MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting Date:** Tuesday, March 7, 2017  
**Meeting Time:** 6:00-8:30 PM  
**Location:** Hirata Hall, McKinley High School  
**Attendees:** see attendance record  
**Subject:** Community Meeting 3, Second Public Review Draft

This community meeting for the O’ahu General Plan Update Project was held at McKinley High School’s Hirata Hall on Tuesday, March 7, 2017. The purpose of the meeting was to present the Second Public Review Draft of the General Plan Update, answer questions and receive input.

**WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND PROJECT BRIEFING**

Scott Ezer, meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM, and introduced Mayor Kirk Caldwell. Mayor Caldwell offered welcoming remarks, which included thanking everyone for their participation in the update process, recognizing community leaders in the audience, and highlighting the importance of the General Plan as a living, breathing document that determines how we live, how and where we grow, and how we accommodate future development. Mayor Caldwell also shared his personal views on O’ahu’s two most valuable assets: the island’s natural beauty and the people that give the island life.

Kathy Sokugawa, Acting Director of the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP), then offered introductory remarks from DPP. Kathy expressed appreciation for all in attendance, and explained that the first public review draft—which was originally meant to be a focused update on a few key topics—resulted in a greater number of comments covering a wider range of topics than anticipated. DPP decided to add the second public review draft in response to the public comments on the first draft.

Scott Ezer then introduced the planning team (including DPP staff), reviewed the meeting agenda and housekeeping items, and provided a project briefing.

**QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

Meeting participants were asked to submit their questions in writing. Scott read each of the following questions out loud and provided a response. Both the questions and responses have been documented nearly verbatim to maintain both the accuracy and authenticity of the statement. Due to meeting time constraints, not all of the questions were answered (SEE ATTACHMENT A for questions/responses that were not answered during the meeting)

1. **Will the O’ahu General Plan identify significant features such as the Ala Wai Canal that impacts the Waikīkī shoreline, golf course, Iolani School and other public uses in Waikīkī and the Convention Center?**

The General Plan does not get into that level of detail. It is a very broad umbrella of statements that we adopt as a community that directs us on how we should make decisions that affect land use. It doesn’t specifically call out these kinds of issues in the text of the General Plan. Kathy just reminded me that the City is in the process of getting ready to update the development plan for the Primary Urban Center, so those kinds of questions will be addressed in the update to the Primary Urban Center DP.
2. Why the special emphasis on the word “communities”? I assume that refers to the sustainable communities plans?

The individual who submitted the question provided additional clarification: I noticed where old words like “districts” and “areas” were being replaced with the word “communities,” “communities,” “communities.” I just wondered why this was such a special word this time?

RESPONSE: Well, you know, planning’s an interesting profession, and buzz words change over time. “Communities” is en vogue right now. It’s a word that people identify with. It says something. That’s why we use the word communities a lot.

3. Please provide the revision status of the General Plan and the each of the eight Development/Sustainable Communities Plans. What is the date of the last comprehensive revision (by year date of City Council adoption); status of next update process (at DPP, at Council); year date that next update is/was due—and identify how to access information on each of the plans and contact its project manager/team.

RESPONSE: I think we covered the progress of the General Plan, and that we hope to have it adopted by the end of this year. The eight development plans: North Shore update was adopted in 2010; the Ko’olau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan is in progress right now, it is before the City Council for adoption; Ko’olau Loa Sustainable Communities Plan is before the City Council and it’s waiting adoption; Central O’ahu will be submitted to the Planning Commission in the next two or three months, and that will then follow up to the City Council for adoption; the PUC is being worked on; East Honolulu is being worked on; ‘Ewa was adopted recently, like in the last year or so; and Wai‘anae was adopted in 2011, around there. Then the date of the last comprehensive revision? I can’t remember all of the SCPs and DPs, although most of them, their adoption dates were either in the late 1990s—’98, ’99—or very early 2000s—2000, 2001, 2002, 2003. The status of the next update process? It’s not going to happen for a while. By Charter, the SCPs and the DPs are supposed to be updated every five years. As the Mayor said, the General Plan’s supposed to be comprehensively updated every ten. As you know, we have not been able to hold to that schedule. And identify how to access information on each of the project manager teams? If you go to the DPP website, there’s a link to Planning, you click on Planning, and it has a link to Development Plans. Click on that, and it lists all eight of the SCPs and the DPs. Each SCP and DP has its own website, and there’s an awful lot of information on each of those pages. I believe it does identify project manager, so if you need to call or talk to anybody, you can do that.

