## August 16, 2017 Reserved Housing Public Hearing Transcript

1	HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY	
2	STATE OF HAWAII	
3	and the second section of the second	
4	the second of th	
5	PUBLIC HEARING	
6	RE:	
7	AMENDMENT OF HAWAII ADMINISTRATIVE RULES,	
8	TITLE 15, CHAPTER 218,	
9	"KAKA'AKO RESERVED HOUSING RULES"	
10		
11		
12	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
13		
14	Wednesday, August 16, 2017	
15		
16	Taken at 547 Queen Street, Second Floor	
17	Honolulu, Hawaii 96813	
18	commencing at 9:08 a.m.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	Reported by: LAURA SAVO, CSR No. 347	
25		

1	APPEARANCES	
2	John Whalen, Chairperson	
3	Mary Pat Waterhouse, Vice Chairperson	
4	Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Develo	opment
5	Aedward Los Baños, Administrative Services Off:	icer
6	Garett Kamemoto, Communications & Community Out Officer	treach
7	Michael G.K. Wong, Deputy Attorney General	
9	Lori Sunakoda, Deputy Attorney General	
10	MEMBERS PRESENT:	
11	Beau Bassett	
12	Wei Fang	
13	Laurel Johnston	
14	William Oh	
15	David Rodriguez	
16	Kathy Sokugawa	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2		PAGE
3	I. Call to Order	4
4	II. Introduction	4
5	III. Staff Report	7
6	IV. Board Discussion	20
7	V. Adjournment	41
8		
9	PUBLIC TESTIMONY BY:	
10	Jennifer Darrah-Okike	3.5
11		
12	the management of the contract	
13		
14		
15	g de la company de la comp	
16		
17		
18		
19	The second secon	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	But the failer of the first the configurations of the configurations and the configurations are the configurations and the configurations are configurated as the configuration and the configu	- 12
25		

Wednesday, August 16, 2017, 9:08 a.m.

-000-

CHAIR WHALEN: Good morning. I'd like to call to order the August 16, 2017, public hearing of the Hawaii Community Development Authority. The time is now 9:08 a.m. My name is John Whalen, Chair of the Authority, and I'm the presiding officer for this hearing.

Let the record reflect that the following members are present: David Rodriguez, Wei Fang,
Mary Pat Waterhouse, Beau Bassett and John Whalen.
We expect another one to arrive shortly, but we have quorum.

At an earlier public hearing on

June 7th, 2017, the Authority voted not to adopt
the Draft Kaka'ako Reserved Housing Rules posted on
April 6, 2017, for a public hearing held on
May 17, 2017, and directed staff to prepare a new
draft presented to the Authority at its
July 5th, 2017, meeting.

I'd just like to note for the record that board member William Oh has arrived.

At its July 5th, 2017, meeting, the
Authority approved the proposed draft Kaka'ako
reserved housing rules with three HCDA staff-proposed

amendments for the purpose of holding a public hearing.

Notice of today's public hearing was published on July 16, 2017, in the Honolulu Star-Advertiser, Maui News, The Garden Island, Hawaii Tribune-Herald and West Hawaii Today. The notice was also sent to HCDA's email list and posted on the HCDA website. A copy of the notice can also be viewed outside in the foyer if anyone present is interested in reviewing it.

In addition to the required 30-day notice, the Authority also posted a meeting notice/agenda six days prior to this meeting to give the public additional notice above and beyond what is required.

Today's public hearing on the proposed draft Kaka'ako reserved housing rules published on July 16th, 2017, is convened under the provisions of Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 91 and 206E, and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Chapter 15-219, to consider the following matter: The HCDA is proposing to amend Hawaii Revised -- Hawaii Administrative Rules, Chapter 15-218 entitled Kaka'ako Reserved Housing Rules to promote development of more reserved housing units as well as preserve existing reserved housing stock. Proposed amendments to the Kaka'ako

Reserved Housing Rules will expand the source of reserved housing units, preserve reserved housing stock, encourage development of for-sale and rental reserved housing units, and create consistency with affordable housing rules administered by other state and city agencies.

The proposed amendments also provide for buyback of and equity sharing in workforce housing units. In addition, the proposed amendment clarifies certain definitions in existing provisions.

