

Minutes of a Special Meeting
of the Members of the
Hawaii Community Development Authority
State of Hawaii

Wednesday, June 24, 2015

KAKAAKO BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

A general business meeting of the Kakaako Members of the Hawaii Community Development Authority (“Authority” or “HCDA”), a body corporate and a public instrumentality of the State of Hawaii, was called to order by Chair Whalen at 9:02 am June 24, 2015, at Authority’s principal offices at 547 Queen Street in Honolulu, Hawaii, 96813, pursuant to Article IV, Section 1 of the Authority’s Bylaws.

Members Present: Tom McLaughlin
John Whalen
Mary Pat Waterhouse
Beau Bassett
David Rodriguez (DOT)
Scott Kami (B&F)
William Oh
Jason Okuhama
Steven Scott

Members Absent: George Atta (DPP non-voting)

Others Present: Anthony Ching, Executive Director
Lori Tanigawa, Deputy Attorney General
Aedward Los Banos, Asset Manager
Deepak Neupane, Planning Director
Laura Savo, Court Reporter
Tommilyn Soares, Secretary
Craig Uemura, Asset Management Specialist

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Kakaako Regular Meeting of June 3, 2015
Chair Whalen asked if there were questions or corrections to the minutes of June 3, 2015 and hearing none, the minutes were approved as presented.

III. KAKAAKO BUSINESS

2. Information and Discussion re: Update on Environmental Impact Statement and Master Plan and for Active Use Facilities at the Kakaako Makai Parks.

Executive Director, Anthony Ching reported the Authority previously authorized preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) for the Makai-area parks for active-use facilities and held open houses to solicit scope, understanding and ideas within the park planning process. He introduced PBR Hawaii as the consultant for this project.

Member Mary Pat Waterhouse joined the meeting at 9:11 AM

Russell Chung, Tom Schnell and Catie Cullison of PBR Hawaii presented on the Kakaako Makai Parks Master Plan. Ms. Cullison reported on public outreach through community meetings, Russell Chong reported on the evolution and design and Tom Schnell reported on the EIS process and next steps.

Member Basset asked what the difference is between an active and passive park. Mr. Schnell responded a passive park is an open lawn, and an active park would allow some activities for people to participate in. Thomas Square Park is an example of a passive park.

Member McLaughlin asked in PBR’s assessment if they believe views of the public comments received represent a fair cross-section of the community or reflect a bias of those who attend these meetings. Ms Cullison stated those that have an interest come out and are vocal and noted it was important for PBR to go back to the 2011 Master Plan where much more community input was incorporated in the presentation. Mr. Schnell mentioned PBR allowed online public comments as well.

Member McLaughlin asked during public outreach whether PBR received any comments like “fix it, clean it up and leave it alone.” Mr. Chung and Ms. Cullison replied they did not hear or receive “leave it alone” type comments on this project.

Chair Whalen commented on the appearance of Tom Benepe Trust for Public Land in the video citing Bryant Park and that same statement was made for Ala Moana Park planning. Kaka’ako Waterfront Park is in no way similar to Bryant Park, as it’s in mid-town Manhattan. He expressed concern about the idea of commercializing the park as it detracts from public use, and also there will be other uses in that vicinity that will compete with other commercial uses in the park. Chair Whalen also questioned the completion date of the EIS, as there is a separate Environmental Assessment for the Seagull School site and expressed concern about possible conflicts between the two proposed uses.

Member Rodriguez liked the idea of interactive art sculptures but hasn't noticed any art in the current park and asked if HCDA would qualify for art in public places by the State Foundation of Culture and Arts. Mr. Ching responded yes, but would need to find whether it would be specifically commissioned for outdoor park and/or whether it needs some cover or protection.

Member Rodriguez asked with OHA as new landowners and is interested in moving forward to create a Hawaiian sense of place like a Hawaiian Cultural Center, how that might incorporate into the park. Mr. Chung replied, they hope to work together in creating a plan that benefits everyone.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the EIS addresses how the project gets paid for and who will actually fund all the improvements. Mr. Schnell responded there will be cost estimates in the EIS and as the Master Plan is being developed, it will be implemented at the decision of the board or HCDA.

Vice-Chair Scott asked if the current homeless issue in Kakaako is being addressed in the EIS. Mr. Schnell responded it needs to be addressed in some fashion but did not know if it's the job of the EIS or master plan to resolve the homeless issue in general. Chair Scott commented that he was not saying you have to solve it but if you're not addressing the environmental issue, then you're not providing a complete report.

Member Bassett commented, rather than looking outside of Hawaii, it would be very smart to hone in and think about what's unique about this space in the community and emphasize on those things that are unique here.

