai‘anae side of Kualaka‘i Parkway and *makai* of Farrington Highway, but has struggled to finance development of a campus at that site.
  ▪ An earlier agreement with Hunt Development Company by which Hunt would give the University $150 million in exchange for developing 200 acres adjacent to the campus fell through in 2008.
  ▪ The Governor's release of $48 million in funds appropriated by the State legislature in 2010 allows UHWO to meet a December 31, 2011 deadline for beginning construction of the East Kapolei site, avoiding return of 200 acres to the James Campbell Company. The $48 million will allow preparation of the site, installation of infrastructure and landscaping, and construction of three buildings.
  ▪ UHWO needs to sell 15 to 20 acres of developable lands adjacent to the campus to help pay the debt service on additional revenue bonds which would provide the $60 million needed to build a library, campus center, and administration building.\(^\text{36}\)
  ▪ Additional sales will be needed to finance completion of subsequent phases of the campus if the goal of a campus with 7,600 students and 1,040 faculty and staff by 2025 is to be realized.
• Kalaeloa
  ▪ The original transfer of land under the Base Realignment and Closure agreement was on a non-profit basis.
  ▪ The City has abandoned ambitious plans for developing a sports recreation complex on City lands at Kalaeloa.
  ▪ Much of the infrastructure to be turned over by the Navy is old and was not built to City standards.
  ▪ Because most of the land is controlled by public agencies or non-profits, the usual means of financing needed infrastructure improvements through

requirements on new developments is not available. HCDA has proposed that tax increment financing be used to pay for needed infrastructure.

- The only for-profit land owner in Kalaeloa at present is Ford Island Ventures which, in the past, has claimed it is exempt from State and City land use controls because it is leasing the property from the Navy on a 99-year lease with an option to buy the land.
- The City's position is that lands which are not being used to carry out a U.S. Department of Defense mission are subject to State and County land use planning and development regulations, including requirements to provide off-site infrastructure improvements needed to serve their developments.

- DHHL Ka Makana Ali'i Regional Shopping Center, Office, and Hotel Complex
  - In 2006, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) announced its intent to "lease land in Kapolei to a developer interested in building [a shopping center that] ... could one day rival the size of ... Ala Moana Center." 37
  - In response, the Department of Planning and Permitting wrote DHHL in March 2006, expressing surprise at the proposal, and informing DHHL that "the proposed use of [the] parcel for a 'super regional mall' is not consistent with the plans for 'Ewa's development and the creation of O'ahu's Second City." The Department noted that "the 'Ewa Development Plan does call for development of a residential-commercial mixed use area around the intersection of North-South Road and Kapolei Parkway" but not at the scale proposed. 38
  - DHHL announced in 2007 that it had selected DeBartolo Development LLC to develop a 67-acre regional commercial center by the intersection of Kualaka'i Parkway and Kapolei Parkway. 39
  - Plans for the site announced in 2008 called for development of 1.6 million square feet of retail space, two hotels with a total of 300 rooms and two office towers with 100,000 square feet of floor space by 2022. 40

---

39
In a June 30, 2008 letter to the Department of Planning and Permitting, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands exempted the shopping center site from City land use planning and zoning, exempted the developer from needing any permit or Development Plan amendment to allow building to a height of 120 feet, and stated that the site "shall be treated for all purposes as if it is zoned BMX-3 and BMX-4."\(^{41}\)

Since 2008, the groundbreaking for the project has been delayed two times. Recently it was reported that DeBartolo Development had renegotiated its lease with DHHL, and that the initial development at the site would be for a 200,000 square foot neighborhood retail center.\(^{42}\)

The Ka Makana Ali'i Center's shopping, offices, and hotels will face competition from developments elsewhere in 'Ewa, including:

- Shopping centers located closer to major freeway interchanges at Kapolei Commons, UH West O'ahu, and Fort Weaver Road/H-1;
- Hotels located near the water and beaches at Ko Olina and Hoakalei; and
- Office complexes near the City of Kapolei and the UH West O'ahu campus.

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Amend the **Plan** to remove references to the Olympic village and major ball field projects on City lands in Kalaeloa since those plans have been abandoned. (See p. 3-9 [Plan Ch. 2 change R].)

- Add language supporting establishment of a commercial shopping center at the DHHL site at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka'i Parkway in addition to the medium density mixed use transit oriented development around the transit station planned for the site. (See p. 3-22 [Plan Ch. 3 change AU].)

- Include language in the text of the **Plan** noting that DHHL has exempted itself from the City's planning and zoning and intends to develop a major regional commercial center, two hotels, and a 100,000 square feet of office space with

---


\(^{41}\) Letter from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to the Department of Planning and Permitting, "Portion of Tax Map Key No. (1) 9-1-16:108 East Kapolei / 'Ewa, O'ahu," June 30, 2008.

heights of 120 feet at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka’i Parkway. (See p. 3-22 [Plan Ch. 3 change AT], and p. 3-33 [Plan Ch. 5 change A].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Support full development of the UH West O’ahu campus.
- Extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei and Kapolei West which will support job development in Transit Oriented Development areas around transit stations at the intersection of Kualaka’i Parkway and Kapolei Parkway, in Kalaeloa, and in the City of Kapolei.
- Use submittal of the HCDA’s Kalaeloa Master Plan to the Council for acceptance as the Special Area Plan as the vehicle for coordinating State and City infrastructure planning for Kalaeloa.

2.3.6 HISTORIC, CULTURAL, AND NATURAL RESOURCES

2.3.6.1 Historic and Cultural Resources

Issue Analysis

- The City relies on the State Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) and its State Historic Preservation Division to provide expert review, analysis, and preservation and impact mitigation recommendations for historic and cultural resources because the City does not have the expertise or mandate to provide the lead in these areas.
- Typically, zoning and other land use entitlements are approved with conditions requiring that developers document compliance with State Historic Preservation Division requirements for preservation, adaptive use and/or mitigation of historic and cultural resources before subdivision applications, and construction and building permits can be approved.

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

- Plan vision, policies, and guidelines are generally valid and appropriate, but the clarity of the Plan could be improved by adding guidelines that describe existing legal requirements for new developers to conduct surveys and get approval for historic and cultural mitigation plans from the SHPD, and for developers to stop work and get approval from the SHPD for amendment of mitigation plans for any
new resources discovered during development. (See p. 3-8 [Plan Ch. 2 change L], p. 3-10 [Plan Ch. 2 change W], and p. 3-11 [Plan Ch. 3 change E].)

2.3.6.2 ‘Ewa Plantation Villages

Issue Analysis

The City purchased the ‘Ewa Plantation Villages from Campbell Estate in 1993 with the intention, as noted in the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan (EVMP), of:

- Preventing displacement of Village residents due to the impending expiration of the lease between O‘ahu Sugar Company and Campbell Estates;
- Retaining affordable housing and offering home ownership opportunities for the Village residents;
- Preserving the historic character of the Village;
- Creating value, jobs, and economic development opportunities for the community;
- Providing needed community facilities and infrastructure; and
- Solving existing drainage problems.  

By purchasing the Villages, the City did prevent the displacement of Village residents from the employee housing they rented from the O‘ahu Sugar Company.

Extensive renovations of existing plantation homes, construction of replacement plantation homes, and development of new single family homes in Renton and Tenney Villages and the use of discounts, special funding and loan packages provided tenants with opportunities for home ownership while allowing the option of continuing to rent a home if the tenants did not choose to buy.

Varona Villages was scheduled to be renovated last, but with the dissolution of the City Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) in 1998, the City stopped doing redevelopment work in the Villages before any work was done on Varona Village.

Tenants in Varona Village were offered opportunities to rent homes elsewhere in the Village or to buy homes in the renovated Tenney and Renton Villages and in the new single family areas, but a large number of families chose not to move.

---

43 Department of Housing and Community Development, Executive Summary: ‘Ewa Villages Master
from their homes in Varona Village. They have been allowed to continue to rent those homes so long as they are habitable. The City has no plans to "directly redevelop" Varona Village due to the "enormous infrastructural improvements" that would be required.

- Redevelopment of Tenney and Renton Villages was done in a way that retained the plantation village character of the villages, and adaptive use has been made of community buildings like the administration building and community store while retaining their historic character.

- Adaptive use and redevelopment/restoration of key historic structures at the Mill Site and the Manager's Mansion envisioned in the EVMP to house a festival marketplace, a neighborhood convenience store, and a Plantation Mill Museum has not been completed.

- As a result, job creation and economic development opportunities that were tied to development of the festival marketplace and museum at the center of the Villages have not been realized.

- Significant City investments in parks and needed infrastructure have proceeded, including development of the ‘Ewa Mahikō District Park, and the ‘Ewa Villages Golf Course, and construction of needed drainage improvements.

- Since dissolution of DHCD, responsibility for implementing the EVMP has been shared by six City agencies coordinated through the Managing Director's Office.

- With the completion of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka‘i Parkway, the imminent development of the elevated rapid transit system with an East Kapolei station, and the proposal by Department of Hawaiian Home Lands to develop a regional shopping center across Kapolei Parkway from its East Kapolei headquarters building, undeveloped ‘Ewa Villages land near the proposed transit system stations and shopping center has increased development potential which should be addressed in an updated EVMP.

---

Plan (Honolulu, October 1992), pp. 3-1 to 3-4; 4-1 to 4-17.
44 E-mail communication from Randy Wong, Department of Community Services, February 7, 2007.
45 Letter from Mayor Mufi Hannemann to Patrick Hange, Varona Village Improvement Association, September 15, 2009.
Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

- Existing Plan policies for the Villages are still valid, and can be fine tuned in a future review based on the results of the community based planning process to update the EVMP which is now underway.

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Update the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan and use it to serve as a guide for City infrastructure, facilities, and land use in the Villages and for provision of affordable housing, historic preservation, and economic revitalization of the Villages.

- Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, what institutional changes might be made to better coordinate City operations, investments, and redevelopment activities for ‘Ewa Villages and to support economic opportunities and revitalization in the Villages.

2.3.6.3 Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites

Issue Analysis

- Several reviewers raised concerns about the Plan's treatment of Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites.
  - The Office of Hawaiian Affairs pointed out that the Plan, while calling for protection of Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites, does not explicitly protect "areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices" as required "by various case law, state statutes and Hawai‘i’s Constitution."\(^{46}\)
  - Shad Kane felt that the Plan should list many more historic and cultural sites, including Pu‘uokapolei, Pu‘umakakilo, Maka‘iwa Gulch and Pālehua.\(^{47}\)
  - Kane also felt that "view planes from Pu‘uokapolei of Diamond Head (Leahi) and the rising sun in the east and the setting sun in the west" and "from Pu‘umakakilo of Moloka‘i, Maui, Lāna‘i, Kaho‘olawe and Hualālai on Hawaii‘i Island" should be protected because of their historic and cultural importance.\(^{47}\)

\(^{46}\) Letter from Clyde W. Namu'o, Administrator, Office of Hawaiian Affairs, January 22, 2009.
\(^{47}\) E-mail from Shad Kane, June 25, 2009. E-mail letter from Shad Kane, received July 5, 2009.
Although the ‘Ewa Beach Midden Site is on the Hawai‘i Register of Historic Places, and the ‘Oki’okiolepe Pond is on the National Register of Historic Places, neither are on the adopted Plan’s list of Significant ‘Ewa Historic and Cultural Resources to be protected.

State law requires new projects to conduct an archaeological and cultural survey as part of environmental assessments that must precede land use entitlement approvals. State law also requires that the Department of Land and Natural Resources State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) make a determination of what the appropriate level of preservation or mitigation should be for any resources discovered or identified as part of the survey.

Unilateral Agreement requirements adopted as part of zone change approvals have typically included a requirement that the developer follow an archaeological and cultural resources preservation and mitigation plan approved by the Department of Land and Natural Resources State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), and a requirement that if any new historic or cultural resources are discovered during development, the developer must immediately notify SHPD and amend their resource preservation and mitigation plan if SHPD requires it.

SHPD funding and staffing problems are causing delay in responses to requests for consultations and in processing development approvals.48

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

Add language recognizing the need to identify and protect sites that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices. (See p. 3-8 [Plan Ch. 2 change L], p. 3-10 [Plan Ch. 2 change W], and p. 3-11 [Plan Ch. 3 change E].)

Add Pu‘u Makakilo, and Pu‘u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette to the list of significant historic features to be preserved. (See p. 3-16 [Plan Ch. 3 change Y])

Add the ‘Ewa Beach Midden Site and ‘Oki’okiolepe Pond to the list of significant Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological sites to be protected, reflecting their State Historic Register and National Historic Register status. (See p. 3-16 [Plan Ch. 3 change Y])

• The many additional Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites in ‘Ewa, while not specifically listed in the Plan, are protected.

• Section 3.4.1 of the Plan calls for preservation of "significant historic features from the plantation era and earlier period" and use of "in situ preservation and appropriate protection measures for historic, cultural, or archaeological sites with high preservation values" and says that the method of preservation, restrictions on adjacent uses, and the appropriateness of public access should be determined in consultation with the SHPD.

• Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites are also protected by preservation and mitigation plans which must be followed as a condition of zoning approvals, and by State law requiring surveys to be done, the SHPD consulted, and a preservation and mitigation plan to be approved by SHPD before any land development or land alteration is done which might "take, appropriate, excavate, injure, destroy, or alter any historic property or burial site..." 

  o Add language calling for surveys of historic and cultural resources and identification of appropriate protection to be done prior to approval of new development, recognizing existing requirements under State law and standard requirements imposed by Council as conditions of zone change approvals. (See p. 3-8 [Plan Ch. 2 change L], p. 3-10 [Plan Ch. 2 change W], and p. 3-11 [Plan Ch. 3 change E].)

2.3.6.4 World War II Historic Sites

Issue Analysis

o Reviewers called attention to the importance of ‘Ewa Field, Pu'u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette, and Honouliuli Camp as World War II historic sites and called for them to be protected in the Plan.

• There is significant local and national interest in preserving the Honouliuli Internment Camp site as part of the National Park system.

---

49 Hawaiʻi Revised Statutes, Sec. 6E-11(c) and 6E-42(a). Hawaiʻi Administrative Rules, Title 13 Department of Land and Natural Resources, Subtitle 13 State Historic Preservation Division Rules, Chapter 284 Rules Governing Procedures for Historic Preservation Review to Comment on Section 6E-42, HRS, Projects.
The Camp, which was opened in March 1943, held as many as 320 "Americans and foreign nationals detained by the federal government after the attack on Pearl Harbor."50

The Japanese Cultural Center of Hawai‘i, with the assistance of National Park Service archaeologist Jeff Burton, has submitted a formal nomination of the Honouliuli Internment Camp for listing on the National Historic Register.51

In April, 2009, Hawai‘i’s Congressional delegation introduced companion bills, Senate Bill 871 and House Bill 2079, which would direct the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the significance, suitability, and feasibility of including the Camp in the National Park System, possibly as a satellite site in the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument.

Subsequently, an appropriation was approved in the FY2010 Department of the Interior budget funding a National Park Study of all confinement sites in the State of Hawai‘i. The final Recommendation Report for the Study is expected to be sent to Congress in 2012.

The owner of the Camp site, Monsanto Seed, has indicated that it will support conveyance of the site to the National Park Service if it is seen as an appropriate addition.52

Concerns have been raised about the plans for the ‘Ewa Field site in Kalaeloa.

The Field was home to the ‘Ewa Marine Air Station during the attack on Pearl Harbor and suffered the destruction or damaging of 50 aircraft and the deaths of four Marines in the attack.53

The ‘Ewa Field site is under split ownership.

---

The major portion of the site has been conveyed from the Navy to Ford Island Properties under a 99 year lease with option to buy. The remainder of the site is part of 421 acres scheduled to be transferred to the City and County by the National Park Service in the near future, and is planned for development as a regional park.

In conveying the 499 acres in Kalaeloa which include the ‘Ewa Field to Ford Island Properties, the Navy stated that:

- The “‘Ewa Field . . . is considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places due to its association with the December 7, 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor;”
- The "new lessees or landowners are responsible for complying with any required environmental documentation prior to development of the land;"
- No "activity that would affect any identified historic property" could be taken "without the Department of the Navy's approval;" and
- If "the new landowner or lessee propose any development that would potentially cause effects to cultural resources such as ‘Ewa Field, separate NHPA (National Historic Preservation Act) consultation and environmental documentation could be undertaken at that time."

The 2009 State Legislature adopted House Concurrent Resolution 49 H.D. 1 which urges full preservation of United States Marine Corps Air Station ‘Ewa as a national monument, museum, and restored park for the State of Hawai‘i.

Because the Field is located in Kalaeloa, the site is under the land use planning and zoning authority of the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority.

The State Historic Preservation Division has called for surveys of historic resources at the Field before further development occurs.

---

54 Commander, Navy Region Hawai‘i, Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for Environmental Assessment (EA) for Conveyance of Navy Retained Land and Utility Systems at Kalaeloa, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i, August 22, 2008.

55 Letters to Navy Region Hawai‘i Commander from Nancy A. McMahon, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, September 11, 2008 and November 6, 2008. Letter to the Department of Planning and Permitting from Astrid M. B. Liverman, State Historic Preservation Division, Department of Land and
- Pu'u Kapolei/Fort Barrette is under the control of the City's Department of Parks and Recreation. The Department has no plans to develop the Fort or to create historical exhibits or a museum at the site, at this time.

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Add language supporting protection of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the 'Ewa Marine Corp Air Field until surveys can be completed and a determination made of the appropriate treatment of the historic resources at the two sites. (See p. 3-15 [Plan Ch. 3 change X].)
- Add Pu'u Kapolei/Fort Barrette to the listing of significant historic resources in 'Ewa. (See p. 3-16 [Plan Ch. 3 change Y].)

**Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation**

- Conduct surveys of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the 'Ewa Marine Corp Air Field to determine the historic resources at the two sites and make a determination of the appropriate treatment of those resources.

### 2.3.6.5 OR&L Historic Train Operations

**Issue Analysis**

- The adopted Plan calls for restoring historic train operations on the OR&L right-of-way to run between 'Ewa Villages and the Waipahū Cultural Garden Park and Hawai'i Plantation Village.
- Research during the review disclosed that energy pipelines originating in Campbell Industrial Park run in the roadbed of the OR&L right-of-way starting near the West Loch Shoreline Park and on into the Primary Urban Center. The energy companies whose pipelines are in the right-of-way have long term easement rights, and will not allow train operations to run along the top of their pipelines.
- The OR&L right-of-way between Fort Weaver Road and the Waipahū Cultural Garden Park has no railway tracks. The Hawaiian Railway Society estimated that the cost of restoring the railway roadbed between 'Ewa Villages and Waipahū would be $90 million.56

---

The Hawaiian Railway Society's 1995 Master Plan included plans to build "an historic train station and a railway museum." However, those plans have had to be delayed due to the need, as noted in the 2000 update to the Master Plan, to be "more cautious about ... goals."57

A train station with a platform and canopy and a non-operational water tower has been proposed to be built as part of a shopping center on the mauka side of the intersection of 'ōlani Street and Ali'i Nui Drive in Ko Olina. The 'ōlani Street station would be right across the street from the 800-room Disney hotel. The architect for the 'ōlani Street station stated in a letter to the Department that "development of the train station as well as increased operations of the historic railway are ideas which are fully endorsed by Walt Disney Parks & Resorts. . . "58

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

Delete the policy calling for extension of historic train operations from the ‘Ewa Plantation Villages to the Waipahū Cultural Garden because of the high cost of restoring the railway roadbed and the unwillingness of the energy companies to allow train operations running over their pipelines buried in the roadbed of the OR&L. (See p. 3-16 [Plan Ch. 3 change AA].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, how historic train operations on the OR&L between ‘Ewa Villages, Ko Olina, and Nānākuli, and the development of a train station and railway museum might be coordinated with redevelopment of the historic core of ‘Ewa Villages and establishment of a mill museum.

2.3.6.6 Light Pollution

Issue Analysis

John Gallagher raised concerns about the impact of light pollution on energy efficiency, health, and on wildlife, and asked that the Plan address the issue.59

58 Letter from William L. Paluch, Studio Director, Eight inc., to the Department of Planning and Permitting, December 22, 2008.
Light pollution is defined as light that either shines directly upward without serving any useful purpose for illumination or security, causes glare, shines into areas where illumination is not needed or wanted, or interferes with natural processes such as bird flight patterns or movement of turtle hatchlings from nests to the ocean.

In 2009, the State Legislature passed Act 161 (S.B. No. 536) which calls for the State to develop a statewide starlight reserve strategy and for the State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism to submit a report with proposed legislation "to implement a statewide intelligent lighting and light pollution law." However, formation of the required advisory committee was delayed a year by the Governor due to the State's financial problems, with the first meeting occurring in July 2010. As a result, the report with the proposed legislation has also been delayed.

There has been significant discussion nationally of the adverse impacts of light pollution and ways to mitigate the impacts.

- A California energy expert estimated in 2008 that use of efficient outdoor lighting systems with smart controls could reduce energy use for outdoor lighting in the United States by 30%, "saving enough energy to power over 3.6 million homes for a year."

- Environmental experts have provided evidence of significant adverse impacts of light pollution on wildlife, including the death of millions of birds in the United States due to light interference with night time flights and migration. Locally, 300 to 500 birds downed due to light interference are brought to Sea Life Park for rehabilitation every year.

---

60 Twenty-Fifth Legislature, 2009, State of Hawai‘i, Act 161: A Bill for an Act Relating to Starlight Reserve, Section 2 and Section 5.
61 Telephone interview with Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism staff, October 20, 2010.
62 Lee Cooper, Manager, Emerging Technologies, Pacific Gas & Electric, presentation at June 20, 2008 International Dark-Sky Association Congressional Briefing.
Medical experts have provided evidence of adverse health impacts due to light interference with natural circadian rhythms.\(^{65}\)

- In a series of recent settlements, public and private agencies on Kaua'i have agreed to implement measures to reduce the number of birds that are harmed by outdoor lighting on the island.
  - Kaua'i County entered into a plea agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice to pay restitution and modify operations by auditing the lighting at "all county facilities and creating plans to minimize harm to seabirds during the fledgling season."\(^{66}\)
  - Kaua'i Island Utility Cooperative, which was indicted by the U.S. Department of Justice in May 2010 for violations of the Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, filed a draft Short-Term Seabird Habitat Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as part of an "incidental take" permit application. The Habitat Conservation Plan calls for shielding of lighting and reconfiguring and burying of power lines.\(^{67}\)
  - The St. Regis Princeville Resort, which was being sued by four environmental groups, reached a settlement with the groups by which it will "lower the lighting on its property" and "fund programs aimed at restoring populations of the (Newell's shearwater)."\(^{68}\)
  - Fines for the taking of a bird protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are substantial. Kaua'i County faced "statutory maximum fines of $15,000 to $25,000 for each MBTA or ESA violation . . ."\(^{69}\)

\(^{65}\) David E. Blask, Ph.D., M.D., Bassett Research Institute, Presentation at June 20, 2008 International Dark-Sky Association Congressional Briefing.


\(^{68}\) Audrey McAvoy, Associated Press, Honolulu Star-Advertiser, October 19, 2010.

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

- Add language calling for reduction of light pollution's adverse impact on wildlife and human health and its unnecessary consumption of energy by using, where sensible, fully shielded lighting fixtures using lower wattage. (See p. 3-17 [Plan Ch. 3 change AE].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Study light pollution plans and regulations for other jurisdictions and make recommendations for best practices and regulations to minimize light pollution on O'ahu.
- Continue participating in the advisory committee called for by Act 161 (2009) to help the State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism prepare a proposed statewide intelligent lighting and light pollution law.

2.3.7 HAZARDS PLANNING

2.3.7.1 Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise

Issue Analysis

- Under a Department of Planning and Permitting contract, University of Hawai'i experts are wrapping up a study of coastal erosion at sandy beaches around the island, including 'Ewa. The study provides a historic basis for establishing setbacks for new coastal developments.
- University of Hawai'i experts expect that sea rise in Hawai'i will be at least three feet above the 1990 level by 2100 (or one foot every 30 years).\(^{70}\)
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) is now requiring that all new COE projects be designed, built, and operated in ways that take into account a possible future rise in sea levels between 1.6 feet and 4.9 feet by 2100.\(^ {71}\)
- It is prudent to assess the potential risk of such a rise for O'ahu coastlines, to set up systems to monitor sea rise, and to design projects and buildings to take the risk of sea rise into account.

\(^{70}\) Dr. Chip Fletcher, Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Hawai'i's Changing Climate, Center for Island Climate Adaptation and Policy Briefing Sheet, 2010, p. 4.

Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan

- Add language clarifying that the 1997 Plan policy calling for expansion of shoreline setbacks to 150 feet "where possible" should be based on historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion rates. (See p. 3-11 [Plan Ch 3 change I].)
- Add a policy requiring analysis of the possible impact of sea level rise for new public and private projects in shoreline areas and incorporation of mitigations "where appropriate and feasible." (See p. 3-12 [Plan Ch 3 change J].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

- Do studies, similar to those done in 2009 for California\(^\text{72}\), which would model the likely impact of sea level rise on coastal erosion and flooding for O'ahu and provide erosion and flood hazard mappings and risk assessments for use in deciding what adaptations and mitigations will be needed.

2.3.7.2 Hurricane Shelter Shortage

Issue Analysis

- There is a shortage of public emergency shelters in 'Ewa to provide the minimum amount of space (10 sq. ft/ person) required to shelter the 30 percent of the population expected to seek public shelter in case of a major hurricane.\(^\text{73}\)
- In addition, most existing shelters, principally school facilities like gyms and cafeterias, were not built with the secure roofs or window protection needed to withstand the wind pressure and flying debris caused by a Category 3 hurricane (sustained winds of 111-130 mph), and many would be unsafe even with a Category 1 hurricane (sustained winds of 74 to 95 mph).\(^\text{74}\) For comparison, Hurricane 'Iwa was a Category 1 hurricane with peak winds of 90 mph on its

---


\(^{73}\)For share of public likely to seek shelter in event of a major hurricane, see City and County of Honolulu, *Emergency Operations Plan* (January 12, 2007), Annex T, Appendix 1, p. 5, 9. In 'Ewa, eleven public emergency shelters were reported by the Department of Emergency Management to have capacity for 21,187 people in 2009. 'Ewa's population in 2007 is estimated to have been 88,745. Capacity needed to house 30% of the estimated 2007 population is 26,623.

closest approach to Kaua‘i;\textsuperscript{75} Hurricane ‘Iniki was a Category 4 hurricane with peak winds of 145 mph when it made landfall on Kaua‘i).\textsuperscript{66}

- In some cases, shelter managers are able to shelter people in classrooms such as music classrooms or other rooms which offer protection against flying debris and have been built to withstand wind damage.
- The new Statewide building code to be in effect no later than 2011 will require all new State and City public buildings which could serve as public shelters to be built to withstand a Category 3 Hurricane.\textsuperscript{74}
- There is need for funding to retrofit existing shelters to make them also capable of withstanding a Category 3 hurricane.
- Most of the public is not expected to go to a public shelter. Civil Defense agencies do encourage the public to shelter at home if adequate shelter is provided.\textsuperscript{77}

- Revisions to the State Building Code approved by Governor Linda Lingle on April 4, 2010 to take effect in May 2011 call for all new homes to either have hurricane resistant glass or have a "safe room."\textsuperscript{78}
- Support should be given to individual home owners and community associations to build private shelters in homes or community association buildings since this will reduce the pressure on the public shelters.
- In the past the State has provided financial support for such shelters.\textsuperscript{79}
- Kaua‘i provides tax breaks for owners who build a safe room for their home.\textsuperscript{80}

**Recommendations For Revision Of The Plan**

- Add three new policies to address the shortfall in shelter capacity and hurricane readiness:

\textsuperscript{75} National Weather Service, Central Pacific Hurricane Center, \textit{The 1982 Central Pacific Tropical Cyclone Season}.
\textsuperscript{76} National Weather Service, Central Pacific Hurricane Center, \textit{Hurricane ‘Iniki Natural Disaster Survey Report}.
\textsuperscript{77} Telephone conversation with State Civil Defense staff, July 22, 2009.
\textsuperscript{78} Travis Kaya, “Materials Tested for Building Hurricane-Proof Safe Rooms,” \textit{Honolulu Star-Advertiser}, August 20, 2010.
\textsuperscript{79} Hawai‘i State Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs Insurance Division, \textit{Loss Mitigation Grant Program Report} (December 2009).
\textsuperscript{80} Dennis J. Hwang and Darren K. Okimoto, \textit{Homeowner’s Handbook To Prepare for Natural Hazards}.
Survey and retrofit, as appropriate, Department of Education and other public buildings to make up the shortfall in hurricane resistant shelters.

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

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

(See p. 3-31 [Ch. 4 change AA].)

Recommendations For Improvement Of Implementation

-支持州资金对现有公共避难所进行改造，以应对3级飓风。
-研究为私人组织和个人房主提供财产税激励的可行性和有效性，以装备他们的房子以应对飓风。

(University of Hawai‘i Sea Grant Program: June 2007), p. 73.
3. RECOMMENDED CHANGES

This chapter provides proposed updates and revisions to the ‘Ewa Development Plan, proposed improvements to the implementation of the Plan vision and policies, and proposed follow-up studies and research needed to understand how key issues should be addressed.

3.1 PROPOSED UPDATES AND REVISIONS TO THE PLAN

Based on the Department's Review of the ‘Ewa Development Plan, we have concluded that there is not a need for major amendments to the Plan. The vision for ‘Ewa’s future development, and the policies needed to realize that vision have widespread support. The most significant concerns are how we can more fully realize that vision and improve the implementation of key policies, especially those involving infrastructure adequacy. Most of the changes that are proposed for the Plan help clarify existing policy or are logical extensions of existing policy.

We have prepared two versions of the proposed revised Plan.

To help reviewers understand how the proposed revised Plan differs from the existing Plan, a modified Ramseyer version has been prepared and provided as a reference guide. It shows two types of changes that are proposed in the revised Plan:

- Updated factual data (numbers, dates, place and project names), revised exhibits and tables, and clarifications of context and background information which are identified with shading; and
- Substantive revisions of vision elements, policies, guidelines, and implementation actions which are identified with strikethroughs for text that is deleted and underlining for text that is added.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

This allows the reviewer to understand exactly what changes from the existing Plan are proposed for the key vision elements, policies, guidelines and implementing actions, and to be aware what background and context information has been modified. If the reviewer wants to see exactly how the shaded text, exhibits, or tables differ from the background and context information in the existing Plan, comparisons can be made with the existing Plan, which is available on line at:

http://www.honoluludpp.org/Planning/DevSust_Ewa.asp.

Changes made to the proposed revised Plan to put all policies and guidelines in active verb/object format, to correct spelling, to add Hawaiian diacritical markings, or to correct grammar are not identified in the modified Ramseyer version.

A clean version of the proposed revised ‘Ewa Development Plan is attached as Exhibit A for the draft adopting ordinance which has been transmitted to the Planning Commission and City Council for formal review and decision making. (A copy of the draft adopting ordinance without Exhibit A is provided in Appendix A of this Review Report.) The clean version of the Plan, as amended by the City Council, will be adopted by reference as the new ‘Ewa Development Plan, replacing the existing Plan which was adopted by Council in 1997.

3.1.1 CHANGES MADE THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PLAN

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

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

- Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 in the 1997 Plan included policies, principles, and guidelines. The proposed revised Plan has only policies and guidelines because, upon examination, it was felt that the principles from the 1997 Plan could be better stated as either policies or guidelines. The principles were sorted and moved either into the policy sub-section or guidelines sub-section.

- The terms “high-density, medium-density, and low-density residential” used in the 1997 Plan were replaced with “medium density apartment, low density apartment, and residential” in the proposed revised Plan in order to be consistent with how the terms high density, medium density, and low density apartment are defined and used in the Land Use Ordinance (LUO).
  
  o The 1997 ‘Ewa Development Plan describes “high-density residential” uses as multi-story apartment buildings no higher than 150 feet. The LUO A-2 medium-density apartment zoning district is the best fit for buildings of that height because the LUO A-3 high-density apartment zoning district is adopted with heights greater than 150 feet.
  
  o Also, the 1997 Plan describes “medium density residential” as townhouse or low-rise apartment buildings “not over three stories” which is more consistent with the LUO A-1 low density apartment zoning than with the LUO A-2 medium density apartment zoning.

3.1.2 SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES BY SECTION OR CHAPTER

Proposed substantive changes to the 1997 ‘Ewa Development Plan are listed below by page number for the modified Ramseyer version of the proposed revised ‘Ewa Development Plan. The text of the change is provided for the most significant changes.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

Key:

S = Significant Changes.

Preface And Executive Summary

The ‘Ewa Development Plan, when adopted in 1997, did not have a Preface and Executive Summary, unlike the revised Plans which were adopted after it. A Preface and Executive Summary has been created for the proposed revised Plan, following the format and content used for the other Development Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans.

Chapter 1: ‘Ewa’s Role In O‘ahu's Growth

A. Clarifies General Plan policy supporting agricultural diversification (p. 1-2);
   • Promotes diversified agriculture on prime agricultural lands along Kunia Road and surrounding the West Loch Naval Magazine in accordance with the General Plan policy to support agricultural diversification in all designated agricultural areas on O‘ahu;

B. S Adds language distinguishing between rural areas and non-‘Ewa / Central O‘ahu urban fringe areas (p. 1-2);
   • Helps relieve urban development pressures on rural and urban fringe Sustainable Communities Plan Areas (Wai‘anae, North Shore, Ko‘olau Loa, Ko‘olau Poko, and East Honolulu) so as to preserve the “country” lifestyle of those areas and sustain the stable, low density residential character of the urban fringe areas;

C. Replaces the existing map with a map showing Primary Urban Center, Secondary Urban Center, Urban – Fringe, and Rural areas as well as the eight Development Plan and Sustainable Communities Plan areas shown on the existing map (p. 1-3);
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

Chapter 2: The Vision For ‘Ewa's Future

A. Updates the description of pedestrian ways and bike paths to include Pearl Harbor Historic Trail and OR&L Railway R-O-W (pp. 2-2, 2-16);

B. Adds language discussing how achieving the General Plan goals of protecting agricultural lands and open space and reducing development pressures on the rest of O‘ahu by developing the Second City and the ‘Ewa Urban Fringe has required development of prime agricultural land in ‘Ewa, and putting that loss in the context of the thousands of acres of agricultural lands that are protected by the Community Growth Boundary in Central O‘ahu, the North Shore, and elsewhere (p. 2-3);

Prime agricultural land loss. Development of jobs in the City of Kapolei and the areas around it and creation of master planned residential communities in the “Ewa Urban Fringe Areas has been a key element in the City’s growth management strategy adopted as part of the 1977 General Plan and reinforced by subsequent City actions approving land use plans and infrastructure investments since 1977. It is true that the development of ‘Ewa lands within the Community Growth Boundary has resulted in the conversion of thousands of acres of highly productive agricultural land as the sugar plantations closed, and new homes and job centers were developed.