Before we receive public testimony, let me briefly explain the procedures for this hearing. First, the HCDA will present its report. Following that, we will hear testimony by the public in the order that the individuals have signed up. Individual comments will be limited to no more than three minutes, but we will accept written testimony of any length. Only members of the Authority will be permitted to ask questions of the public. This is not a decision-making hearing. So there will be no decision made today.

Members, if you have any questions for a testifier, please raise your hand at the conclusion of their remarks.

Now, Director of Planning and Development

Deepak Neupane will provide the HCDA staff report.

MR. NEUPANE: Thank you, Chair and members. A copy of the draft rule is in your packet, and I will just walk through some of the highlights and go section by section in the PowerPoint, and then try to address any of the questions that the members may have.

Just some broader housekeeping kind of things that I wanted to address out front. First, the title of the chapter is amended to Kaka'ako Reserved Housing and Workforce Housing Rules just to reflect that the chapter covers not only reserved housing but workforce housing too.

Also, the section titles are amended because there are -- there are changes to the section titles and some new sections were added. So that's not part of the rule, but that's more of the housekeeping of the rules.

On subchapter 1, General Provisions, section 15-218-1, Purpose and Intent is amended to provide clarity. It provides clarity in that reserved housing is a requirement for developing residential projects in Kaka'ako. It also clarifies that the workforce housing program is a voluntary program. It is not a mandatory program.

And section 15-218-3 and -4 is amended to provide clarity. So grammatical stuff and those kind of comments.

Section 218-5, Definitions, it adds definitions -- new definitions and it deletes some of the old definitions that are not used in the rules anymore.

And section 218-17, Requirements of
Reserved Housing, amends the requirement to 20
percent of the total number of residential units in a
multi-family residential development instead of 20
percent of the square foot. The current rule
requires that 20 percent of the floor area be set
aside as reserved housing. That has changed to 20
percent of the units. And part of the reason being
there is that later on in the rule, you know, there's
a table for --

The intent of 20 percent initially was to encourage building more bigger, larger reserved housing units, and that the three-bedroom kind of reserved housing units, that would be taken care of by that unit-size factor. So that is no longer needed, and floor area is no longer needed to make those kind of adjustments.

In that section further down, the

reserved housing to begin construction prior to initial certificate of occupancy, and there's a requirement on the developer to provide financial guarantee to the HCDA that those units will be built.

Also, because of the change in the statute several years ago, there's a provision that deals with a cash-in-lieu payment instead of providing reserved housing. Also, some changes are for revisions to provide clarity in the rules.

Paragraph -- section 218-18, Reserved
Housing Unit Floor Area, this more deals with
exemptions where it still keeps the provision that
floor area used for reserved housing doesn't count
towards FAR; therefore, it provides almost 20 percent
bonus floor area for providing reserved housing. No
requirement for public facilities dedication for
reserved housing units. It provides flexibility in
off-street parking requirement, building height,
building setback and off-street loading requirements
of Mauka Area Rules.

There's a new section added, and I mentioned it earlier, 218-19, Unit Type and Corresponding Factor, where a two-bedroom unit is considered to be one unit, and then, you know, a three-bedroom and three-bedroom-plus and bigger units

are considered to be a little bit more than one unit, and, similarly, one bedroom and a studio are considered to be less than one unit, and this is what I was addressing earlier. It takes care of the incentive of providing larger units. So we didn't have to resort to floor area concept and things.

2.0

Also, the calculation makes it -- the calculation is a lot easier too when you look at 20 percent of the unit versus 20 percent of floor area.

Another section, 218-20, was added to provide guidelines for sales and rentals of reserved housing. Now, this is just a guideline. This is similar to what is used by HHFDC on the occupancy of the reserved housing. So it helps to ensure larger units are provided to larger families and, you know, acts as a guideline for the developer and sales of the unit. And the occupancy is based on the occupancy guideline of City and County of Honolulu housing code.