4. TOD throughout the entire island sets us up for future problems. Why not keep TOD on rail corridor only? TOD use at bus stations gives the impression that development is planned in the future. Do we have to use TOD throughout?

RESPONSE: I think the primary use of TOD in the City and County relates to the areas directly around the rail stations themselves. The ordinances that are working through City Council right now are land use controls that would directly deal with development in and around each one of the rail stations. I think a number of them have been adopted.

ADDITIONAL RESPONSE FROM K. SOKUGAWA: There are eight TOD neighborhood plans covering 19 of the 21 stations. We don’t cover two of them because they’re in Kaka’ako, and we don’t have zoning responsibility for the Kaka’ako area. So of the eight plans, some of them cover just one station, like Ala Moana, and some of the plans cover three stations, like the Aiea-Pearl City plan. They have varying levels of geographic span, and they are in the process of being adopted. The plans cover the stations all the way to East Kapolei. The City Council has adopted the plans for Waipahu and Aiea-Pearl City, they’re in the process of looking at the Kalihi and Downtown plans, and Ala Moana plan. We have the draft
Aloha Stadium available for review, the Airport plan is about to be distributed for comment, and we need to update the East Kapolei plan.

The individual who submitted the question provided additional clarification: Is a park-and-ride being referred to as TOD outside of the corridor of the rail? I was under the impression that the General Plan is looking at using TOD throughout the island, as the question was asking. And so, are we now going to look at park-and-rides and bus stations throughout the island as TODs just to be consistent with verbiage?

RESPONSE (K. SOKUGAWA): The first tier is the rail corridor, so where’s the train going to go—which is East Kapolei to Ala Moana—and so that is where we’re concentrating on the TOD right now. But as we create a more vibrant, stronger connection with the bus system, then you can see some connection. Right now, the TOD corridor is limited just to the rail corridor, it’s not an island-wide policy. The General Plan does not look at that at the present time either. The rail corridor is just the 20 miles between East Kapolei and Ala Moana and Kapolei, and eventually to the University and Waikīkī, and maybe Mililani.

5. Do the people of the North Shore really want the City to facilitate further resort growth at Turtle Bay?

RESPONSE: I think the issues related to the Turtle Bay Resort have been resolved. A limit has been agreed to on the number of resort units and other residential units that will be allowed at Turtle Bay. In exchange, there has been a significant amount of land put in Conservation easement, and I believe that was part of the Koʻolau Loa SCP that is working its way through Council.

6. Where did the idea to designate Lāʻie a resort area come from?

RESPONSE: There’s always been a small hotel associated with the Brigham Young University Hawaiʻi at Lāʻie campus and PCC. There’s been a resort node identified as part of the language in the General Plan at Lāʻie going back to 1977, and that’s been carried over in the second draft of the General Plan.

7. Why are you permitting short term vacation rentals in non-resort areas?

RESPONSE: Again, this is really a hot button topic that has been the subject of many, many meetings both in neighborhoods on the North Shore, neighborhoods on Windward Oʻahu, at City Council—lot of discussion within DPP on how to deal with vacation rentals in residential neighborhoods. The City has proposed, more than once, rules and regulations intended to try to give them more regulatory teeth, to make sure that they can regulate that. It’s an ongoing conversation, and I think the language that we refer to that’s going into the General Plan makes it clear that the intent, at a policy level, is only to allow these kinds of facilities in residential neighborhoods if they’re discussed with the community and there are appropriate regulations that will enforce their use.

8. Did the people on the Waiʻanae coast really ask for Mākaha Valley to be designated a resort area?

RESPONSE: There has been a resort designation for an area in Mākaha that goes back, I think to the ‘70s. The Waiʻanae Sustainable Communities Plan was adopted—again—2011, with a resort component at Mākaha.