However, this is the cost of protecting agricultural lands and open space in the rural areas of O‘ahu. By focusing new job growth and residential development in ‘Ewa, Central O‘ahu, and Honolulu’s core urban area from Pearl City to Kāhala, the vision of keeping the Country country can be achieved. Thousands of acres of agricultural lands in the Sustainable Communities Plans (SCP) areas are protected by the Community Growth Boundaries in those plans, including 50,000 acres in the Central O‘ahu and North Shore Sustainable Communities Plan areas and hundreds of acres in other SCP areas including Wai‘anae, near Kahuku, in Waiāhole/Waikāne, and in Waimānalo.

C. Adds language including the UH West O‘ahu as part of the Secondary Urban Center in recognition of its role in job creation for ‘Ewa (p. 2-3);

D. Reorganizes the order of vision elements (p. 2-4);

E. Adds a vision element calling for neighborhood centers, town centers or "Main Streets" to be identified and established in new developments (pp. 2-4, 2-18);

The master plans and design of new developments must demonstrate how they would create communities that interact with neighboring communities and
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

support the vision for development of the entire ‘Ewa region. Such communities should be designed with identifiable and easily accessible town and village centers or “main street areas” and incorporate a mixture of residential and commercial development. While not every community will have a “main street”, all should have a community center. (p. 2-4)

These master plans will incorporate planning principles and guidelines to preserve historic and cultural values, establish open space and greenway networks, and create well-designed, livable communities. Such communities should be designed with an identifiable, distinct and easily accessible main street, town center or neighborhood center which may include a mixture of residential and small scale community related commercial development. (p. 2-18)

F. S Adds a vision element specifying that accessory apartments (‘granny flats’) and ‘Ohana units could be used to provide housing for seniors, students, and young families where infrastructure will support the additions (p. 2-4);

These communities must be designed to meet the needs of a wide range of families and age groups. Ample housing should be provided for families needing affordable units and starter homes as well as for those seeking large multi-family and single-family units. Housing for persons of all ages will be needed, including students going to school at the UH - West O‘ahu campus, young families seeking their first home, and senior citizens wanting a retirement home close to their grandchildren. Such a desirable variety in housing types could be partially achieved through the inclusion of “granny flats” (small, accessory apartments) and/or “Ohana units where infrastructure will support these additions.

G. S Adds a vision element clarifying that connectivity should be provided within and between communities by an approximate ¼ mile roadway grid which will allow improved emergency access and provide increased pedestrian and bicycle connections to parks, schools, community centers and transit facilities (pp. 2-5, 2-20);

Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use - ‘Ewa will be developed with a transportation system which reduces congestion by providing connectivity, both within and between subdivisions, provides easy access to transit, uses traffic calming design, and encourages people to walk and bike, reducing the need for use of the automobile.

Where allowed by terrain, communities will be designed with multiple street/walkway
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

Connections to adjacent communities and collector roads at approximate ¼ mile intervals, thereby facilitating and encouraging convenient auto, pedestrian and bikeway access to parks, schools, neighborhood shopping and transit corridors. These connections will also reduce congestion on major regional roads by offering multiple alternative routes and facilitate improved neighborhood access for emergency and utility vehicles. (p. 2-5)

Connectivity will be established within subdivisions by use of block and street standards and between subdivisions by establishing and implementing a 1/4 mile collector/connector master road plan, where permitted by terrain. (p. 2-20)

H. (PRD ▲) Clarifies that the rapid transit corridor is for an elevated system (per the Council decision) (p. 2-5);

I. S Adds updated language on the location of the rapid transit corridor (which will go through Kalaeloa instead of running on Kapolei Parkway past the Villages of Kapolei) (pp. 2-5, 2-20);

Sufficient land will be reserved in the corridor so that an at-grade separated An elevated rapid transit system could be developed on the corridor at some point in the future. (An at-grade separated system would not be elevated and would have its own exclusive right of way.) The first segment of the rapid transit system will start near the proposed Kroc Center on Kualakai Parkway and continue on to Waipahu along Kualakai Parkway and Farrington Highway. Sufficient land will be reserved to allow extension of the system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei, ending near the intersection of Kapolei Parkway and the planned extension of Hanu'a Street. See Appendix A: Public Facility Map, and Phasing Map. (p. 2-5)

Through 2020, it is projected that transit service along the corridor will be provided by mass transit bus service running on roadways shared with other vehicles. However, The first segment of the rapid transit system will start near the proposed Kroc Center on Kualakai Parkway and continue on to Waipahu along Kualakai Parkway and Farrington Highway. Sufficient right-of-way shall be reserved for the establishment, when needed in the future, of a separated at-grade an elevated rapid transit system along a route which would extend the system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei, ending near the intersection of Kapolei Parkway and the planned extension of Hanu'a Street. (p. 2-20).

J. Adds clean up of contaminated systems as a natural resources protection objective (p. 2-6);
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

K. Adds expanded language on how potable water will be conserved and supplemented (p. 2-6);

L. (PRD ▲) Adds language calling for surveys of historic and cultural resources and identification of appropriate protection to be done prior to approval of new development (p. 2-6);

M. ▲ Adds City policy adopted in 2002 regarding roles and responsibilities for providing adequate infrastructure to address current deficiencies and impacts of future development (p. 2-6);

Provide Adequate Infrastructure to Meet the Needs of New and Existing Development

Public agencies and private developers will work together to create adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of the residential and working population of the area. Current deficiencies in roads, schools, and parks will be addressed, and new developments will not be approved until availability of key infrastructure can be guaranteed. Public-private mechanisms for financing infrastructure will be developed to support concurrent development of infrastructure. Public agencies will work with the community (residents, businesses, developers, and landowners) to address current deficiencies in roads, schools, and parks and to create adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of the residential and working population of the area.

Where possible and practical, construction of new development that generates increased service demands for public schools, emergency medical services, and roadway capacity, will be coordinated with the provision of needed infrastructure capacity.

N. ▲ Adds language emphasizing the role that completion of the elevated fixed guideway rapid transit system for the vision of providing adequate transportation infrastructure to meet the needs of existing and new development (p. 2-6);

Completion of the first increment of the elevated fixed guideway transit system (from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center) is critical to the O'ahu General Plan policy of relieving development pressure elsewhere on O'ahu by developing the Second City and the Urban Fringe in ‘Ewa. It is needed to provide an effective and reliable alternative to commuting by auto for a significant numbers of commuters by 2020. Without the project, traffic delays for ‘Ewa commuters would increase by 46% compared to today according to the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Environmental Impact Statement (p. 3-28).
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

O. Adds language supporting use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Community Facilities Districts (CFD) financing mechanisms as a way to improve delivery and timing of infrastructure provision (pp2-7; 2-23)

Public-private mechanisms for financing infrastructure such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Community Facilities Districts (CFD) should be considered to support timely infrastructure provision. (p. 2-7)

Phased-Planned development of ‘Ewa will support the City of Kapolei’s development and conserve scarce infrastructure dollars. It shall be characterized by:

Adequate Funding for Infrastructure through methods such as Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Community Facilities District (CFD) which provide funding for infrastructure concurrently with, or in advance of, residential and/or commercial development. (p. 2-23)

P. Updates Table 2.1 which provides estimates of development capacity for ‘Ewa. Eliminates phasing categories and substitutes land use entitlement status in its place (properties with zoning, properties with State Land Use District but need zoning, properties needing both State Land Use District amendment and zoning). Includes HCDA and DHHL capacity estimates (p. 2-11);

Q. Updates Table 2.2 by adding Pearl Harbor Historic Trail to the open space network, removing the Maka‘iwa Hills Golf Course and Makakilo Golf Course (PRD▲), removing Pu’u Pālailai Regional Park, and adding Ali‘i Nui Drive, Kealanui Avenue, Kama‘aha Avenue, ‘A‘awa Drive, and Keone‘ula Boulevard (p. 2-15);

R. Removes development of a sports recreation complex and Aloha Stadium replacement facility from the vision for Kalaeloa (p. 2-16);

S. Recognizes establishment of an Enterprise Zone covering most of the ‘Ewa Development Plan area (p. 2-17);

T. Adds language supporting efficient use of water supplies through conservation and leak repair to the natural resource protection vision (p. 2-21),

‘Ewa Natural Resources, including potable water, coastal water quality, and wetlands and other wildlife habitat, will be conserved by:
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- Efficiently using all water supplies through conservation measures and distribution system leak repair;

U. Adds protection of endangered species in sinkholes and cleanup of contaminated areas to natural resource protection vision. (PRD▲) Adds protecting open space outside the Community Growth Boundary, and requiring surveys to identify endangered species habitat and appropriate mitigations to natural resource protection vision. (p. 2-21);

V. (PRD▲) S Adds the Honouliuli Internment Camp, the ‘Ewa Marine Corps Air Field, Pu‘u Makakilo, and Pu‘u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette as significant historic features (p. 2-21).

‘Ewa’s Historic and Cultural Resources will be preserved and enhanced by:
- Preserving significant historic features from the plantation era and earlier periods, including:
  - The “Ewa Plantation Villages and other remnants of the plantation era;
  - The OR&L right-of-way and railway stock;
  - The Honouliuli Internment Camp;
  - The ‘Ewa Marine Corps Air Station;
  - Pu‘u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette;
  - Pu‘u Makakilo;
  - Lanikūhonua; and
  - Native Hawaiian cultural and archaelogical sites;

W. (PRD▲) Adds language stating that historic and cultural resources will be protected by identifying and protecting areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices (p. 2-22).

X. (PRD▲) S Replaces references to phased development with planned development (p. 2-22).

2.2.10 PHASED PLANNED REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Phased Planned development of ‘Ewa will support the City of Kapolei’s development and conserve scarce infrastructure dollars. It shall be characterized by:

Å. Increased land supply to support economic development and job creation and to accommodate major residential growth with an emphasis on providing affordable housing and a diversity of housing types,

AX. Moderate growth of commercial centers in Urban Fringe Areas to primarily serve the needs of the surrounding residential communities

AA. Phasing Approval of Residential and Commercial development to that supports development of the Secondary Urban Center (See Table 2.1);
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

Chapter 3: Land Use Policies And Guidelines

A. Adds use of open space to protect natural, historic, and cultural resources (p. 3-2)
B. Adds clarification that gulches and ravines are important for their role as drainageways and storm water retention areas (p. 3-2);
C. Updates description of pedestrian ways and bike paths to include language for the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail/OR & L Railway R-O-W (p. 3-2, 3-8);
D. Amend language regarding mountain access to reflect Unilateral Agreement conditions for Makaïwa Hills which provide trail access through Pālehua Road (p. 3-3)
E. (PRD▲) Adds language calling for identifying and protecting areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices in mountain areas (p. 3-4);
F. S Clarifies the Natural Gulches and Drainageways guideline to recognize that there may be situations in which use of natural or man-made vegetated channels may not be practical (p. 3-4);
   • Where possible practical, retain drainageways as natural or man-made vegetated channels rather than concrete channels.
G. (PRD▲) Adds language calling for adequate parking to be provided to make shoreline access usable by the public (p. 3-4);
   3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area
   • Provide public pedestrian access to the shoreline at intervals of approximately 1/4 mile, except where access is restricted by the military for security reasons. To make this access usable by the public, provide adequate parking.
H. (PRD▲) Adds language calling for identification and protection of shoreline areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices, as is required by State law (p. 3-5);
I. (PRD▲) S Adds language clarifying that the 1997 Plan policy calling for expansion of shoreline setbacks to 150 feet "where possible" should be based on historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion rates (pp. 3-5, 3-73, 3-78);
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3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area
- Provide, at a minimum, a 60-foot setback along the shoreline, and, where possible, expand the setback to 150 feet where justified, based on historic or adopted projections of coastal erosion rates. (p. 3-5)

Barbers Point Industrial Area
Coastal Environment
- Set back all buildings a minimum of 60 feet from the shoreline and 150 feet where possible if justified based on historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion rates. (p. 3-73)

Kalaeloa
3.13.2 Guidelines
Coastal Environment
- Require a minimum building setback of 60 feet and a lateral public access easement along the entire shoreline, with the entry point at the former military beach recreation center. Where possible, the setback should be expanded to 150 feet where justified by historic or adopted projections of shoreline erosion rates. (p. 3-78)

J. (PRD▲) S Adds a policy requiring analysis of the possible impact of sea level rise for new public and private projects in shoreline areas and incorporation of mitigations "where appropriate and feasible" (p. 3-5);
- Analyze the possible impact of sea level rise for new public and private projects in shoreline areas and incorporate, where appropriate and feasible, measures to reduce risks and increase resiliency to impacts of sea level rise.

K. (PRD▲) Adds clarifying language adopted as City policy in 2002 regarding the accommodation of existing paths and bikeways in the design of new golf courses (p. 3-6);
- Safe public access should be provided through golf courses, as necessary, for regional pedestrian and bicycle routes. Consider the impact on existing and proposed regional trails, paths and bike routes in designing new golf courses. Where necessary for these trails, paths and bike routes, provide safe corridors by or through the course.

L. Adds language regarding undergrounding of transmission lines adopted as City policy in 2002 (p. 3-8);
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3.1.3.8 Greenways and Open Space Corridors

- When overhead or underground transmission and distribution lines are located within or adjacent to a road right-of-way, provide sufficient width to permit the growth of landscaping adjacent to the transmission line, consistent with all applicable operations, maintenance, and safety requirements. The purpose of the landscaping is to divert attention from the overhead lines and, preferably, obscure views of the overhead lines from the travel way and adjacent residential areas. Place new transmission lines underground where possible under criteria specified in State law.

M. Deletes the proposal for an “Olympic Village” and a "baseball complex" at Kalaeloa, and clarifies that a major regional park facility is still proposed but the lands have not yet been conveyed (pp. 3-9, 3-10, and 3-11);

N. (PRD▲) Clarifies that Pu’u Pālailai will not be a City park and that it is to be used primarily as a hiking trail/nature park providing access to the view from the Pu'u top (p. 3-11);

- Develop Pu’u Pālailai Park below Makakilo as a private nature park providing hikers excellent views of the ‘Ewa Plain and distant views of downtown Honolulu and Diamond Head.

O. (PRD▲) Deletes the policy requiring a community integration program and establishing specific guidelines for golf course approvals because policy is outdated and criteria are already part of factors considered in the existing approval process (p. 3-13);

- Approve golf course development only after determination that the course meets social, growth, economic, and environmental guidelines and approval of a community integration program.

P. Add groundwater conservation policy to the residential communities, commercial retail centers, Ko Olina, industrial centers, and Ocean Pointe sections (p. 3-12, 18, 52, 60, 61, 69, 72, 79;

- Use xeriscaping (the use of native landscape materials with low water demand), non-potable water for irrigation, and efficient irrigation systems wherever possible to conserve groundwater resources.

Q. (PRD▲) Recalculates need for parks to meet DPR standard of two acres of park per 1,000 residents to include acreage in known and
proposed private and public parks used to meet park dedication requirement. Revises language regarding standards for community-based parks to reflect current City standards and recalculates adequacy of 'Ewa community-based parks, separating need for district parks from all other community based parks (pp. 3-14 and 3-15);

- Provide adequate parks to meet residents' recreational needs. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) standard for community-based parks is that a minimum of two acres of community-based parks should be provided per 1,000 residents, with one acre per thousand needed for district parks and one acre needed for community parks, neighborhood parks, and mini-parks. (Even if these standards are met, there may still be unmet park needs due to demographic or other community conditions.) New residential development should strive to provide land for open space and recreation purposes at a minimum of two acres of park per 1,000 residents. The need for community-based parks can be met either through public parks operated by the City and County or private community parks and recreation centers operated by home owner associations.

R. (PRD▲) S Updates language regarding provision of access to trail heads from new developments to reflect the fact that there are no new development areas in 'Ewa that could provide access to the mountains (p. 3-15);

- Protect and expand access to recreational resources in the mountains, at the shoreline, and in the ocean. Trails to and through natural areas of the gulches and mountains are an important public recreational asset. Some areas are difficult to access because of landowner restrictions. New development projects are an opportunity to provide public access to trail heads from the streets extending toward the mountain slopes or approaching the edges of the gulches.
- Support efforts to expand access to mountain and gulch trails in areas where urban development will not occur.

S. Adds acreage for private golf courses to Table 3.1 (p. 3-17);

T. (PRD▲) S Adds language supporting continuation of existing agreements allowing controlled access to Wai‘anae Range mountain trails via Pālehua Road for hiking organizations, and amends language for the Makaïwa Hills development to make it clear that they provide the access for hikers by connecting to Palehua Road at the top of their development (p. 3-18);
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3.3.2.2 Access to Mountain Trails

- Support continuation of controlled access to the Wai‘anae Range mountain trails via Pālehua Road for hiking organizations.
- Provide access to mountain trails in the Pālehua Ridge area via Pālehua Road as part of the Makaiwa Hills project.

U. Removes language about linking park facility funding to the phasing map priorities because development phasing has been eliminated from the Plan (p. 3-19);

V. Clarify that existing policy requiring use of in situ preservation and appropriate protection for high value historic, cultural, or archaeological sites is guided by recommendations by the State Historic Preservation Officer (p. 3-19);
   - Use in situ preservation and appropriate protection measures for historic, cultural, or archaeological sites with high preservation value because of their good condition or unique features, as recommended by the State Historic Preservation Officer.

W. S Adds language adopted as City policy in 2002 that states that impact mitigations adopted as part of prior development approvals can be assumed to carry out the ‘Ewa Development Plan vision and policies for preservation and development of historic and cultural resources (p. 3-20);
   - Where known archaeological and cultural sites have been identified and impact mitigations approved as part of prior development approvals, assume that the mitigations carry out the Plan vision and policies for preservation and development of historic and cultural resources in ‘Ewa.

X. (PRD▲) S Adds language supporting protection of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the ‘Ewa Marine Corp Air Field until surveys can be completed and a determination made of the appropriate treatment of the historic resources at the two sites (p. 3-20);
   - Protect the Honouliuli Internment Camp site from development until efforts to evaluate it for National Historic Register listing and for inclusion as a satellite site in the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument have established the value of the site and its appropriate treatment.
   - Protect the ‘Ewa Marine Corps Air Field site in Kalaeloa from development while a study is done to establish the condition of the site and the appropriate treatment of historic resources at the site.
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Y. (PRD ▲) Adds the ‘Ewa Marine Corp Air Field, the Honouliuli Internment Camp, Pu’u Makakilo, and Pu’u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette to the list of Significant Historic Features and Landmarks. Adds the ‘Ewa Beach Midden Site and ‘Oki’okiolepe Pond to the list of significant Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological sites, reflecting their National Historic Register and State Historic Register status. (p. 3-22);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC FEATURES AND LANDMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Ewa Plantation Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ewa Marine Corps Air Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honouliuli Internment Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanikūhonua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR&amp;L Historic Railway &amp; Railway Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Harbor National Historic Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu’u Makakilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu’u O Kapolei/Fort Barrette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVE HAWAIIAN CULTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbers Point Archaeological District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ewa Beach Midden Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oki’okiolepe Pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One‘ula Archaeological District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z. (PRD ▲) Clarifies that feasibility is to be considered in retention of public views and that undergrounding of utilities must be in accordance with criteria specified in State law (p. 3-23)

- **Public Views** - Design and site all structures, *where feasible*, to reflect the need to maintain and enhance available views of significant landmarks and vistas. Whenever possible, relocate or place underground overhead utility lines and poles that significantly obstruct public views, under criteria specified in State law.

AA. (PRD ▲) S Revises the language about the future route of the OR&L Historic Railway to reflect the reality that pipelines running in the roadbed of the OR&L right-of-way make extending railway operations to Waipahu highly unlikely. Adds language allowing cross-traffic at appropriate intervals along the OR&L R-O-W. (p. 3-23);

- Preferably, the route would extend from Ko Olina to Waipahu. *Extend the route from ‘Ewa Villages to Nānākuli.* If this is not feasible, preservation efforts should focus on restoring the historic rail link between Ewa Villages and Waipahu, with a terminus at the Waipahu Cultural Garden.
- To allow connectivity within the region, accommodate cross-traffic at appropriate intervals along the right-of-way.

AB. Adds policy language regarding OR&L Historic Railway adaptive use, adjacent uses, and public access adopted as City policy in 2002 as CO
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SCP design guidelines for the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail (pp. 3-23 and 3-24);

AC. (PRD▲) Adds a new section 3.5 with Natural Resources Policies, reflecting vision statements in Chapter 2 (p. 3-26);

AD. (PRD▲) Adds language calling for surveys of new development areas to identify endangered species habitat and to require appropriate mitigations (p. 3-26);

3.5 NATURAL RESOURCES

3.5.1 GENERAL POLICIES

- Require surveys for proposed new development areas to identify endangered species habitat, and require appropriate mitigations for adverse impacts on endangered species due to new development.

AE. (PRD▲) S Adds language calling for reduction of light pollution's adverse impact on wildlife and human health and its unnecessary consumption of energy by using, where sensible, fully shielded lighting fixtures using lower wattage (p. 3-26);

3.5 NATURAL RESOURCES

3.5.1 GENERAL POLICIES

- Reduce light pollution's adverse impact on wildlife and human health and its unnecessary consumption of energy by using, where sensible, fully shielded lighting fixtures using lower wattage.

AF. Updates the City of Kapolei section to include the recent Council actions in approving zone changes and adopting revisions to the Urban Design Plan and proposed mixed-use commercial areas adjacent to the proposed Hanua Street extension (p. 3-27 through 3-34);

AG. S Adds a business hotel as a use that could be permitted in the City of Kapolei. (p. 3-30);

- In the commercial emphasis mixed-use areas, retail development (shopping, restaurants, services, etc.) should be encouraged to locate along the street front, with required parking located behind the building or above the ground floor. Offices may also be located on the ground floor, as well as on upper floors. Housing, when provided, should be located above the ground floor. A business hotel to provide short term inexpensive accommodations for business travelers and others who are not seeking resort accommodations could also be allowed.
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AH. (PRD▲) S Adds language supporting future development of a terminal for a commuter ferry from Hoakalei Mariana to downtown Honolulu if such service is found to be feasible and financing can be obtained for the improvements needed to serve such a ferry (p. 3-39);
- Develop Hoakalei as the region’s principal recreational marina destination for local residents and visitors. With over 1,100 acres located between ‘Ewa Beach and Kalaeloa, the Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei community should be centered around a marina that should serve as a major recreational resource and visual amenity for the community. The marina should provide recreational boating opportunities, supported by boat slips, marine haul-out and other repair facilities, and a public boat ramp. The marina could also serve as a terminal for a commuter ferry to downtown Honolulu if such service is found to be feasible and if financing can be found for the improvements needed to serve such a ferry.

Al. S Revises the Ocean Pointe section to reflect the proposed Kalo‘i Gulch drainage outlet through One‘ula Park (pp. 3-39, 3-43, and 3-44)
- The City supports timely development of the Ewa Marina as a key element needed to mitigate drainage impacts in the Kaloi Gulch watershed during major storms. The marina’s role as a storm water storage and detention basin has been acknowledged and included in previously approved environmental impact statements and land use approvals for projects in the Kaloi Gulch watershed. (p. 3-39)
- **Medium Density Residential Area** – Develop a medium density residential area located adjacent to the Marina Mixed Use area and across the marina waterway behind Oneula Beach Park to provide a transition between the mixed uses of the Marina Mixed Use area and the Low and Medium Single Family and Low Density Residential area to the east. (p. 3-43)
- With the exception of the island within the marina, there should be a minimum building setback of about 40 feet along the marina’s edge to accommodate a public waterfront promenade. On the island within the marina, the minimum setback may be as little as five feet. Lesser setbacks may be permitted upon design review and approval by the Department of Planning and Permitting. (p. 3-43)

**Natural Environment**
- Design the golf course and marina to accommodate storm water runoff in a manner that maintains coastal water quality and avoids the use of concrete
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channels for diversion drainage. Design the waterway to accommodate the runoff of collected storm waters generated by a potential 100-year storm. Channel design should use the most effective means to provide natural flushing of its waters. Develop silting ponds mauka of the site to preserve water quality so that use of the marina and near-shore waters for recreational purposes and aesthetic enjoyment is not limited in any way. (p. 3-44)

AJ. Deletes land use descriptions for areas around the Ocean Pointe marina basin because they duplicate land use information provided in the following Guidelines section (p. 3-40)

AK. Adds the existing City policy that requires 30% of housing units in new residential developments to be affordable to low and low-moderate income households. (p. 3-46)

• Affordable Housing – Require that thirty percent of the housing units in new residential developments be affordable to low and low-moderate income households.

AL. S Adds language to the Existing and Planned Residential Communities section indicating that the planning for these communities should identify where its village center, town center, or "Main Street" is and how that center will be established and supported by the development (p. 3-47);

• Community Centers – In the Master Plan for each new residential community, identify where its village center, town center or "Main Street" area is and how that center or Main Street will be established and supported by any existing or planned commercial development.

AM. (PRD▲) S Adds language and guidelines for establishing connectivity within and between subdivisions (p. 3-47, 3-50 and 51);

• Connectivity – Minimize dead end streets, provide for intersections at regular intervals, and connect with adjacent development. Allow roadway cross-sections within new residential developments to be reduced from current standards where higher capacity is provided by multiple alternative routes.

• Pedestrian and Bicycle Travel – Encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel, particularly to reach neighborhood destinations such as schools, parks, and convenience stores. At a minimum, provide pedestrian and bikeway connectivity, where roadway connectivity is deemed not feasible, to allow direct travel through the community and to neighborhood districts. (p. 3-47)
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Connectivity
- Use the circulation plan to define the hierarchy of streets within the project and its relationship to the surrounding transportation network.
- Use a modified grid street pattern (modified as necessary to fit the topography or other limitations) with block lengths of 300 feet by 500 feet or any combination of two sides summing to 800 feet. (See Exhibit 4.2 Street Network Guidelines.)
- Provide pedestrian pass-throughs or mid-block cross walks where blocks exceed 500 feet on a side.
- Connect new residential development to adjacent subdivisions to allow creation of an east-west and mauka-makai roadway network at approximately 1/4 mile intervals. (p. 3-50 and 51)

AN. Adds language to the guidelines for density of Residential areas to provide guidance on what design characteristics are desired (p. 3-48);

AO. (PRD▲) S Adds language regarding provision of bus transit routes and facilities adopted as City policy in 2002 (p. 3-51);

Transit Routes and Facilities
- Show existing and proposed bus routes and specific measures to accommodate efficient bus transit service for as many households as possible on the circulation plan.
- Design the rights-of-way along existing or potential bus transit routes to make provisions for bus shelters, bus pull-outs, and, if applicable, park-and-ride facilities and/or future rapid transit stations in accordance with Department of Transportation Systems design standards.
- Require street patterns showing the alignment of proposed or potential bus transit routes to be submitted to the Department of Transportation Services as part of the subdivision roadway master plan review process.
- Design the circulation plan so that at least 85 percent of all residences will be within a five-minute (or 1/4 mile) walking distance of an existing or potential bus route or rapid transit stop, unless localized topographic conditions make such a requirement impractical.
- Design the circulation plan so that all commercial development with more than 1,000 square feet and all employment sites with more than ten employees are within 1/8 mile of a existing or potential bus or rapid transit stop.
- Design the circulation plan so that all development is within 1/2 mile of an existing or potential bus route or rapid transit stop, unless localized topographic conditions make such a requirement impractical.
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- Design the circulation plan so that potential bus transit routes have two different access points into the proposed development. The route alignment should seek to achieve optimal operational efficiency between the two access points.

AP. Adds language reiterating that areas within the City of Kapolei should be zoned for medium density apartment use and that mixed use should be encouraged (p. 3-53);

AQ. (PRD ▲) Corrects, clarifies, and updates appropriate zoning districts for land use designations in the Plan (3-54);

AR. S Adds language supporting multi-family residential use above the first floor as a permitted use to be encouraged in planned commercial centers (p. 3-56);
  - Permit multi-family residential use above the first floor and include it wherever possible in commercial centers.

AS. S Adds language and guidelines for how structures in commercial centers and areas can support the establishment of village centers, town centers, or "Main Streets." (pp. 3-56, 3-57 and 3-58);
  - Wherever possible, design new commercial centers to help create and/or support pedestrian-friendly village centers, town centers, or "Main Street" areas for their communities.
    - Such centers or Main Streets provide a place where people from the surrounding neighborhoods gather, shop, dine, or play and are a key element that defines a community's identity. (p. 3-56)

Orientation to "Main Street" or the Town/Village Center
- Structures in the commercial center should be located and oriented to the street up to the "build to" line along the designated "Main Street" or Town/Village Center frontage.
- Most parking for commercial structures fronting "Main Street" or the Town/Village center should be located behind the structures in joint development parking lots or structures although some on-street parking can be provided on the Main Street or Town/Village Center frontage.
- The main entrance to commercial structures fronting the "Main Street" or Town/Village Center should be located on that street frontage with secondary entrances from parking areas.
- Sidewalks in front of retail uses fronting the "Main Street" or Town/Village Center should be wide enough (12 to 16 feet) to allow window shopping or outdoor
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dining. (p. 3-57 and 58)

AT. Adds a note to the adopted policy which calls for Major Community Commercial and Regional Shopping Centers to be located only in the City of Kapolei disclosing that DHHL has notified DPP that it has exempted itself from City planning and zoning and will develop a 1.6 million square foot regional shopping center on 67 acres with two hotels with 300 rooms and two office towers with 100,000 square feet of office space at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road); (pp. 3-56 and 57)

AU. Adds language supporting establishment of commercial centers near the intersection of Kunia Road-Farrington Highway as part of the Ho‘opili project and at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualakai Parkway (North-South Road) (in addition to medium density mixed use transit oriented development around the transit station planned for that latter location) (p. 3-57);

• Allow Community Commercial Centers at ‘Ewa Beach, Laulani, Ho‘opili (near the intersection of Farrington Highway and Kunia Road), East Kapolei (near the intersection of Farrington Highway and the Kualakai Parkway [North-South Road] and near the intersection of Kapolei Parkway and the Kualakai Parkway [North-South Road]), the Villages of Kapolei, Makaïwa Hills, and Ko Olina Marina as shown on the Urban Land Use Map in Appendix A.

AV. (PRD▲) Adds language to the Planned Commercial Retail Centers policies in support of medium density mixed use commercial development within a quarter-mile radius of proposed transit stations on the rapid transit corridor as a way of implementing the Sec. 2.1 and 2.2.7 vision of transit oriented development around the stations (p. 3-57);

AW. (PRD▲) Adds language supporting inclusion of office uses serving the UH West O‘ahu in the Transit Oriented Development areas around the two transit stations closest to the campus (p. 3-57);

• Restrict office uses as a principal use in ‘Ewa Community Commercial Centers. Offices that provide services to the local community may be included in the centers, but the emphasis should be on retail uses. Offices providing support to functions of the University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu may be included in the Transit Oriented Development areas around the two transit stations closest to the

Department of Planning and Permitting         ‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report
3-22
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AX. Adds guidelines for Regional Commercial Centers from the 1995 Planning Department ‘Ewa Development Plan Report, the technical report prepared by the consultants as backup to the 1997 ‘Ewa Development Plan (pp. 3-62 and 63);

AY. Removes Ko Olina guidelines calling for development of medium-density apartments on the site where the 750-unit Marriott Beach Club time-share resort is being developed and identifies the area as part of the Resort Center where hotel and resort condos are planned to be developed. Clarifies that development of 4,000 visitor units at Ko Olina is not a cap, but is the minimum that should be developed (p. 3-67);

AZ. Adds language to the Ko Olina guidelines for the OR&L right-of-way which notes that the right-of-way is part of the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail project which goes from ‘Aiea to Nānākuli (p. 3-69);

BA. Deletes obsolete language supporting development of a "commercial, cultural or recreational entertainment attraction" fronting the OR&L right-of-way, reflecting the Council-approved land use zoning and developer's site plan for the Kapolei West project which shows a golf course in that area (p. 3-70);

BB. (PRD▲) Adds language supporting industrial mixed use for the northern parts of Kapolei Business Park, Kapolei Harborside, and Kalaeloa reflecting Council approval of IMX-1 zoning for a northern portion of Kapolei Harborside and HCDA 2011 proposed rules for Kalaeloa that would establish mixed use "zoning" for Kalaeloa industrial areas81 (p. 3-71)

BC. (PRD▲) S Adds language supporting development of a major film studio in the Barbers Point Industrial Area and noting that overnight crew

81 Hawai‘i Community Development Authority, Notice of Public Hearing, May 18, 2011 (April 16, 2011). The Public Hearing is to repeal Title 15, Chapter 200, Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR), in order to adopt proposed Title 15, Chapter 215, HAR, Kalaeloa Community Development District (KCDD) Rules and Title 15, Chapter 216, HAR, KCDD Reserved Housing Rules.
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accommodations are allowable as an accessory use to a major film studio (p. 3-71);

- If a major film studio is developed within this area, allow accessory uses, such as film production offices, a "back lot" area with commercial uses, and visitor attractions. Overnight accommodations for film crews are allowable as an accessory use to a major film studio.

BD. (PRD▲) Adds language to the policy for the Honouliuli Industrial Area to reflect City land use decisions in 2006 and 2009 to allow light industrial and industrial-commercial mixed use for areas adjacent to the Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant (p. 3-71);

- Develop Honouliuli as a smaller industrial area, used primarily for wastewater treatment and for light industrial and industrial-commercial mixed uses to serve the surrounding communities.