A new section added on workforce housing: 218-21. Again, I'd like to emphasize that it makes it clear that it's a voluntary program, and the requirement for workforce housing where 75 percent of the units are priced based on an AMI of 140 percent or below. It eliminates the unit size, a

specification that's in the current rules, provides for 100 percent floor area bonus and exempts from public facility dedication fee. There is also a provision that the Authority may consider modifying off-street parking and loading requirements.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Section 218-29, it governs the sale, rental or transfer of reserved housing and workforce housing units. It describes the process in the rule. The general qualification, the only amendment that's addressed in that section, is that the qualifying household should have sufficient gross income to qualify for a loan. It's something that wasn't in the earlier rules, and this provision comes directly from the provisions that HHFDC has in its affordable housing program. It also provides for a provision for someone who already owns a reserved housing unit in Kaka'ako but had changes in family because of birth of children and, you know, the size of the family has increased, for those families to be able to apply for a larger unit if it's available within the district. It didn't exist in the current rule, but that's added in the new amendment.

Section 218-31, Sales and Rental of
Reserved Housing, it standardizes the workforce
housing and reserved housing sales program, and it

provides that the Authority may manage the sales program itself or allow the developer to manage it. It addresses sales notice requirement and information to be included in the notice and adds a provision that priority shall be given to any family displaced within the Kaka'ako Community Development District because of development in the district.

Section 218-32 amends the provision where it exempts a retirement account from counting towards assets and also provides that the 20 percent of the purchase price that's used as down payment from counting towards assets.

has been revised to make sure that the purchaser of the unit is an occupant of the unit. It allows for verification requirement and for the Authority to enforce the rule in case, you know, a purchaser of the unit is not the occupant of the unit too. And it adds verification requirement too. It allows for the HCDA to require that the owner, at a regular interval, provide information that the owner is the occupant of the unit.

Section 218-34, Factors to Be Used,
establishes factors for reserved housing and
workforce housing sales price determination based on

a couple of elements there where a down payment --

- 5

Now, this is just for the purpose of calculating the sales price. It should be limited to 10 percent of the sales price. Also, the applicable AMI, like, whether it's at 100 percent, 110 percent, 120 percent and so forth. And, also, the housing cost limits to 33 percent of the household income and includes mortgage payment, mortgage insurance premium, AOAO dues, and also takes into account the interest, which is published by Freddie Mac for a 30-year mortgage, and also the unit factor that is -- was part of the earlier provision.

It allows for a maximum sales price to be based on 140 percent of AMI as long as the weighted average sales price of all of the reserved housing units of the project is no more than a price calculated based on 120 percent of AMI, and also requires that the executive director establish and publish a reserved housing sales price formula every year.

This is an example. It's too busy and small to read, but this is an example of the price calculation template or basically a formula that will be provided to a developer on a project that has reserved housing, and the developer can work through

this spreadsheet to determine the various pricing levels at various AMIs.

Housing: Establishes the first option to purchase the reserved housing or workforce housing unit by the Authority, which has been amended to 30 years. The current rule provides for five years, but the amended rule provides for a 30-year buyback period. And it establishes the formula to determine the buyback purchase price where the buyback price is based on the original fair market value of the unit appreciated by an index, which is the index published by the Honolulu Board of Realtors, minus the Authority's equity in the unit. And also provides for consideration for owner-made improvements in the unit in determining the buyback price.

It regulates subsequent mortgages placed on the reserved housing units. It needs to be approved by the ED, and then it limits the subsequent mortgages to the buyback price established by the formula. Basically, what it does is that it doesn't jeopardize the Authority's equity being mortgaged by a homeowner, and this amendment was provided taking into consideration the comments provided by a lot of Honolulu banks and Honolulu Mortgage Bankers

Association and the financing community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I have an example there on, typically, how you would calculate buyback price and, you know, the original sales price of the unit and then the original fair market value so that it establishes the equity sharing. And then the next column after that is the annual median sales price change published by Honolulu Board of Realtors. the rest is showing you the calculation that, you know, based on past data from 2016 to 2012, if someone bought a unit in 2012 and it was \$408,000, pretty much the buyback price established by the Authority would be 518,000. The Authority's equity would be 62,000 in the unit, and then the owner's profit would be 110,000. So this addresses a lot of concerns and comments that was received concerning, you know, the opportunity for an owner of a unit to build equity in the unit. And I believe the way the formula is set up, it provides a very robust opportunity for, you know, increasing equity for the owner of the unit.