9. If we believe in climate change, why are we building close to the water?

RESPONSE: Climate change is a really interesting subject. I think most people that are familiar with looking at it will agree that climate change is occurring and that sea-level rise is happening. What people do not agree with, or do not understand completely, is how to characterize how sea level rise is going to occur within a certain period of time. I’m working on a project right now that involves a property on the ocean, and I’ve been working very closely with a group of ocean engineers. If you look at
climate change out to the year 2100 and intermediary points at 2130, 2150, and 2170, NOAA—which is the federal agency responsible for understanding how climate change works—provides a wide range of projections as to how sea level rise will occur over that time period, and they present each one of those time points as a range. So there’s the “least bad” projection and then there’s one that’s the “worst bad”—I don’t know what else to call it. Those numbers range considerably. I was looking at numbers today out to the year 2070, and that number can range anywhere from 0.8 feet to 2.3 feet, that’s for the year 2070. The question is why are we approving development on the shoreline? Well, the State and the counties have adopted policies to provide guidance on how to review development projects that are on the ocean. There’s a requirement to consider sea level rise in any new development. You have to put that into any environmental impact statement you write. If you’re an agency, any building or any facility that you construct HAS TO—there’s no maybes about it—you HAVE TO consider the effects of sea level rise and how you plan for that building. In many instances, particularly if you’re talking about highways or wastewater treatment plants, the guidance is to adopt the worst case scenario when you’re looking at how things are going to play out. I think all we can do is follow the science over the next few years—and whether that’s in my lifetime or your children’s lifetime or your grandchildren’s lifetime—and follow what happens and the science and the metrics on what sea level is doing and what climate is doing. We all read the stories in the newspaper everyday, and we know about all the wacky weather. So, the long answer to the short question was, we are looking at it, and it is becoming a very everyday fact of how you deal with development on the shoreline.

10. Hawai‘i’s public education system is so poor as to not prepare children for the future. This will impede many objectives in this plan. O‘ahu holds most of Hawai‘i’s population. Shouldn’t O‘ahu be supplementing what the State can offer?

The County does not have oversight on education. That’s a State function. The General Plan is not necessarily the forum to try and solve the problem of education.

11. RE: Primary Urban Center? Downtown, Nu‘uanu, Makiki, UH, Waikīkī. How will people working and living in above areas move to higher grounds as advised by O‘ahu Disaster Preparedness Guide?

RESPONSE: This question refers to the tsunami evacuation zones and how that works. There are maps that have been given a lot more distribution and awareness in the last 3-5 years, I think particularly because of the recent Japan tsunami and other things that have been happening on ensuring that people know, if you’re in a low-lying area, how do you move to safety. I think it’s incumbent on everybody to understand where they live and work with respect to tsunami inundation and evacuation zones. These maps are published online. They’re published in all kinds of places. I know that if there were disaster, our transportation systems are going to be taxed. You need to know where you need to get to, and when the siren rings, you need to get there.

12. Is there a way to see how effective the General Plan has been and who uses it (i.e., private vs. public)?

RESPONSE: This is a really interesting question. The General Plan is a document that not many people are familiar with. It is referred to frequently when there are proposals for development or policy that are before decision-making bodies like the City Council or the Land Use Commission or within agencies. It’s a guiding document, and I think that particularly when you get to the level of preparing the sustainable communities plans and the development plans, the guidance that the General Plan provides to those documents is important. I’m not sure that there’s been any study to provide metrics on how effective the General Plan is, but that’s what it’s there for.
13. As a professional planner, do you feel the 2002 Plan initiatives were/are successfully used as a guideline over the past 10-15 years by City agencies, departments and politicians? If not, what is the purpose of the current exercise?

RESPONSE: Well if you make an assumption that this is a futile exercise, then we’re all in trouble. The General Plan is an important document. It HAS set out—going back to 1977—the manner in which the island has intended to develop. I think, by and large, the island has developed according to the blueprint that the General Plan provided, and it goes back to 1977. Now, we may not all be completely happy with some of the ways that has happened and some of the details on that, but I think the general pattern of development has reflected what was in the General Plan. To respond to all of the other detail policies and objectives, I’m not sure I’m the person to ask at this point.

14. In planning circles, relative to the O‘ahu General Plan, is the concept of carrying capacity ever considered? Do you planners believe that growth can continue indefinitely on an island or does there come a point whereby residents and visitors overwhelm the environment, jeopardizing everyone’s health, safety and well-being?

RESPONSE: Carrying capacity was a very popular subject back in the 1980s, and even when I was in planning school in the early-mid-1970s. The thought was that there’s only so many resources—whether that be water, AG land, transportation networks—that can sustain a population before the whole system collapses. The carrying capacity concept kind of went out of vogue because it was very difficult to empiricize, very difficult to create numbers and come up with numbers on what carrying capacity really meant. Now, we live on an island, we all understand that. We have a finite amount of land, we have a finite amount of water, yet the population continues to grow. One of the things we cannot control is—I forget which article in the Constitution allows freedom of travel within the United States. We can’t control people moving here, we don’t control birth rates. We don’t control—YET—immigration (chuckle) from a number of countries from around the world. So we have to make an assumption that our community is going to grow. It’s going to grow in terms of population. We need to be able to understand how many housing units we’re going to need in the next 30 years. We need to understand where those housing units are going to be. We need to understand how much water we’re going to need. We need to understand where those water resources are coming from. Carrying capacity was something that was considered, but it is not part of this review.