BE. (PRD▲) Deletes language calling for acquisition of an additional 60 acres for Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant since the City acquired the land in 2010. (p. 3-71)

BF. (PRD▲) Deletes language calling for Honouliuli wastewater treatment structures to be at least 300 feet from "any access road that is planned for redevelopment of Kalaeloa" since existing and planned Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant buildings are over 300 feet from Kapolei Parkway and the Kualaka‘i Parkway, but existing buildings are within 300 feet of both Geiger Road and Roosevelt Avenue, and relocation would be costly and unnecessary (p. 3-74);

- Require wastewater treatment structures to be at least 300 feet from the proposed alignments of the Kapolei Parkway, and the Kualaka‘i Parkway, and any access road that is planned for redevelopment of Kalaeloa. Setbacks for other industrial uses should be as given in the zoning standards.

BG. Updates Table 3.6 to reflect revised acreage for Kalaeloa Regional Park and the most recent land transfers to the HCDA (p. 3-76);

BH. Clarifies language regarding establishment of a continuous pedestrian route along the ‘Ewa shoreline in the general policies for Kalaeloa (p. 3-77);

- Create a continuous pedestrian route along most of the entire ‘Ewa Coast by reserving the entire shoreline of Kalaeloa for public access and recreation after
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Military use of BPNAS ceases, and linking to adjacent pathways in Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei and Campbell Industrial Park.

Bl. Clarifies the purpose of the general policy calling for the Kalaeloa road network to be integrated with the ‘Ewa regional circulation system (p. 3-77);
- Integrate the road network within Kalaeloa with the regional circulation system for all of ‘Ewa to provide additional ways for residents and workers to cross ‘Ewa from east to west and north to south.

Bj. Adds language reflecting the move of the UH West O‘ahu Campus back to the Farrington Road/Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) site, the proposed development of an adjacent University Village, and the need for connectivity between UHWOC and its larger community, adjacent transit nodes, Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road), and Farrington Highway (p. 3-80);

Bk. Adds language about the importance of creating a University Village as a community center anchored by the UH West O‘ahu campus at one end and the transit station at the other (p. 3-81); and

Bl. (PRD▲) Adds a clarification that structures on the UH West O‘ahu campus which have forms (like a stage loft) which are functionally necessary but would "visually dominate the site" are allowed (p. 3-82).

Chapter 4: Public Facilities And Infrastructure Policies And Guidelines

A. Updates road transportation projects in ‘Ewa based on O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035 (ORTP) and ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan (p. 4-3 through 6);

B. Deletes projects from Sec. 4.1.3 to reflect their inclusion in the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan and/or O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan as planned extensions of the roadway network (p. 4-7);

C. (PRD▲) Adds extension of Keaunui Road to connect with Renton Road to the list of additional needed roadway elements that are not reflected in the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan, or the ORTP (p. 4-7);

D. Adds development of an additional east-west road between East Kapolei and Fort Weaver Road and extension of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (formerly North-South Road) through Kalaeloa to connect with Ocean Pointe to the
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list of additional needed roadway elements that are not reflected in the
‘Ewa Highway Master Plan, or the ORTP (p. 4-7);

E. Clarifies right-of-way and station requirements and transit-ready and
transit oriented development priorities for the elevated rapid transit system
(pp. 4-9 and 10, 4-13 and 14);

F. Adds City transportation development priorities adopted in 2002 which
state that projected demand for peak-hour transportation will be met by
increased use of transit and by transportation demand management (p. 4-
13);

- **Transportation Development Priorities** - Meet demand for peak-hour
  transportation in ‘Ewa by:
  - Increased use of transit; and
  - Transportation demand management through:
    - Provision of improved service on High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)
      facilities;
    - Provision of park-and-ride facilities; and
    - Use of other programs which encourage reduced use of the single
      occupant private automobile.

G. Adds policy and guideline language calling for establishing a quarter-
mile network of east-west and mauka-makai collector-connector streets (p.
4-13, 4-16 and 17);

**Comprehensive Roadway Network**

- Design and develop the roadway system to provide multiple routes for traveling
  among the various residential communities and activity centers of ‘Ewa, thereby
  lending variety to travel within the region and promoting communication among its
  communities. Network designs for communities should take on more of a grid
  pattern, providing intersections between collector or connector streets at
  approximately quarter-mile intervals. (p. 4-13)

4.1.7 GUIDELINES

- Design the street network to provide multiple options for reaching major amenities
  such as the Main Street/Village Center shops, schools, parks and community
  facilities, without needing to access an arterial boulevard.
- Consider view corridors to the mountains, open space, and other local and
  regional landmarks in the arrangement of streets, commercial centers, and
  shared spaces within both residential and mixed use districts.
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- Provide a circulation network master plan for ‘Ewa that is comprised of a loose “grid” of arterials at 1/2-1 mile intervals, collector streets at 1/4 mile intervals and connectors roads between individual developments at regular intervals between collectors, where permitted by terrain. See Exhibit 4.2.

- Connect existing adjacent neighborhoods to new streets, bike ways, paths, and trails.

- Use traffic calming measures to slow traffic making short cuts and support a desirable living environment.

- Use multiple connecting streets within and between residential neighborhoods to knit neighborhoods together, not form barriers.

- Use streets, bikeways, and walkways to create a unifying circulation network that provides convenient routes throughout the community.

- Establish specific connectivity standards (minimum intersection frequency, maximum dead end length, number of dwellings or buildings on a cul-de-sac, and minimum street spacing) for each zoning district. (p. 4-16 and 17)

H. S Clarifies policy language regarding use of "grid" street patterns by calling for subdivisions to be built with fewer dead-end streets and with smaller blocks (p. 4-14);

- **Reduction in Automobile Use** - Reduce reliance on the private passenger vehicle by:
  
  
  - Use of more traditional "grid" patterns for street systems in new development areas to facilitate bus routes and encourage pedestrian travel. Designing street systems in new development areas which reduce the length of dead end streets and provide for smaller blocks in order to facilitate bus routes, provide better access for emergency and utility vehicles and encourage walking and biking;

I. S Adds language calling for establishment of a commuter ferry service from Hoakalei Marina to downtown Honolulu if such service is found to be feasible and if sufficient financing can be found to pay for the needed improvements (p. 4-16);

- **Transit**

  - Establish a commuter ferry service to downtown Honolulu from Hoakalei Marina if such service is found to be feasible and if sufficient financing can be obtained to construct improvements needed to provide such service from the Marina.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

J. Adds language to clarify that adequacy of water supplies is evaluated at the time of zone changes and confirmed as part of land subdivision or building permit application (p. 4-20);

K. Updates Table 4.2 Potential Sources of Potable and Nonpotable Water for ‘Ewa based on BWS revisions (p. 4-21);

L. Adds two Water Use Efficiency and Conservation policies (p. 4-22);

Water Use Efficiency and Conservation
- Require developments to conserve water resources by implementing water conservation measures, such as low flow plumbing fixtures, drought tolerant landscaping, sub-metering and efficient irrigation systems with soil moisture sensors. Such requirements shall be determined during review of building permit applications.
- Encourage owners of existing plumbing systems to conduct regular water audits and effect repairs to reduce water loss.

M. S Clarifies that the requirement for developing dual water lines should apply to developments with large landscaped areas (such as golf courses, parks, or schools), with roadway landscaping, or involving industrial processes (p. 4-22);

- Dual Water Lines - Require developments with large landscaped areas (such as golf courses, parks, or schools), roadway landscaping, and industrial processes to have dual water lines to allow conservation of potable water and use of nonpotable water for irrigation and other appropriate uses. Such requirements shall be determined during review of project water master plans for new developments and approval of zoning applications and construction plans.

N. (PRD ▲) S Revises the policy on Development and Allocation of Potable Water to include non-potable water and to clarify the BWS role in coordinating such development and allocation (p. 4-22);

- Development and Allocation of Potable and Nonpotable Water - The State Commission on Water Resource Management has final authority in all matters regarding administration of the State Water Code. Under that authority, the Board of Water Supply should coordinate development of potable water sources and allocation of all potable water intended for urban use on Oahu. State and private well development projects could then be integrated into and made consistent with City water source development plans. By City Charter, the Board of Water Supply has the authority to manage, control and operate the water systems of the City, and therefore should coordinate the development and allocation of potable and non-potable water resources.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

nonpotable water sources and systems intended for municipal use on O'ahu as guided by the City's land use plans and the OWMP.

O. Adds two Alternative Water Supplies policies and deletes a Water Reclamation policy and Integrated Resource Management policy as requested by BWS (p. 4-23 and 24);

**Alternative Water Supplies**
- Where practical, develop alternative water supplies using new technologies in water reclamation, membrane and distillation desalination and deep ocean water applications to ensure adequate supply for planned uses.
- Encourage use of technologies conserving water and using renewable energy that could support alternative water supplies, such as seawater air conditioning, photovoltaics, efficient plumbing and lighting fixtures, wave energy, and bio-fuels.

**Water Reclamation** - The City will reclaim and distribute wastewater effluent, provided that paying customers can be found for the nonpotable water. No additional costs will be borne by sewer users to subsidize private users of recycled effluent.

**Integrated Resource Management** - Management of all potable and nonpotable water sources, including ground water, stream water, storm water, and effluent reuse should be integrated through amendments to the Oahu Water Management Plan and future Integrated Resource Management plans, which will require Council approval and adequate public review, following City development of plans and adoption of an appropriate management process.

P. To be consistent with City policy adopted in 2002, revises the language regarding undergrounding of new transmission lines to clarify that the undergrounding must be consistent with criteria specified in State law (p. 4-26)

Q. To be consistent with City policy adopted in 2002, revises the language regarding the City review and approval process for new electrical power plants (p. 4-26);
- Consider any proposed major new electrical power plant or proposals for a new above-ground or underground transmission corridor carrying voltages of 138kV or greater shall be considered through a City review and approval process, such as the Plan Review Use process, which provides public notification and opportunity to comment and public agency analysis of impacts and mitigations review, complete analysis, and approval from the Department of Planning and Permitting and the City Council.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

R. Adds a policy prohibiting development of a landfill in Maka'īwa Gulch (as proposed in 2003) since that would be inconsistent with the land use approvals for the Maka'īwa Hills project given by Council in 2008; and deletes language regarding a site in East Kapolei identified in the 1995 *Solid Waste Integrated Management Plan* as a potential landfill site since the current *Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan* (2009) does not include the site anymore. (p. 4-28);

S. (PRD▲) Adds a policy calling for developers of master planned communities to consult with the City on how their communities can be best be designed to handle solid waste disposal and to encourage recycling (p. 4-28)

- For master-planned communities, plan, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Services, for how solid waste will be handled, to include estimates of solid waste to be generated by the communities, provisions for collection of solid waste, and provisions for and encouragement of recycling.

T. S Clarifies the drainage general policy supporting use of natural and man-made vegetated drainageways to recognize that concrete-lined channels can be permitted if there is no feasible alternative (p. 4-32);

- Use natural and man-made vegetated drainageways and retention basins as the preferred solution to drainage problems wherever they could promote water recharge, help control non-point source pollutants, and provide passive recreation benefits. However, concrete-lined channels can be permitted, despite their potential adverse environmental impacts, if there is no other reasonable alternative to meet specific design challenges.

U. S Removes policy language describing the Ocean Pointe Marina as playing a key role (as a storm water storage and detention basin) in the Kalo'i Gulch drainage system, reflecting the current approved drainage plan which retains flood waters on site and directs excess flood waters to the ocean through an emergency outlet through One‘ula Beach Park (p. 4-33);

The following guidelines apply specifically to development within the Kalo‘i Gulch drainage basin.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

- **Key Role of Ewa Marina.** The City supports timely development of the Ewa Marina as a key element needed to mitigate drainage impacts in the Kaloi Gulch watershed during major storms. The marina's role as a storm water storage and detention basin has been acknowledged and included in previously approved environmental impact statements and land use approvals for projects in the Kaloi Gulch watershed.

V. Updates Table 4.3 to reflect existing and planned schools (p. 4-35);

W. Replaces the Schools Project Review and Approval Assessment policy from the 1997 ‘Ewa DP with City policy adopted in 2002 (p. 4-36);

- **Project Review and Approval Assessment** - As new residential developments are reviewed as part of the project application review and approval process, request that the DOE report to the Department of Planning and Permitting whether the DOE will be able to provide adequate school facilities, either at existing schools or at new school sites, so that needs from the proposed development can be met. The State Department of Education (DOE) should review and recommend on the adequacy of school facilities, either at existing schools or at new school sites to be made available when the development is completed.

X. Revises the Schools Fair Share Contribution policy from the 1997 ‘Ewa DP to reflect the possibility of DOE establishing impact fee districts.

- **Fair Share Contribution** - Support the State Department of Education's request for establishment of impact districts to obtain fair share contributions requirements from developers of residential projects and enforce existing agreements to insure that adequate school facilities are in place at existing and new schools to meet the needs of residents.

Y. Updates Table 4.4 to reflect current plans by the Honolulu Fire Department and the Emergency Medical Service (p. 4-38);

Z. **Includes language adding the need for emergency medical service facilities to the existing first responder policy(p. 4-39);**

- Approve new development only if staffing and facilities will be adequate to provide fire and police protection and emergency medical service when development is completed. (p. 4-39)

AA. (PRD▲) **S** Adds a new Table 4.5 listing existing public emergency shelters in ‘Ewa and their capacity and three new policies to address the shortfall in shelter capacity and wind resistance (p. 4-39 and 40).
3.1 Changes to the Plan

- Survey and retrofit, as appropriate, Department of Education and other public buildings to make up the shortfall in hurricane resistant shelters.
- Require new City buildings which are “critical facilities used for public assembly and able to perform as shelters” to be designed and built to withstand a Category 3 hurricane.
- Provide incentives for private organizations to create hurricane resistant shelter areas in their facilities and for homes to include hurricane resistant “safe rooms.”

AB. (PRD▲) S Adds principles for location and mitigation of antennas for communications purposes (p. 4-41).
- Encourage co-location of antennas; towers should host the facilities of more than one service provider to minimize their proliferation and reduce visual impacts.
- Mount antennas onto existing buildings or structures so that public scenic views and open spaces will not be negatively affected. However, antennas on single-family dwelling roofs in residential districts are not appropriate.
- Use stealth technology (e.g. towers disguised as trees) especially on free-standing antenna towers in order to blend in with the surrounding environment and minimize visual impacts.

Chapter 5: Implementation

A. S Deletes phasing as a tool of implementation; and discusses how Council will have the ability to phase development through zoning approvals for projects not yet entitled, and how subdivision and building permit reviews will be used to address infrastructure requirements for already entitled projects (p. 5-1 through 5);
- Limiting urban development to areas within the Urban Boundary to support the vision for protection of agricultural lands and open space in 'Ewa; Phasing development to support the vision for Ewa and to maximize the effect of infrastructure investments; (p. 5-1)

5.1 Phasing of Development

Phasing development provides the opportunity to focus the impact of scarce public funds for infrastructure development, supports the directed growth strategy of the General Plan, and provides a clear signal to private landowners and developers as to where and when development will be supported. Active projects in various stages of the development process are proceeding for all the undeveloped areas in 'Ewa within the Urban Boundary.
3.1 CHANGES TO THE PLAN

1. As identified in Table 2.1, residential projects with estimated development capacity of over 35,000 units either can exempt themselves from County zoning or already have the zoning needed to proceed to apply for subdivision approval, and construction and building permits. These projects, subject to availability of infrastructure, are the projects likely to be developed first. These projects, if subject to County zoning, will have to meet both unilateral agreement conditions if adopted as part of zoning approval for each of these projects, and subdivision approval requirements that help insure that adequate infrastructure is available, and that project development implements key elements of the Plan vision.

2. Finally, there are projects which need the State Land Use Commission to approve a change from the State Agricultural District to the Urban District and then the City Council to approve a zone change. These projects have an estimated residential development capacity of over 14,000 units.

The City Council, in reviewing and deciding on the zone changes for these latter projects, will have the opportunity to evaluate the availability of infrastructure and require conditions that the developer must meet as a condition of zoning to insure infrastructure adequacy and attainment of key elements of the Plan vision.

However, there are two major projects involving substantial amounts of residential, commercial, and office development which are not required to gain Council approval or incorporate conditions regarding infrastructure adequacy or other elements of the ‘Ewa Plan vision.

- The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) currently is developing 630 acres in ‘Ewa, located along the North-South Road. Because the DHHL has the power under the State Constitution to exempt itself from all State and County land use laws, rules and regulations, the City has no ability to require DHHL to follow the ‘Ewa Development Plan vision, policies and guidelines. Over 2,600 residential units and a million square feet of retail and office space could be developed under DHHL’s current plans for the area.

- In 2002, the State Legislature transferred redevelopment responsibility for Kalaeloa to the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority (HCDA). HCDA also has the power, under its establishing statutes, to exempt itself from County land use laws, rules and regulations. The HCDA estimates that almost 6,500 dwelling units could be developed at Kalaeloa by 2025, and over 116 thousand square feet of commercial space, 725 thousand square feet of office space, 1.8 million square feet of light industrial space, and 470 thousand square feet of light industrial mixed use space.
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The City will seek the cooperation of the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands and the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority in implementing the vision for ‘Ewa’s development.

5.1.1 PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PHASING AREAS

The ‘Ewa Development Plan provides a clear signal to private landowners and developers as to where development will be supported.

The Urban Expansion Area is shown on the Phasing Map in Appendix A. The Urban Expansion Area shows where new urban development is occurring and where applications for new urban development will be accepted for processing.

Projects in the Urban Expansion Area needing zone changes and other development approvals would be eligible for processing with the adoption of the revised Plan and will be supported if:

- The project implements the vision for ‘Ewa and relevant policies and guidelines, and
- Adequate infrastructure will be available to meet the demand resulting from the project.

No additional areas should be approved for development beyond the Community Growth Boundary in order to protect agricultural and preservation lands.

Three types of areas are identified in the Phasing Map in Appendix A, indicating when zoning changes and infrastructure investment would be supported if the project advances the Development Plan vision for Ewa and implements the relevant policies, principles and guidelines:

-Urban Expansion, 1997–2005—High priority areas supported for zoning changes and infrastructure investments within the next ten years if the project supports the vision for Ewa and implements relevant policies, principles, and guidelines;

-Urban Expansion, 2006–2015—Secondary priority areas supported for zoning changes and infrastructure investments after the next ten years if the project advances the vision for Ewa and implements relevant policies, principles, and guidelines; and

-Urban Expansion, 2016 and Beyond—Projects in these areas will generally be supported for zoning changes and infrastructure investments if projects in the earlier phases have demonstrated substantial progress. (pp. 5-1 through 5-4)
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5.1.2 PUBLIC FACILITY INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

Capital Improvement Projects shall be developed to support the development of High Priority Areas during the first eight years (1997 - 2005). (p. 5-4)

B. (PRD▲) Recognizes development of elementary, middle, and high schools identified by the DOE as needed by 2035 as a public facility investment priority (p. 5-4);

C. Revises references to the UH West O‘ahu Campus location to reflect the current location near the corner of Farrington Highway and Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) (p. 5-5);

D. Recognizes completion of the initial phase of Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) and establishes completion of the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan projects and the East-West arterial as high priority capital improvement projects (p. 5-5);

Significant Capital Improvement Projects of the highest priority for the ‘Ewa Development Plan are:

- The North-South Road and other Uncompleted elements of the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan, and the East-West arterial between UH West O‘ahu and Fort Weaver Road;

E. Recognizes development of a network of collector / connector roads (at approximately ¼ mile interval) as a public facility investment priority (p. 5-5);

Significant Capital Improvement Projects of the highest priority for the ‘Ewa Development Plan are:

- A network of collector / connector roads (at approximately 1/4 mile intervals) where feasible;

F. Recognizes that HCDA has been given responsibility for planning and coordinating development at Kalaeloa and has prepared a community-based master plan for Kalaeloa, which should be submitted to the City Council for acceptance as the Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa (p. 5-6);

Responsibility for planning for and coordinating redevelopment of Kalaeloa was transferred from the Redevelopment Commission to the Hawaiian Community
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Development Authority (HCDA) in 2002 by the Hawai‘i State Legislature. HCDA has prepared a community-based Kalaeloa Master Plan that was approved by the HCDA Board and the Governor in 2006, and should be submitted to the City Council for acceptance as the revised Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa.

G. Deletes the Exhibit 5.1 flow chart of the EA/EIS acceptance and zone change review process (and text references to it) to be consistent with the format adopted for the other seven DPs and SCPs (pp. 5-9 and 10);

H. Deletes the Table 5.1 listing of Land Use Ordinance zoning district categories, titles and map designations (and references to it) to be consistent with the format adopted for the other seven DPs and SCPs (pp. 5-11 and 12);

I. Revises requirements for Project Master Plans to clarify that acceptance of a prior FONSI can be the basis for not requiring preparation of a Project Master Plan (p. 5-13);

Projects associated with a significant zone change for 25 acres or more, shall include a Project Master Plan as part of the Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement submitted to the Department of Planning and Permitting. The Project Master Plan shall cover all project phases. It shall be reviewed to determine whether the project supports the vision, policies, and guidelines of the ‘Ewa Development Plan. In the event a FONSI or a Final EIS has already been accepted by the City for a particular project, a subsequent Project Master Plan will not be required.

J. S Adds requirement that Master Plans for major projects need to identify where the community center is located and show how any planned commercial development helps create a pedestrian friendly environment for that center (p. 5-14);

5.4.2 PROJECT MASTER PLANS
5.4.2.2 Key Elements

- Land Use - The Master Plan should indicate the proposed pattern of land uses by general zoning district category.

- The Master Plan should identify where the community’s “main street” or village or town center is located and show how any planned commercial development will help create a pedestrian friendly environment for that center.
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K.  **S** Adds requirement that Master Plan circulation patterns minimize dead end streets and provide adequate connectivity (p. 5-14 and 15);
   - **Circulation** - The Master Plan should indicate:
     - General street patterns and the application of street and block standards which minimize dead end streets and provide adequate connectivity;
     - Intended connections to the regional roadway network and adjacent communities; and
     - Intended Potential transit routes and pedestrian and bicycle routes.

L.  Clarifies and corrects language about the Planning Commission’s and the City Council’s role regarding unilateral agreements adopted as part of zone changes (p. 5-17);

M.  Deletes the introductory paragraph to Sec. 5.8 which discussed the transition from the previous Development Plan format to the conceptual plan format required by the 1992 Charter amendment (p.5-19)

N.  Updates the comparison of the projected ‘Ewa 2025 share of O’ahu population with the **General Plan** population distribution guideline (p. 5-20);

O.  Updates the description of the purpose of the Review and Revision of Development Codes (p. 5-20); and

P.  (**PRD▲** S) Adds a new Section 5.11 Implementation Matrix and a Table 5.1 Implementation Matrix providing a listing of **Plan** policies and guideline statements and the associated programs, implementing agencies, and roles played by each agency in implementing the policies and guidelines (pp. 5-23 through 5-41).
3.2 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN
VISION AND POLICY

The following listing summarizes actions identified in Chapter 2: Issues Identification And Analysis as needed to insure implementation of the vision, policies and guidelines of the ‘Ewa Development Plan:

Transportation Infrastructure Adequacy

A. Complete construction of the first increment of the elevated rapid transit system as soon as possible.
B. Extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei/Kapolei Commons as soon as possible after completion of the first increment in order to support development of the City of Kapolei as O’ahu’s Second City by giving it a Transit Oriented Development core with a rapid transit connection to the rest of O’ahu's major employment centers.
C. Improve the functioning of the H-1 HOV lanes so that riders in transit and high occupancy vehicles have a clear advantage in travel time over single occupant automobile commuters.
D. Adopt updated impact fees to support building of needed additional east-west and mauka-makai connector roadways within ‘Ewa, as identified in the updated ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan.
E. Use the ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study as the starting point for subdivision applications and urban design reviews discussions establishing or extending roadways in new and existing communities.
F. Develop the East Kapolei lands within walking distance (1/2 mile to ¼ mile) from the transit stations since East Kapolei residents within walking distance of transit stations are much more likely to use transit than residents farther from the stations, thereby causing less roadway traffic congestion than new development elsewhere in ‘Ewa or Central O’ahu.
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Schools Permanent Classroom Capacity Adequacy

G. Continue to enforce UA conditions that require DOE to certify developer compliance with fair share provisions before the City will approve development permits.

H. Support DOE and community efforts to obtain funding for permanent school capacity from the State Legislature.

Protection Of Open Space And Agricultural Lands

I. Resolve lack of agency support for creation and maintenance of the open space network.
   a. Study whether a public-private regional open space and greenway ‘ohana should be established to advocate for creation of the network, raise funds to support the network, and coordinate development, operation, and maintenance of the open space network.
   b. Study whether public access easements could be used to give private owners tax incentives to allow establishment of public pedestrian and bike paths on utility corridors and drainage ways.

J. Design the elevated rapid transit right-of-way to include a public greenway running beneath the elevated transit line.

Housing Affordability

K. Amend the Land Use Ordinance to allow residential use as a permitted use on the second floor and above for parcels zoned B-1 or B-2 as a way of supporting placemaking and increasing the supply of affordable and appropriate housing for seniors and low-income households.

Infrastructure Concurrency

L. Support use of creative financing programs like Community Facilities Districts and public-private partnerships as a way of financing critical roadways and transit support infrastructure so that infrastructure is built as new residential, retail and office development is built.
3.2 IMPROVEMENTS TO IMPLEMENTATION

Jobs And Economic Development

M. Support full development of the UH West O'ahu campus.

N. Extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei and Kapolei West to support job development in Transit Oriented Development areas around transit stations at the intersection of Kualaka'i Parkway and Kapolei Parkway, in Kalaeloa, and in the City of Kapolei.

O. Use submittal of the HCDA's Kalaeloa Master Plan to the Council for acceptance as the Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa as the basis for coordinating State and City infrastructure planning for Kalaeloa.

Historic, Cultural, And Natural Resources

P. Update the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan and use it to serve as a guide for City infrastructure, facilities, and land use in the Villages and for provision of affordable housing, historic preservation, and economic revitalization of the Villages.

Light Pollution

Q. Continue participating in the advisory committee called for by Act 161 (2009) to help the State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism prepare a proposed statewide intelligent lighting and light pollution law.

Hurricane Shelter Shortage

R. Support State funding for retrofits of existing public shelters to withstand Category 3 hurricanes.
3.3 PROPOSED FOLLOW-UP STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The following listing summarizes follow-up studies and research identified in Chapter 2: Issues Identification And Analysis as needed to understand how key issues should be addressed:

**Protection of Open Space and Agricultural Lands**

**A.** Resolve lack of agency support for creation and maintenance of the open space network.
   a. Study whether a public-private regional open space and greenway ohana should be established to advocate for creation of the network, raise funds to support the network, and coordinate development, operation, and maintenance of the open space network.
   b. Study whether public access easements could be used to give private owners tax incentives to allow establishment of public pedestrian and bike paths on utility corridors and drainage ways.

**Housing Affordability**

**B.** Study how the Land Use Ordinance and other development regulations and standards might be amended to allow inclusion of granny flats, ‘ohana units, and other accessory residential units in residential developments where appropriate.

**Infrastructure Concurrency**

**C.** Study the possibility of using Community Facility District funding to build permanent classroom capacity in anticipation of legislative appropriations to cover the cost of the new classrooms.

**Placemaking**

**D.** Study how the development process standards and regulations can be changed to encourage or require large developments to be designed with a specified "Main Street", "Town Center" or community center which is...
3.3 FURTHER STUDY NEEDED

pedestrian friendly and accessible from surrounding residential areas. Desirable features include:

a. Placing buildings along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage up to the build-to line;
b. Hiding most parking behind the buildings so that a pedestrian friendly environment is created along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage; and
c. Building the first floors of buildings along the "Main Street" or "Town Center" frontage to allow commercial uses.

Historic, Cultural, And Natural Resources

E. Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, what institutional changes might be made to better coordinate City operations, investments, and redevelopment activities for ‘Ewa Villages and to support economic opportunities and revitalization in the Villages.

F. Conduct surveys of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the ‘Ewa Marine Corp Air Field to determine the historic resources at the two sites and make a determination of the appropriate treatment of the those resources before permitting any development at the sites.

G. Study, as part of the ‘Ewa Villages Master Plan Update, how historic train operations on the OR&L between ‘Ewa Villages, Ko Olina, and Nānākuli, and the development of a train station and railway museum might be coordinated with redevelopment of the historic core of ‘Ewa Villages and establishment of a mill museum.

H. Conduct surveys of the Honouliuli Internment Camp and the ‘Ewa Marine Corp Air Field to determine the historic resources at the two sites and make a determination of the appropriate treatment of those resources.
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Light Pollution

I. Study light pollution plans and regulations for other jurisdictions, including the Seabird Habitat Conservation Plan for Kaua‘i prepared as part of recent plea agreement entered into by Kaua‘i County to resolve violations of the Endangered Species Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act caused by light pollution, and make recommendations for best practices and regulations to minimize light pollution on O‘ahu.

Coastal Erosion and Sea Level Rise

J. Do studies, similar to those done in 2009 for California, which would model the likely impact of sea level rise on coastal erosion and flooding for O‘ahu and provide erosion and flooding hazard mappings and risk assessments for use in deciding what adaptations and mitigations will be needed.

Hurricane Shelter Shortage

K. Study the feasibility and effectiveness of implementing property tax incentives for private organizations and individual homeowners to equip their homes with hurricane resistant "safe rooms."
3.3 FURTHER STUDY NEEDED
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TO ADOPT THE REVISED ‘EWA DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU.

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

SECTION 1. Purpose. The purpose of this ordinance is to repeal the existing Development Plan (DP) for ‘Ewa, Article 3, Chapter 24, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, and to adopt a new Article 3 incorporating the revised ‘Ewa Development Plan.

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

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

SECTION 2. Article 3 of Chapter 24, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu 1990, as amended (“‘Ewa”), is repealed.

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

"Article 3. ‘Ewa

Sec. 24-3.1 Definitions.

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

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

“City” means the City and County of Honolulu.

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

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

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

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

“Director” means the director of the department of planning and permitting.

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

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

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

"Functional plan" means the public facility and infrastructure plans prepared by public agencies to further implement the vision, policies and guidelines set forth in the 'Ewa Development Plan.

"General plan" means the general plan of the City and County of Honolulu as defined by Section 6-1508 of the Charter.

“Hawai‘i Revised Statutes" or “HRS" means Hawai‘i Revised Statutes, as amended.
"Planning commission" means the planning commission of the City and County of Honolulu.

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

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

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

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

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

3. Any change in zoning of more than 5 acres to an apartment, resort, commercial, industrial or mixed use zoning district; or

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

"Special area" means a designated area within the ‘Ewa Development Plan area that requires more detailed planning efforts beyond what is contained in the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

"Special area plan" means a plan for a special area.

"Unilateral agreement" means a conditional zoning agreement made pursuant to ROH Section 21-2.80 or any predecessor provision that imposes conditions on a landowner or developer’s use of the property at the time of the enactment of an ordinance for a zoning change.
"Vision" means the future outlook for the ‘Ewa region extending out to the year 2035 and beyond that entails creation of an community growth boundary and an open space network, development of the secondary urban center with its core at Kapolei, building of master planned communities with pedestrian and transit orientation, protection of historic, community and natural resources, and provision of adequate infrastructure and community facilities to meet ‘Ewa’s existing and future needs.

Sec. 24-3.2 Applicability and intent.

(a) The ‘Ewa Development Plan area encompasses the coral plain which stretches from the northeastern end of Kunia Road down to Waipahū and Pearl Harbor, and around the southwestern corner of O’ahu along the shoreline up to Nānākuli where the coral plain meets the moderately steep slopes of the southerly end of the Wai‘anae mountain range, which form ‘Ewa’s mauka sector.

(b) It is the intent of the ‘Ewa Development Plan to provide a guide for orderly and coordinated public and private sector development in a manner that is consistent with applicable general plan provisions, including the designation of ‘Ewa as the secondary urban center for O‘ahu and the ‘Ewa urban fringe areas as one of the principal areas for residential development.

(c) The provisions of this article and the ‘Ewa Development Plan are not regulatory. Rather, they are established with the explicit intent of providing a coherent vision to guide all new public and private sector development within ‘Ewa. This article shall guide development for ‘Ewa, public investment in infrastructure, zoning and other regulatory procedures, and the preparation of the City’s annual capital improvement program budget.

Sec. 24-3.3 Adoption of the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

(a) This article is adopted pursuant to the Revised Charter Section 6-1509 and provides a self-contained development plan document for ‘Ewa. Upon enactment of this article, all proposed developments will be evaluated against how well they fulfill the vision for ‘Ewa enunciated in the ‘Ewa Development Plan and how closely they meet the policies and guidelines selected to implement that vision.

(b) The plan entitled, “‘Ewa Development Plan,” attached as Exhibit A, is hereby adopted by reference and made a part of Chapter 24, Article 3, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu.
(c) Chapter 24, Article 1, entitled "Development Plan Common Provisions," in its entirety is no longer applicable to the ‘Ewa Development Plan area. The ‘Ewa Development Plan, as adopted by reference by this ordinance, supersedes any and all common provisions previously applicable to the ‘Ewa development plan area.

Sec. 24-3.4 Existing zoning and subdivision ordinances, approvals, and applications.

(a) All existing subdivisions and zoning approved prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall continue to remain in effect following the enactment of this ordinance.

(b) Subdivision and zoning ordinances applicable to the ‘Ewa Development Plan area enacted prior to the effective date of this ordinance shall continue to regulate the use of land within demarcated zones of the ‘Ewa Development Plan area until such time as the subdivision and zoning ordinances may be amended to be consistent with the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

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

Sec. 24-3.5 Consistency.

(a) The performance of prescribed powers, duties and functions by all city agencies shall conform to and implement the policies and provisions of this article and the ‘Ewa Development Plan. Pursuant to Revised Charter Section 6-1511.3, public improvement projects and subdivision and zoning ordinances shall become consistent with the ‘Ewa Development Plan, as adopted.

(b) Any questions of interpretation regarding the consistency of a proposed development with the provisions of the ‘Ewa Development Plan and the objectives and policies of the general plan shall ultimately be resolved by the council.

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

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

Sec. 24-3.6 Review of development and other applications.