Some sections that are no more required and, therefore, are deleted are sections 36 and 37.

Section 218-36 (sic) addresses the foreclosure requirement to notify the Authority. The

Authority becomes party to any foreclosure action, and the Authority is in second position after the lender and entitled to any remaining proceeds up to the maximum of its equity sharing. And the owner is entitled to any remaining funds after all that is taken care of.

2.5

And section 218-39 provides for foreclosure sale. And this section addresses some of the comments that we have received regarding regular secondary mortgage market with FHA and all of that where this meets the requirement for FHA to provide — to purchase a mortgage in the secondary market where, if it's a foreclosure sale, then all of the requirements of the rules are extinguished at that point and not applicable.

Section 218-40 requires for -- it creates the deed restriction by incorporating equity sharing and then the buyback provisions in the deed.

Section 218-41 addresses equity sharing, amends the formula a little bit, makes it consistent with actually HHFDC's formula. And the last bullet point there on "HCDA's equity sharing subordinated to any mortgage created for the purchase of reserved housing or workforce housing unit," that amendment was included based on the comments provided by the

Mortgage Bankers Association where the current rule provides only for a first mortgage being — the equity sharing being subordinated to just the first mortgage created for the purchase of the unit. And the comment was received that because there is a 20 percent down payment requirement, a person might have to take a second mortgage to purchase a unit and — or pay mortgage insurance premium, which is money out front. So this is to provide more opportunity for the buyers and make it easier for the buyers who qualified for the loan — for a second mortgage that we made the changes.

1 4

And, again, the criteria from staff side was to look at whether the Authority's equity share would be in jeopardy or not, but allowing that — restricting it to the mortgage created only for the purchase of the unit, you know, I believe that it doesn't jeopardize the Authority's equity sharing in the unit. And it allows flexibility for bankers and flexibility for the owners. It particularly creates additional opportunity for the owner for financing the purchase of the unit.

Going back to the formula on equity sharing, it is a percentage based on the original

fair market value and original reserved housing sales price. And I have an example there.

Section 218-42, "Deferral," provides for deferral of first option to purchase and adds conditions to deferral of first option to purchase in equity sharing. This section was added to address situations where there's real situations where someone, say, because of their job or family situation, have to move out or, you know, move to a foreign country or move to the mainland, but they don't want to sell their unit. So it creates opportunity for those people to either transfer the unit to a family member if the family member qualifies and those kind of circumstances, and it creates for a life trust and situations like that.

"Terms of Reserved Housing and Workforce
Housing For Rent": Again, maximum qualifying income
of 140 percent of AMI for rental units as long as the
weighted average rent is based on an household income
of 120 percent. I've listed the factors for
determining monthly rents for reserved housing units,
and 30 percent of the applicable AMI includes
utilities, exempts parking, telephone, television and
internet, and ED to establish a formula. So on the
spreadsheet there, there's a formula on the bottom

that really calculates what the applicable rents are.

The next provision, 218-45, "Rental of Reserved Housing and Workforce Housing Unit By Owner," and this provision was added to, again, address the situations where, you know, it's a purchase by say sometimes --

We had a case where it was a military family who purchased the unit and was transferred to, I believe this was Japan, and wanted to keep the ownership of the unit, and we had no provision for the owner to allow — to rent the unit. So it clarifies that; that a family that needs to — because of personal circumstances, needs to move out of the unit, is allowed to rent the unit as long as the unit is rented to a qualified household.

Section 218-46, cash-in-lieu provision.

Again, as I mentioned earlier, the cash-in-lieu provision is added because it's put in the statute again, and it establishes a formula which is higher of the two, 7 percent of gross revenue of the project or the difference of average — fair market value and average reserved housing sales price, whichever is greater, and I have a formula there on how it gets calculated.

Section 218-47, that's just the effects

of subsequent rule amendments. This is for owner of reserved housing where, under the current rule, it provides the option for those owners to come under the new rules or to stay within the existing -- the rules that they qualified under. A new section was added, section 218-48, to address fees for provisions for establishing fees for administering reserved housing and workforce housing program. We get a lot of requests for buyback and things like that, and right now there is no provision for fees established for spending, especially asset management staff. So we're spending a lot of time going through that analysis and administering the program. So there is a provision for fee. Wall we not all we want below to

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that, that ends my presentation, and if board members have any questions, I can address those.

CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you, Deepak.

Before we get into questions of board members, I just want to note for the record that Kathy Sokugawa and Laurel Johnston --

MEMBER JOHNSTON: Sorry I was late. I apologize.

CHAIR WHALEN: Actually, if I may, I'll

start out with a question. I didn't see, well, in your presentation, the amendment that eliminates the requirement in the present rules that workforce housing projects may not receive any form of subsidy or assistance. But I don't see it actually in the Ramseyer version of the rules.

MR. NEUPANE: It is in the Ramseyer version, but let me go back and address that. The current provision is that to qualify as a reserved housing -- sorry -- the workforce housing program, the workforce housing project cannot use, you know, state/federal government funds. That provision has been taken out in the proposed rules.

CHAIR WHALEN: So it would be sort of the situation -- well, there was a newspaper story today about the dedication of Keahole where it met the rental housing requirements for reserved housing, but they received funding from HHFDC. I think either a construction loan or a GET waiver.

MR. NEUPANE: Yeah, I believe it was a GET exemption. For that project, it was negotiated with HHFDC. The requirement -- the HCDA's rental reserved housing requirement is only for 15 years.

CHAIR WHALEN: Right.

MR. NEUPANE: So for receiving GET, the

project agreed to be -- keep it as a reserved --2 administered as a reserved housing unit for 30 years, and that was the reason for that. 3 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. 5 MR. NEUPANE: The Authority's policy in 6 the past has been that if there is going to be any additional HHFDC funding, like GET exemption and 7 situations like that, to allow that if it goes over 8 9 and beyond what is required by the current rules. 10 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. I just wanted to 11 IA3 clarify that. I don't know if there are other 12 projects that are examples of that. 13 MR. NEUPANE: The 440 Keawe Street of the 14 Kamehameha Schools has the situation where it was 15 exempted from GET, but now instead of 15 years, it's 16 regulated for 30 years. 17 CHAIR WHALEN: So it's a combination of 18 incentives and direct assistance? 19 MR. NEUPANE: That is correct. 20 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Are there any other 21 questions? 22 MEMBER BASSETT: I have a question. 23 CHAIR WHALEN: Yes. 24 MEMBER BASSETT: This is regarding the 25 Ramseyer format 15-218-19 and its relationship to

what you're mentioning how you amended the other chart regarding -- where is it? Basically, you took out the requirement for the reserved housing unit's square footage to be correlated with the FAR. What section was that?

MR. NEUPANE: That's section 17.

MEMBER BASSETT: So what was the reason for that change?

MR. NEUPANE: Well, initially, in 2011 when the rule was -- new rule was adopted, it went from 20 percent of the unit to 20 percent of the floor area. The thinking at that time was that, you know, if it is floor area, then it probably will provide incentive for the developer to build larger units, saying that three bedroom units and all, you know, because it reduces the number of bathrooms and kitchens and things like that; right? So instead of providing, say, on a 100-unit project, the requirement would have 20 units, but now if you use floor area, then the developer doesn't necessarily have to build 20 units. It could be 15 units, but some of the units would be a three-bedroom unit. So that was the incentive.

But now because of the table that's introduced in section 19 where there is an incentive

provided to the developer by providing a larger unit, we didn't believe that, you know, we still needed to keep the floor area and go to the number of units now because it basically does the same thing.

MEMBER BASSETT: So the way that I see this is, is that one potential, which is like on the bad side of things, right, is that if you have a developer that's required to build 20 units, then they could just cram as many bedrooms as they can into a very small area and that would meet -- you know, they could develop less than 20 percent of their FAR. Just squeeze in maybe like three bedrooms into what should have been, like, an 800-square-foot spot. Is that a concern?

MR. NEUPANE: No, that's not a concern because, you know, the size of living spaces is determined by Honolulu housing code. So the building code takes care of, you know, the size of the -- the minimum size of the units anyway. From a health and safety issue, that's not a concern.