15. Will the General Plan support Native Hawaiian gathering rights, including on City property?

RESPONSE: That’s an interesting question. I haven’t heard that that has been an issue. The General Plan does support Native Hawaiian gathering rights. I’m not sure if there’s a specific instance that this person is thinking of, but there is Supreme Court law in the State of Hawai‘i that supports and allows and requires Native Hawaiian gathering rights. If gathering rights are being suppressed, then the people who feel that that’s occurring can go to court and make sure that they’re allowed, regardless of who the property owner is.

16. One of the policies mentions making O‘ahu “the home of nations knowledge.” What does this mean?

RESPONSE: There’s a quote here that speaks of the center of higher education in the Pacific. I can’t remember it specifically, other than there’s a desire to ensure that O’ahu becomes an important educational center, and is looked upon by communities outside of O’ahu from other areas in the Pacific.
17. Can we separate affordable housing from homelessness?

RESPONSE: I don’t think we can. I know the City Council is working very hard and the Mayor is and the Governor is. It’s one of those issues that just seems to elude solution. I think there are a lot of people working very hard to try to make it right, and we have to work together to make sure that happens.

The individual who submitted the question indicated that the response did not address the question. The individual elaborated on the question: You had homelessness as a category when you showed the General Plan priorities. You lumped it with affordable housing, which has nothing to do with homelessness. When you think of affordable housing, you think of the middle class. When you think of homeless people, you think of public housing or low-income housing. The two are so far—affordable housing vs. homelessness—that they don’t really belong in the same category. It’s very disingenuous to speak about affordable housing and homelessness. Every forum I go to, you have directors of housing—both State and City—talking about affordable housing and homelessness, and they all get tied together. As soon as I hear it, I think it’s shibai.

RESPONSE: The suggestion was that affordable housing and homelessness lumped together should not occur, that they are very different, and we need to address both individually. I would not argue with that comment. If in your review of the General Plan, you find you don’t like the way that’s written, please send us a written comment. I can tell you very honestly that many changes have been made to this draft because of comments that we received from people like you during review of the first draft, so thank you for your question.

18. Does the General Plan address the State of Hawai‘i renewable energy 2045 goal?

RESPONSE: I don’t believe that there’s a specific reference. There’s language to increase energy self-sufficiency and reduce dependence on fossil fuels, but again, if the person who wrote this question believes that is important that we do that, please give us a written comment.

19. Mahalo for this presentation to the public. Have you had smaller meetings with community groups and stakeholders such as developers? If so, how many, when, and with whom?

RESPONSE: When the budget for this contract was agreed to back in 2008, we had a very specific scope of work that told us what we were to do over the course of the project. At that time, we had a number of community meetings, focus group meetings, and other meetings, and City folks went to neighborhood boards. Because of the overwhelming response that we received to the first public review draft—which was really wonderful that there were so many people that were interested in the General Plan to send us comments—the City decided it was important. Initially we were just going to go from the first public review draft straight to the Council. Because of the overwhelming response to the first draft, even though it took a number of years, the City added an extended comment and review period, and this meeting. So initially this was not budgeted, and moneys had to be scraped together to facilitate this. This is going to be the only public meeting involved for the second public review draft. DPP would go to neighborhood boards, if requested to attend.

The individual who submitted the question elaborated on the question: Specifically I wanted to know if you had discussions about the General Plan particularly with private developers, and if so, who and when, because developers seem to have the inside track on a lot of stuff.

RESPONSE: The answer to that question is, no, that has not happened.

20. Why does the development plan still create primary dependence on the automobile when it could design walking to neighborhood shopping? The dependence on cars is not reflected in improved road capacity?
RESPONSE: The General Plan is now full of references to live-work-play type communities, transit, and multi-modal transportation. If you take the time to read what’s in there, I think you hopefully will be surprised and happy.