The review of applications for zone changes and other development approvals will be guided by the vision of the ‘Ewa Development Plan. Decisions on all proposed developments should be based on the extent to which the project enabled by the development approval supports the policies and guidelines of the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

The director may review other applications for improvements to land, to help the responsible agency determine whether a proposed improvement supports the policies and guidelines of the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

Sec. 24-3.7 Zone change applications.

(a) All zone change applications relating to land in the ‘Ewa development area will be reviewed by the department for consistency with the general plan, the ‘Ewa Development Plan, and any applicable special area plan.

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

(2) A project master plan shall be part of an EA or EIS for any project involving 25 acres or more of land. The director shall review the project master plan for its consistency with the ‘Ewa Development Plan.

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

(4) If a final EIS has already been accepted for a development, including one accepted prior to the effective date of this ordinance, then a subsequent project master plan shall not be required for the development.

(b) Projects which involve a significant zone change shall be required to submit an environmental assessment to the department of planning and permitting prior to an application for a zone change being accepted. Any development or phase of a development which has already been assessed under the National Environmental Policy Act, HRS Chapter 343, ROH Chapter 25, or the provisions of this article, and for which a FONSI has been filed or a required EIS has been accepted, shall not be subject to further EA or EIS requirements under this chapter.

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

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

(e) Zone changes shall be processed in accordance with this section, Section 5.4 of the ‘Ewa Development Plan, and ROH Chapter 21.

Sec. 24-3.8 Annual capital improvement program review.

Annually, the director shall work jointly with the director of the department of budget and fiscal services and the city agencies to review all projects in the city’s capital improvement program and budget for compliance and consistency with the general plan, the ‘Ewa Development Plan and other development plans, any applicable special area plan provisions, and the appropriate functional plans. The director of planning and permitting will prepare a written report of findings to be submitted to the council in accordance with Revised Charter Section 6-903.
Sec. 24-3.9 Five-year review.

(a) The department of planning and permitting shall conduct a comprehensive review of the ‘Ewa Development Plan, adopted by reference in Section 24-3.3(b), every five years subsequent to the plan's adoption and shall report its findings and recommended revisions to the council.

(b) The ‘Ewa Development Plan will be evaluated to assess the appropriateness of the plan's regional vision, policies, guidelines, and implementing actions, as well as its consistency with the general plan.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting the processing of a revision to the ‘Ewa Development Plan in the event either the biennial report of the director of planning and permitting or council recommends consideration of such a revision, pursuant to the Revised Charter of the City and County of Honolulu.

Sec. 24-3.10 Authority.

Nothing in this article shall be construed as an abridgement or delegation of the responsibility of the director, or of the inherent legislative power of the city council, to review or revise the ‘Ewa Development Plan pursuant to the city charter and the above procedures.

Sec. 24-3.11 Severability.

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

Sec. 24-3.12 Conflicting provisions.

Any provision contained in this article shall prevail should there be any conflict with any other provisions under Chapter 24.”

SECTION 4. Effective Date of the ‘Ewa Development Plan. The City Clerk is hereby directed to date the ‘Ewa Development Plan with the effective date of this ordinance.
SECTION 5. This ordinance shall take effect upon its approval.

INTRODUCED BY:

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

DATE OF INTRODUCTION:

________________________

________________________

Honolulu, Hawaii __________ Councilmembers

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

________________________
Deputy Corporation Counsel

APPROVED this _____ day of _____________, 20 _____.

________________________
PETER CARLISLE, Mayor
City and County of Honolulu
EXHIBIT A

‘Ewa Development Plan
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APPENDIX B: PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR KAPOLEI MOVIE STUDIO
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PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR KAPOLEI MOVIE STUDIO

SUMMARY OF PROCESS

Beginning in September 2007, John Whalen of PlanPacific requested, on behalf of an unnamed client, amendments to the ‘Ewa Development Plan and the Land Use Ordinance to support a proposed film studio at Kapolei on a site in the Kapolei Business Park which is zoned I-2 General Industrial District.

A formal request for amendment of the Development Plan was submitted to the Department by Mr. Whalen on November 21, 2007.

In addition, at Mr. Whalen's client's request, Council initiated a proposal for amendment of both the ‘Ewa Development Plan and the Land Use Ordinance which was adopted as Resolution 08-93 on August 20, 2008 and forwarded to the Department on August 20, 2008.

However, as was noted in the Department's October 3, 2008 letter to the Council, Resolution 08-93 was not transmitted to the Department as required when first introduced and consequently, the Department had not had an opportunity to identify the documentation needed to process the amendments which is required to accompany the transmittal of the adopted resolution. (The October 3, 2008 letter identified the documentation that was needed for processing the two requested amendments.)

The request for amendment of the ‘Ewa Development Plan was considered and reflected in the proposed revisions of the ‘Ewa Development Plan circulated by the Department as a Public Review Draft in October 2008.
On November 18, 2008, Mr. Whalen provided comments on the Public Review Draft (PRD) revisions, urging inclusion of language which would allow development of visitor units at the film studio site, questioning the appropriateness of mentioning the zoning variance approach as a method for approving overnight accommodations for film crews, and suggesting that provision of a business hotel in the City of Kapolei would not insure that the film studio's need for affordable accommodations for its film crews would be met.

Mr. Whalen's comments on the PRD have been considered in the final proposed revisions of the ‘Ewa Development Plan as is described below.

**REQUESTED AMENDMENT**

The change requested by Mr. Whalen in his November 21, 2007 transmittal was as follows:

Amend Section 3.7.3.1 (General Policies for Industrial Centers), second paragraph of the subsection titled "Barber Point Industrial Area" as follows, with the proposed addition shown by underscoring:

The future industrial and transportation uses of Barbers Point Naval Air Station (BPNAS) will be determined by the Barbers Point Redevelopment Commission. The northern parts of Kapolei Business Park and any BPNAS lands designated for industrial use should provide for light industrial uses as a transition between heavy industry at Campbell Industrial Park and the City of Kapolei. If a major film studio is developed within this area, it may include accessory uses, such as film production offices, a "back lot" area with commercial uses, visitor attractions, and on-site overnight accommodations for film crews and visitors.
DPP ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE

We are supportive of the attempt to create a film studio in ‘Ewa, viewing it as implementing the vision of creating a network of job centers around the City of Kapolei, and a valuable diversification of the economy.

We also understand the value and efficiency of providing affordable short-term overnight accommodations at the studio for the film crew members. The Director, as noted in the Department's March 17, 2009 response to Mr. Whalen, has determined that boarding facilities for the crew are allowable as an accessory use to a film studio. Language making this point was added to the final proposed revised Plan. Thus, concerns for crew accommodations are unjustified.

In this regard, we cannot agree to attach another principal use like a hotel ("overnight accommodations for visitors") to the film studio, merely so the underlying project uses can make financial sense.

We do agree that there could be a need for a low-cost, non-resort business hotel to provide economical and utilitarian short-term housing for ‘Ewa, but believe that it should logically be located in the City of Kapolei.

Accordingly, we proposed addition of language supporting development of a business hotel in the City of Kapolei. In addition, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands has notified us that they intend to develop a shopping center at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka’i Parkway which will include two hotels with a total of 300 rooms.

FINAL PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE ‘EWA DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Changes include:

- Adds a business hotel as a use that could be permitted in the City of Kapolei. (p. 3-30);
- In the commercial emphasis mixed-use areas, retail development (shopping, restaurants, services, etc.) should be encouraged to locate along the street front, with required parking located behind the building or above the ground floor. Offices may also be located on the ground floor, as well as on upper floors. Housing, when
provided, should be located above the ground floor. A business hotel to provide short term inexpensive accommodations for business travelers and others who are not seeking resort accommodations could also be allowed.

- Adds language supporting development of a major film studio in the Barbers Point Industrial Area and noting that overnight crew accommodations are allowable as an accessory use to a major film studio (p. 3-71);
  - If a major film studio is developed within this area, allow accessory uses, such as film production offices, a "back lot" area with commercial uses, and visitor attractions. Overnight accommodations for film crews are allowable as an accessory use to a major film studio.

(Document references are to the Final Revised Proposed ‘Ewa Development Plan [modified Ramseyer version] which shows updates, corrections, and clarifications with shading and additions and deletions to with underlining for strikeouts.)

**DOCUMENTATION OF THE PROCESS**

1. September 25, 2007. John Whalen to DPP re Proposed Film Studio at Kapolei, O'ahu, Hawai'i (Doc. No. 570085).
2. November 14, 2007. DPP to John Whalen re Proposed Film Studio at Kapolei, O'ahu (Doc. No. 581142).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLAN REVIEW PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>WC-02</td>
<td>Include pet owners in the planning process and use them as resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>All citizens have been invited to participate in the community based planning process and the formal review and adoption process at the Planning Commission and City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.020 | WC-37 | Please extend the deadline for comments from January 30, 2009 to July 31, 2009 | OK | After consultation with Council Chair Apo, the Director agreed to extend the deadline for comments on the Public Review Draft 'Ewa Development Plan and preliminary Plan Review findings until March 15, 2009.  
(This was the second deadline extension.  At the request of Council Chair Apo, the deadline for comments had previously been extended from November 15, 2008 to January 31, 2009.)  
All comments received after the deadline have been addressed in revising the Plan and preparing the Review Report. |
| 1.030 | WC-40 | Defer the revision of the 'Ewa DP until a transportation functional plan is prepared by the Department of Transportation Services and adequate level of service (concurrency) guidelines for regional transportation are developed, applied, and the results incorporated as part of the revised Plan | ✓ | The transportation functional plan for O‘ahu is the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan (ORTP) which is regularly updated and approved through the O‘ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization.  
The most recent revision, ORTP 2035, was adopted in April 2011.  It was prepared with the participation of the City Department of Transportation Services and the State Department of Transportation.  It identifies projects needed to meet the projected growth on O‘ahu through 2035.  Elements of the ORTP 2035 are included for informational purposes in the ‘Ewa DP Section 4.1.  
**Level of service guidelines** are already in place.  The ORTP 2035 provides level of service evaluations for the entire O‘ahu transportation system.  Specifically, implementation of the broad range of ORTP 2035 transportation projects is expected to stabilize the geographic pattern of peak period travel times, and result in the diversion of significant traffic to transit and other non-automotive travel.  Level of service guidelines for specific modes are used by the City Department of Transportation Services and Department of Planning and Permitting and by the State Department of Transportation in evaluating the plans for individual transportation projects, and in evaluating transportation needs and placing requirements on land development projects. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.040 | WC-57| "...the ('Ewa Development Plan) is ten years late and over due for public review and assessment, missing the first and second five year review cycles. … the 'Ewa Development Plan … should have been reviewed and assessed on a more timely basis." | √    | We apologize for the length of time it has taken to complete the formal review and revision of the 'Ewa Development Plan which began in 2003.  
However, throughout this lengthy process, there has been broad support for the view that the adopted Plan vision, policies and guidelines are basically sound, and do not need significant changes, but that implementation of the policies and guidelines needs to be improved, particularly with regard to transportation infrastructure, connectivity, and place making.  
There have been significant efforts since 2004 to address those deficiencies in implementation. |
| 1.050 | WC-57| "Since 1997, I think the city intentionally 'foot dragged' by postponing and delaying the first ever ('Ewa Development Plan) public draft." | √    | During 2003, research and interviews with community members were conducted, and materials for an Orientation Workshop were prepared.  
In 2004, an Orientation Workshop was held in January followed by a series of Smart Growth Workshops in May.  
However, beginning in 2002, development activity had begun sharply increasing, and had more than doubled from 2002 levels by 2006, requiring ever more staff time to process applications, review permits for compliance with zoning conditions, and administer affordable housing agreements.  
Finally, it was decided that staff assignments had to be juggled to allow key staff to focus just on completing the Review and preparing the Public Review Draft Plan.  
The delay in completing this update was due to insufficient departmental resources and was not caused by a desire to postpone the release of either the Review findings or the suggested revisions to the adopted Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>“… (Bob Stanfield) may have had a hand in colluding with the city to add all those proposed and on-going projects into the draft (<a href="#">Ewa Development Plan</a>) without public review, to simply, accommodate the developers and interest groups in the ‘Ewa region.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>All the projects listed in the October 2008 Public Review Draft are projects approved when Council adopted the ‘<a href="#">Ewa DP</a> in 1997. The Urban Growth Boundary approved in the 1997 <a href="#">Plan</a> is the same Boundary proposed in the 2008 Public Review Draft. The projects listed in Table 2.1 and shown on Exhibit 2.3 in the Public Review Draft are the same projects found in Table 2.2 and shown on Exhibit 2.2 of the 1997 <a href="#">Plan</a>. The draft of the 1997 <a href="#">Plan</a> received full public review, was the subject of extensive public hearings, and was adopted after lengthy testimony and consideration by the Council. The community has been consulted through interviews, workshops, and meetings since 2003, resulting in numerous changes to the proposed revised <a href="#">Plan</a>. Developers and interest groups have participated in the process, as is their right, but they have not received special treatment. There will be additional opportunities to express your views about the proposed revised <a href="#">Plan</a> and influence what changes Council approves as the Planning Commission and the Council review the Department’s proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>“… is the city willing to partner with the players (in) the region in reviewing and assessing the draft EDP?”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The process for the City’s ‘Ewa DP Review has been and will continue to be open for all members of the community to raise questions and concerns and make suggestions on how to improve the <a href="#">Plan</a>. All members of the public are continually invited to contact us by phone, fax, mail or e-mail. We have offered to meet anywhere with members of the community during working hours, and have maintained a Web site since 2003 providing information on the Review process, and documentation of the community workshops. DPP will offer presentations to both of the ‘Ewa Neighborhood Boards and hold a Public Information Meeting in ‘Ewa to present the final proposed revised <a href="#">Plan</a> and the Review Report before the Planning Commission holds its hearings on the proposed revised <a href="#">Plan</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**  
√ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report  
‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.080 | WC-57| “...is the city willing to be involved in present, on-going, and continuous future planning?” | ✓ | The Department is involved in continuous future planning. We regularly update our projections of socio-economic conditions and survey major developers to determine the status of their projects. We provide those projections and status reports in our Annual Report on Status of Land Use on O‘ahu, and supply them to City and State infrastructure agencies for use in their infrastructure planning.
We regularly review development applications, using the adopted ‘Ewa Development Plan as the guide for what conditions the development should be required to meet. We enforce those conditions by requiring them to be met before approval for subdivision, construction permits, and building permits is given. We are more than willing to meet with community members to discuss their concerns and to explore how the Plan might be made better or implementation improved.
Our primary finding from the Review we have been conducting since 2003 is that the basic vision and policies of the ‘Ewa DP are valid, but we need to improve implementation, particularly with regard to infrastructure, connectivity, and place-making. |
| 1.090 | WC-41| “...the (‘Ewa DP) is a working document that needs to accept the sentiments of those currently residing within the area that would be affected by a neighboring development. Some of these sentiments are a frustration with the lack of accommodations for our schools, congested highways, and the loss of agricultural lands. We welcome the growth and job creation, so long as it is sustained.” | ✓ | The vast majority of testimony received when the ‘Ewa DP was adopted in 1997 was supportive of the vision of the Plan which includes:
- Support for DOE's efforts to provide adequate school capacity,
- The creation of a network of east-west and mauka-makai roadway connections in ‘Ewa so that less traffic has to travel on Fort Weaver Road,
- Improvements to increase Fort Weaver Road’s capacity, and
- The protection of 3,000 acres of agricultural land outside the Urban Boundary.
Evaluative comments received during community outreach workshops in 2004 supported the conclusion that the vision for ‘Ewa was still valid but that implementation of that vision should be improved. Specific recommendations on how implementation can be improved are included in the Review Report. |
"With the numerous housing developments planned for the Central and 'Ewa Plain areas, the State of Hawaii and the City and County of Honolulu should take into account the following concerns before further development proceeds:

1) Preservation of prime agricultural land;
2) Relief of traffic and transportation congestion;
3) Planning and execution in creation of employment opportunities; and
4) Construction of adequate infrastructure including water, sewage, and schools in and around the affected developments."

The adopted 'Ewa Development Plan and the adopted Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan address each of the issues.

1) The two Plans and the adopted North Shore Sustainable Communities Plan protect a combined total of 53,000 acres of agricultural land, including the Galbraith lands above Wahiawa.

2) The two Plans call for job development in the Second City, completion of the rapid transit elevated guideway, and improvement of the Express Bus/HOV service on the zipper lane as alternatives to single occupant auto commuting to downtown Honolulu, and for use of traffic demand management to reduce congestion and peak hour driving.

3) The Plans support job creation. Job creation in 'Ewa has outpaced population growth in 'Ewa while job creation in Central O'ahu has matched population growth in Central O'ahu since 1980. Enterprise zones cover much of 'Ewa and Central O'ahu, providing incentives to businesses which create new job centers.

4) The Plans support State efforts to provide adequate school capacity. Obtaining funding from the State Legislature to provide the new permanent classrooms that DOE needs to avoid having to use multi-tracking, mobile classrooms, and busing has been challenging. Building permits are not issued by the City without adequate water and sewer capacity.

The lands north of the H-1 freeway and on the Waianae (west) side of Kunia Road almost to Schofield have been purchased by agricultural companies for agricultural use. However, this land is divided between the 'Ewa Development Plan and the Central O'ahu (Sustainable Communities) Plan. We would like ... all this agricultural area (to be) in the same planning district. ... This would allow the contiguous agricultural community to focus its efforts and inputs to (one) development plan rather than fragment it between the two areas."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>WC-45;</td>
<td>Change &quot;should&quot; to &quot;shall&quot; in order to strengthen policies.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The language legally required to be used in plans for policy statements is &quot;should&quot; because the Development Plan and Sustainable Communities Plan policies are guidelines; they are not regulations like the Land Use Ordinance which do use the verb &quot;shall.&quot; The &quot;should&quot; gets translated into &quot;shall&quot; when the Council adopts zone changes and amends land use regulations in order to implement the Plan, and when the City Departments amend their rules and best practices standards to implement the Plan. The Charter requires that the Council and the City Departments must be consistent with the DPs and SCPs when they take such actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>WC-48;</td>
<td>&quot;The word 'should' has been deleted from the current draft Plan and in its stead, mandatory language has once again been inserted. We believe the original language is more appropriate.&quot; See examples in Sec. 3.8.2 Guidelines on p. 3-49 of the PRD. 54: &quot;(We) would like to see the language remain as guidelines as originally intended with the &quot;Ewa Development Plan.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The introduction to the guideline sections throughout the proposed revised Plan makes the following statement: &quot;The following guidelines suggest how the general policies for (the topic area) should be implemented&quot; (underlining added). Each policy and guideline was revised to make an active verb statement of what is the desired outcome that should be achieved and the best practice or action that should be followed, if feasible. The introduction to each set of guidelines makes clear that these guidelines are to be used as a starting place in designing and reviewing what is to be done, not rigid requirements that must be followed in the way that the LUO or Subdivision Rules and Regulations must. To clarify this point, additional language has been added both in the preface and in the introduction to each set of policies to emphasize that the vision, policies, and guidelines are not regulations but instead, provide guidance that decision makers and administrators should follow in approving project development, and in revising rules and regulations and standard practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.040</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>Change all references to Ocean Pointe to Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei or Hoakalei as appropriate</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text and maps have been revised to reflect the appropriate name changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report Department of Planning and Permitting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>HR263</td>
<td>The O'ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Department of Planning and Permitting should &quot;develop a planning template for ensuring sufficient regional highway, both state and county, improvements to serve emerging residential developments in the 'Ewa Development Plan area and the existing and new residential communities in the Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan area&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The template already exists. It has three parts: 1) Land Use (growth) policies included in the adopted O'ahu General Plan (GP), the adopted 'Ewa DP, and the adopted Wai'anae Sustainable Communities Plan; 2) Complimentary transportation policies included in those three plans; and 3) the O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan's identification of implementing transportation projects eligible for federal funding and provision of phasing for the projects over a 25 year period. The O'ahu GP establishes the basic growth management policy for the island and identifies key transportation policies needed to carry out that policy. The 'Ewa and Wai'anae plans implement GP policies which call for 'Ewa to accommodate significant growth in a new city and in master planned communities, and for Wai'anae to accommodate only limited growth to retain its country/rural feel. To implement this template, a fourth element could be considered which would encourage funding of the identified transportation improvement projects on a timely basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, CH. 1: ‘EWA’S ROLE &amp; CH. 2: THE VISION FOR ‘EWA’S DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Exec Sum) Add Central O‘ahu to the list of eight development plans and sustainable communities plans.</td>
<td>OK ES-6</td>
<td>The text was corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Exec Sum) &quot;The following bullet should be added to 'Ewa's Role in O'ahu's Development Pattern: 'Provides major Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHIL) communities and developments' &quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This section summarizes what the General Plan says 'Ewa's role in O'ahu's development is supposed to be so the suggested amendment is not appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Exec Sum) Revise UH West O‘ahu staffing estimates and date achieved</td>
<td>OK ES-8</td>
<td>The text in the Executive Summary and other sections of the proposed revised Plan was updated to reflect the staffing expected by 2025.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.040</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Exec Sum) &quot;The following bullet should be added to The Vision to 2030: 'Completion of DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2 projects' &quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This section is intended to give the reader quantitative measures describing projected growth in population, housing, jobs, and visitor units for 'Ewa through 2035. The intent is not to list individual projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Exec Sum) &quot;Change 'Naval Magazine' to 'Naval Munitions Command, Pearl Harbor' &quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text was corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Ch. 1) Amend the 1st bullet on p. 1-2 as follows: &quot;Provides for a variety of housing types from affordable units and starter homes to mid-size and larger multi-family and single-family units as well as new DHHL communities.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This bullet is one of a series of bullets summarizing what the General Plan says 'Ewa's role in O'ahu's development is supposed to be. The General Plan does support all efforts to provide affordable quality housing for O'ahu residents, but provides no policies specifically regarding DHHL developments so the suggested amendment is not appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Ch. 1) Add 'Central O'ahu' to the 4th bullet on p. 1-2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Central O'ahu does include agricultural areas and noteworthy plantation villages. However, it is not included in the list of rural and urban fringe areas which are to be protected from urban development because Central O'ahu, along with 'Ewa and the Primary Urban Center, is an area where the General Plan says development is supposed to occur to &quot;Keep the Country country&quot; and relieve development pressures elsewhere on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>WC-18</td>
<td>(Ch. 1 'Ewa's Role in the GP) &quot;Population being brought in from elsewhere ... does not serve the public ...&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Between 2005 and 2035, O'ahu's population is expected to increase by over 211,000 people which is more people than currently live on the Windward Side and in East Honolulu. 'Ewa has been identified in the O'ahu General Plan since the 1970s as the site of O'ahu's Second City and the location for development of low-rise, medium density master planned residential communities. 'Ewa was chosen to play this role to help &quot;Keep the Country country.&quot; By accommodating O'ahu's new housing and jobs in 'Ewa, Central O'ahu, and urban Honolulu, development is diverted from rural areas like Wai'anae, the North Shore, and Waimānalo and established suburban communities on the Windward side and in East Honolulu. The new developments in 'Ewa significantly address the demand for housing for the next generations of new families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report

Department of Planning and Permitting

Ewa Development Plan Review Report C-8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.090</td>
<td>WC-36</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1) &quot;I have witnessed the progress and growth of our community of ‘Ewa Beach which I have been a resident for the past twenty-five years. Although there are positive benefits for this growth, the responsibility of ensuring our residents are the ones that benefit not only the developers is a main concern...I am interested in the quality of living, the future job opportunities, and the future plans that are being considered for our community...&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>We look forward to receiving specific comments on how the proposed revised Plan’s vision, policies and guidelines could be improved to better insure quality of life, creation of job opportunities, and development of new communities that benefit all ‘Ewa residents. In addition, we welcome the public’s input on project proposals to assure that community needs and benefits are part of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>WC-18; WC-23; WC-26; WC-28; WC-29; WC-30; WC-45; WC-49; WC-52</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space) 18: &quot;What's left of O'ahu's land should be used to provide its existing citizenry so that it will be less dependent on fossil fuel to import food and goods. What's left of this land could be used to produce food, renewable products, and ... solar and wind energy.&quot; 23: &quot;We must preserve (limited natural resources, open space, and farmland), otherwise we will lose the quality of life that we still enjoy. ... the farmland between Kapolei and Waipahu should remain (in) agriculture.&quot; 26: &quot;We, in Kapolei, do not want to see more housing construction in the ‘Ewa area. Please help us keep the (Ho'opili land) agricultural.&quot; 28: &quot;We need land to grow local fruits and vegetables.&quot; 30: &quot;Do we really want to rely on planes and boats to bring us our food? We have wonderful ag land here, let's use it.&quot; 35: &quot;Leave the ag land ag. We are going to need these lands for food and fuel.&quot; 45: &quot;... preserve our most productive, prime agricultural land.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Studies done for the Department indicate that, at this time, there is sufficient land on O’ahu planned for agriculture, and for solar and wind energy capture islandwide. Three thousand acres of farmland is protected by the adopted ‘Ewa Development Plan, ten thousand acres by the adopted Central O’ahu Sustainable Communities Plan, and forty thousand acres by the adopted North Shore Sustainable Communities Plan. Significant additional agricultural lands are also protected the adopted Plans for the Wai’anae, Ko’olau Loa, and Ko’olau Poko areas. The Hawai’i Community Development Authority’s Kalaeloa Master Plan sets aside 240 acres for solar or hybrid energy generation in ‘Ewa, a use which would be consistent with the economic development policies of the ‘Ewa PRD. A recent study, done as part of the O’ahu General Plan Update, identifies thousands of acres of fallow or underutilized protected agricultural lands on O’ahu available for those who would like to farm, and finds that, if we had to replace all the foods we currently import which have been previously been successfully raised in Hawai’i, that there is more than enough protected agricultural land on O’ahu to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>HB1693</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space) The city and county of Honolulu's development plan for the 'Ewa planning area (should) provide for the protection of open space and important agricultural lands</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan vision, policies, and guidelines do provide for protection of open space and important agricultural lands. An Urban Growth Boundary protects preservation lands and 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land from development. An Open Space Network protects key open space areas within the Boundary from development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space) Amend the 2nd paragraph on p. 2-2 as follows: …Explosive Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD) arc …</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Agricultural Lands and Open Space) Developers are being required to develop drainageways and retention basins that are greenways because of federal standards, yet the City does not want to accept responsibility for the maintenance of these drainage facilities. We believe it should not be the responsibility of developers or homeowners to maintain these drainageways.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Your comments are addressed in the Review Report evaluation of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Develop the Secondary Urban Center) &quot;After his first term in office, the mayor had shown no interest (in) … further advancing the Plan in the 'Ewa region.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>It is not true that City administrations have shown no interest in advancing the vision for 'Ewa as approved in 1997. Major department headquarters have been moved to the City of Kapolei; since 2005 Cabinet meetings have been held at Kapolei Hale once a month; and the City has participated in major public-private partnerships and made major infrastructure investments to improve conditions for 'Ewa residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Develop the Secondary Urban Center) &quot;... some of us living in the region have lost sight of (the vision for a second city), and ... cannot continue to remain positive and hopeful that the planned goals of building a second city will ever come to fruition ...&quot;</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A key finding from our Review is that there has been significant progress made since 1997 towards creating O‘ahu’s Second City and an alternative job center so that 'Ewa residents have an alternative to commuting to downtown Honolulu. See the Vision Scorecard in the Review Report for quantitative and qualitative assessments of success in creating jobs in ‘Ewa and in developing the critical urban mass at the City of Kapolei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>WC-38; WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Develop the Secondary Urban Center) 38: &quot;(Definition of the Secondary Urban Center should not include) projects and areas located within the 'Ewa DP urban fringe ... While we feel many projects within the 'Ewa DP area contribute greatly to the economic vitality and growth of the region, the highest priority for the provision of public services, resources and infrastructure should be focused within the (Secondary Urban Center) as set forth in the O'ahu General Plan.&quot; 48: &quot;Some of the employment opportunities listed appear to be outside of the SUC ... including Ko Olina, the marina resort/mixed use area of Ocean Pointe, and the (UHWO).&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The two projects mentioned, the UH West O'ahu College and the Hoakalei Resort, are important regional job centers that will attract students and visitors from outside 'Ewa and contribute to the critical mass of jobs needed to create a Second City in 'Ewa which is what the Secondary Urban Center is supposed to do. Support for development of the Hoakalei Resort is specifically mentioned in the General Plan as one of six policies supporting the objective of developing the Secondary Urban Center. The inclusion of these two 'Ewa Urban Fringe area projects as part of the vision to create a wide range of job centers centered around the City of Kapolei does not indicate any lessening of support for the provision of public services, resources or infrastructure in the core Secondary Urban Center area. Ko Olina is in the Secondary Urban Center along with Campbell Industrial Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Develop the Secondary Urban Center) Add Honouliuli to the industrial areas contributing jobs as part of the development of the Secondary Urban Center</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Honouliuli is identified in the proposed revised Plan as an industrial mixed use area, but it is located in the 'Ewa Urban Fringe rather than the Secondary Urban Center, and is expected to provide jobs primarily serving customers in the surrounding Urban Fringe communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>WC-02</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use) Incorporate pet-friendly policies and land use planning...People and their pets should be integrated throughout our community. Follow-up letter provides a list of specific pet-friendly policies</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan calls for provision of pedestrian walkways, an Open Space Network, and preservation of agricultural lands and other open space areas which may make 'Ewa more pet friendly. Specific pet-friendly policies would be implemented by changing operational policies and rules of public and private agencies. The Development Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans provide policies to guide regional land use and infrastructure development. They are not the appropriate vehicle for more detailed policies regarding pets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>WC-18;</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking,</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted <strong>Plan</strong> calls for adequate infrastructure as a fundamental need to be taken care of. Fulfilling that vision is a major challenge that needs to continue to be addressed. Current congestion is a result of a recent surge in development of the Second City and Urban Fringe areas in 'Ewa. As a result, as is recognized in the adopted <strong>Plan</strong>, there is an urgent need to build additional mauka-makai and east-west connecting roadways as well as provide a rapid transit system. A significant number of ‘Ewa roadway projects will be completed in the next two or three years, and ground has been broken for the elevated rapid transit system with completion from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center expected by 2019. (See the listing in the Review Report Transportation Issues discussion.) The DOE is seeking funding to open 5 more schools by 2016. New housing comes with more park space, provision of missing links in the ‘Ewa roadway network; and bikeways and walkways that support healthy active lifestyles by encouraging walking and biking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC-49;</td>
<td>WC-52;</td>
<td>WC-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking,</td>
<td>OK 2-4</td>
<td>The list of master planned communities has been revised to include mention of all three of the projects within East Kapolei (DHHL East Kapolei, UH West O‘ahu, and Ho‘opili).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use) 39: Add UH West O‘ahu to the list of master planned communities and, if necessary, adjust the estimate of residential growth. 59: Add DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2 to the list of master planned communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use) Delete all references to Gentry Ewa Makai since &quot;it is part of the master planned community of Ewa by Gentry and not a separate development.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-4</td>
<td>All references to Gentry Ewa Makai have been replaced by Ewa by Gentry or Ewa by Gentry (Makai), as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.220</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Build Master Planned Communities That Support Walking, Biking, and Transit Use) How are the community centers called for in Sec. 2.1 defined?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The specifics are provided in the first bullet under Sec. 3.10.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**  √ No change needed in Plan; **OK** Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; **R** Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use) &quot;in 2005, ... mass transit ... became a top priority on (the Mayor's) political agenda...&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan supports provision of rapid transit running on an elevated guideway running from East Kapolei to the Ala Moana Shopping Center as the most effective way of providing capacity for 'Ewa residents who have to commute to downtown Honolulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>WC-23; WC-30; WC-45; WC-49</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use) 23: &quot;Even with rail transit, the (development) ... of the (farmland) ... between Kapolei and Waipahu will further congest our highways.&quot; 30: &quot;I can't even imagine the traffic mess that people from the North Shore, Leeward and 'Ewa areas would have to sit in if (Ho'opili) is developed.&quot; 45: ...the only means left to lessen further major degradation of freeway traffic is to prevent Ho'opili from winning entitlements.&quot; 49: &quot;...the proposed Ho'opili housing project, or any other plan for more homes of any type on that land, is a terrible plan.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ft. Weaver and the H-1 are likely to continue to be congested during peak hours in the future, but implementation of the proposed revised Plan will provide alternatives to being stuck on Ft. Weaver or the H-1. The proposed revised Plan calls for increased east-west and mauka-makai roadway connections in 'Ewa to reduce congestion within 'Ewa; creation of new jobs in 'Ewa, and provision of rapid transit and improved bus and high-occupancy vehicle service as alternatives to low-occupancy auto commuting to Honolulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>WC-49</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use) &quot;There are no guarantees that lots of high rises will not be built on that Ho'opili land along the proposed rail route, just like those two high apartment towers by Sams in Pearl City.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan provides guidelines for the Ho'opili project, and other projects seeking changes to zoning. The Plan sets a limit of 90 feet for Medium Density Apartment areas which are encouraged within a 1/4 mile radius around the transit stations. Across Kualakai Parkway from the Ho'opili project, the City Council has already approved BMX-3 zoning with a 90-foot height limit for the University Village area around the future UH West O'ahu Campus. In contrast, the two towers by Sam's Club are over 400 feet tall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.260</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use) &quot;communities ... designed with multiple street/walkway connections to adjacent communities and collector roads at approximately 1/4 mile intervals (will facilitate and encourage) convenient auto access to parks, etc. ... (and will not reduce automobile use.)&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Increasing connectivity has been shown to reduce automobile use by providing much shorter and more direct routes which promote walking and biking to nearby sites like parks, schools, and shopping centers in place of driving. The lack of connectivity in past suburban projects in 'Ewa often makes the auto the only choice available for many trips.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
Department of Planning and Permitting
'Ewa Development Plan Review Report C-13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.270</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Communities Designed to Reduce Automobile Use) “… in the (<em>Ewa Development Plan</em>), mass transit is not mentioned at all, and void of any provision. At the initial meeting on the Plan, nearly fifteen years ago, rail was never on the agenda, never an agenda item at subsequent meetings, not even a subject of interest at public community meetings.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The 1997 <em>Ewa DP</em> does include discussion of rapid transit in Sec. 2.1 and Sec. 2.2.7 where it calls for a rapid transit corridor to be reserved between the City of Kapolei and Waipahu, and encourages higher density residential and commercial development around future transit station sites along the corridor to support buses and other forms of mass transit along the corridor. Additional details on the Planned Rapid Transit Corridor and policies for reservation of the Rapid Transit Corridor and promoting land uses that would anticipate future rapid transit provision are provided in Sec. 4.1 of the 1997 <em>Ewa DP</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>HB1693; WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources) The city and county of Honolulu's development plan for the *Ewa planning area (should) provide for protection of the pueo (Hawaiian owl) and ensure the preservation of the existing population.” 50: &quot;We must … preserve the flora and fauna that is endemic to the area; for example, the Hawaiian Pueo. Cementing the area will definitely drive these birds to extinction. Acreage must be set aside for them.”</td>
<td>OK 3-26</td>
<td>The adopted Plan vision, policies and guidelines do call for protection of &quot;valuable plant and wildlife habitats&quot; and protects lands either outside the Urban Growth Boundary or identified as part of the Open Space Network within that Boundary from development. (See Table 2.2 and Exhibit 3.2) Protection is provided not just for the pueo but for all endangered plants and animals in <em>Ewa</em>. Applicants for new development projects are required to hire professionals to do an assessment of impacts on endangered species and provide mitigation if endangered plants or animals will be impacted. When asked, State DLNR staff did not identify any specific areas in <em>Ewa</em> as important to preservation of the pueo, but emphasized the need for careful surveys of any grassy areas near forested areas to determine if the pueo is present. The proposed revised Plan strengthens the protections in the adopted Plan, and calls for appropriate mitigations to be required if pueo or other endangered species habitat is identified in a proposed project area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  √  No change needed in Plan;  OK  Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version;  R  Implementation issue, see Review Report
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'Ewa Development Plan Review Report