MEMBER BASSETT: I see. Okay. And also, I guess, the market will, you know, address that as well.

MR. NEUPANE: And the market does address it. I mean, typically, in the newer units, a

1 = three-bedroom unit tends to be, you know, 11-, 1200 2 square foot anyway. 3 MEMBER FANG: I think I might add, at the 4 time, we were also discussing the City's proposed 5 affordable housing changes, and they had a similar kind of unit-factor-type table. 6 MR. NEUPANE: Yeah, I mean, the City and County's current affordable housing rules, and I 8 9 believe they are going to adopt some of that in the 10 new version too, does have a similar table like this. 11 Theirs is more elaborate. It takes into account, you 12 know, different kinds of bedrooms and bathrooms and 13 all. We simplified it to just go by the number of 14 bedroom units. 15 CHAIR WHALEN: I believe they have a different formula for TOD areas. 16 17 MR. NEUPANE: Yeah. On the requirement 18 for affordable housing. 19 MEMBER BASSETT: I have another question. 20 This morning, we received some testimony from the 21 Speaker of the House regarding a concern that the 2.2 transfers that he's specifying here could trigger our 23 buyback and equity sharing provisions. I'm not sure 24 if staff has a response to these concerns. 25 MR. NEUPANE: Yes, I do. I mean, you

know, this is -- we had received this comment earlier too, and the comments are taken care of in the rules, actually, by the, you know, provision of deferral that I just went through. Let me point out the section here: 218-42. That takes care of, you know -- it provides for deferral of first option to purchase and equity sharing. And if you look in the paragraph in the Speaker's comment, that says 15-304, that's 127, "Permitted Transfer," it takes care of bullet No. 2, paragraph 2, No. 2 through 7, and it's the exact language from that that's in our rule because I copied it pretty much from HHFDC's provisions.

And the No. 1 paragraph there is taken care of because, you know, the rule was amended to allow for, you know, a second — a second mortgage of the buyback — all the way up to the buyback price established by the Authority. So in that sense, I think the Speaker's comments are already taken care of and included in the rules and addressed in the rules.

MEMBER BASSETT: The difference is that the language that he's citing here from HHFDC says that "that corporation must require -- shall require that consent be granted to those transfers," where

ours says "that we may." Is there a reason why we 1 2 chose not to follow completely the language of HHFDC? MR. NEUPANE: Well, it's up to the 3 4 discretion of the Authority. It's always been at the 5 discretion of the Authority, and we wanted to leave 6 the language like that. 7 MEMBER BASSETT: Has it ever been our practice historically to not allow for these kinds of 8 9 transfers? 10 MR. NEUPANE: Not sure. 11 Asset Manager or Aedward, do you have --12 I am not aware of anyone transferring it 13 to family members, but, you know, a lot of the cases, 14 the Authority has either exercised its option to 15 purchase, and if the Authority doesn't exercise its 16 option to purchase, then the unit can be sold at 17 market. So --18 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Any other questions 19 before we get public testimony? 20 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: In this same section under part 2, "Transfer to a Relative," and 21 22 in looking at the definitions, it said, you know, if 23 it's not -- it's not in that section. In looking at Merriam-Webster, a relative is anyone by blood or by 24

affiliate, which I'm assuming is by marriage.

25

what I'm concerned about is, you know, it could be a cousin. How far -- how far do we go with this? And I think the other sections, you know, do address descendants, spouses, children. But I don't know what -- what else was the thought behind that.

MR. NEUPANE: Well, the terminology, like I said, you know, is completely borrowed from HHFDC's rule, and we haven't defined "related." But then there is a tacit provision in the definition section that says that "Terms not defined in the section shall be accorded their commonly accepted meanings." So that provides for flexibility and interpretation either to the executive director or to the Authority in how the Authority or the executive director decides to make that determination.

Now, you know, we could -- we could define what a relative is, but once there is a definition, it's going to be fairly narrow. And if the intent of the Authority is to make it fairly narrow, I can go back and define "relative" in the rules, but then you have to keep in mind that that is the definition. If something comes -- if we get into a situation other than that, then it creates some kind of conundrum at a later time.