21. What does sustainability mean? Is that the new vogue word for carrying capacity?

RESPONSE: Sustainable goes back to the 1980s. There was an international convention in Europe (the Brundtland Commission) that came up with the term sustainability as it applies to land use and community development. It has three basic components to it, and hopefully they all intersect. If you envision this as a Venn diagram, there will be circles related to the social environment, the economic environment, and the natural environment. Everything, all decisions that should be made related to us as a community, should be made with those three components in mind, and not at the expense of any one of the three. There’s been a lot of talk about, with sustainability, you leave something behind that is the same as you found it and that can be used for future generations. The Hawaiian culture has an interesting approach to understanding—beyond the ahu’apa’a system—what sustainability is. There’s a reference I’ve heard many times as I’ve worked around the island on plans, on sustainable communities plans and other things. Try to look ahead seven generations. The seven generations concept is you should be making decisions about how you use your resources so that those who come seven generations after you have the availability of those resources. Sustainable has certainly taken over a large part of how we address development in the last 30 years or so, but it’s a very important concept and even though we may over use it, it’s something that is part of all of the land use policies for the City and County.

22. When will ordinances be reviewed to reflect changes in the DPs/SCPs?

The individual who submitted the question offered additional details: When the department was reviewing the Ko’olau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan, we were told that the ordinances would be changed when all of the development plans are approved. Just the statutes. We’re now finishing the development plans, and we’ve jumped ahead without completing the development plans. We’re into the General Plan, so there doesn’t seem to be any order anymore. It used to the General Plan, then the development plans, then the ordinances. My question is regarding the ordinances.

RESPONSE (K. SOKUGAWA): You’re absolutely right. We were thinking about that, we didn’t get enough support to do that. Right now, we are actually implementing the development plans with respect to agriculture and rural quality and character, so we’re looking literally at the land use ordinance and the subdivision ordinance, looking at other programs that tie into to help preserve and beef up our policies and implementing the policies regarding AG and rural. Some of the other things? Yes, we haven’t had enough time and resources to develop yet, but on an ongoing basis, again as Scott was mentioning, these are guidelines for decision-making of all kinds. Standard form of content on an EIS, or environmental assessment is, “How is this project consistent with the General Plan and the development plans?” So that is helping to make a better decision about what is proposed. All I can tell you right now is we’re concentrating on AG-rural implementation. We’ve done the TOD plans, which are kind of like the special area plans called for for the PUC DP. We are very excited about the Important Agricultural Lands—some of you, I know, have gone to those meetings, and so we should be bringing them up forward to the City Council hopefully later this year. Again, mostly through the TOD plans, we’re looking at new urbanism, mixed-use development, more compact development, implementing the development plans so that we really are getting a more livable, high-quality, high-amenity urban core in the primary urban center so we can keep the rural areas country.
23. **The HCDA—which is the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority which has control over Kaka‘ako and is a State agency—is taking more and more of O‘ahu for development fast tracking. How accommodating is the General Plan to this accelerated development?**

**RESPONSE:** In recent years, the HCDA started out and the only land area within their jurisdiction was Kaka‘ako. They have since added the former lands at the Barbers Point Naval Air Station, now referred to as Kalaeloa. That is under the jurisdiction of HCDA. They also have an area in He‘eia. Because they have taken over those lands, they have cut the County out of their jurisdiction. The County doesn’t have any say in ultimately how those lands will be used or developed. All things being equal, the State should be looking at the County General Plan to see how their decisions in those areas affect what’s going on on O‘ahu, but the City does not have the regulatory authority to prevent the State from doing what it wants in those areas.

24. **Will the General Plan encourage incorporation of historic sites in developments such as in Kakaʻako, Waikīkī, etc.?**

**RESPONSE:** There is a lot of language in the General Plan that deals with the preservation of historic and cultural sites and their importance to us as an island community and ensuring that they be preserved.

**PARTICIPANTS’ COMMENTS**

Meeting participants wishing to speak were asked to sign up in advance of speaking. Each speaker was given two minutes to speak. Each speaker’s comments have been documented nearly verbatim to maintain the accuracy and authenticity of their statement.