C-14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.290</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources) &quot;While OHA understands that the General Plan identifies ‘Ewa as the Secondary Urban Center for O’ahu, we believe that the volume of development planned for this area has the potential to have dramatic, negative impacts on the natural and cultural resources of the area. New housing, job centers, and supportive uses can be developed while protecting significant natural and cultural resources. The existing Plan and the proposed revised Plan include specific policies and guidelines to accomplish this. Starting in the late 70’s, the City decided that we should keep the Country country and steer the bulk of future growth to the existing urban areas around downtown Honolulu, a new second city in ‘Ewa, and urban fringe areas in ‘Ewa and Central O’ahu. Based on that decision, millions of dollars in public and private infrastructure investments have been made over the last 30 years to provide the support for the planned development. It is unlikely that shifting planned growth in ‘Ewa to another location on O’ahu will create less of an impact on resources in that location, particularly given the studies and investments that have been made in ‘Ewa to absorb the impact of planned growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources) The ‘Ewa shoreline, secluded in areas and rich in resources, is a little-known, tightly-kept secret. This shoreline is of particular significance to our beneficiaries, who have conducted their traditional and customary practices along these beaches for generations. The crush of new development has significantly impacted ‘Ewa’s marine resources and the Native Hawaiian cultural practices that are dependent upon those resources. Limu gathering and fishing are specific practices that have been affected by increased development, run-off and drainage issues. The adopted Plan calls for shoreline access in ‘Ewa for all O’ahu residents to be maintained and expanded where it was previously restricted. Recent development, including the transfer of the Kalaeloa area from U.S. Navy control, has increased the number of O’ahu residents visiting the ‘Ewa shoreline. We agree that with increased access, it is important to ensure protection of valuable coastal resources from overharvesting. The existing ‘Ewa Development Plan policies call for preservation, conservation, and enhancement of natural resources, and for retention of storm waters on site or in appropriate detention basins and wetland areas to control and reduce the impact of runoff on coastal waters. The State has the responsibility for protection of coastal waters, and the legal ability to restrict access to protect endangered natural and cultural resources. The City is cooperating with the State to help protect coastal waters. Because most ‘Ewa streams are very intermittent and rarely send substantial flows to coastal waters, run-off and drainage from ‘Ewa areas have not had a major impact on ‘Ewa coastal resources .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  ✓ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramsey version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>WC-44</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Protect Natural, Historic, and Cultural Resources) &quot;… not all architectural resources in (‘Ewa) have been thoroughly identified or assessed under special criteria considerations for potential significance … (including) World War II era temporary structures such as Quonset huts and other military resources associated with former Marine Corps Air Station ‘Ewa Field and former Naval Air Station Barbers Point. … Other resources of concern include the ‘Ewa Villages historic district (which includes Varona Village), the setting of the … OR&amp;L right-of-way, as well as the Honouliuli internment camp site. … Rural landscapes, view sheds, plantation history, and Traditional Cultural Properties should also variously be documented, prioritized, or identified.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.320 | HB1693 | (Sec. 2.1 Provide Adequate Infrastructure to Meet the Needs of New and Existing Development) The city and county of Honolulu’s development plan for the ‘Ewa planning area (should) address the capacity of the ‘Ewa region to support projected increases in resident population, including the infrastructural capacity of:  
  A) Freeways, highways, and roads to service level B at a minimum;  
  B) Connectivity to urban Honolulu; and  
  C) Water and sewer | √ | The existing Plan calls for provision of adequate capacity to meet existing and planned development, improved connectivity within ‘Ewa, and alternatives to single occupant auto use commuting. It also provides information about planned projects and public facilities that will provide that capacity. The details for how these policies are to be accomplished are provided by functional plans like the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan and the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan.  
A level B standard for State highways during peak periods would be an extremely expensive and unsustainable standard. Maximum capacity at posted speed limits is typically reached at Level D, and Level E is generally recognized to represent the threshold of unacceptable operating service.  
There is adequate water and wastewater capacity for existing development, and plans for how capacity will be added in the future as needed. Availability of water and wastewater services is determined at time of subdivision and/or building permit approval for new development. Approval to proceed is not given unless adequate service is available. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>WC-33; WC-45</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Provide Adequate Infrastructure to Meet the Needs of New and Existing Development) 33: Changes should be made to policies re “traffic from the Westside of the island to the Eastside”. 45: The freeway traffic jam has backed up three miles and the provisions in the Plan will make it far, far worse.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan does provide policies to address freeway congestion by calling for development of alternatives to single occupant auto commuting to Honolulu, including the elevated rapid transit system planned to be operational by 2019, and the improvement of service for Express Buses and HOV on the zipper lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.340</td>
<td>WC-33; WC-49</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Provide Adequate Infrastructure to Meet the Needs of New and Existing Development) 33: &quot;Changes should be made to policies re &quot;the safety of the people if disaster were to ever occur.&quot; 49: &quot;...none of our government officials seem to care about all of the people on this side of O'ahu when a serious hurricane inevitably hits this area, no additional hurricane shelters are being added, despite the non-stop home construction.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-37</td>
<td>Language has been added to the proposed revised Plan discussing the short fall in emergency shelters and providing three new policies to address the problem. The issue is also discussed in the Review Report Vol. 1 Sec. 2.3.7.2 Hurricane Shelter Shortage. However, the existing <em>Ewa Development Plan</em> does already provide policies which help protect against damage from flooding, coastal erosion and tsunamis, and other natural and man-made hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.350</td>
<td>WC-24; WC-28; WC-29; WC-30; WC-45; WC-49; WC-52; WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) 24: &quot;The <em>Ewa Development Plan</em> should be amended to move (the) urban growth boundary to EXCLUDE all currently farmed land between Kapolei and Waipahu. &quot;Ho'opili&quot; should remain Agricultural Land!&quot; (The same statement or similar statements were received from the other commenters listed.)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>We cannot support the proposed boundary change. Beginning in 1977, the Ho'opili area was identified in the O'ahu General Plan (GP) as part of the strategy to develop a Second City in 'Ewa surrounded by an urban fringe of low and moderate density master planned residential communities. Subsequent GP revisions in 1992 and 2002 also included Ho'opili as part of the 'Ewa urban-fringe. Consistent with the GP, Council adopted the 1997 <em>Ewa Development Plan</em> (DP) which approves development of the Ho'opili area in three phases (1997, 2006, and 2016) and reserves a rapid transit corridor to serve East Kapolei at some point in the future. Substantial public and private investment to implement the GP and 'Ewa DP has been made. In addition, development of Ho'opili will provide a critical link in a significant East-West connector road, providing an alternative to Farrington Highway, and Roosevelt Avenue/Geiger Road. Although the Ho'opili lands are currently being farmed, there are adequate agricultural lands elsewhere on O'ahu to support diversified agriculture. The existing <em>Ewa DP</em> protects 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land in 'Ewa from urbanization, and the adopted plans for Central O'ahu and the North Shore protect an additional 50,000 acres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Department of Planning and Permitting

`Ewa Development Plan Review Report`
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.360</td>
<td>WC-38; WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) 38: &quot;...Table 2.1 does not seem to describe a phasing of development...&quot; 48: &quot;It is unclear what (Table 2.1) is supposed to represent. ... remaining number of housing units and acreages to be potentially developed as of a certain date? Status of zoning and SLUC approvals? The total number of housing units and acreages broken down by development? ... the table need not be broken down by the pre- and post-1997 dates.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-11</td>
<td>The Table 2.1 title has been changed to clarify its purpose, and the division into pre- and post-1997 has been eliminated. As indicated in the text, the purpose of Table 2.1 is to show the most current estimate of development capacity existing within the Community Growth Boundary in 'Ewa and the entitlements that have been approved for that capacity. Table 2.1 does provide information that suggests the phasing that will occur due to the need to first obtain entitlements and then build backbone infrastructure before residential, commercial, or industrial development can proceed. It is not intended to report on total units or acres already developed in past years. That information is reported in the Department's Annual Report on the Status of Land Use on O'ahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) Update text and Table 2.1 to reflect the zoning approvals for UH WOC, estimated residential units, and acreages</td>
<td>OK 2-10, 11</td>
<td>The text and Table 2.1 has been updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) Table 2.1 should be updated to reflect changes in status and the most current estimates of capacity.</td>
<td>OK 2-11</td>
<td>Table 2.1 has been updated to reflect suggestions made and estimates of residential capacity for other projects as of July 2009 collected in our annual survey of developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) Table 2.1 should be revised to reflect different estimates of Ocean Pointe/Hoakalai capacity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Table 2.1 shows remaining development capacity in residential units, and undeveloped acres; not build-out totals. It reflects the latest information collected in DPP's annual survey of developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) &quot;Approximately 2,650 new housing units are planned for DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2 projects ...&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-11</td>
<td>Table 2.1 has been updated to reflect the latest estimates of residential capacity for DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.1 Community Growth Boundary) &quot;While we concur with the paragraph (on p. 2-10 which notes that the timing and conditions of development for 1,600 acres under the control of DHHL and HCDA are not subject to review and approval by the City) the ’Ewa DP should acknowledge that there are master plans for the 1,600 acres (controlled by DHHL and HCDA) ...&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-10</td>
<td>Text has been added to the paragraph to indicate that both DHHL and HCDA have prepared master plans for their projects which have been approved by the Governor. The proposed revised Plan does acknowledge the Kalaeloa Master Plan in Sec. 3.13, and calls for the Kalaeloa Master Plan to be submitted to the City Council for acceptance as the City's Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa as a means for insuring coordination between HCDA's planning and development and City support actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Department of Planning and Permitting

'Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.420</td>
<td>WC-42</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.2 Retention of Agricultural Lands) ... the 'Ewa Development Plan ... does not appear to consider any of the agricultural sector needs other than identifying where those lands are to be located. The document appears to focus on residential, industrial, and commercial user needs.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The 'Ewa DP does include vision and policy guidance regarding agricultural land use and needed infrastructure support (See Sec. 2.2.2, Sec. 3.1.3.4, and Sec. 4.2.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.430</td>
<td>WC-42</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.2 Retention of Agricultural Lands) Update the Plan to reflect the recent sale of lands along Kunia Road above H-1 to &quot;companies committed to maintaining this land in agriculture.&quot; Also, revise the description of the Navy controlled agricultural lands to note that the limits on uses due to both military restrictions and the brackish water supply.</td>
<td>OK 2-13</td>
<td>The text has been updated to reflect these comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.440</td>
<td>WC-42</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.2 Retention of Agricultural Lands) Change all references to Hawaii Sugar Planters' Association to Hawai'i Agricultural Research Center.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>All references to HSPA were changed to HARC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.3 Open Space and Greenways) &quot;Is the Iroquois Point Park still military?&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-14</td>
<td>Table 2.2 has been revised to clarify that Iroquois Point Beach Park is the shoreline park which is still owned by the military and leased to Ford Island Properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.460</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.3 Open Space and Greenways) New 'Ewa Beach Golf Club should be changed to 'Ewa Beach Golf Club. Complete names of other golf courses should be provided for consistency</td>
<td>OK 2-15</td>
<td>The names of all golf courses/clubs have been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.3 Open Space and Greenways) &quot;The list of Greenway Corridors appears to be incomplete, as it does not include greenways in Kapolei, 'Ewa Villages and West Loch, and throughout the master planned communities by Ewa by Gentry and Ocean Pointe.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-15</td>
<td>The Table 2.2 list of greenways has been expanded to include additional major arterials (120' wide) and minor arterials(100' wide) which either have landscaped median strips and landscaped sidewalk areas or could be redeveloped to include such landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.3 Open Space and Greenways) Add Campbell Industrial Park, Kalaela, and Ewa by Gentry to the areas linked together by the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail, and delete the Waipahū Cultural Garden.</td>
<td>OK 2-16</td>
<td>Kapolei Business Park, Kapolei Harborside, Kapolei West, Kalaela, and Ewa by Gentry were added to the list, but Waipahū Cultural Garden was retained because there are plans to link the Pearl Harbor Historic Trail to the Waipahu park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Department of Planning and Permitting

'Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.490</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.4 Kalaeloa Regional Park) The PRD Sec. 2.2.4 &quot;includes a description for Kalaeloa Regional Park. … the activity and use associated with such a Kalaeloa Regional Park is consistent with the vision and objectives within the [Kalaeloa Master Plan (KMP)]. While this same section of the (PRD) also forecloses development of sports complex, … the development of either a regional park or sports complex is consistent with the preferred land uses described in the KMP.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The PRD does incorporate the vision and objectives of the KMP to the extent possible, reflecting its proposed role as the Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa, when accepted as such by the City Council. The deletions of vision elements in Sec. 2.2.4 which call for developing a professional baseball training facility and for building a replacement for Aloha Stadium in ‘Ewa did not involve sites within Kalaeloa. These two regional recreation complexes were proposed for areas in East Kapolei, and are no longer viable projects. There is no language in either the adopted ‘Ewa DP or the proposed revised Plan which would preclude development of a sports complex within Kalaeloa. The adopted Plan also includes policies providing guidance for how such a regional sports complex should be designed. (See Sec. 3.2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.4 Kalaeloa Regional Park) Retain the notion of a replacement stadium for Aloha Stadium in ‘Ewa, and add the following: &quot;If deemed feasible, a new sports facility to replace Aloha Stadium should be identified through a community-based planning process, in conjunction with the major landowners in the area.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Because of the severe traffic congestion that would result from moving Aloha Stadium's big event traffic to ‘Ewa, we cannot support adding the suggested policy to the Plan. Aloha Stadium is located close to the population center of O'ahu and will be well served by the elevated rapid transit system by 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.510</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.5 Secondary Urban Center) &quot;Recreate financial strategies to attract and draw more business employers to the region, i.e. offers of tax incentives, tax credits, bonds, etc. …&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>One of the success stories for the adopted ‘Ewa DP is that non-construction jobs in ‘Ewa grew from 11,500 in 1990 to an estimated 27,700 in 2005. Under enabling legislation approved by the Council in 1995 and extended in 2002, almost all of ‘Ewa is part of an Enterprise Zone. Qualifying businesses who open new job centers receive a package of incentives including lower property taxes, waiver of fees, exemptions from excise taxes, and income tax credits (See p. 2-17).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>WC-43</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.6 Master Planned Residential Communities) <em>(Exhibit 2.3) appears to suggest that some of the property that (Ford Island Properties, LLC) … now owns under long term leases with the Navy is not urban land, but rather, is designated as urban expansion. Please revise Exhibit 2.3 to accurately depict the location of urban land, pursuant to State Land Use classifications, …</em></td>
<td>OK 2-19</td>
<td>Exhibit 2.3 has been updated to make it consistent with the areas that are shown as urban areas in the Appendix A Urban Land Use Map. The designation as urban expansion is not reflective of State Land Use District status; instead it indicates that the lands are vacant developable lands within the <em>‘Ewa DP</em> Community Growth Boundary which are meant to be developed for urban uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.530</td>
<td>WC-43</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.7 Communities Designed to Support Non-Automotive Travel) <em>(Add) Kalaeloa … to the list of communities that will be linked by the (rapid transit) system …</em></td>
<td>OK 2-20</td>
<td>Kalaeloa was added to the list of master planned residential communities in ‘Ewa which will be served by the rapid transit system when it is extended to the City of Kapolei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.540</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.6 Master Planned Residential Communities) Add DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2 to the list of master planned communities.</td>
<td>OK 2-17</td>
<td>The text has been updated by adding DHHL East Kapolei to the list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Exhibit 2.3) Modify the exhibit so that there are symbols for both DHHL East Kapolei 1 and 2 instead of just one symbol for both.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The purpose of the map is to indicate the general location of the project, and adding symbols to show phasing for only the DHHL project and not other projects is not necessary for that purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.560</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.1 Vision Statement, 2.2.6 Master Planned Residential Communities, and 2.2.7 Communities Designed to Support Non-Automotive Travel) <em>The Plan proposes new standards relating to connectivity and the creation of town and village centers or &quot;main street areas.&quot; Upon adoption of the revised <em>‘Ewa DP</em>, would these new requirements apply to all developments, including existing communities that are still being developed, such as Ewa by Gentry … any such requirements (should)... not apply to existing master planned communities for which millions of dollars have already been invested in plans for infrastructure improvements…</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Existing subdivisions which have received approval for their transportation master plans are not affected. Connectivity standards, as outlined in the <em>‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study</em> (May 2009), apply to transportation master plans for new subdivisions. Standards encouraging creation of town or village centers will be applied at the time of zone change application and in the review and revision of land use regulations. Both of these set of standards are not meant to significantly affect the residential or commercial development potential upon which infrastructure decisions were based; they are meant only to guide the layout of that development potential in ways that promote pedestrian friendliness and relieve the traffic pressures on major streets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.570</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.7 Communities Designed to Support Non-Automotive Travel) &quot;... building communities which are more pedestrian and bicycle friendly is a noteworthy goal...(but) we question whether implementation of quarter-mile grids with smaller grids within is the most effective way of accomplishing this goal. ... grid patterned streets often add to the cost of housing because of infrastructure layout requirements. They also require more pavement and encourage automobile use, which is less environmentally friendly and a less sustainable use of resources. Further, through streets and through traffic increase the danger of traffic accidents and injury to the children of these family oriented communities. We suggest that this requirement be stricken wherever it appears in the Plan.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>What is proposed is not a strict geometric grid network laid down on 'Ewa without regard to topography. What is proposed, as noted in the 'Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study (May 2009), is a hybrid layout providing strong arterial system continuity with a constrained and more diffuse grid system where possible. The grid system need not use more pavement, if street widths are adjusted to reflect the lower traffic volumes likely on all streets as result of the increased alternative routes. We agree that standards and regulations may need to be revised to reflect this. Grid systems have been shown to reduce automobile use, not encourage it. Modified grid systems combining aspects of cul-de-sac and grid layouts and designed with narrow streets and other traffic calming devices can create safer environments for pedestrians than conventional suburban layouts. In addition, increased connectivity has been shown to significantly improve response time for fire and emergency service providers and to allow more efficient operation of waste pick up services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.580</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.7 Communities Designed to Support Non-Automotive Travel) &quot;... consideration (should) also be given to cul-de-sac layouts that provide public access easements in between homes or buildings to provide &quot;short cuts&quot; and make it easier for pedestrians to get to transit stops or other destinations. ... buyers prefer to purchase homes on cul-de-sacs, rather than on through streets because of safety concerns (less traffic), a more peaceful environment, and a desire for privacy.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Grid systems are not incompatible with cul-de-sacs, and a hybrid system incorporating the best aspects of both designs can deliver both the connectivity of the grid system and the low traffic, peace, and privacy that residents desire. However, the policy of promoting connectivity does not support developments with lengthy dead end streets or suburbs with only one way in and out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.8 Conservation of Natural Resources) &quot;(Amend the DP) to require the preservation and restoration of valuable habitats for endangered plants and animals at the Batis Salt Marsh, West Loch, Kalaeloa, and elsewhere.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Nothing in the existing Plan would preclude efforts to restore or improve the environmental quality of the protected habitat areas. The 1997 Plan explicitly calls for the protection of valuable plant and wildlife habitats, and identifies Batis Salt Marsh, West Loch refuge areas, and Kalaeloa habitat areas as areas to be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.9 Preservation and Enhancement of Historic and Cultural Resources) &quot;While the <strong>Ewa Development Plan</strong> does provide for some protections to Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites, not enough protections are afforded to Native Hawaiian practices. These practices are protected by various case law, state statutes and Hawai’i’s Constitution. ... protection of traditional and customary Native Hawaiian rights (should be part of the vision and policy of the Plan) ... (Add to Sec.) 2.2.9 ... a bullet point (which calls) for the identification and protection of areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>A bullet point, as requested, has been added to Sec. 2.2.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.610</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.9 Preservation and Enhancement of Historic and Cultural Resources) Amend the first bullet as follows: Preserving significant historic features from the plantation era and earlier periods, including &quot;,(the) ‘Ewa Villages and other remnants of the plantation era, except those that pose a health and safety risk;&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan already includes policies and guidelines in Sec. 3.4. which provide guidance on how this vision element is to be implemented if there are health and safety risks which may not allow retention of historic structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.10 Planned Regional Development) &quot;Isn't phasing of developments in the 'Ewa DP being deleted?&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The Section title in the proposed revised Plan was changed to reflect the proposed elimination of formal phasing periods for development. There will still be phasing of development through the entitlement process, requirements established by conditions of zoning, and the need to build backbone infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.630</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.10 Planned Regional Development) &quot;...add 'Kapolei Court Complex' and 'Hale Kalaniana'ole (DHHL Office Building) to the list of State offices ... (to the list of public projects that support the directed growth policy of the <strong>General Plan</strong>&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Hale Kalaniana’ole has been added to the list of projects. The Kapolei Court Complex is already covered by the mention of State and City offices in the Kapolei Civic Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.640</td>
<td>WC-43</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.10 Planned Regional Development) Add Kalaeloa as an example of public-private infrastructure and project development.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>It remains to be seen what the extent of public-private infrastructure development will be in Kalaeloa. This will be a major challenge that needs to be met if planned development is to go forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.10 Planned Regional Development) &quot;(Add) the words 'existing or proposed' before the word infrastructure (in the 4th bullet)&quot;</td>
<td>OK 2-22</td>
<td>The language has been revised to make it clear that the requirements adopted at the time of zone change approval ensure that sufficient infrastructure is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>WC-55</td>
<td>(Sec. 2.2.10 Planned Regional Development) &quot;zoning and other approvals should not be granted unless adequate capacity for major peak-hour commuting to work in the Primary Urban Center can be available at the time of occupancy. ... At the present time, once a project is zoned, there is no stopping the development. ... We need some way to force further development to move ahead after we have had relief on the freeway, and then move ahead in concert with further betterment (of) freeway traffic.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Rather than focus on freeway conditions for drivers of single occupant automobiles commuting to downtown Honolulu, the proposed revised Plan supports new jobs in ‘Ewa, building roads in ‘Ewa to relieve traffic on over-crowded arterials like Fort Weaver Road, development of the rapid transit elevated guideway system, improved bus service and HOV lanes, and use of traffic demand mechanisms to reduce congestion and control peak travel. Projects still can be delayed after receiving zone change approval, either because conditions of approval are not met or because of moratoriums imposed until critical infrastructure is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.010</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1 Open Space Preservation and Development) &quot;...(are) golf courses … considered either community-based parks or district parks...&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Golf courses are considered part of the Open Space Network, providing view amenities from adjacent roads and communities, helping to define the edges of communities, and serving as retention areas for storm waters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.011</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1 Open Space Preservation and Development) &quot;It is important to maintain the expansive feeling of the 'Ewa Plain by protecting the open space.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan vision calls for protection of open space and provides policies and guidelines to carry out that vision. A Community Growth Boundary protects open space and 3,000 acres of agricultural land. Inside the Boundary, an Open Space Network identifies key open space areas to be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.012</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1.3.1 ) Add a &quot;a bullet point (calling)…for the identification and protection of areas that are important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices … to Section 3.1.3.1 Mountain Areas and 3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area...&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-4,5</td>
<td>A bullet point was added to each section in the proposed revised Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1.3.1 Mountain Areas, 3.1.3.2 Natural Gulches and Drainageways, &amp; 3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area) (Amend the DP) to preserve, protect, and restore the native environments of 'Ewa's natural areas, such as natural gulches..., mountains..., and shorelines ...,regardless of whether their environments are critical habitat for endangered species.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The existing Plan does call for protection of these three areas, placing mountain areas outside the Urban Growth Boundary with the result that no urban development is permitted there, and including natural gulches and the shorelines as part of the Open Space Network which is also protected against development. In addition, the Plan includes further policies and guidelines whose implementation would protect the natural environment in each of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.014</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1.3.1 Mountain Areas &amp; 3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area) ...in areas of the (DP) that discuss protecting and expanding public access to the mountains and shoreline...consideration should be given to the impact that ... increased, expanded access has on the natural resources of those areas and associated cultural practices ...(and) possible measures that could mitigate those impacts.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-4,5</td>
<td>A bullet point calling for protection of areas important to Native Hawaiian cultural practices has been added to both Sec. 3.1.3.1 &amp; 3.1.3.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.015 | WC-34 | (Sec. 3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area) "... the development plan (should) require developers to consider the impact of global warming and sea level rise when designing and planning projects that affect the shoreline."
| | | | OK 3-5 | The Sec. 3.1.3.3 language has been amended to indicate that any expansion of the shoreline setback to 150 feet is to be done where justified by historic or adopted projected erosion rates. The requirement in the existing Plan is based on studies commissioned by the City in 1989. The 1989 studies have been updated for beaches around the entire island to reflect the historic erosion since 1989, and can serve as the basis for future planning and regulation revision.

In addition, a new policy has been added to Sec. 3.1.3. requiring new projects in shoreline areas to analyze the possible impact of sea level rise, and where appropriate and feasible, incorporate measures to reduce risks and increase resiliency to impacts of sea level rise. |
| 4.016 | WC-50 | (Sec. 3.1.3.3 Shoreline Area) "Beach access is becoming increasingly limited for local residents. There is minimal parking at our marinas and the parking spaces are far from the ocean. This has had the effect of minimizing beach access."
| | | | OK 3-4 | The text of the proposed revised Plan has been amended to indicate that adequate parking should be provided to allow the pedestrian beach access, which the adopted Plan calls to be provided every 1/4 mile, to be used by the public. |
| 4.017 | WC-56 | (Exhibit 3.1) Revise the map to more accurately depict the extent of the land the Navy will convey to the City for the Kalaeloa Regional Park.
| | | | OK 3-7 | The map in the proposed revised Plan has been revised. |

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.018</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1.3.6 Golf Courses) The requirement for designing &quot;new golf courses … to accommodate existing and proposed regional trails, paths, and bike routes … appears to be both dangerous and impractical …&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-6</td>
<td>The requirement to accommodate public access and incorporate hiking, biking, and pedestrian pathways in golf course development has been City policy since 1991. The policy language proposed in the PRD was adopted as City policy in 2002 as part of the CO SCP. However, the last bullet in Sec. 3.1.3.6 is revised to make clear that fencing and solid barriers are permitted if landscaping, setbacks and modifications to the course are not feasible methods of providing safe crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.019</td>
<td>WC-16</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.1.3.8 Greenways and Open Space Corridors) Minor refinements to language regarding landscaping utility corridors are suggested</td>
<td>OK 3-8</td>
<td>Changes have been made to the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.020</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2 Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes) Revise the description of City and Navy recreation facilities in Kalaeloa to reflect current status and Navy plans.</td>
<td>OK 3-9</td>
<td>The description has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>WC-41; WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2 Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes) 41: &quot;The ('Ewa DP) should identify a dog park (within the Kalaeloa district) and have it listed on a map in which our elected officials can then lobby for the funds to complete it.&quot; 50: &quot;There should be creation of 'dog parks' and 'graffiti parks.' &quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The 'Ewa DP supports the need to develop adequate parks to meet resident needs which may include a dog park or graffiti parks. We have shared these proposals for establishing dog parks and the proposal for graffiti parks to the Department of Parks and Recreation. The listing of specific proposed public facility projects in the DP is only conceptual and does not bind the City Council to either approve funding for listed projects or to not fund unlisted projects so long as the unlisted project is found to implement the vision for 'Ewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.022</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2 Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes) There should be more baseball parks in 'Ewa.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The PRD identifies a shortage of park space, particularly at the district park, and indicates that 132 acres of new district park space will be needed by 2030. Such fields are typically located at district parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.023</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2 Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes Identifying Hawaii Prince, … 'Ewa Beach, Coral Creek, etc. as private golf courses is inaccurate as these courses are public courses. Hoakalei Country Club is the only private course in this region.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-10</td>
<td>The distinction being made was between publicly owned (City, US Navy) and privately owned golf courses, and the text has been revised to reflect the difference between private courses and privately owned courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.024</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2 Regional Parks and Recreation Complexes) The Hoakalei Country Club is open as of the fall of 2008.</td>
<td>OK 3-10</td>
<td>The text has been updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>WC-58</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2.1 Regional Parks and Recreation Centers General Policies) &quot;The Department of Parks and Recreation does not support the proposal … to develop Pu‘u Pālailai into a public nature park site given the past uses of this site.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-11</td>
<td>The property is owned by Campbell Estate which currently plans to retain the site as open space. The proposed revised Plan has been amended to call for development of the site as a private nature park with hiking trails providing access to the summit and its views of the ‘Ewa Plain and downtown Honolulu and Diamond Head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2.1 Regional Parks and Recreation Centers General Policies and Sec. 3.2.2.5 Sports and Recreation Complexes) &quot;What does ‘Recreation Complexes … refer to? Is this a carryover from the previously proposed State Sports Center near the intersection of North-South Road and Kapolei Parkway or is this a reference to the Kroc Center?&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan provides policies and guidelines to be used in designing and evaluating proposed recreation complexes. Over the years, theme parks, ball parks, a major concert arena, a drag strip, a roller coaster park, a stadium, and other projects have been proposed for ‘Ewa. The Plan helps applicants understand what conditions they would have to meet if they want to develop a recreation complex project in ‘Ewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.027</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.2.2.1 Appropriate Scale and Siting) &quot;What does &quot;major recreation events area&quot; in the first bullet of (Sec.) 3.2.2.1 … refer to?&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>It could be a soccer stadium at a regional park or an open air concert shell at a regional recreation complex. The idea is to provide cues to attendees to guide them to parking and the entrance to the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3 Community-Based Parks) &quot;a moratorium (should) be issued on the development and approval of new golf courses until the required acreage of community-based and district parks are met for ‘Ewa…especially considering that developers are having a hard enough time developing the required amount of parks in the area.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>There is no evidence that a moratorium on golf course development would have any impact on parks development which is required of residential developers by the Park Dedication Ordinance. There is also no evidence that “developers are having a hard enough time developing the required amount of parks in the area.” Much of the shortfall is for district parks which typically are developed by the City. Some of the shortage may be eased by development of the Kalaeloa Regional Park and the Kroc Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.029</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3 Community-Based Parks) &quot;... the (DP) should do a better job of determining how future development will meet park requirements.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-14, 15, 16</td>
<td>Additional information has been added to Chapter 3, identifying existing and planned parks for ‘Ewa. See Sec. 3.3 and Table 3.1 The Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible for preparing the master park development plan for ‘Ewa and other regions of O‘ahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.030</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3 Community-Based Parks) Add details on planned community-based parks to be provided in Kapolei West and Mā‘iliwa Hills</td>
<td>OK 3-16</td>
<td>Table 3.1 has been updated to list the planned two community parks and four neighborhood parks to be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ✓ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report