Vice-Chair Scott asked what is the environmental issue if you change the topography. Mr. Schnell responded there may be some opportunities to change the topography a little without hitting the encapsulated areas. That would be the most efficient way since you can't flatten it all without major effort, but there may be some opportunities to mold different areas.

Vice-Chair Scott asked Mr. Ching if there is a study of what is actually there and why it's there. Mr. Ching responded the park is in essence a closed landfill so there are serious environmental costs associated with trying to change that particular part of topography. Mr. Schnell commented that PBR is doing an air quality study to find out what's coming out of those flumes.

Member McLaughlin asked to circle back to the homeless issue question. How do we make the park accessible to people without the barrier of the homeless there. If the homeless weren't there what would the park be like? Would the park activate itself organically? Mr. Chung offered comments as a Kakaako resident and noted the homeless issue has become much worse. Five years ago the homeless issue wasn't as great and, if you go back 20 years, the park was never really used well. Comparing Kakaako and Ala Moana, families can come

setup and enter the water more safely at Ala Moana. Kakaako is more of a surfer/good swimmer type area and limits the families that want to come, set up and enjoy the water. So the park is a little different in terms of what type of activities you want to do. Mr. Ching offered to include as an alternative in the EIS Member McLaughlin's suggestion of limited development, to fix it and leave it "as it is" type of situation.

Member Bassett commented when the area gets developed, there will naturally be more people going through because they will be exploring the area. It is worthwhile to have a working relationship with the new landowners to get an understanding of how people will be moving into the area.

There were no additional comments on this item from board members or the public.

Chair Whalen called recess at 10:31 a.m.

Chair Whalen reconvened the meeting at 10:52 a.m.

3. Decision Making: Shall the Authority Approve a Finding of No Significant Impact for the Final Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Early Education Center in the Kakaako Waterfront Park Area, Tax Map Key No.: (1) 2-1-060: 008 (Por.), in Accordance with HRS Chapter 343?

Mr. Ching summarized the report located in tab 3 of the packet.

Chair Whalen commented with the Kakaako Waterfront Park Improvement EIS currently being conducted, we would like to be sure approval of the Final Environmental Assessment is compliant with Chapter 343 as it is interpreted by the Office of Environmental Quality Control ("OEQC"). Mr. Ching suggested the matter be deferred further on the Agenda until confirmation from OEQC is received.

There were no additional comments on this item from board members or the public.

Member Waterhouse made a motion to enter executive session. Member Oh seconded the motion. All members unanimously approved entering into executive session.

Chair Whalen recessed the meeting at 11:13 a.m.

Pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(4), Hawaii Revised Statutes, the Authority convened in Executive Session at 11:13 am

The regular meeting was reconvened at 11:51 a.m.

Chair Whalen entertained a motion for this item. A motion was made by Member Oh for the Authority to Approve a Finding of No Significant Impact for the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Early Education Center in the Kakaako Waterfront Park Area and seconded by Member Kami. The motion was approved unanimously.

4. Decision Making: Shall the Authority Approve a Request for the 1025 Waimanu Street Parcel (Artspace) to be encumbered as Affordable Housing in Perpetuity?

Chair Whalen stated agenda item is listed as decision-making, but will be for discussion purposes only.

Mr. Aedward LosBanos summarized the report located in tab 4 of the packet and mentioned it actually has not changed to discussion and is still on the agenda for decision making.

Kathleen Kelly, Deputy Corporation Counsel for the City and County of Honolulu (“City”) and Gary Nakata, City Director of Community Services clarified the City would not be preparing a resolution to address the perpetuity issue.

Chair Whalen stated, in his understanding, a perpetual lease would be very unusual on public land.

Member Kami asked regarding the financial obligation how land, after a 65 year lease end, would get transferred back to HCDA. Mr. Handberg of Artspace replied after 65 years, the HCDA would receive the building and land back, effectively promising the property will continued to be operated as affordable housing. Mr. Handberg also commented there is a discussion on how that covenant might be enforced.

Member Scott asked what would happen if HCDA isn’t in existence after 65 years. Deepak Neupane replied, most likely it would be returned to the state.

There were no additional comments on this item from board members or the public.

Member McLaughlin made a motion to enter executive session. Member Waterhouse seconded the motion. All members unanimously approved entering into executive session.

Chair Whalen recessed the meeting at 12:13 p.m.

Pursuant to Section 92-5(a)(4), Hawaii Revised Statutes, the Authority convened in Executive Session at 12:13 p.m.

The regular meeting was reconvened at 12:28 p.m.

Chair Whalen deferred decision-making on this item until more information or a draft restrictive covenant can be furnished to the Authority for its review and consideration.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Whalen adjourned the regular meeting at 12:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

John Whalen,
Chair

Note: The transcript of this meeting contains a verbatim record and should be consulted if additional detail is desired.