1. **Flora Obayashi:** My name is Flora Obayashi, and I’m the chair of Kahalu‘u Neighborhood Board. Our meeting is tomorrow night. Our board has been working on the Ko‘olau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan. I just wanted to remind everybody that we do have a constitutional mandate to protect our agricultural lands. We also have a Kahalu‘u Community Master Plan that governs the activities in our area. I wonder if you know that after the public comment period on Ko‘olau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan, there were three development projects that had been submitted and they were not supported by DPP for some very good reasons. However, on February 1st, our representative introduced a change to the urban growth boundary, and the Mayor spoke about the urban growth boundary. By including this development project at the base of the Ko‘olau mountains, it will destroy a riparian buffer zone. It will destroy a watershed area. There’s no infrastructure to support this, and our community is very concerned about it. It’s called externalities, which is the economic term for all the people that are going to be affected by this transaction. I just wanted to say that even though we have in the General Plan about natural environment and resource stewardship, and we have these wonderful sustainable communities plans, those plans can be disregarded at the last minute. What was very, very hard for the community was that they did not know that that development project was at a hearing because it had been introduced the day of the hearing, and so they did not know. We wonder about this. This General Plan, and the Ko‘olau Poko Sustainable Communities Plan, and the Kahalu‘u Community Master Plan, and how that’s all disregarded to damage our watershed. One more thing. Remember a 16-inch water main was built in the last two years under Kamehameha Highway to take Kahalu‘u water all the way out to supplement Hawai‘i Kai. So our water is important and destroying and developing and putting a housing subdivision on watershed land damages all of us.

2. **Andrea Anixt:** I’m Andrea Anixt, Ka‘a‘awa Community Association board. My plan is basically no more development in Ko‘olau Loa. There are over 4,300 vacant, urban-zoned lots that are available to build on and that will be built on. Population and the addition of this is 20,780 at U.S. Census
standard of 5 per household. We have less than 17,000 people in our moku as it is, and so this will add another 21,000 people. We’ve also got the development of Turtle Bay Resort happening. This is a partial count—that figure of 4,300 lots—by the DPP at the Planning Commission in 2013, and this is something that the Planning Commission didn’t pass on for some reason to the City Council, even though this would more than double the population on our trafficked road, which is falling into the ocean at Ka’a’awa. We also have the problem with all of the TVUs, they’re called transient vacation unit rentals. Our particular moku in Ko’olau Loa, has 69% of all rentals are these TVUs. There’s not enough housing being kept for people that live in this area. It makes more homeless people, and then we will all get to pay for this subsidized housing that will have to be built, while other people are making money with these illegal vacation rental units. The obvious thing is that, so far, DPP has shown no ability to enforce effectively the rental of these places, and now they want to put more in the General Plan in the neighborhoods? It just does not make sense. Even if Airbnb’s…..1000-plus units in Hawai’i, that’s only one of the many websites that there are. We have a person in our neighborhood who gets people from Russia. They have another website in Germany. I just think that it’s obvious that there’s no ability to enforce effectively anything to do with the TVUs, which will only cause more housing problems.

3. Larry McElheny: Aloha. My name is Larry McElheny. I’ve lived on the North Shore, in Pūpūkea, for about 50 years. Our group—several groups—have had pretty significant success preserving open space out there—1,100 acres at Pūpūkea-Paumalū, Turtle Bay, Waimea Valley. The reason I’m here tonight, I have some very, very serious concerns about the language that I see in the population section of the new document. I have to say that I strongly disagree with the Mayor’s assessment about growth, as well as Scott’s. I just don’t believe that you can continue to grow and add additional population on an island such as we live on. If you follow that rationale, this is what you end up with (showing photo of gridlock traffic). Particularly in the area where I live, we have a two-lane highway servicing the side of the island from Haleiwa to Kahalu’u, and the highway is eroding and falling into the ocean. This idea that we can continue to grow and add additional population, it just doesn’t make sense to me. There has to be a limit. I think we need at least a limit, or we’re at least very close to it, with the gridlock and so on that we see. This plan—this is the 1990 version, revised in 2003—this is the General Plan that we’re supposed to be operating under now. I’d like to reach you couple things about what this plan says about population. “Objective A: To control the growth of O’ahu’s resident and visitor populations in order to avoid social, economic, and environmental disruptions.” Policy 1: Control over population growth. Policy 2: Reducing in-migration. Policy 5: Encourage family planning. Policy 6. This is the key policy as far as I’m concerned. “Policy 6: Publicize the desire of the City and County to limit population growth.” This is all good stuff. Most of this language has been removed from the current version. Very, very concerning to me. I’d like to know who requested that that language be removed.