Department of Planning and Permitting

‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report

C-27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3 Community-Based Parks) “Ewa needs a community swimming pool, roller hockey rink, and skate park… in addition, permanent football fields at ‘Ewa Mahikō Park with lights (and) … bench seating stands, concessionaires, and goal posts … should be listed on the (‘Ewa DP)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Requests for these facilities should be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation and to the City Council as part of the annual CIP budget process. The listing of specific proposed public facility projects in the DP is only conceptual and does not bind the City Council to either approve funding for listed projects or to not fund unlisted projects so long as the unlisted project is found to implement the vision for ‘Ewa. The Krock Center being developed in East Kapolei is planned to include a community swimming pool and play fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.032</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3.1 General Policies) &quot;New park standards are being proposed based on DPR standard for community-based parks…(of) a minimum of two acres of community-based parks … per 1,000 residents … This requirement differs from the Park Dedication Standards which have been adopted by ordinance.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The standard is not new. Since the 1960s, the DPR standard has been that two acres of park should be developed for every 1,000 residents, and that one of the two acres should be in district parks. This standard helps City planners determine how many acres of parks are needed as ‘Ewa develops. As noted, the Park Dedication requirements are established by ordinance, and define how much of the parks need developers are required to meet. As currently written, enforcement of park dedication requirements on new developments will not provide all the park acreage needed to meet the DPR standard. The shortfall in ‘Ewa is in the acreage needed for district parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.033</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3.1 General Policies) &quot;Should the proposed Kroc Center be mentioned in the third paragraph on p. 3-15.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-16</td>
<td>Table 3.1 has been updated to include all know planned parks, including the Kroc Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3.1 General Policies) Amend the 1st sentence in the 3rd para to strike Keaunui Neighborhood Park since it has been deeded over to the Ewa by Gentry Community Association as a private park.</td>
<td>OK 3-15</td>
<td>The third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs have been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>WC-58</td>
<td>(Table 3.1) &quot;… the total area designated for park purposes (at Kalaeloa) to be conveyed to the City and County of Honolulu is approximately 484 acres.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-16</td>
<td>Table 3.1 has been corrected, based on Department of Parks and Recreation information that 413 acres will be conveyed to the City for Kalaeloa Regional Park, 7.5 acres to the City for a Kalaeloa Downtown Neighborhood Park, and 96 acres to HCDA for a Kalaeloa Heritage Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>WC-58</td>
<td><em>(Table 3.1)</em> &quot;... the correct size of (the) ... proposed ... Keaunui Neighborhood Park) is 9.18 acres.*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>3-16  The acreage for Keaunui Neighborhood Park has been added to the total for Ewa by Gentry private parks, and the proposed &quot;Area 19C&quot; park of 9.2 acres has been added to the listing of planned public parks in Table 3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.3 Community-Based Parks)</em> &quot;We question why the huge regional park at Kalaeloa and the numerous golf courses which are in our 'Ewa community are not being counted toward fulfilling the recreational needs of 'Ewa's population.*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The Kalaeloa Regional Park will help meet some of the recreational needs of 'Ewa residents, but it will not be within the two mile maximum walking distance that is characteristic of a community-based park, nor is it likely to have the full range of facilities that a district park or community park typically would provide. Golf courses provide many important community benefits, but they don't meet the need for community based recreation that mini-parks, neighborhood parks, community parks and district parks do meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.038</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td><em>(Table 3.1)</em> Add the &quot;various private parks in 'Ewa by Gentry which are currently not included...<em>(and make)</em> corrections to Table 3.1*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>3-16  Table 3.1 has been updated and corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>WC-44</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.3.2 Community-Based Parks Guidelines)</em> &quot;The ('Ewa DP) requires parks in all developments. However, developers are allowed to pay a fee so that they do not have to provide these parks and can instead build homes on the park land at great profit. There should be a strong stipulation in the Plan that waivers for parks can only be granted by the (DPP) if the Neighborhood Board for the area pre-approves the waiver.*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The most direct vehicle for a change in the in-lieu fee process is through an amendment to the ROH Chapter 22 Article 7, including adding a requirement for Neighborhood Board input. In practice, developers of small projects are allowed under the Park Dedication Ordinance to pay in-lieu fees rather than provide land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3.2.2 Access to Mountain Trails) Eliminate the existing policy requiring provision of access from public roads to mountain trails in the Pālehua Ridge area as part of the Makaiwa project because a 2007 agreement with DLNR established &quot;public access to the private Honouliuli conservation area and trails via Kunia Road … (and there) are no trail systems in the Pālehua Ridge area north of Makaiwa Hills below the conservation area located approximately 2.5 miles mauka of the project area. … there are no feasible or existing opportunities for recreational trail access across private agricultural land directly mauka of Maka‘iwa Hills.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-15, 18</td>
<td>The Sec. 3.3.2.2 guideline and the more general Sec. 3.3.1 policy has been amended to make clear that what is desired is a continuation of the controlled access to Wai‘anae Range mountain trails via Pālehua Road which hiking organizations have enjoyed since 1919, and not access to hiking trails crossing the private agricultural lands to the Conservation District. The reference to the Maka‘iwa Hills project has been revised to reflect the condition of the 2008 zone change for Maka‘iwa Hills that requires the developer to provide a connection to Pālehua Road as the means for providing access to Wai‘anae Range mountain trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>WC-62</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.3.2.2 Access to Mountain Trails) &quot;We would definitely want to retain the access (to hiking trails in the Conservation District above Makakilo) through Makakilo. There are 2 hikes we do using this access. … The club first hiked these trails in November of 1919, and have been hiking them regularly since that time, and would not want to lose them. Attempting to access them from Kunia Road would be impractical. These hikes are very popular with our membership, and with the hiking community in general. Please insure that the access through Makakilo is retained.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-18</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) &quot;… it is obvious that not much research or work went into the preparation of this section. … To rely totally on commenting to develop the language and guidance principles with respect to cultural resources for a place such as ‘Ewa would be a tremendous mistake.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Comments collection was only a part of the work done for the review. Although we have requested comments from governmental agencies and the public on draft policies and findings, substantial consultation and research has been done to understand and respond to identified issues, to prepare the Plan revisions, and to identify appropriate ways to improve implementation of the Plan vision, policies, and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) &quot;The State (DLNR) and the (SHPO) has been understaffed and under budgeted for too many years to have done a thorough job in documenting historic and cultural sites eligible for listing in the State Historic Registry. … in the Ahupua’a of Honouliuli alone there are hundreds times more cultural sites in our backyard than are listed on the State’s Historic Registry.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan supports protection of significant historic and cultural resources regardless of whether they have been listed on a Historic Register and calls for archaeological, historic, and cultural surveys to be done prior to approval of any new urban development in order to identify significant resources and to determine what the appropriate method is to protect the historic and cultural resource values. Typically, the applicant pays for the cost of the survey work which is submitted to the SHPD for evaluation and acceptance as a professional quality survey and mitigation program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) &quot; … only a small section is dedicated to HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES. … It would be a big mistake to forget our Hawaiian cultural history of the ‘Ewa region. Our cultural history is a unique one which should be shared. We here in ‘Ewa have more to offer than most of us are even aware.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan vision, policies, and guidelines do support the protection and preservation of ‘Ewa’s historic and cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.041</td>
<td>WC-06; WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) 6: Support for a memorial and/or educational center at the site of the World War II Honouliuli Internment Camp with access from the UH WO mauka site. 48: ‘(give) consideration … to including the Honouliuli WWII internment camp memorial … to the list of historic features and landmarks.”</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan has been revised to include the Honouliuli Internment Camp as a significant historic feature and indicate that it is being considered for listing on the National Historic Register and is proposed for acquisition as a satellite site of the National Park Service’s World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument. In addition, a guideline has been added which calls for the site to be protected until a study is done to establish the condition of the site and its appropriate treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>WC-17; WC-47</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) 47: Create a historic ‘Ewa Field Park of around 50 acres in Kalaeloa to save the known Dec. 7, 1941 battlesites, the still existing 1943 hangar building, and the full length of the original main runway … (The Park should be) part of the Kalaeloa Regional Park … and location of a planned future Pacific War Museum.&quot; 48: ‘(give) consideration … to including the … ‘Ewa Field bombing to the list of historic features and landmarks.”</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan has been revised to include the ‘Ewa Marine Corps Air Field as a significant historic feature. In addition, a guideline has been added which calls for the site to be protected until a study is done to establish the condition of the site and its appropriate treatment. The suggestion that the Field should be part of the Kalaeloa Regional Park has been forwarded to the Department of Parks and Recreation for their consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report

Department of Planning and Permitting

‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.043 | HB1693; WC-50 | (Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) HB1693: "The city and county of Honolulu's development plan for the 'Ewa planning area (should) ensure the preservation and restoration of historical entities and sites, such as significant historic buildings within 'Ewa Villages, the chemical mixing plant, the Japanese internment camp, World War II bunkers, the 'Ewa railway, and other significant landmarks in the region."

50: "'Ewa's historic and cultural resources will be preserved and enhanced by preserving historic features from the plantation era and earlier periods; including but not limited to the 'Ewa Manager's Mansion...Verona Villages; Renton Village; Tenny Village; Lincoln Village; 'Ewa Mill; ...Chemical Mixing Plant; ... Renton Road as a historical corridor in 'Ewa Villages..." |
| OK 3-20, 21, 22 | The Honouliuli Internment Camp and the 'Ewa Marine Corps Air Field have been added to the list of significant historical resources in the FPP. The existing Plan calls for all the other sites you mention, with the exception of the "chemical mixing plant," to be protected and appropriately conserved with guidance from the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD).

Not all resources can or should be preserved or restored. Some sites may be appropriate for adaptive reuse such was done in converting the 'Ewa Villages plantation store into a day care and private school facility. Other sites may be found by the SHPD to be appropriate only for documentation and artifact recovery.

The proposal for preserving and restoring the chemical mixing plant is problematic since it is a significantly contaminated brownfield site. DHHL has received permission from SHPD to demolish the structure after completing an Architectural Inventory Survey and documenting the structure with photographs. |

| 4.044 | WC-34 | (Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) "Native Hawaiian kupuna Shad Kane stated in his comments that he was 'disappointed' with the historic and cultural resources section of the Draft 'Ewa Development Plan because 'not much research or work went into the preparation of those sections. OHA advises the ...Department to work more closely with Mr. Kane and others in the Native Hawaiian community to improve those sections."

As of the date of this comment, we had not had the benefit of receiving written comments from Mr. Kane. We welcome the opportunity to talk more about how the Plan could be improved if OHA or Mr. Kane and others in the Native Hawaiian community would like to meet with us.

After receiving this comment, we sent an invitation to Mr. Kane to provide his comments and meet with us if he would like. He has subsequently submitted written comments which we have considered in revising the Plan and preparing the Review Report. |
| √ | | |

| 4.045 | WC-34 | (Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) "...the development plan should include language that emphasizes the need to identify Native Hawaiian cultural sites and to involve the community in that process." 

Sec. 3.4 in the existing Plan provides general policies and Sec. 3.4.2.5 provides specific guidelines for identifying and protecting Native Hawaiian cultural sites and involving the community in that process. |
<p>| √ | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>WC-47</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4 Historic and Cultural Resources) &quot;(Preserve and restore) Fort Barrette as an Historic Park that tells the story of the US Army Coast Artillery...Another story that can be told ... is the story of the Hawai‘i National Guard Nike Hercules sites that were above Makakilo. ... In addition, Fort Barrette was attacked on December 7, 1941 and a U.S. Army soldier was killed in this attack.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-22</td>
<td>Fort Barrette/ Pu‘u Kapolei was added to the list of significant historical resources in the proposed revised Plan. The site does have some protection since it is part of the Kapolei Regional Park, and DPR has no plans for development of the site. The existing Plan supports protection of the site, and preservation of its significant historic, cultural, and archaeological values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4.1 General Policies) &quot;(In) Table 3.2 Significant Views and Vistas -The fourth bullet, 'Mauka and makai views' is too broad.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-23</td>
<td>A modification has been made to the Sec. 3.4.2.2, indicating that retaining such public views is to be considered in the design and siting of structures and in deciding whether to underground or relocate overhead utility lines and posts, where feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.048</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4.1 General Policies) &quot;...the last bullet point in Section 3.4.1 ... is confusing and should be clarified... to assume that previously-approved mitigations adhere to the development plan’s vision and policies is dangerous. The development plan is a living document that is regularly amended. Projects and their mitigation measures should be revised to conform to these amendments to better align with the Ewa Development Plan’s vision and policies.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Duly noted. However, this policy, which was adopted as City policy in 2002, simply clarifies that adoption of new DP policies does not automatically trigger a review of mitigation measures previously approved by the State Historic Preservation Division based on approved surveys of historic and archaeological resources. Also, this policy does not apply if new previously unknown resources are discovered at a site. In that case, the State Historical Preservation Officer can legally modify an existing mitigation plan to insure appropriate protection of any newly discovered resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Exhibit 3.2) Because an agreement has been reached with the SHPD on what archaeological sites are to be preserved within the Makaiwa Hills, Kapolei West, and Kapolei Harborside projects, the Exhibit 3.2 map should revised to remove the shading indicating dispersed sites from the project areas.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The Exhibit 3.2 map is conceptual, and provides useful contextual information to aid understanding of the policies in the Plan. In addition, the note at the bottom of Exhibit 3.2 specifically notes that some sites were identified for protection in the course of project development, and that project documents should be consulted to determine which sites have been retained. The map accurately reflects the pre-development location of dispersed archaeological sites, also suggesting that the projects in those locations probably have continuing responsibilities to protect and preserve some sites as a condition of zoning and mitigation plans approved by DLNR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** ✓ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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C-33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.4.1 General Policies, Exhibit 3.2 and Table 3.2) &quot;Section 3.4.1 relies too heavily on known cultural sites and SHPO's eligible list of State Historic Registry. It is important to understand that the stories or mo'olelo are as important as the specific cultural or archaeological site. SHPO does not provide all the mo'olelo associated with archaeological sites. All of this is lacking from ... section 3.4.1. ... Issues such as this can best be addressed by a group of cultural experts.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Sec. 3.4.1 in the adopted Plan and the proposed revised Plan provides general policies for protection and treatment of all significant 'Ewa historic, cultural and archaeological resources, not just &quot;known cultural sites&quot; or sites on the State Historic Register. Your concerns that the mo'olelo be associated with the specific cultural or archaeological sites are duly noted, but may be more appropriately addressed in the State Historic Preservation Division policies and rules. The adopted Plan does call for Hawaiian cultural organizations to be consulted in determining the extent of public access to Native Hawaiian cultural and archaeological sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>&quot;... Table 3.2: ... SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC FEATURES AND LANDMARKS ... should also include Pu'uokapolei and Pu'umakakilo. They are historic landmarks.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Pu'u O Kapolei and Pu'u Makakilo have been added to the list of significant historic features and landmarks in Table 3.2 of the proposed revised Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>&quot;(Table 3.2) NATIVE HAWAIIAN CULTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES failed to include the very important cultural sites of Makaiwa Gulch and Pālehua.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Two 'Ewa archaeological sites already listed on either the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the State Register of Historic Places (SRHP) have been added to Table 3.2 of the proposed revised Plan. With their addition, all 'Ewa archaeological sites on either the NRHP or SRHP are listed. The fact that sites are not listed does not exempt them from the applicable policies and guidelines of the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>WC-63</td>
<td>(Table 3.2) &quot;...it is important that view planes from Pu'uokapolei of Diamond Head (Leahi) and the rising sun in the east and the setting sun in the west is protected preserved from any obstruction. It is as important that the view planes from Pu'u Makakilo of Moloka'i, Maui, Lāna'i, Kaho'olawe and Hualalai on Hawaii Island is protected. Pu'u Makakilo gets its name from this view plane.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Text has been added to Table 3.2 of the proposed revised Plan, noting the importance of views of central Honolulu and Diamond Head from Pu'u O Kapolei and Pu'u Makakilo. The view of the rising sun from Pu'u O Kapolei can be protected, but the view of the setting sun will be obstructed due to the entitlements approved in 2008 which allow buildings up to 150 feet tall on central blocks in the City of Kapolei. The adopted Plan already protects the upper slopes of Pu'u Makakilo from development that would obstruct views of the Neighbor Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.050 | WC-63| (Sec. 3.4.2 Guidelines) "Section 3.4.2 falls short by relying on only documented sites. A good example of what could happen is what Haseko did to many of the cultural sites in One’ula. All the more important cultural sites were destroyed to make way for their marina. What is left is hardly representative of what was once there."
|      |      |         | √    | Sec. 3.4.2 does not rely only on "documented" sites. It applies equally to sites discovered through supplemental searches and as a result of construction activities. State law requires that an assessment must be done by the SHPO to determine what is to be done with archaeological, cultural, and historic resources identified by surveys or discovered during development, and for a mitigation and preservation plan to be approved by SHPO and followed by the developer. Haseko followed this process for the Ocean Pointe project, and has protected those sites identified by the SHPO for protection. |
| 4.050 | WC-63| (Sec. 3.4.2.5 Native Hawaiian Cultural and Archaeological Sites) "We need a better means of identifying those places of significant historic and cultural sites and not rely totally on the SHPO. … Section 3.4.3.3 … will fail if it relies only on those features that the State Historic Preservation Office has recommended for such treatment."
<p>|      |      |         | √    | The proposed revised Plan does not call for a process that relies &quot;totally on the SHPO.&quot; Cultural experts, archaeologists, and lay people all have a role to play in identifying important resources and advocating for the treatment of those resources which they feel is appropriate. However, the SHPO has the legally mandated responsibility under State law to make determinations of what is the minimum required to be done with historic, cultural, and archaeological resources. As a result, the City must rely on SHPO guidance as to how to protect and preserve historic, cultural, and archaeological resources. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>WC-32</td>
<td>(3.5 Natural Resources) &quot;Control of light pollution needs to be incorporated into all facets of the plan where artificial lighting is used for illumination of areas such as street lights, shopping malls, parks, sports fields, walkways, around schools, outside building illumination, outdoor lighting around homes, and ...business signs. ... (incorporate) fully shielded fixtures that use lower wattage lamps ... (return) the night sky to one of beauty and awe for our people. Our keiki are being denied the imagination and inspiration of seeing the vastness of the universe - to wonder what's out there. ... Quite small amounts of stray artificial light entering bedrooms at night can interfere with sleep. ... There is no reliable scientific evidence that lighting reduces actual crime. ... By redirecting light down to the ground where it is needed, the required lamp wattage can be reduced. Wattage can also be reduced by accepting the orange tint of low- or high-pressure sodium lighting... Most if not all illuminated advertising and decorative lighting (should) be banned.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>New policy language was added to the proposed revised Plan, calling for use, where sensible, of fully shielded lighting fixtures using lower wattage lamps to reduce light pollution's adverse impact on wildlife and human health and its unnecessary energy consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.051</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Exhibit 3.3 &amp; Sec. 3.6.1.2 Key Open Space Elements) &quot;...several revisions are needed to the City of Kapolei roadway pattern ... in Exhibit 3.3 ... (including) the renaming of Wai Aniani Way to Ala Kahawai Street&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Exhibit 3.3 was revised, and changes were made to text in the proposed revised Plan describing the City of Kapolei roadway patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.052</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>&quot;(Sec. 3.6.3.2 Natural Environment and Landscaping) ... mentions xeriscaping with native plants. The concept of landscaping with native plants should also be added to the sections relating to regional parks, sports and recreation complexes, golf courses, and master-planned communities.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The policies on landscaping throughout the proposed revised Plan Chapter 3 were revised to include or incorporate this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.053</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.7 'Ewa Plantation Villages) &quot;The 'Ewa Manager's Mansion ... should be willed or leased to ... (the) 'Ewa Historical Society.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The 'Ewa DP is not the appropriate vehicle for specifying ownership or lease holders for 'Ewa Villages historic structures. Your suggestion will be considered during the update of the 'Ewa Villages Master Plan currently underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.7 'Ewa Plantation Villages) &quot;The metal structures (of the Chemical Mixing Plant mauka of 'Ewa Villages) can be cleaned, preserved, and stored for future rebuilding. The area it stands on needs to be capped and cemented over so that the structure can be rebuilt on top of the concrete. This landmark needs to be reconstructed at the current site and entered for historical protection with the State and Federal governments.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The 'Ewa DP is not the appropriate vehicle to provide specific details of how a historic structure is to be treated since any changes to the details could require a Council amendment of the Plan adopting ordinance. The proposal for preserving and restoring the chemical mixing plant is problematic since it is a significantly contaminated brownfield site. DHHL has received permission from SHPD to demolish the structure after completing an Architectural Inventory Survey and documenting the structure with photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.7 'Ewa Plantation Villages) &quot;Renton Road as a historical corridor in 'Ewa Villages. Design and architecture of current and future buildings should conform to the overall design of the villages during the plantation era.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan does call for preservation of the existing rural form and historic character of the Villages and restriction of traffic levels on Renton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.7 'Ewa Plantation Villages) &quot;This paragraph should be amended to clarify that the 'Ewa Villages Master Plan will be undergoing a major review in the near future and that changes to the master plan may be implemented ... (and) the existing General Policies, Planning Principles and Guidelines ... may be superseded by ... the revised master plan.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-35</td>
<td>Language to that effect has been added to the proposed revised Plan Sec. 3.7 (formerly 3.6), making it clear that the updated Master Plan policies will take precedence over the 'Ewa DP policies if there is a conflict, avoiding the need to seek a DP amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.8 Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei) The Urban Design Plan has been updated and approved by DPP as of August 2008.</td>
<td>OK 3-38</td>
<td>The text for Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei in the proposed revised Plan has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>WC-58</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.8 Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei) &quot;The Board of Land and Natural Resources recently denied Haseko's application for a permit to lower a natural beachfront berm that would permit the proposed Kalo‘i Gulch drainage outlet across One‘ula Beach Park.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The BLNR decision does not affect any of the proposed revisions to the Ocean Pointe section of the Plan. The major proposed change acknowledges that the City has decided that the marina cannot play a role as a storm water storage and detention basin because of the conflict with the Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant ocean outfall line. The principal impact of the BLNR decision will be on mauka developments upstream on Kalo‘i Gulch which will have to continue to hold storm water on site because there is no approved ocean outlet through One‘ula Beach Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.8.1 General Policies) &quot;(Revise) to add that the marina should also be used for a ferry system (or other similar water-based public transportation system) if deemed feasible.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Language has been added to the proposed revised Plan Sec. 3.8.1 (formerly 3.7.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.8.1 General Policies) Amend the third bullet as follows: &quot;... creation dedication of a District Park on Fort Weaver Road.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been amended to reflect the fact that the District Park area has been prepared for dedication to the City (graded, grassed, and provided with irrigation facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.061</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.8.4 Circulation) Add North-South Road to the destinations for the route from Ocean Pointe through Kalaheo.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been revised to add Kualakai Parkway (formerly North-South Road) as a destination of the route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.1 General Policies) &quot;While we feel higher density residential development should be encouraged around future transit areas in general, setting a broad minimum density policy does not allow flexibility for areas near designated transit locations that may be developed many years in advance of the currently planned mass transit alignment. We ask that allowances be made for interim development scenarios and that the implementation of standards occurs through overlay zoning at transit locations nearer to the time of development of transit facilities.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The policies in the current 'Ewa DP encourage development at 25 units to 90 units per acre within a quarter mile radius of the transit stations. They do not call for setting minimum densities. However, regulations anticipating future transit-oriented development, when adopted, may prohibit some low density uses as inappropriate for the area around a transit station. The existing Plan calls for street patterns and rights-of-ways to be designed to accommodate the future mass transit service and for development to be Transit Ready to the extent possible given market realities, since it is not clear at this time when the rapid transit line will be extended beyond the Kroc Center station to the City of Kapolei. The land around transit stations in 'Ewa is covered by Urban Design Plans and/or &quot;transit ready&quot; guidelines that can address interim levels of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.1 General Policies) Change the reference to Medium Density Residential in the second bullet to Medium Density Apartment to be consistent with the changes in the rest of the section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK 3-46</td>
<td>The change was made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>WC-38; WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Circulation System) 38: &quot;Setting a minimum block size policy across the entire ‘Ewa DP area … should be qualified to include the flexibility to vary from the standards depending on site specific factors assessed on a case by case basis.&quot; 48: &quot;We recommend that this requirement be either deleted in its entirety from the Plan, or amended to read: 'Maximum block size where allowed by topography feasible should be 300’ by 500’ or any combination of two sides to 800’.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK 3-50, 51</td>
<td>The language was revised to make it clear that other limitations in addition to topography could be the basis for modification of the block length standards. Language from the recently approved ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study (May 2009) was also added, specifying mitigations to be provided if deviations from the block size standard have to be approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.065</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Circulation System) &quot;Connectivity, 3rd bullet - Amend to read ‘New Where feasible, new residential development should connect to adjacent subdivision...&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The statement is a guideline, not a regulation. In situations where topography and other factors make the guidelines infeasible, exceptions are permissible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.066</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Circulation System) &quot;Connectivity, 4th bullet - A new requirement states that street patterns showing the alignment of proposed transit routes must be submitted to DTS at the first stage of the development planning process. This is not always feasible because the City does not always have this information available at the outset of a development.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK 3-51</td>
<td>The language has been modified to make it clear that the review takes place as part of the subdivision transportation master plan review and that what is being evaluated by DTS when they review the applicant's roadway master plan is the ability to route bus service through the subdivision in an efficient and effective way at some point in the future even though they may have no plans to immediately begin bus service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities) &quot;The standards related to commercial and residential density minimums and locational requirements are overly restrictive and should be addressed to transit-oriented zoning specific to each transit sites rather than in the ‘Ewa DP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OK 3-51</td>
<td>The text has been revised to make it clear that these guidelines are for bus transit stops, not the rapid transit stations. The Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities policies are not commercial or residential density minimums; there are requirements that the roadway master plan for new developments provide for bus stops within walking distance of commercial locations and most homes where allowed by the topography.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.068</td>
<td>WC-39;</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities) 39: &quot;(Reword) these guidelines ... so that they allow exceptions for the development of the UH West O‘ahu property.&quot; 59: &quot;We believe the requirement that all commercial developments with more than 1,000 square feet and all employment sites with more than ten employees be within 1/8th mile of a transit stop to be too restrictive.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been revised to make it clear that the guidelines are meant to insure the provision of adequate bus transit and bus stops, and have nothing to do with requirements for Transit Oriented Development around rapid transit stations. The Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities policies do not refer to the two planned rapid transit stations adjacent to the UH West O‘ahu lands or the transit station by the DHL Shopping Center at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualakai Parkway; they refer to the standards that must be met by developers when they submit their transportation master plans at the time of subdivision. These guidelines insure that adequate bus service can be provided to the residents and workers in the new development by insuring that there is sufficient right-of-way for bus stops and pullouts, that efficient and effective bus routes through the development are possible, and that most residents and workers can easily walk to the nearest bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities 2nd and 3rd bullets) &quot;(Would) these requirements apply to land already zoned for development? ... will the city install a transit stop within 1/8 mile (of a commercial development) if one does not currently exist? Or (what)...if a development is not located within 1/2 mile of a transit stop? Will these developments be prohibited from proceeding?&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been revised to make clear that the requirement applies to the transportation master plan, and simply means that the roadway network has to be designed so that DTS feels a bus stop could be located within the required distance of the job sites at some point in the future. Development can proceed when the subdivision (and the transportation master plan) is approved, regardless of whether the City actually is operating a bus route through the area. (In most cases, the City does not begin bus service until the development is substantially complete.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.070</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities 4th bullet) &quot;This new requirement states that the developer is to construct all necessary transit stops in accordance with (DTS) design standards. We question why this requirement is being placed on the developer. Shouldn't building bus stops be a responsibility of the City? Wouldn't a [rail] 'transit' stop cost tens of millions of dollars?&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been revised to make it clear that the stops are bus stops and pullouts, not rapid transit stations. What is required is that there is provision for bus stops and pullouts in the transportation master plan since once the roadway goes in, it is very difficult to put them in later if insufficient right-of-way has been provided. Construction of bus stops is a City responsibility. Providing sufficient width in the roadway for the stop and, where needed, a pullout is a responsibility of the developer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities 4th bullet)</em> Amend the sentence as follows: &quot;Require the developer to construct all necessary transit stops in accordance with the Department of Transportation Systems design standards.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The transportation master plan for new subdivisions will not be approved unless it meets DTS design standards, so it is not a request that they meet those standards for sufficient right-of-way for construction of bus stops and pullouts; it is a requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.072</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.9.2 Transit Routes and Facilities 5th bullet)</em> &quot;Amend the first sentence to read: 'Design Where feasible, design the circulation plan so that…&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>As noted previously, the guidelines are not regulations, so there is no need to add this kind of qualifier. In situations where topography and other factors make the guidelines infeasible, exceptions are permissible. However, the burden is on the applicant to show why implementing the guideline is not feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.9.2 Landscape Treatment)</em> Amend the sentence to be consistent with the roadway widths specified in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.</td>
<td>OK 3-52</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan text has been updated to reflect the change in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations since 1997. The term &quot;major collector streets&quot; has been replaced with the term &quot;minor arterials&quot; to be consistent with current terminology and required widths and landscaping in the SR&amp;R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td><em>(Table 3.5) &quot;An IMX-1 category should be added to the Industrial land use designation (in Table 3.5).&quot;</em></td>
<td>OK 3-54</td>
<td>The Industrial land category in the Table in the proposed revised Plan has been revised to include IMX-1 and to clarify that either IMX-1 or I-1 zoning are appropriate for areas near the City of Kapolei and master planned residential communities, not I-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td><em>(Table 3.5) &quot;add Resort as an acceptable zoning for the (Ko Olina) Marina Mixed Use area …(in Table 3.5).&quot;</em></td>
<td>OK 3-54; 3-66</td>
<td>Resort district zoning has been added to both the Marina Mixed Use section of Table 3.5, and the text of Sec. 3.11.2. in the proposed revised Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>WC-01; WC-03; WC-07; WC-59</td>
<td><em>(Sec. 3.10 Planned Commercial Retail Centers)</em> Support the DHHL's commercial project in East Kapolei...a lifestyle mall...providing employment and small business opportunities, and services...will reduce traffic by not having to drive to Pearl Ridge or Ala Moana...will provide revenue to DHHL in difficult financial times (WC-7: 21 people with same letter) 59: &quot;A 1.5 million square foot super mall is planned in the commercial parcel of DHHL East Kapolei I ...&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan supports establishment of a Community Commercial Center of up to 250,000 sq. ft. at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road) with mixed-use moderate density retail, office, and residential uses within a quarter mile of the transit station planned to be built at that location. A note has also been added, stating that the DHHL has exempted itself from City planning and zoning and intends to develop a Regional Commercial Center with two hotels with a total of 300 rooms and two office towers with 100,000 square feet of office space at the Kapolei Parkway/Kualaka'i Parkway location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9 Planned Commercial Retail Centers) &quot;(Create) a new University Town Center category that will allow for the most flexibility and not restrict what is permitted under the BMX-3 lands.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The adopted Plan does not &quot;restrict what development is permitted&quot; on the UH WO BMX-3 lands. Developers will be able to pursue all permitted uses allowed by the LUO for those lands, subject to any Transit-Oriented Development regulations that are adopted in the future. Although the adopted Plan does not specify that a Town Center can be created on the UH WO lands, it does call for medium density mixed use commercial development within a quarter mile radius of the two proposed rapid transit stations on Kualaka’i Parkway (North-South Road) which is consistent with the BMX-3 zoning which was approved by Council in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.9.1) &quot;…add a bullet for the University Town Center designation stating: Allow mixed use development, including commercial activities that cater to regional shopping, commercial, office and educational needs as the UH West O’ahu will serve as a major mixed-use, employment and education center within the region.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The Public Review Draft Plan already indicates that a Community Commercial Center (up to 250,000 sq. ft. of floor area) should be developed near the corner of Kualaka’i Parkway (North-South Road) and Farrington Highway, and that medium-density mixed use commercial development is permitted within a quarter mile radius of the two proposed transit stations serving the UH WO lands. We do not agree that a Regional Shopping Center should be developed on the UH WO lands, but rather retail and office uses that serve the University campus and the surrounding East Kapolei community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.079</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.10.1 General Policies) Revise the fifth bullet on p. 3-57 as follows: “Limit the development of Major Community Commercial Centers or Regional Commercial Centers to the City of Kapolei since the City of Kapolei is intended to provide for most regional shopping needs and to DHHL’s Ke Makana Ali’i regional shopping complex, as the latter would be located near a proposed Transit Node.”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The purpose of focusing regional shopping in the City of Kapolei is to help create the critical mass of jobs and customers needed to realize the vision of creating O’ahu’s Second City. Significant mixed-use development is supported by the adopted Plan at all transit nodes, including the Ke Makana Ali’i site, the Kroc Center station area, the UH West O’ahu College University Village station, and the Ho’opili Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.10.1 General Policies) Amend the last bullet point in the section to allow developments primarily oriented to office uses in the UH West O’ahu property.</td>
<td>OK 3-57</td>
<td>The last bullet in Sec. 3.10.1 (General Policies for Planned Commercial Retail Centers) has been amended to allow offices providing support to functions of the UHWO to be included in TOD areas around the two transit stations closes to the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  ✓ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report Department of Planning and Permitting  
  'Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.081 | WC-48; WC-59 | (Sec. 3.10.1 General Policies) 48: "We question why the restriction on office uses (as a principal use in ‘Ewa Community Commercial Centers) is being placed on ‘Ewa. Shouldn’t the market determine what goes into a commercial center? Why are ‘Ewa people being forced to drive to Kapolei or Honolulu to go to the doctor, dentist, title company or to conduct other business?"
59: "We respectfully disagree that office uses should be located only in the City of Kapolei. Restricting or not allowing the mixing of land uses outside of the City of Kapolei forces work-related commuter traffic to congest Kamokila Boulevard and other streets within the City of Kapolei."

√ | The adopted Plan does not require office uses to be located only in the City of Kapolei. The Plan allows offices for doctors, dentists, and other professionals who provide services to the residents of the surrounding community to be located in the various existing and planned Commercial Centers in ‘Ewa.
The policy does oppose large free standing office buildings located outside of the City of Kapolei, particularly if the offices are serving regional, island-wide, national, or international customers.
Those kind of uses should be encouraged to locate in the City of Kapolei so that a critical mass of urban uses can take root there, and create the alternative urban employment location envisioned in the General Plan and the ‘Ewa Development Plan.
The grid of streets in the City of Kapolei is scheduled to be completed soon, providing multiple alternative routes to Kamokila Boulevard for workers in the City. In addition, there is the capacity to develop over five thousand residential units in the City within walking distance of those offices.
Finally, in the long run, it is planned to extend the elevated rapid transit system through Kalaieao to the City of Kapolei, providing speedy access to City of Kapolei jobs for workers living in East Kapolei and Kalaieao residential areas. |

| 4.082 | WC-48 | (Sec. 3.10.2 Orientation to Main Street or the Town/Village Center) "A set of new requirements is being imposed on the development of new commercial centers which would require compliance with a strict set of design guidelines. We question why all new shopping centers throughout the ‘Ewa DP area have to have the same "look." Further, for communities already in their final stages, commercial center layouts have already been established, and this new set of requirements is not feasible."