And, also, again, I would like to mention

133 that any changes that we made in the rules, and the 2 AG probably will provide more detailed information on 3 this, may cause us to go back to another set of 4 hearings too. So I just want to caution about 5 changes -- making changes to the rule at this point 6 where it may trigger another set of hearings. 7 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: And I know we 8 cannot do any decision-making at this time. 9 MEMBER JOHNSTON: Can I ask that really the determining factor is whether they're eligible; 10 11 right? So you could be related to them and not be 12 eligible. So it's not going to matter how we define 13 "relative." 14 MR. NEUPANE: Yes. 15 CHAIR WHALEN: Katherine? 16 MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Do we know in the next 17 5 or 10 years how many sites will be affected by the 18 new rules? In other words, we anticipate they'd be 19 redeveloped to include housing that would be having 20 to be required to follow these rules on 21 affordability? 22 MR. NEUPANE: I don't know the exact 23 number of, you know, projects or sites that may be 24 affected, but what I can say is that any project 25 outside of Kamehameha Schools Master Plan and Ward

Neighborhood Master Plan would be -- would have to follow these rules if these rules get adopted.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Right. But it's also not applicable to under 20,000-square-foot lots.

MR. NEUPANE: That is correct, yeah.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: So we can kind of do some back-of-the-envelope estimate based on existing, underdeveloped uses and, therefore, a possibility that they may be redeveloped in the next five, ten years.

MR. NEUPANE: I could look at that. I haven't really looked at that.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: The other question -- I have lots, but I'll try to restrain myself. So section 48 talks about establishing fees. Could we add something about the purpose of the fees or what they're expected to perform or cover? It has the words that, "The Authority may establish if it's deemed necessary." Okay. I get that. "Reasonable or convenient," I don't get that. What would be a convenient fee? And I would think that it would be helpful to know, for the director to establish those fees, is it intended to cover the cost of running the whole program, a portion of the cost? Should there be differentiated fees for first-time buyers, resale?

1 Do we have an estimate of how much it's going to cost 2 us to process these applications? 3 MR. NEUPANE: We do. It's mostly to 4 address, you know, buyback situations and then -mostly to address buyback. We get requests for 5 6 buybacks, and then the staff has to, you know, go 7 through the paperwork, has to appraise the units and those kind of things. It's intended to cover that. 9 Typically, initial sale, up until now, 10 the Authority has always allowed the developer to 11 administer the sale program. So, therefore, there is 12 no initial cost to that applicant, and the intent of 13 that section is to cover only if there's a buyback 14 request. 15 MR. LOS BAÑOS: So, Member Sokugawa, the 16 only thing I'll add is that this rule was also 17 something borrowed from HHFDC, something that 18 currently exists as well. 19 MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Thank you. 20 MR. NEUPANE: And mirrors the language 21 too." A SELLIE S 22 MEMBER SOKUGAWA: We have experience --23 the Department of Planning and Permitting does have 24 experience with this issue. We qualify first-time 25 homeowners. We qualify buybacks. So it takes a

considerable amount of time to do that work. And so it's not a small cost if you base it on our experience. So I just wanted to know that -- what is the intent of the fees and how they should be calculated.

The other question I have is there's a provision here that says the Authority may modify the off-street parking. I would suggest that we get more explicit, especially if they're within a transit station, that across the board from the beginning, that the parking — as the city has been doing, is reducing the parking automatically by half to encourage a reduction of cost on affordable housing rather than leave it open-ended.

MEMBER BASSETT: What provision is that?

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: There's a provision

that says "The Authority may modify the off-street

parking requirement." And I'm suggesting that if

it's near a rail station, the affordable housing

should at least be cut by half.

MEMBER BASSETT: What section is it?

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: It was kind of in -
page, whatever, 2-18 -- section 218-18, "Adjustments
to High Density and General Development

Requirements."

MEMBER FANG: At the very end of that section.

MR. NEUPANE: Member Sokugawa, the parking requirement is administered by Mauka Area Rules. And so the provision in the reserved housing rules is just for the Authority to be able to amend that.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: I understand that, but I think we should be even beyond that and make a rule or a guideline that says as a minimum, you would only need to provide half the parking that would normally be authorized by TOD. You can go lower or you can go higher, but I think that would be a very good signal to developers to say, "That's some place where I could automatically cut costs."