4. Choon James: I completely concur with Larry McElheny. I’m Choon James from Kahuku, Lā‘ie. I was an English major, and it is very painful to read through the documents and see the wordsmithing at play. I honestly don’t know whether you need a more talented wordsmith or you need a more talented planner. It’s just so hard. The word games are just really, really insulting—I think—to the public intelligence. In my opinion, like what Larry is saying, we are not amending the General Plan, we are REPLACING the General Plan. Would you agree with that? There’s so much. We are not just amending, we’re replacing, with a lot of very drastic changes. It is so drastic that if we allow this General Plan to go on, we will not recognize O’ahu in the next 20 years. Just look at Ala Moana now. I cannot even recognize Ala Moana anymore because there’s been so much change. We are not against development, but we want the City to respect, adhere, and follow the O’ahu General Plan
because we think it is a good plan. It has been planned by many people in the 1970s through many stakeholders, and it is a versatile plan enough to give everybody a little bit of everything. You get to grow in Kapolei, you get to grow in Honolulu, but for goodness sakes, we need to protect our farmland, our agriculture, our water, our quality of life, our sanity. Nobody wants the whole of O‘ahu to turn into a huge parking lot. Thank you.

5. Mark James: Aloha. I wanted to first pay my respects to Governor Ariyoshi because this is his greatest legend and legacy for us because this Plan— it is a living document—and I hope that we will sustain it and keep it moving forward, that we might be able to preserve that great idea that he had for us. Unfortunately, the Plan is a guide. We heard that term earlier, and in that sense it’s a little like the Bible. It’s a guide, but often neglected and rarely read. And that’s unfortunate. I want to touch base just briefly on two particular points. I’m going to use the number in that left hand column to talk about them. Point Number 340 says, “Seek the satisfactory relocation of residents before permitting their displacement by new development, redevelopment, and neighborhood rehabilitation.” That is a sad recognition that TOD devices are about to explode all along the rail corridor, and we are going to be replacing and relocating—whatever you want to call it—a lot of people and that scares me. The last point I’d like to refer to is Point Number 320. It talks about “Ensure the social and economic vitality of rural communities by supporting infill development and modest increases in heights and densities around existing rural town areas where feasible and modest adjustments to growth boundaries and to maintain an adequate supply of housing for future generations.” That language is dangerous to me. That’s just not letting the camel’s nose in the tent, that is letting the genie out of the bottle, and there is no going back. I strongly recommend that 320, Policy 6 be stricken as a new suggestion in the second draft. Thank you.

6. Guy Archer: Aloha. I’m looking at this General Plan. The devil is in the details. Looking at this particular General Plan, and looking at this Section 3, page 27 from the O‘ahu General Plan, contains a section entitled Natural Environment and Resource Stewardship. In that section, there’s a number of policies set forth. All very noble and winsome policies, but when you look at them a little more carefully—for example, Policy 2—“Seek the restoration of environmentally damaged areas and natural resources.” It makes me wonder, Policy 3 is simply, “Protect, restore and enhance.” That’s clear. Why is Policy 2—when we’re talking about environmentally damaged areas and natural resources—why are we saying “seek the restoration?” Why don’t we just say “restore” and be a little bit more clear about it? Over the years, I don’t specialize in reading General Plans, but I have from time to time been in situations where I had to look at General Plan language. This stuff is so generic. There’s nothing dynamic here. We’ve seen it before. It may be even worse based on some of the text that I’ve seen than it was before. It’s just too vague and general. That’s my comment. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

Scott thanked meeting participants for taking the time to attend the meeting, and encouraged everyone to take a look at the document on line and send in written comments. He asked that written comments be specific, including references to specific sections being commented on and suggestions for alternative wording. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.
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ATTACHMENT A | OTHER QUESTIONS

The following questions were not addressed during the Question-and-Answer portion of the meeting due to time constraints.

a. Rather than always relying on mainlanders, why not tap into young, new-thinking innovative students of UH? Utilize the young of Hawai‘i nei. Experience does not necessarily equate to new ideas and ways.

RESPONSE: The planning team is comprised of local, Hawai‘i-based planners, most who were born, raised and educated in Hawai‘i. In fact, all members of the planning team (both from DPP and HHF Planners) graduated from UH-Manoa School of Urban and Regional Planning, and have spent their professional careers working in Hawai‘i. It’s idealistic to work with UH students. Unfortunately, the City does not always have flexibility with their project schedules, staffing, and funding to take on additional responsibilities of managing/supervising UH students.

b. How does the General Plan address affordable housing and the houseless population?

RESPONSE: Proposed revisions to housing policies in Chapter IV emphasize the need for affordable housing, and new policies are being added to address homelessness (see Chapter IV, Objective A, Policies 16 and 17). This was touched upon during the briefing/presentation. A few examples of the policy statements in the second public review draft that address low-income housing and homelessness were presented in the briefing.

c. How does the General Plan deal with illegal rentals for vacation homes?