√ | The proposed new policy requires buildings, parking lots, and street frontages in new centers and redeveloping old centers to be arranged to encourage people to get out of their cars and walk instead of drive between the stores, and to create a safe and comfortable setting for walking and congregating in public places.
The policy says nothing how the buildings are to be designed, and will not result in all centers having the same look. Projects which are in the final stage of development would be unaffected by the new policy which will be applied at the time that new projects submit initial site plans and apply for permits. |

---

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report Department of Planning and Permitting

‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.10.2) &quot;... the words &quot;encouraged&quot; and &quot;should&quot; have been removed from the guidelines, thus making certain design guidelines mandatory. We prefer the previous language as being more appropriate and commensurate with the 'guidelines' purpose of the DP.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The word &quot;should&quot; has been removed from statements of individual policies and guidelines but has not been removed from the proposed revised Plan. The proposed revised guidelines now clearly state, in active verb form, what the best practice or action is that should be followed, if feasible. But these guidelines are suggestions to be used as a starting place in designing, reviewing, and approving what is to be done, not strict requirements that must be followed in the way that the LUO or Subdivision Rules and Regulations must. To implement the vision called for by the Plan, developers in designing their projects and decision-makers and administrators in approving those projects should follow the policies and guidelines, to the extent feasible. That is made clear in the introduction to this section and other guideline sections throughout the proposed revised Plan which says: &quot;The following guidelines suggest how the general policies for Planned Commercial Retail should be implemented&quot; (underlining added).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.084</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.10.2 Neighborhood Commercial Center/Building Siting) &quot; ... we question what is meant by 'Place parking and service areas behind the buildings.'&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This is the City policy that was adopted in 1997 as part of the 'Ewa Development Plan' (see Sec. 3.7.1.3, p. 3-62) restated in an active verb form. It means that the neighborhood commercial center should be developed with the buildings fronting the street and the parking behind to make the center more accessible and safer for pedestrians from adjacent areas who don't have to walk through the parking lot to get to the buildings. It is meant to give the center more of the pedestrian friendly &quot;Main Street&quot; feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td>(Exhibit 3-6) &quot;redraw the shape of the marina to better reflect the existing configuration of the marina. ... The... Open Space Map, Urban Land Use Map, Public Facilities Map, and Phasing Map should also be revised ... &quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The additional precision requested for the Exhibit 3-6 Ko Olina Land Use Map is not necessary because Exhibit 3-6 and the Appendix A maps are conceptual maps whose purpose is to illustrate the information, vision elements, policies and guidelines of the Plan. They do not need to provide parcel specific details such as are provided by zoning maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td>(Exhibit 3-6) &quot;Extend the Marina Mixed Use designation on Exhibit 3-6... to ... the marina frontage area around the mauka side of the marina, the marina frontage area around the makai side of the marina, the portion of the park area located adjacent to the Marina Mixed Use ... to better reflect the actual boundaries of the subdivided lot designated for park use.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>As required by the City Charter, Exhibit 3-6 is a conceptual map illustrating the information and policies of the Plan. Adding the level of detail requested will not better illustrate the policies of the Plan. The requested level of detail is more appropriate for zoning maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td>(Exhibit 3-6) &quot;... extend the Residential and Low Density area located on the mauka side of the eastern end of Ali‘inui Drive in a westerly direction. Although the (area mauka of the eastern end of Ali‘inui Drive) is not designated on the Land Use Map, it is part of the Ko Olina Resort and Marina.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-65</td>
<td>Planned uses for the area near the intersection of Kō‘ō Drive and Aliinui Drive have been included in Exhibit 3.6 to show the proposed community park area with the adjacent proposed school site shown as part of the Residential and Low Density area. DOE staff have confirmed that they currently have no plans for developing a school at the Ko Olina site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.088</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12 Industrial Centers) &quot;This section ... should be amended to include a discussion of the IMX-1 area in Ewa by Gentry ... because of the different types of uses envisioned (for Honolulu). ... what is envisioned for the IMX-1 industrial-commercial site in Ewa by Gentry ... is industrial and commercial uses to serve the neighboring communities, similar to the Gentry Business Park in Waipio.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-70, 71</td>
<td>The introductory text in Sec. 3.12 and the policy language in Sec. 3.12.1 have been amended to recognize the changes to the zoning for the area since 1997, including the Ewa by Gentry IMX-1 zoning and the recent approval of the 72 acre ‘Ewa Industrial Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.089</td>
<td>WC-16</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies) Minor clarifications to the policy for the HECO Kahe Plant are suggested</td>
<td>OK 3-72</td>
<td>The clarifications of HECO policy were made to the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>WC-20</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies) Ensure that any proposed changes to roadways and land uses in the vicinity of Kalaeloa Barbers Point Harbor are compatible with harbor operations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>DOT is regularly asked to comment on zone changes and other land use approval applications and on significant roadway projects. DOT is also asked to comment on transportation master plans involving access to State roads as part of the Subdivision approval process, and other permitting processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>WC-19</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies) Add &quot;on-site overnight accommodations for film crews and visitors&quot; as permissible accessory uses to a major film studio in the Barbers Point Industrial Area</td>
<td>OK 3-71</td>
<td>Overnight visitor accommodations are not appropriate for a heavy industrial area. Text indicating that overnight film crew accommodations can be permitted as an accessory use to a major film studio has been added (so long as no kitchen facilities are included). See discussion in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies) “… a northern portion of the Kapolei Harborside project area is zoned IMX-1 Industrial Mixed Use and may not ultimately be developed strictly for light industrial uses.</td>
<td>OK 3-71, 73</td>
<td>The text of the section has been amended to indicate that both light industrial uses and compatible commercial uses are permitted uses in the transition zone between the heavy industry in Campbell Industrial Park and the urban uses in the City of Kapolei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.093</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies) &quot;The allowance for small lot sizes should also be extended to Kapolei Harborside given its proximity to the future mass transit alignment and the IMX-1 Industrial Mixed Use zoning within the project area.</td>
<td>OK 3-73</td>
<td>The Use Allocation bullet has been revised to allow small lot sizes on the Wai‘anae side of Kalaeloa Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.094</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies/Other Industrial Areas) &quot;(Amend) the first sentence (in the first bullet) to read: ‘Allow service-oriented industrial uses as permitted by zoning throughout the region as noted below.’</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed amendment dilutes the existing policy and uncouples the connection to the direction that the rest of the policy statement provides in advising what kinds of industrial uses are appropriate to approve near to the City of Kapolei and the master planned residential communities (i.e., small lot uses providing useful services for residents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.095</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.1 General Policies: Other Industrial Areas) &quot;What defines a ‘larger lot’ and why do such uses need to be located in Campbell Industrial Park?&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The point of this part of the policy is that large industrial plants are not appropriate to locate near the residential communities or the City of Kapolei, and should be located in Campbell Industrial Park where the noisiest, largest, and dirtiest industrial uses on O‘ahu are supposed to be located.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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‘Ewa Development Plan Review Report C-46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.096</td>
<td>WC-14.1</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.12.2 Guidelines: Barbers Point Industrial Area) DLNR owns a 110-acre shoreline parcel in 'Ewa zoned I-2. &quot;The current DP does not include any specific distance(s) for shoreline setbacks.&quot; No rationale is provided for &quot;increasing the setback from the current 40-foot requirement, nor ... guidelines or criteria for when the minimum setback may/should be increased up to 150 feet...&quot; DPP should either &quot;eliminate any specific distances for minimum shoreline setbacks and instead continue to provide such details in the Shoreline Setback Ordinance ... (or) specify guidelines and criteria for increasing any minimum shoreline setbacks. ...since DLNR intends to offer a long-term ground lease or leases to private entities in furtherance of DLNR's income-generating activities, any increased shoreline setback may give rise to a claim for regulatory taking requiring compensation.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-73</td>
<td>The existing ‘Ewa DP does include language about setbacks, calling for a 60 foot setback &quot;at a minimum&quot; and 150 feet &quot;where possible.&quot; (See Sec. 3.1.4.3, p. 3-6; and Sec. 3.7.3.3, p. 3-76.) Revised text in the proposed revised Plan clarifies that an increase to 150 feet should be based on historic or adopted projected erosion. Recently updated estimates of historic beach erosion along the 'Ewa coastline range from ½ foot to 5 feet per year. However, erosion of the coastline in front of DLNR's shoreline parcel is minimal, given the protection afforded by the lava rock and raised coral reef which fronts it. DLNR's Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands has described the 40 foot setback as inadequate, calling for erosion rate based setbacks. While development of an existing parcel can be approved with a 40 foot setback if a certified shoreline survey is provided, the standard shoreline setback for new subdivisions is 60 feet. Generally, restrictions to protect public health and safety are not regarded as a regulatory taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.13 Kalaeloa) &quot;The (Public Review Draft of the ‘Ewa DP) refers to (Kalaeloa) as a Special Area and states that the (Kalaeloa Master Plan (KMP)) should be submitted for acceptance by the City Council. As the promulgation of the KMP required that the document was first adopted by the HCDA and subsequently approved by Governor Linda Lingle, the HCDA will take under advisement the necessity for securing further ratification of the KMP by the City Council.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan language reflects previous assurances by HCDA staff that the KMP would be submitted to the Council for acceptance as the Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa. Acceptance of the KMP by Council is not &quot;ratification.&quot; It signifies that the City Council accepts the KMP as the Special Area Plan for Kalaeloa, agrees that the vision and objectives of the KMP are consistent with the O'ahu General Plan and the ‘Ewa DP, and will support actions by City agencies to help implement the KMP vision and objectives. The support of the City and County will be critical to the success of the redevelopment of Kalaeloa, and having the City Council accept and indicate support for the KMP would be a useful step toward insuring cooperation and coordination between HCDA and City agencies in the future. Acceptance is also an avenue for getting a MOU for infrastructure responsibilities to be met by the City, the State, and private developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.13) &quot;...regional connectivity is one of the most important objectives of the (Kalaeloa Master Plan [KMP]) and would require that significant commitment from federal, state, and county agencies are needed to achieve the vision of both the (‘Ewa Development Plan [EDP]) and the KMP. To enhance regional connectivity, I believe that the extension of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) from Kapolei Parkway through (Kalaeloa) to Keone‘ula Road in Ocean Point is a critical element to promoting vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the entire region. The realignment of the (City's) Saratoga Road from Geiger Road to Kalaeloa Boulevard is another priority for enhancing east-west connectivity throughout the region.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-77, 78, 4-7, 15</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan contains policies supporting the need for integrating the Kalaeloa road network with the regional circulation system to provide additional east-west and mauka-makai connectivity. (See Sec 3.13.1, 3.13.2, and 4.1.6) The proposed revised Plan specifically identifies the extension of Kualaka‘i Parkway from Kapolei Parkway to connect with Ocean Pointe/Hoakalei. Language in the proposed revised Plan would amend the existing Plan to reflect the KMP vision of a link involving Geiger Road, Saratoga Road, and Kalaeloa Boulevard. (See Sec. 4.1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.099</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Table 3.6) &quot;...conveyance of the Navy's Reverse Osmosis System on 33 acres in (Kalaeloa) to the Board of Water Supply was proposed and considered. In recent times, the BWS has indicated that it will not pursue the conveyance of this facility and parcel due to the condition of the facilities.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-76</td>
<td>Table 3.6 in the proposed revised Plan has been revised to describe the situation regarding Kalaeloa lands conveyed to the BWS. Twenty acres of land in the southwest corner of Kalaeloa have been conveyed to the BWS for a seawater desalination plant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Table 3.6) &quot;The Department of Transportation Services … received 66 acres of land within (Kalaeloa) via a 2001 Memorandum of Agreement involving various roads throughout (Kalaeloa).&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-76</td>
<td>Table 3.6 in the proposed revised Plan was reformatted to make it clearer which lands were retained and which were conveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.101</td>
<td>WC-31</td>
<td>(Table 3.6) &quot;The Department of Environmental Services … is slated to receive … the Waste Water System that sits on 4 acres of land within (Kalaeloa) … (by) the first quarter of 2009. …. The Department of Parks and Recreation is scheduled to receive 485 acres of land within (Kalaeloa) for park purposes … by the end of 2009.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 3-76</td>
<td>Table 3.6 in the proposed revised Plan has been updated to reflect the final decisions regarding the transfers of land to ENV and DPR. ENV decided not to take over operation of the Navy Wastewater System; DPR is to receive a total of 421 acres for the Kalaeloa Regional Park and the Downtown Kalaeloa Neighborhood Park (An additional 96 acres are to go to HCDA for a Kalaeloa Heritage Park.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report

Department of Planning and Permitting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.13 Kalaeloa) &quot;The roads within Kalaeloa are substandard and not up to city standards.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The introductory section on Kalaeloa has been amended to report that the Kalaeloa Master Plan identifies upgrading all major infrastructure systems (roads, drainage, water supply, and wastewater) to City standards as needed to support the extensive residential, retail, office, and industrial development envisioned for Kalaeloa in the Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.103</td>
<td>WC-56</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.14 Pearl Harbor Naval Base [West Loch]) Amend the introductory paragraph as follows: &quot;The West Loch Branch Annex of Naval Magazine Lualualei Munitions Command, Pearl Harbor is proposed to be the principal site where U.S. Department of Defense ordinance handling and storage for O‘ahu is consolidated. The existing Explosive Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD) Zone at West Loch remains, but does not need to be enlarged.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text in the proposed revised Plan has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.104</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15 University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu) Revise the second paragraph of this section to update the status of the campus and development of the non-campus lands.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text has been updated based on the information provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>WC-06</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15 University of Hawai‘i West O‘ahu) Support UH site mauka of H-1 between Makakilo and Kuna for future educational and research purposes to compliment the new UHWO campus makai of H-1.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Text was added to the introductory paragraphs in Sec. 3.15 to note the potential future use of the mauka UH lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.106</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15.2 Guidelines: Place Making) Revise the text of the first bullet to better reflect the current plan for the property</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text has been updated based on the information provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.107</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15.2 Guidelines: Regional Integration) Revise the third bullet to refer to the entire UH WO development, not just the campus.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Sec. 3.15.2 includes guidelines only for the development of the UH West Oahu campus. Policies and guidelines for the development of the residential and commercial areas outside of the campus area are provided in Sec. 3.9 Existing and Planned Residential Communities and 3.10 Planned Commercial Retail Centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15.2 Guidelines: Architectural Forms) Revise the second bullet . . . as follows: Aside from buildings with specific academic programming requirements, avoid the use of structures which visually dominate the site.</td>
<td>OK 3-82</td>
<td>The text has been amended to note that there need to be exceptions for buildings which need to be tall or large to carry out their purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.109</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 3.15.2 Guidelines: Circulation) Revise the second bullet . . . to allow for other ways of highlighting the hierarchy of circulation patterns than distinctive design.</td>
<td>OK 3-82</td>
<td>The text has been amended to allow for other ways of highlighting the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CH. 4 INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.010</td>
<td>WC-06</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) Support for a public ferry terminal at Hoakalei Marina.</td>
<td>OK 4-10, 16</td>
<td>TheBoat's operations were terminated in June 2009. Language has been added to the proposed revised Plan indicating that a terminal for a commuter ferry to Honolulu should be built at Hoakalei Marina if such a service is feasible and sufficient financing for the improvements can be obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.020</td>
<td>WC-06</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) Support for a park and ride facility on Farrington Highway near Longs Waipahū.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This suggestion was considered in the preparation of the Draft Waipahū Neighborhood TOD Plan and the Public Review Draft Central O‘ahu Sustainable Communities Plan (due to be released in the near future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) The ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study should be added to the list on p. 4-2 of regional planning and transportation analysis that has led to the listing of planned and proposed roadway elements in the Plan.</td>
<td>OK 4-2</td>
<td>The Connectivity Study completed in May 2009 has been added to the list of plans on p. 4-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.040</td>
<td>WC-20</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) The &quot;timing of proposed roadway projects, projected transit development, and the future full build-out of the region&quot; will impact surface transportation infrastructure. &quot;A comprehensive traffic impact analysis that assesses cumulative activity and impacts during different phases of development and construction is ... essential for balancing infrastructure needs and growth in the region.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed revised Plan does include information from the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035 and the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan that identify, prioritize, and fund roadways needed for ‘Ewa. Both of these plans are supported by extensive transportation modeling to identify and prioritize needed roadways. The transportation analysis done for these two transportation plans is based on the Department's projections of the population, housing, jobs and visitor industry growth for O‘ahu likely to result based on historic trends, existing capacity, and the policies of the General Plan and the General Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  ✓ No change needed in Plan;  OK  Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version;  R  Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.050</td>
<td>HB1693; WC-50; WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) HB1693: &quot;The city and county of Honolulu's development plan for the 'Ewa planning area (should) account for the collective cumulative impact of traffic for all development along the leeward coast, including existing and future development, as opposed to a piecemeal traffic analysis for each development project.&quot; 50: Traffic impact analysis for new developments must include all past, present, and future developments for the entire region as opposed to just considering one project at a time. Current traffic congestion in the H1 corridor from 'Ewa to Honolulu is at grade level F. This impact on the quality of life of current residents must be taken into account when considering future developments. The Counties have been doing traffic studies one project at a time instead of looking at the cumulative impact of all projects.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>It is not correct that the State and the City and County have been doing traffic studies one project at a time in planning the island-wide transportation system or the roadway system for 'Ewa. A comprehensive update of island-wide transportation planning is done every five years by the O'ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization. An update for the <em>Ewa Highway Master Plan</em> was completed in March 2011. See the discussion above regarding the existing island-wide and regional transportation modeling, analysis, and monitoring that is done to identify transportation needs, prioritize public projects, and set requirements for private projects for 'Ewa and Wai'anae. We agree that 'Ewa and Wai'anae commuters deserve to have alternatives to driving in Level F conditions. The proposed revised Plan supports the completion of Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road), the improvement of the zipper lane service for express buses and HOV, and completion of the elevated fixed guideway rapid transit system to provide those alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>WC-40</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) &quot;...there is no determination in the proposed 'Ewa (DP) which attests to the ability of existing and proposed transportation improvements to adequately accommodate all of the development allowed or proposed in the 'Ewa Development Plan...(The revised 'Ewa DP should) include a finding as a result of applying ... (level of service) standards that existing and proposed transportation improvements in the (DP) area are adequate and can accommodate all of the development(s) allowed or proposed in the 2009 'Ewa Development Plan ...&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>There is such a determination of the ability of existing and proposed transportation improvements to meet the demand from projected growth, but it is not included in the Development Plans and Sustainable Communities Plans. Instead, the determination of what transportation improvements are needed to meet projected growth for the near term (next 10 years) and the long term (11 to 25 years) is made during the O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan (ORTP) update process, and then programmed through the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). These TIP projects are then funded by the City Council, State Legislature, and the Federal Government. The most recent plan is the ORTP 2035 which was adopted in April 2011 and identifies projects needed through 2035. The proposed revised 'Ewa DP does include a listing of planned and proposed transportation projects needed to meet expected growth for the next twenty five years, based mainly on the ORTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) &quot;The only traffic congestion mitigation measures presently in sight are the 'Ewa bound zipper lane and the H1 and H2 merge reconfiguration, with projected completion dates of late 2009 and 2011, respectively. The rail is scheduled to come on line in 2016 - but with the current economic downturn, it is expected that completion dates of all projects will be much delayed.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The first segment of the elevated rapid transit system is scheduled to come on line in 2013 with additional segments being opened until the full line from East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center is completed in 2019. According to the Honolulu High-Capacity Transit Corridor Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (p. 2-30, p. 3-9, Table 3-9), It will provide enough capacity to hold 90% of the 'Ewa and Wai'anae commuters that were driving toward downtown Honolulu at the Kunia Road/Fort Weaver Road &quot;screenline&quot; in 2005. Funding for transportation projects continues to be provided. Federal transportation project funds with strict completion deadlines were made available to stimulate the rebound of the economy. In addition, the pace of development has also been slowed by the recession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.080</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1 Transportation Systems) &quot;The push to develop the second city of Kapolei requires better planning. The H-1 Freeway was designed to carry some 9,000 vehicles per hour. Projections with rail in operation have that number around 17,000 per hour by the year 2030.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Congestion on H-1 Freeway is projected to continue even with the completion of the East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center segment of the elevated rapid transit system. City policy, adopted in 2002, is that commuting needs should be addressed by providing alternatives to single occupant auto travel on H-1 by creating the equivalent of the capacity of a six lane freeway (DTS, <em>Honolulu on the Move</em> [May 2008]) by 2019 with completion of the first increment of the rapid transit system, and by supplementing rapid transit with much improved service by express buses and HOV operating in the HOV lane. The only proven method of reducing highway congestion is to impose congestion fees that penalize travel during peak hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.2 Planned Extensions of the Roadway Network) UH WO has requested to be involved in the update to the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan and has asked that the proposed East-West Road and the widening of Farrington Highway from Fort Weaver Road to Kapolei Golf Course be added to the list of projects for inclusion in the impact fee program.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text in the proposed revised Plan has been updated to include a note that both the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan and the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan have been updated. The request for UH WO participation in the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan update was shared with DTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.100</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.3 Additional Elements of the Roadway Network) Extend Keaunui Drive to Renton Road</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text in the proposed revised Plan has been amended to add extension of Keaunui Drive to connect with Renton Road as a proposed project to be considered for inclusion in future updates of the ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan and the O‘ahu Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.3 Additional Elements of the Roadway Network) Connect Ocean Pointe to Kalaeloa</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The existing Plan calls for a connection to be made between Ocean Pointe and Kalaeloa (See p. 4-7, first bullet at the top of the page).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.120</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.3 Additional Elements of the Roadway Network) If a high school is developed as part of the Ho‘ opi project near the Honowai Street intersection with Kunia Road, the roadway &quot;plan should not include a traffic signal at the intersection of Honowai Street and Kunia Road...&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Neither the adopted ‘Ewa DP or the proposed revised Plan provide guidance on roadways in this particular area beyond calling for improved connectivity. Because individual project descriptions in the Plan are only conceptual and do not bind the specifics of City and State infrastructure planning, the Plan is not a suitable vehicle for this detailed traffic planning request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions about what access will be allowed from the proposed high school to Kunia Road, if any, will be made during the subdivision process and require approval from DOT, DTS, and DPP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.3 Commuter Ferry System) Provide more specifics on TheBoat passenger ferry service including where it will be boarded in ‘Ewa and how parking and transport will be provided.</td>
<td>OK 4-10, 15</td>
<td>The last day of operation for TheBoat was June 30, 2009. Language has been added to the proposed revised Plan indicating that a commuter ferry terminal should be located in the Hoakalei Marina if such service is found to be feasible and if sufficient funds to construct the terminal can be obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.140</td>
<td>WC-14.1</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4 Transit and Appendix A: Public Facilities Map) DLNR owns two parcels west of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) and mauka and makai of Farrington Highway. “Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.4.2, when read in conjunction with the Public Facilities Map, appear to provide for the rapid transit corridor and a park-and-ride facility to be located within the DLNR parcels. ... As of [Nov. 6, 2008], BLNR has not granted ... approval [for any easement or other rights] nor has any request for approval been presented to the BLNR.”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The policies and mapping in the proposed revised Plan are conceptual, and are not meant to be interpreted as parcel specific. Consequently, the Plan policy language is flexible enough to allow the City to proceed with an alternative routing and transit stop location if the DLNR and the City are unable to come to an agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.150</td>
<td>WC-42</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.1 Bus Service) &quot;Bus routes/stops, as well as park &amp; ride areas, need to be considered for the employees of the agricultural operations in the Kunia area to help minimize traffic along Kunia Road.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The ‘Ewa DP does support establishment of transit service throughout ‘Ewa and creation of linkages feeding into transit nodes along the rapid transit corridor. However, it is not the appropriate vehicle for establishing bus routes for Kunia Road. Your comments have been forwarded to DTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.160</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.2 Planned Rapid Transit Corridor) Clarify what is meant by the rapid transit corridor providing both an ‘Ewa shuttle service and a commuter service.</td>
<td>OK 4-9</td>
<td>The text has been revised to make it clear that the rapid transit system can be used either to travel to all the communities in ‘Ewa on the line between the City of Kapolei and Waipahū, or to commute to Downtown Honolulu for work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ #</td>
<td>ID #</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.170</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.2 Planned Rapid Transit Corridor) &quot;We note that the Transit EIS reports that the fixed guideway may require a width of 28 feet to 32 feet. The last sentence of (the 2nd para on p. 4-9) ... should be revised to read &quot;Such a system will require a minimum 28 foot right-of-way ...&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-10</td>
<td>The text has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.180</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.2 Planned Rapid Transit Corridor) Clarify that the rapid transit right-of-way runs along the east side of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) corridor and not in the median.</td>
<td>OK 4-10</td>
<td>The text has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.2 Planned Rapid Transit Corridor) Revise the description of the walking time for a 1/4 mile radius around the transit station to be 5 minutes, instead of 15 minutes.</td>
<td>OK 4-10</td>
<td>The text has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.200</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.4.2 Planned Rapid Transit Corridor) &quot;... improved bus service between 'Ewa and downtown Honolulu needs to be pursued and will complement the rail transit service once it is developed and operational.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The PRP includes the City policy adopted in 2002 which calls for both increased use of rapid transit and improved express bus and HOV service on the zipper lane to meet the demand for peak hour transportation which is consistent with your suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.210</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.5 Bikeway System) The Navy should allow limited pedestrian and bicycle access to Essex Road so that &quot;'Ewa Beach residents utilizing the Leeward Bikeway can have a safer way to access the beaches in Kalaeloa.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Essex Road is inside Kalaeloa and is under the control of the Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA). HCDA's Kalaeloa Master Plan (2006) does not show Essex Road as part of the bicycle network. Your suggestion has been forwarded to HCDA for their consideration in future planning for Kalaeloa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>WC-20</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) Include DOT in reviews as planning for proposed projects advances to &quot;a site-specific basis and detailed components are defined.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan does identify the critical role consultation with State DOT plays in transportation planning and development in 'Ewa. The shared responsibility for roadway planning and the coordination of federal funding to the State and the City through the O‘ahu Metropolitan Planning Agency is described in Sec. 4.1.2 of the existing Plan. The need for such consultation in determining conditions of approval for private projects is indicated in proposed revisions included in Sec. 4.1.6 of the proposed revised Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramsey version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.230</td>
<td>WC-20</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) Account for all land use and airspace protection requirements for operations at Kalaeloa Airport and Honolulu International Airport, including airfield protection zones, flight paths, and noise contours.</td>
<td>OK 3-53</td>
<td>Text has been added to Sec. 3.9.3 Relation to Urban Land Use Map calling for residential developments to be compatible with the Aircraft Approach and Clearance Zones for both airports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.240</td>
<td>WC-20</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) Coordinate roadway network improvements affecting the H-1 Freeway system, its interchanges, and other DOT roadways in the region with the DOT Highways Division</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>See the response to Comment 5.220 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>WC-25; WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;There is only congestion, anger, frustration, unhappiness and no Aloha on this once friendly route (from 'Ewa Beach to Waipahu) . . . There must be improvement made first before any more structures are built. There must be a moratorium on any more building until a reasonable way to move our people to and from the area is built and in place.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>An alternative to Fort Weaver Road has been provided by the opening of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) and Kapolei Parkway in early 2010. In addition, congestion on Fort Weaver Road was eased by the completion of the widening of Fort Weaver Road from Geiger Road to H-1 in 2009. As noted in the PRP, Council has the option of tying approvals of new zoning to availability of key infrastructure. Council also always has the option of declaring a building moratorium if they determine critical transportation infrastructure capacity is not available to support building activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.260</td>
<td>WC-26</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) We are firmly against the Hoopili land development. The zoning for the 33,000 house development should be RETRACTED!!!! Infrastructure on the 'Ewa side of the island is inadequate and cannot handle the demand of a new development. The additional cars will only cause an extraordinary amount of traffic congestion!!!! Our traffic jams are already one of the worse in the country!</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed residential development capacity for the Ho'opili project has been estimated at 11,750 units, not 33,000. ‘Ewa roadway capacity and connectivity does still need to be increased, but substantial improvements were completed in 2009 and 2010 with the widening of Fort Weaver Road to Geiger Road and the opening of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road)/Kapolei Parkway connection to H-1. Development of the rapid transit system between East Kapolei and Ala Moana Shopping Center over the next ten years will add capacity equivalent to six freeway lanes as an alternative to driving on congested freeways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) 26: "Future development (of Ho'opili) should only be considered when the light rail system is completed."  28: "Until the mass transit rail is operating, please prevent new housing development in the 'Ewa plains, and the west side of O'ahu."  30: "...some form of rail may be helpful, but not for years."

The first segment of the elevated rapid transit system between East Kapolei and Pearl Highlands is scheduled to be completed in 2013 with the final segment linking to Ala Moana Shopping Center scheduled to be completed by 2019.

The Ho'opili project still needs numerous approvals that will take time to obtain. As a result, it is likely that the transit system will be operating before most units at Ho'opili would be developed.

(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) "a comprehensive mass transit and bus system needs to be developed to promote connectivity among the Kalaeloa, 'Ewa Beach, and Kapolei West communities."

The existing Plan and the proposed revised Plan both support reducing individual auto use by encouraging walking, biking, and transit use for travel within 'Ewa.

(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) "(Build) another freeway or underwater tunnel between 'Ewa and Honolulu before more development is approved in our area."

The existing Plan adopted in 1997 calls for reduction in automobile dependence.

The proposed revised Plan would add the City policy adopted for Central Oahu in 2002 which says commuting needs should be met by increasing use of transit, making use of the HOV lane by express buses and car pools faster than single driver commuting, and using other forms of traffic demand management.

Providing more capacity for automobile commuting to Honolulu would only move the congestion problems to downtown Honolulu whose streets are already at capacity during peak hours, and is unsustainable.