RESPONSE: There are new policies in the second public review draft to address this issue. Specifically, as highlighted in the project briefing, two new policies are proposed, including Chapter II, Objective B, Policy 10 and Chapter VII, Objective F, Policy 5. This was discussed during the briefing/presentation.

d. How do the elected officials plan to deal with displaced residents once the General Plan is fully executed? Not everyone will be able to afford these additional buildings.

RESPONSE: Affordable housing is a long-standing, complex issue for Hawai‘i. The State and City are working to ensure that the demand for affordable housing is met. For the General Plan, this is addressed in statements that call for a mix of housing types and choices for different income levels.

e. If population for the PUC is projected downward, how will this affect rail ridership and TOD’s plan for increased density?

RESPONSE: TOD—transit oriented development—which typically incorporates mixed-use, higher-density development around rail stations, should help to attract population back into the urban core along the rail corridor.

f. Very concerned with disaster preparedness. Resilience/what can we do to prepare for a Category 5 hurricane hitting O‘ahu?

RESPONSE: The State and City emergency management agencies are responsible for planning and preparing for natural disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes, tsunamis, etc. While government can help with coordinating preparedness and providing adequate emergency facilities/services, it is contingent on each of us to be individually prepared.

g. How does DPP plan to “strengthen regulatory and enforcement strategies to address the presence of inappropriate non-residential activities”? In regards to vacation rentals.

RESPONSE: This is in reference to Chapter VII, Objective F, Policy 5. Implementation of this policy will involve new ordinances and/or rules adopted at the City Council and department levels.
h. Are there actions that can be taken to encourage population growth, if an increase in growth was desired? If so, please elaborate on how increased population could be obtained.

RESPONSE: For an island community like ours, managing or slowing population growth is a far greater and more realistic concern than encouraging an increase in population. In regards to the population projections which indicate a continual, steady decline in resident population in the PUC, there are strategies that could help to encourage population growth in this area, such as the government investing in infrastructure and public facilities in the PUC, or the City offering incentives for new development in the PUC as a means to attract residents to redeveloped areas.

i. Where is the voice of the Native Hawaiian people in the visioning and planning of the future of Hawai‘i?

RESPONSE: Native Hawaiian culture is not recognized in the current General Plan. New language in the second public review draft recognizes the host culture of the Native Hawaiian people, and encourages greater respect and value for Native Hawaiian practices. Native Hawaiian interests were represented in the focus group discussions on agriculture and the visitor industry. Like all other ethnic groups and community interests, Native Hawaiians could have chosen to participate in the community meetings.

j. As the large population of “baby boomers” grows and creates a demand for elder care facilities, how is this addressed in the Plan?

RESPONSE: Yes, the second public review draft includes new language for an age-friendly city and planning for an aging population (see Chapter IX, Objective A, Policies 8 and 9).

k. As “boomers” with homes pass away, would this offer opportunities to house younger families?

RESPONSE: Yes, that is the assumption. However, given that people are living longer, the growth in our aging population is affecting demand for certain housing types.

l. Projected impact of military on housing?

RESPONSE: When military families live off-base, it takes away housing inventory that would otherwise be used for local families and increases the cost of housing. The second public review draft includes a new policy that encourages the military to provide housing on military bases and in military housing areas.

m. What is meant by adjustments to the urban fringe?

RESPONSE: There are four distinct categories identified on the conceptual map of O‘ahu’s development pattern in Chapter I of the General Plan. The four categories are: (1) Primary Urban Center; (2) Secondary Urban Center (3) Urban-Fringe; and (4) Rural. Urban-Fringe refers to the suburban areas around the island outside the PUC and the secondary urban center in ‘Ewa (e.g., East Honolulu, Kailua, Kāne‘ohe, ‘Āhuimanu, Mililani, Makakilo). The second public review draft proposes several modifications to the urban-fringe areas shown on the conceptual map to incorporate the current boundaries of O‘ahu’s developed areas and areas approved for future development.

n. No mention of island finite carrying capacity! While the General Plan is broad-brush, how can rampant high-density TOD development and island-wide visitor accommodations spread with the continued absence of defined carrying capacity for domestic water supply and sewer infrastructure (relating to Chapter V, Objective B)—as well as the national planning standard of 2-2.5 acres per 1,000 capita of localized recreational space (relating to Chapter X, Objective D)?

RESPONSE: Carrying capacity was discussed in the Q-and-A session. See response to Question #14.