The ORTP process is the appropriate venue for evaluating whether a new freeway or underwater tunnel is the appropriate way of providing added commuting capacity for 'Ewa. OMPO decided against including the underwater tunnel as a project for the ORTP2035 because of the expected high cost of land acquisition for the tunnel entrance on the 'Ewa side of the Pearl Harbor entrance, and Navy opposition to the project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;Ewa will remain a bedroom community. Even with the creation of local employment within `Ewa/Waipahu, data shows that only 30% of residents will be able to secure jobs within the region. The major employers - with better paying jobs - will continue to be Pearl Harbor, Fort Shafter, the financial center of Honolulu, the Airport, and Waikiki - necessitating commuting to town.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Portions of <code>Ewa will remain bedroom communities, and a significant number of </code>Ewa residents will continue to commute to downtown Honolulu. The adopted Plan recognizes the need to provide for commuters, and provides policies and guidelines for meeting that need. However, significant job creation has occurred and is projected to continue in <code>Ewa, and a portion of those jobs will be high paying jobs equivalent to those elsewhere in O</code>ahu. Job creation will help reduce the need to commute. The PRP reports the latest projections from OMPO which indicate that the share of residents who work in `Ewa will grow from 17% in 1990 to 46% in 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.310</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;It is imperative for a mass transit corridor to be maintained for all future development. This will guarantee protection of land along the corridor so that we won't have the problems encountered by the rail system.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The existing Plan calls for protection of a rapid transit corridor linking the City of Kapolei and Waipahu. The City is in the process of surveying and acquiring the right-of-way for the East Kapolei to Ala Moana Shopping Center portion of the elevated fixed guideway rapid transit system. The proposed revised Plan adds language calling for protection of the transit corridor right-of-way from East Kapolei through Kalaeloa to the City of Kapolei / Kapolei West terminus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.320</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;We should guarantee an easy flow between subdivisions and into town.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The Plan cannot guarantee congestion-free circulation systems for the auto. It can, and does encourage circulation systems that provide more alternatives to congested major roadways and that accommodate pedestrian and bike paths and alternative forms of mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.330</td>
<td>WC-50</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;In order to promote healthy lifestyles and a reduction in air pollution and traffic congestion, we should make sure that all planning also includes pedestrian walkways and bike lanes. This is especially true for Fort Weaver Road and Farrington Highway.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan includes policies and guidelines promoting provision of a network of pedestrian walkways and bikeways throughout `Ewa, including Fort Weaver Road and Farrington Highway. That network is illustrated on an in-text map and on maps in Appendix A. Implementation of the Plan policies will be aided by adoption of a new State law, Act 54 (09) that requires the State and the counties to accommodate pedestrians, bikers, and transit on public roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.340</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;(The 'Ewa DP) should require the City or State to build their share of roads concurrently while a new development is built.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The PRP does call for public agencies to work with the community to address current deficiencies and to create adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of the community. It also states that construction of new developments should be coordinated with provision of needed infrastructure where possible and practical. In 2002, the 'Ewa Highway Master Plan (EHMP) was approved and an impact fee program instituted to support construction of 15 roadway projects identified as needed by 2010. Twelve of the 15 projects identified in the EHMP are scheduled to be completed by 2011. An updated EHMP was completed on May 2011 and identifies additional roadway projects to be funded and provides a basis for revising the impact fees needed to provide support for 'Ewa roadway projects. A listing of 'Ewa transportation projects with reports on current status is included in the 'Ewa DP Review Report. See Table 2-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies) &quot;...the city is moving full speed ahead, proposing to build a massive rail transit project ... as the only solution to 'Ewa's problems.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>'Ewa's transportation problems will be addressed by expeditious completion of the first segment of the rapid transit elevated guideway system, job development in 'Ewa, major investments in 'Ewa roadways, improved Express Bus and HOV service on the zipper lane, and traffic demand measures to reduce congestion and single occupant peak hour driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.360</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.6 General Policies: Transit-Oriented Community Street Systems – Reduction in Automobile Use) &quot;(Add) another 'sub-bullet' which states: 'Allowing and encouraging a mix of land uses (including office space outside of the City of Kapolei), to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel and to minimize the centralization of vehicle trips and the congestion of traffic.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan already allows &quot;a mix of land uses&quot; to be developed outside of the City of Kapolei, including office uses. Medium density mixed-use is particularly encouraged within a 1/4 mile radius around the rapid transit stations on the transit corridor, including the station at the corner of Kapolei Parkway and Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road). Specifics on the range of uses permitted in commercial centers outside of the City of Kapolei are provided in Sec. 3.9.1 and include multi-family residential use above the first floor, retail outlets, dining outlets, entertainment centers, and offices that provide services to the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.370</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.7 Guidelines) Phase II of the Leeward Bikeway needs to be funded by the 2009 Legislature. Phase II (which goes ) from the Hawaiian Railway Society's yard to Lualualei Naval Road in Nānākuli has been dropped from the STIP/TIP by the (OMPO) Policy Committee for funding in this current fiscal cycle.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan supports the construction of the full Leeward Bikeway as part of the 'Ewa bikeway network. Funding support for the project is duly noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.7 Guidelines) Build an overpass to allow Farrington Highway traffic to pass over the Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposal for a Farrington Highway overpass should be submitted for consideration in O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan and/or the 'Ewa Highway Master Plan update processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.390</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.1.7 Guidelines) Ft. Weaver Road should be widened to provide an additional town-bound lane onto H-1.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted 'Ewa DP calls for widening of Fort Weaver Road as one of the projects identified in the 'Ewa Highway Master Plan as needed by 2010. The suggestion for an additional town-bound lane should be submitted for consideration in the ORTP update or the TIP processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>WC-08</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) Utilize recycled water for irrigation and other non-potable water purposes.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Sec. 4.2 in the adopted Plan calls for new developments to install dual systems - one to provide potable water and one to provide non-potable water for irrigation and other appropriate urban uses where BWS feels such dual systems should be required. Proposed changes to Sec. 4.2 in the PRP clarify the criteria that BWS uses to determine when such systems are to be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.410</td>
<td>WC-14.2</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) The discussion on the O'ahu Water Management Plan in Section 4.2 could be expanded to make a clearer link between the OWMP and the 'Ewa Development Plan, i.e. that a primary objective of the OWMP is to set forth the allocation of water to land use based on the land use plans and policies established in the county development plans.</td>
<td>OK 4-18</td>
<td>Text was added to Sec. 4.2 reflecting the suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.420</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) Make minor clarifications and updates to Water Reclamation and Desalination Project information</td>
<td>OK 4-18</td>
<td>Requested changes were made to text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.430</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Table 4.2) Update the Table 4.2 listing of potential sources of potable and non-potable water for 'Ewa.</td>
<td>OK 4-21</td>
<td>Requested changes were made to Table 4.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.440</td>
<td>HB1693</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) The city and county of Honolulu's development plan for the 'Ewa planning area (should) protect and enhance the recharge capability of the Honouliuli watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.450</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) &quot;...(update) information … relating to the Kaleloa Desalination Project&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.460</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2 Water Allocation and System Development) &quot;include the actual amount of potable water that is estimated to be needed by the 'Ewa community currently and in 2030. The draft document currently states only the additional amount that will be needed (27 mgd) from the 2000 levels, which is problematic.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.470</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2.1 General Policies) Add requirement for BWS to confirm adequacy of existing capacity prior to building permit approval for existing lot developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.480</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2.1 General Policies) Add determination of requirement for dual water systems at stage of construction plan approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.490</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2.1 General Policies) Rewrite the policy on Development and Allocation of Potable Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2.1 General Policies) Correct and clarify terms used in the policy on Use of Nonpotable Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.510</td>
<td>WC-27</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.2.1 General Policies) Make minor edit to proposed policy on Alternative Water Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.520</td>
<td>WC-08</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.3 Wastewater Treatment) All wastewater plans must conform to DOH rules.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.530</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.3.1 General Policies) &quot;Require the City and County of Honolulu to be in compliance with the federal rules and regulations and specifications for sewage that are set by the Environmental Protection Agency …&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>There is no effect from putting such a policy in the ‘Ewa Development Plan, because with or without such a policy, the City must always comply with City, State, and Federal law in all matters. The City has withdrawn its appeal of EPA’s ruling that secondary treatment is required for all effluent discharged from ocean outfalls, and has reached an agreement with the EPA on how to comply with EPA requirements regarding upgrades to wastewater treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.540</td>
<td>WC-57</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.3.1 General Policies) &quot;Require that all planned development projects within the area that is covered by the ‘Ewa Development Plan … and which will be users of the sewage line grid pay a ‘user fee’ for sewage processed in ‘Ewa.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Fees for wastewater service are established by ordinance by Council, and cover all residential and non-residential projects which are hooked up to the City wastewater system. In addition, new developments typically pay a first time connection charge, as well as paying to install the lines necessary to reach from their development to the nearest wastewater collection line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.550</td>
<td>WC-16</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.4 Electrical Power Development) Add &quot;the need for different types of generation to help reliably integrate additional renewable energy from intermittent sources&quot; as creating need for additional power generation capacity and clarify that the retirement of the Honolulu Power Plant is &quot;possible&quot;, not proposed.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text was revised to reflect the suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.560</td>
<td>WC-16</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.4 Electrical Power Development) Add information about HECO's renewable energy development activities</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Text was added to note that HECO has a number of renewable energy initiatives and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.570</td>
<td>WC-16</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.4.1 General Policies) Don't make change proposed for the 3rd bullet</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The proposed change is not a policy change. It simply changes the policy sentence from the passive form adopted in 1997 to an active verb form restatement of the same policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.580</td>
<td>WC-22</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.5 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal) Correct the capacity provided by the proposed new boiler to be 900,000 tons per year.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The correction was made to Sec. 4.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.590</td>
<td>WC-22</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.5 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal) Update the text to reflect acceptance of the Final EIS for the landfill expansion in October 2008</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The text was updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>COMMENT</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>WC-22</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.5 Solid Waste Handling and Disposal) Update the text to reflect the updating of the Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan in 2008 and submittal for approval by the City Council.</td>
<td>OK 4-28</td>
<td>The text was updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.610</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.6 Drainage Systems) The development plan should include the specific requirements of the EPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program, the State Water Quality Standards, and the State's anti-degradation policy.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The purpose of the Sec. 4.6 introductory section is to provide context for the policies and guidelines that follow, not to provide specific regulatory requirements of the Federal Government and the State. The introductory section already notes that the Federal Government has placed requirements on the states and the counties to reduce non-point source pollution, resulting in strengthening of the City’s Drainage Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.620</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.6 Drainage Systems) The development plan should include a listing of specific Best Management Practices for control and mitigation of non-point source pollution such as use of thick vegetation or buffer strips, and permeable pavement; standards &quot;for the creation and use of sediment basins at critical locations;&quot; or methods of altering channelized waterways to capture sediments.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The cited examples are best practices which are provided in other City documents which provide guidance to developers on what is specifically required for drainage master plans and construction permits. The requested level of detail is not appropriate for a regional land use and infrastructure plan which provides the general policy requiring flood control, minimization of non-source pollution, and the retention and/or detention of storm waters on site and in appropriate open space and wetland areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.630</td>
<td>WC-34</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.6 Drainage Systems) &quot;...many of the drainage features in ‘Ewa are either in interim stages or are out of compliance with federal, state and city standards. ... These nonconformities and probably violations should be rectified and monitoring established to ensure that water quality standards are currently being met. Otherwise, to point out current transgressions while proposing future works is indicative of poor planning and stewardship.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>It is not clear what changes to the Plan are being suggested. Drainage systems in ‘Ewa are in varying stages of development and compliance with standards. The proposed revised Plan identifies current challenges and provides policies and guidelines on how those problems should be addressed. City adoption of such policies and guidelines as part of the ‘Ewa Plan is appropriate and are a necessary first step which serves as the basis for adopting regulations and standards needed to improve implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.640</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.6) Amend the Kalo‘i Gulch Drainage Basin paragraph third sentence as follows: &quot;Historically, the drainage pattern in this basin has flowed from the Wai‘anae Mountain Range above Makakilo through the Kalo‘i Gulch toward the ocean terminating on Haseko’s Ocean Pointe property at One‘ula Beach Park.</td>
<td>OK 4-31</td>
<td>The text in the proposed revised Plan has been amended to reflect that more accurate description of Kalo‘i Gulch drainage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
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<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.650</td>
<td>WC-42</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.6.1 General Policies) &quot;(Include discussion) regarding capturing storm water and using it to recharge the cap rock under the 'Ewa plains … as well as recharge from Waianahole Ditch…&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Both sources of water for recharging the aquifer are already discussed in the existing Plan. Sec. 4.6.2 (p. 4-27) calls for use of storm water as a potential irregular source of water for recharge of the aquifer that should be retained for absorption rather than quickly moved to coastal waters. Sec. 4.2.1 (p. 4-20) calls for the State Water Commission to consider providing Waianahole Ditch Water both to meet agricultural irrigation needs in 'Ewa and Central O'ahu and to provide high quality recharge of the Pearl Harbor aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.660</td>
<td>WC-01</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) Need some private schools building campuses here so we don't have to take our kids into town every morning</td>
<td>OK 4-34</td>
<td>Language was added to Sec. 4.7 recognizing the role that private schools fill in meeting school needs, and identifying the capacity provided by private schools in 'Ewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.670</td>
<td>WC-11; WC-48</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) School impact fee law replaced &quot;fair-share&quot; practice and is being implemented for designated school impact districts. 'Ewa-Kapolei is expected to be designated an impact area, but agreements have already been made for most large developments in 'Ewa.</td>
<td>OK 4-34</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 has been updated to reflect the change in State law and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.680</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) Developers have shown no interest in lease/purchase (of schools).</td>
<td>OK 4-34</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 has been updated to reflect this change in DOE emphasis from policies followed in 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.690</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) DOE is no longer planning multi-track schools. 'Ewa Makai Middle is the last multi-track school in the pipeline</td>
<td>OK 4-34</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 has been updated to reflect the change in State law and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.700</td>
<td>WC-11; WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) DOE is planning for 7 elementary schools in 'Ewa (Mehana, East Kapolei [1 DHHL, 2 UHWO], Ho'opili [3])</td>
<td>OK 4-34, 35</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 and Table 4.3 have been updated to reflect the current plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.710</td>
<td>WC-11; WC-48: WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) Plans for 3 middle schools in 'Ewa ('Ewa Makai Middle [open 2011], DHHL East Kapolei, Makaiwa Hills)</td>
<td>OK 4-34, 35</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 and Table 4.3 have been updated to reflect the current plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.720</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) Plans for 2 high schools in 'Ewa (East Kapolei, Ho'opili)</td>
<td>OK 4-34, 35</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 and Table 4.3 have been updated to reflect the current plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
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<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.730</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) Policy is to design school sites within ranges (Elementary [8 to 15 acres], Middle schools [15 to 20 acres], &amp; High schools [45 to 55 acres])</td>
<td>OK 4-34</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.7 has been updated to reflect current practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.740</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) DOE has problems with policies for schools to serve as &quot;cultural and recreation&quot; centers … There are opportunities for schools to support community activities, but … only after educational purposes are met. facilities (can be made)…available for non-school related use (only) when such use does not conflict with school operations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The policy does not call for DOE's mission to change, but asks that DOE recognize that the community will ask for use of its facilities to meet these community needs, and that factor should be considered and accommodated in designing school facilities if possible without compromising DOE's primary mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>WC-11</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) DOE has problems with co-location policies. Co-location with parks has not worked because it has resulted in restrictions on school use of park space, use of school resources to maintain parks, insufficient space for both schools and parks, and threats to student safety because the school cannot prohibit the public from using the park and has difficulty monitoring students in non-school controlled areas.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The policy does not call for DOE to use the community parks for school recreation needs, or for insufficient space to be provided for either schools or parks. It simply calls for parks to be located next to schools, and for the State and the City consult on ways that needless duplication might be avoided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.760</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Table 4.3) &quot;Agreements are in place with the (DOE) to provide locations for elementary schools in Mākāia Hills and Kapolei West and a middle school in Mākāia Hills.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-35</td>
<td>Table 4.3 was updated to reflect that information as confirmed by the DOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.770</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Table 4.3) Keone‘ula Elementary School opened January 2007</td>
<td>OK 4-35</td>
<td>Table 4.3 was updated to reflect the change from planned to existing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) &quot;Parking at schools needs to be increased.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>We have forwarded your comments to the Facilities Development Branch of the Department of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.790</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.7 School Facilities) &quot;Every (new) school's boundary (identifying where the students for the new school will live) … must be deployed with clarity and announced well in advance prior to surrounding development being determined.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The Plan is not the appropriate vehicle for these suggestions regarding school student feeder area boundaries. The suggestions have been forwarded to the DOE for their separate response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.800</td>
<td>WC-09</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.8 Public Safety Facilities) Provide land for future construction of a police substation in Ho'opili</td>
<td>OK 4-37, 38</td>
<td>The text in Sec. 4.8 and Table 4.4 in the proposed revised Plan has been updated to include the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.810</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.8 Public Safety Facilities) Discussions with the HFD on the location of the future Maka'iwa Hills fire station within the project are underway.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>That is consistent with the adopted 'Ewa DP text and Table 4.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.820</td>
<td>WC-51</td>
<td>(Table 4.4) &quot;The new fire station at Ocean Pointe is anticipated to open late 2010.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-38</td>
<td>Table 4.4 in the proposed revised Plan has been updated to reflect the opening date as late 2011 as confirmed by HFD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.830</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Table 4.4) &quot;The DHHL East Kapolei 1 Subdivision Plan shows a site reservation for an East Kapolei Fire Station. This should be added to Table 4.4.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-38</td>
<td>Table 4.4 in the proposed revised Plan has been updated as confirmed by HFD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.840</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 4.9 Other Community Facilities) &quot;St. Francis West Hospital&quot; is now called 'Hawai'i Medical Center - West&quot;</td>
<td>OK 4-40</td>
<td>The name has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>CH. 5 IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.010</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1 Phasing of Development) Update the information from Table 2.1 to reflect recent changes in land use entitlements</td>
<td>OK 5-2</td>
<td>The text has been updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.020</td>
<td>WC-55</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1 Phasing of Development) &quot;(We) are concerned about dropping the concept of phasing from the 'Ewa Development Plan. ... (If transportation conditions improve), builders of the 33,000 houses already zoned will all want to build. Who will come first? There has to be something in the Plan that will establish the order by which they will all be approved.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The phasing adopted in the 1997 'Ewa DP established when zone change applications could be accepted for processing, and did not involve phasing of building permits for properties already zoned for residential, commercial, or industrial uses which is the concern that you raised. There is no evidence that the phasing in the approved Plan had any effect on the pace of development in 'Ewa since the Plan was adopted in 1997. There does not need to be a City approved order by which housing unit permits will be allowed, in effect choosing winners and losers among developers. So long as adequate infrastructure is available, any developer who has built the required on-site and off-site infrastructure should be able to compete for residential buyers. If Council determines that there is inadequate infrastructure to meet demands caused by new development in 'Ewa, they can place a moratorium on building permits until the shortfall in capacity has been addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.030</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1.2 Public Facility Investment Priorities) <em>(Add) a description of the City and County of Honolulu's … position on and recommended process for utilizing alternative infrastructure financing mechanisms such as community facilities districts …(to) provide valuable information for gauging the feasibility of these types of tools to promote future growth in the 'Ewa DP area.</em></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sec. 2.2.10 in the proposed revised Plan supports the use of public-private financing methods such as TIF and CFD to provide funding for infrastructure concurrently with, or in advance of, residential and commercial development. This issue is discussed in greater detail in Sec. 2.3.4.2 of the Review Report (p. 2-21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.040</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1.2 Public Facility Investment Priorities) &quot;…place a high priority on the dedication of resources for constructing and maintaining infrastructure within the (Secondary Urban Center) to help fulfill the objectives of the O'ahu General Plan and the 'Ewa DP.&quot;</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The revised Sec. 5.1.2 priorities in the proposed revised Plan do indicate the need for significant infrastructure investment and maintenance in both the Secondary Urban Center and the 'Ewa Urban Fringe area to carry out the vision for 'Ewa's development and meet the needs created by that development. The determination of which investments are of highest priority is decided through functional planning and the capital improvement program budgeting process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1.2 Public Facility Investment Priorities) <em>(add) the construction of new elementary, middle and high schools to the list of 'Significant Capital Improvement Projects of the highest priority…</em></td>
<td>OK 5-4</td>
<td>A bullet has been added to the proposed revised Plan calling for financing and construction of all the planned elementary, middle, and high schools identified by DOE as needed to meet the expected increase in population in 'Ewa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.060</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1.2 Public Facility Investment Priorities) &quot;The East West Connector Road must be adopted into the ('Ewa DP) as a priority. The portion of this road that is to traverse private property should be open for public use at the earliest possible time permitted.&quot;</td>
<td>OK 5-5</td>
<td>The text in the proposed revised Plan has been amended to add the network of collector/connector roads, including the East-West Road connecting the UH WO lands and Fort Weaver Road, to the list of significant capital improvement projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.070</td>
<td>WC-41</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.1.2 Public Facility Investment Priorities) &quot;The North South Road must be completed ahead of schedule. As it stands, four of the six lanes to its terminus at Kapolei Parkway coming into 'Ewa Beach from the H-1 freeway is funded and expected to be available for use to the public by 2010. Yet, funding by the state for completion to a full six lanes to the terminus near Keone'ula Boulevard has yet to be solidified.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The adopted Plan does call for completion of the Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road) between H-1 and Kapolei Parkway as one of the highest priority significant capital improvement projects. Extension of Kualaka'i Parkway (North-South Road) into Kalaeloa to connect with Keone'ula Boulevard at the edge of Ocean Pointe is described in the proposed revised Plan Sec. 4.1.3 as an additional element of the roadway network. It is also a project included in the 2011 'Ewa Highway Master Plan update and the recently approved O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035 which makes it eligible for City impact fee funding and Federal support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.080</td>
<td>WC-40</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.3 Functional Plans) &quot;...there are neither service and facility design standards nor level of service, also known as 'concurrency' guidelines for determining infrastructure adequacy in the <strong>Ewa Development Plan</strong>, both of which were supposed to have been incorporated in a new or existing City and County transportation functional plan which was to have been prepared and submitted to the Mayor by the Department of Transportation Services in consultation with the (DPP) and the State (DOT).&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Sec. 5.3 in the adopted <strong>Ewa DP</strong> does not call for the level of service standards to be in the <strong>Ewa DP</strong>, but rather to be included in the functional plans prepared by the line agencies. Level of service guidelines are not synonymous with &quot;concurrency&quot; guidelines. The functional plans prepared by the Department of Environmental Services, the O'ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (with the assistance of the DPP, the Department of Transportation Services, and the State DOT), the Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Board of Water Supply do contain such level of service standards. The most recent transportation functional plan is the <strong>O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan 2035</strong> adopted in April 2011. Final approval for the ORTP is not made by the Mayor; it is approved by the OMPO Policy Committee which is made up of 13 members from the State and City government (5 City Council members, 6 State legislators, the State Director of Transportation, and the City Director of Transportation Services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.090</td>
<td>WC-45</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.3 Functional Plans) &quot;(The <strong>Ewa DP</strong>) requires that Levels of Service be developed during the Capital Improvement Program. Since this has not been done, we want to have this Plan define Service Guidelines for adequate facilities and infrastructure requirements at Level of Service C.&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Levels of Service <strong>have</strong> been defined for transportation and other infrastructure during the functional planning and capital improvement program (CIP) processes. Functional plans and project specific CIP proposals are the appropriate place to provide such standards. A level C standard for State highways at peak hour would be an extremely expensive and unsustainable standard. Maximum capacity is typically reached at Level D, and Level E is generally recognized to represent the threshold of unacceptable operating service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEQ # | ID # | COMMENT | EVAL | REMARKS
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
6.100 | WC-46 | (Sec. 5.4.2 Review of Zoning and Other Development Applications) " (The 'Ewa DP) should require specific facilities for teleworking as a component of reducing H-1 traffic...Telework Centers should be required as part of community master plans." | √ | The adopted Plan calls for Project Master Plans prepared as part of the Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement submitted with significant zone changes to include a discussion of the telecommunications sites and facilities that would be provided to meet expected needs. In addition, the Plan supports creation of jobs at 'Ewa centers as an alternative to commuting, noting that the number of residents working in 'Ewa is expected to grow from 17% in 1990 to 46% in 2030. Nothing in the Plan or existing zoning is a barrier to private firms or public agencies creating telecommuting centers in 'Ewa. The State and the City have moved entire department headquarters to 'Ewa, not just telecommuting centers, and these departments use telecommunications to communicate and coordinate with satellite offices and other agencies.

6.110 | WC-40 | (Sec. 5.4.3 Adequate Facilities Requirement) "...the existing 'Ewa Development Plan requires that level of service ... guidelines to define adequate public facilities and infrastructure requirements be established "during the Capital Improvement Program"...to (be) used in reviewing 'Ewa (DP) area zoning changes ... (The) application of these level of service ... guidelines in reviewing ...zoning changes is simply too late in the process to make a difference given that provision of regional transportation infrastructure improvements and the rectification of regional transportation infrastructure deficiencies are the responsibility of Federal, State and county governments, not area developers..." | √ | We agree that individual developers cannot solve regional transportation problems. However, Sec. 5.4.3 is concerned with what is supposed to happen when zone changes are evaluated, not when regional transportation planning is done. As part of the zone change application review, the responsible line agencies, including the DTS, DPP, and DOT, are asked to provide comments on transportation conditions, and to recommend conditions needed to assure adequacy of local roadways. Typically, the adopted condition of zoning requires that, prior to approval of subdivision or construction permits, the developer must pay for a traffic impact assessment report which is used to identify the required improvements to local roadways the developer must make. Expected impacts and local roadway conditions are evaluated using level of service standards to determine what improvements are needed. This evaluation of local traffic impacts and needed improvements is not to be confused with the evaluation of island-wide and regional transportation needs, overall transportation system performance, and system capacity that takes place during the O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan update process.

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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C-69
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.120 | WC-40  | (Sec. 5.4.3 Adequate Facilities Requirement) “…should there not be adequate regional transportation infrastructure (based on the application of level of service standards) and a finding that not all developments can be accommodated, | √    | There is not one level of service standard to assess a regional transportation system. Multiple measures of performance are used to assess system adequacy. For example, the ORTP 2030 says that:  
- the percentage of people in 2030 traveling by transit, biking or walking will have increased;  
- travel time per vehicle trip will have been slightly reduced;  
- highway congestion will be somewhat worse on average with the worst increases on the Windward Side; and  
- Wai'anae Coast and 'Ewa residents will realize the greatest time savings from planned infrastructure improvements.  
Even if the overall system is adequate, individual elements with the system may still operate at unsatisfactory levels of service because the decision has been made that capacity can be provided more economically elsewhere. For example, the elevated fixed guideway and traffic on City streets might be operating at Level B, express buses and HOV autos at Level C&D, and single occupant autos at Level F. |
| 6.130 | WC-40  | (Sec. 5.4.3) There should be a finding of whether the regional transportation system is adequate in the revised ‘Ewa DP and if it is found to be inadequate, there should be a moratorium and allocation of existing capacity to specific developments | √    | The vehicle for addressing the capacity of transportation infrastructure or the need for a moratorium is not through the ‘Ewa Development Plan.  
The adopted ‘Ewa DP established the policy that there should be adequate infrastructure to meet the demands of existing and planned communities, and that functional planning should be done to establish what infrastructure is needed when.  
The determination of what transportation investments are needed for the region occurs during the ORTP process; transportation infrastructure need assessments for individual projects are made at the time of zone change, and subdivision approvals.  
Council has the ability through each of these processes to determine if a delay or moratorium on development is needed and has the power to impose a moratorium until sufficient capacity is provided. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.140</td>
<td>WC-40</td>
<td>(Sec. 5.4.3. Adequate Facilities Requirement) &quot;(If there is a finding that the regional transportation infrastructure is not adequate) …the order of development allowed to proceed based upon available infrastructure should be in accordance with the Section 5.1 Phasing of Development provisions in the 1997 ‘Ewa (DP), whereby those developments not presently in the State Land Use Urban District and which lack County zoning would be the last to be approved by the Council.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>In order for the City Council to impose a moratorium on building permits, the process by which existing capacity would be allocated to developments would have to be specified in the moratorium ordinance. If a moratorium was needed, Council should determine priorities based on the facts at that time. As a result, it would be inappropriate to specify in advance in the ‘Ewa DP what should be the priorities in case of a moratorium when the facts of such a hypothetical situation are unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.000</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>APPENDIX A: CONCEPTUAL MAPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.010</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Glossary of Terms) Correct the acreage of the campus to reflect the 136 now included in the campus area</td>
<td>OK A-8, 12</td>
<td>The text has been corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.020</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(Glossary of Terms) Clarify whether Transit Node (Medium Density Residential and Commercial) is synonymous with Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use.</td>
<td>OK A-8, 10, 13, 14</td>
<td>The terms have been changed to be consistent with the use elsewhere of Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.030</td>
<td>WC-38</td>
<td>(App. A Open Space Map, Urban Land Use Map, Public Facility Map, Phasing Map) &quot;The ‘Ewa DP conceptual maps represent more access points between Makaiwa Hills and Farrington Highway than are feasible. For instance, the expansion of the Kōʻiʻo Drive/Farrington Highway intersection to serve as a connection to Makaiwa Hills is shown. ... this connection has been assessed and was determined to be infeasible. Access to Makaiwa Hills from the existing Ko Olina Interchange also is neither planned or feasible.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>We agree that access to Makaïwa Hills from the Ko Olina interchange is not feasible, and will revise the App. A maps accordingly. Existing agreements between the developer and State DOT on how access is to be provided from State Highways have established the requirements for Makaiwa Hills development and will not be affected by the adoption of the revised ‘Ewa DP. However, roadways shown in Appendix A of the FPRP are conceptual, indicating desirable connections which may be possible to realize at some point in the future when viewpoints and conditions may have changed. For example, Kōʻiʻo Drive which is now a private, gated roadway, is required under conditions of zoning to be dedicated to the City at some point in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.040</td>
<td>WC-21</td>
<td>(App. A Open Space Map, Urban Land Use Map, Public Facility Map, Phasing Map) Do proposed revisions to the Appendix A maps in the vicinity of Fort Weaver Road reflect a change in policy with regard to the size of the proposed church campus, the location of the East-West connector road, or the permissible use of the site?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>No, the maps in the Plan are conceptual, are not meant to be read as specifying what land uses are permitted or not permitted on specific parcels, or the specific location of infrastructure, and therefore, pose no obstacle to the planned uses of the two parcels. Those details will be determined in the appropriate land use approval, subdivision, and/or permitting processes required for development of the proposed church campus. The Maps illustrate the intent that the area be part of a residential and low-density apartment community, that there are important public views of the Wai‘anae Mountains from Fort Weaver Road along the West Loch golf course, that two important east-west connector roadways will link to Fort Weaver Road in that vicinity, and that the area is not a new development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.050</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(App. A Open Space Map, Urban Land Use Map, and Public Facilities Map) Change the roadway network within the UH WO property.</td>
<td>OK A-15, 17, 19</td>
<td>The roadway pattern has been revised to reflect the recommended roadway pattern for 2030+ from the ‘Ewa Roadway Connectivity Study published by DPP in May 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.060</td>
<td>WC-04</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Show DHHL shopping center as Regional Commercial Center instead of Community Commercial Center</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Substantial public and private investment has been expended to implement the vision of creating O‘ahu’s second city at the City of Kapolei. The existing Plan calls for all regional retail outlets to be located in the City of Kapolei in order to support the creation of the Second City, and for shopping centers in the Urban Fringe Area to be designed at a scale to serve their surrounding communities and not draw significant numbers of customers from outside the surrounding area. Dispersal of regional attractions throughout ‘Ewa would slow the creation of a critical mass of urban activities in the City of Kapolei. However, the proposed revised Plan has been revised to include the information that the DHHL has exempted themselves from this aspect of the Plan and City zoning and will proceed with the development of a Regional Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.070</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Revise the location of the UH WO campus</td>
<td>OK A-17</td>
<td>The shape and location of the UH WO campus on the Urban Land Use Map in the proposed revised Plan has been revised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  √ No change needed in Plan;  OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version;  R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.080</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Revise the land use pattern to reflect the approved land use zoning. Revise the map to show the A-2 with a 60 foot height limit zoning received by the UH WOC in 2007 as Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use instead of Residential and Low Density Apartment.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use shading was extended beyond the 1/4 mile radius around the two transit stations to show the extent of the BMX-3 zoning. The remaining private development lands are shown in residential use since their zoning does not permit commercial mixed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.090</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Revise the relocated Kaloi Gulch drainageway to show it is not in the southern end of the UH WO property</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The Appendix A maps are conceptual maps, intended to illustrate the vision, policies, and guidelines of the Plan. The portrayal of the Kaloi Gulch drainageway on the Open Space and Urban Land Use map indicates the approximate location of the drainageway and its general relationship to infrastructure and projects. Approved drainage master plans will specify the exact location, dimensions, and characteristics of the Kaloi Gulch Drainageway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.100</td>
<td>WC-15</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Will the fact that the Urban Land Use Map shows a Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use on the Hawai‘i Army National Guard land limit the future construction and use of the HIARNG land? Will the Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use designation on the map interfere with plans to construct an Army Aviation Support Facility at Kalaeloa?</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The Urban Land Use Map in the proposed revised Plan has been revised to remove the Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use shading from the HIARNG parcel to clarify that the military use of the site is expected to continue. The maps in the Plan are conceptual, are not meant to be read as specifying what land uses are permitted or not permitted on specific parcels, and therefore, do not pose an obstacle to the planned military uses at your facility. The Medium Density Apartment/Commercial Mixed Use circle near the HIARNG facility illustrates the policy support in the Plan for Transit Oriented Development in the 1/4 mile radius around the proposed Saratoga/Fort Barrette transit station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.110</td>
<td>WC-43</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) “… all lands owned by the federal government should be identified on the Urban Land Use Map as Federal rather than Military … to help clarify for the general public which lands are excluded from state and municipal jurisdiction.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>The designations on the Urban Land Use Map are there to illustrate the land use policies in the ‘Ewa DP regarding what land uses are located where in ‘Ewa, not to indicate who has jurisdiction over that land use. Thus military residential areas are shown in residential use, not in military use. In addition, both the City and State contend that Federal lands not being used for Defense Department purposes are subject to City and State land use controls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: √ No change needed in Plan; OK Change made to Proposed Revised Plan/page # for Ramseyer version; R Implementation issue, see Review Report
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEQ #</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>EVAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.120</td>
<td>WC-54</td>
<td>(App. A Urban Land Use Map) Change the &quot;Urban Land Use Map designation (for the area in Ko Olina proposed for a school site) ... from Public Institution to Residential and Low Density Apartment.&quot;</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The Public Institution shading was removed from this area and from the Keone'ula Elementary school site because there is no intention to show elementary school sites on the Appendix A maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.130</td>
<td>WC-39</td>
<td>(App. A Public Facilities Map) Revise the location of the transit corridor from the west side of the Kualaka‘i Parkway (North-South Road) to the east side of the Kualaka‘i Parkway.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The Appendix A maps are conceptual maps, intended to illustrate the vision, policies, and guidelines of the Plan. The portrayal of the transit corridor on the Public Facilities map indicates the approximate location of the corridor and its general relationship to infrastructure and projects. The exact location, dimensions, and characteristics of the rapid transit right-of-way will be established during the transit system right-of-way acquisition process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.140</td>
<td>WC-59</td>
<td>(App. A Public Facilities Map) Move the intermediate school symbol shown in East Kapolei to a location near the Kroc Center in the DHHL East Kapolei 2 project.</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>The symbol on the proposed revised Plan Appendix A Public Facilities Map has been moved closer to the planned location in DHHL East Kapolei 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.150</td>
<td>WC-48</td>
<td>(App. A Open Space Map, Urban Land Use Map, Public Facility Map, Phasing Map) &quot; ... most of the maps show Asing Park on the wrong side of Fort Weaver Road and a non-existent road in Ewa by Gentry&quot;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Asing Park is a Community Park, and Community Parks are not shown on the proposed revised Plan Appendix A maps. The only community-based parks shown on the Appendix A maps are district parks. The park which is shown on the Wai'anae side of Fort Weaver Road is a district park planned to be developed as part of the Ho'opili development. The road identified is not in Ewa by Gentry. It is Keone'ula Boulevard which runs along the makai edge of the future Ocean Pointe District Park to the Hoakalei Marina.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Abbreviations:

BLNR: Board of Land and Natural Resources, DLNR
CIP: Capital Improvement Program
CO SCP Central O'ahu Sustainable Communities Plan
DBEDT: State Department of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism
DLNR: State Department of Land and Natural Resources
DOH: State Department of Health
DOT: State Department of Transportation
DP: Development Plan
DPR: Department of Parks and Recreation
DTS: Department of Transportation Services
DPP: Department of Planning and Permitting
ENV: Department of Environmental Services
EHMP: ‘Ewa Highway Master Plan
GP: O'ahu General Plan
HARC: Hawai'i Agricultural Research Center
HCDA: (State) Hawai'i Community Development Authority
HFD: Honolulu Fire Department
HOV: High Occupancy Vehicles
HRS: Hawai'i Revised Statutes
HSPA: Hawai'i Sugar Planters' Association
KMP: Kalaeloa Master Plan
LUO: Land Use Ordinance
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding

OMPO: O'ahu Metropolitan Planning Organization
ORTP: O'ahu Regional Transportation Plan
OWMP: O'ahu Water Management Plan
PRP: Proposed Revised ‘Ewa Development Plan sent to Planning Commission and City Council. (All page references are to the Modified Ramseyer version which shows all changes either with shading, or with underlined additions and strikeouts for deletions).
ROH: Revised Ordinances of Honolulu
SCP: Sustainable Communities Plan
SR&R Subdivision Rules and Regulations
TIP: Transportation Improvement Program
UH WO University of Hawai'i West O'ahu College
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<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Astrid M B Liverman, Architecture Branch Chief</td>
<td>State DLNR Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Kioni Dudley, President</td>
<td>Friends of Makakilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>John Bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>John Bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Debra M A Luning</td>
<td>The Gentry Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Svea Breckberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>State Representative Rida Cabanilla</td>
<td>State Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Jon McKenna, Development Project Manager</td>
<td>Haseko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30 Jan 09</td>
<td>Jack Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>11 Feb 09</td>
<td>Mary Moore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>13 Mar 09</td>
<td>Keith Kurahashi</td>
<td>Ko Olina Development LLC (agent for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>13 Mar 09</td>
<td>Kioni Dudley, President</td>
<td>Friends of Makakilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>13 Mar 09</td>
<td>EJ D'Andrea, Lt. Commander, CEC</td>
<td>US Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>15 Mar 09</td>
<td>Glen Oamilda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>25 Mar 09</td>
<td>Lester Chang, Director</td>
<td>City Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>30 Mar 09</td>
<td>Micah Kane, Chairman</td>
<td>State Hawaiian Homes Commission (DHHL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10 Apr 09</td>
<td>Keith Kurahashi</td>
<td>Ko Olina Development LLC (agent for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Apr 09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wahiawā/Whitmore Neighborhood Board No. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>19 Jun 09</td>
<td>Steve Brown</td>
<td>Hawaiian Trail &amp; Mountain Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>05 Jul 09</td>
<td>Shad Kane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC #</td>
<td>Date of Comment</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>28 Apr 09</td>
<td>State Representatives Karen Awana, Kymberly Pine, and Pono Chong introduced</td>
<td>State House of Representatives HR 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>10 Mar 09</td>
<td>State Representative Rida Cabanilla introduced</td>
<td>State House of Representatives HB1693HD1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>