Overlay that has not yet been adopted in the rule, and that, I think, probably one of the key provisions is to reduce the off-street parking requirement. I think, actually, the challenge has been to find developers who are willing to reduce parking.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: I'm not saying it has been easy for us either. Developers and their bankers are resistant to dropping the parking requirement, you know, but I pretty much believe that

in the next 40 years, we're going to be dramatically changing our mobility habits, and there are going to be a lot of empty parking garages, and they're not able to retrofit into habitable spaces. Construction standards are totally different. So unless you've done that now, you're going to be stuck with a lot of empty spaces. So that would be unfortunate, including the front-end cost of affordable housing now, in 20 years, you're not going to need them. CHAIR WHALEN: We're sort of veering from

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

questions to discussion.

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Sorry.

CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you.

Okay. People have been waiting patiently to give their testimony. As of today, the HCDA has received 147 written testimonies. Board members were provided with copies of testimony before today's meeting. Testimony that was received up until 12:00 p.m., August 15th, yesterday, 2017, have been printed and provided to members.

Any other questions we have for staff?

If you emailed or faxed your written testimony, you do not need to resubmit a copy today. If you'd like to submit written testimony today, please hand it to our clerk. Ku'ulei will be taking it. Ku'ulei is sitting there at the table. So she can record it and add it to the record.

2.

We will now hear testimony from the public. Speakers will be called up to testify in the order in which they have signed up. Public testimony, as I stated before, will be limited to three minutes each, but you can also supplement this with written testimony.

Please refrain from reading your written
testimony if it is lengthy, particularly. Instead
summarize your comments in the time that you have
available. When you are called, please come up to
the witness table and speak directly into the
microphone. Please state your name, any organization
that you're representing, and whether you submitted
written testimony.

Now, I don't have anyone signed up to speak. I'm flabbergasted. No one signed up to speak. But let me ask if anyone wishes to speak at this point even if you haven't signed up.

Yes, please come forward. Just sit at the chair and state your name and if you're representing any organization.

MS. DARRAH-OKIKE: Okay. Hi. Thank you, everyone, for coming here to deal with these

important issues. My name is Jennifer Darrah-Okike. I'm representing myself. I am a researcher and professor. I've studied housing policy for many years. I'm here to underscore the importance of strong policy for inclusionary zoning. This is something I've studied for many years. It's a policy tool that is so important. It's one that's been successfully used in other very high-cost-of-living areas like Honolulu.

I understand there's some debate about where to set the limit in terms of where to target the housing in terms of low- and moderate-income households, and I'd like to make a very strong case for keeping that --

Median income. Median income is about the area.

It's a relative measure. So it captures our realities in your area. And to put it in terms that are simple to understand, 100 percent of area median income is right smack dab in the middle. So, by definition, anything that would include up to 100 percent of the area median income, by definition, is talking about half. Half of the households here.

I would encourage this body, as I know it does, to take very, very seriously the charge that it

was given. This area was envisioned in the late
'70s. This body was established with a vision for
creating housing in an urban core that would be vital
and that would include all types of households and
all types of families to benefit. There's bodies and
bodies of research that suggest that societies, as a
whole, improve when there is social mixing. Areas
themselves are stronger when there's social mixing
across income, across group, across occupation. Even
individual households benefit.

So we're really at risk of losing something really important for our society in general and also for our area in particular if Kaka'ako becomes too heavily influenced and occupied by the very highest-income families.

So I'd encourage you to live up to the charge that was given to this body. In very, very high-cost-of-living places, the only way -- research has shown time and time again that the only way there can be some modicum of inclusion is when public bodies like you and public policies stand up affirmatively to balance out the picture and really keep the eye on the prize in terms of inclusion. So I would say keep your eye on the prize of 100 percent area median income.

Every person in the state of Hawaii is taxed. Every person, every household across the income distribution has contributed to the public monies and the millions of dollars that have been invested in Kaka'ako. It's an investment in all of Hawaii's future, all of the island's future. Why would we completely leave out half of the population from even having a chance?

2.1

So I would keep your eye on the prize to target policies at 100 percent so that half -- half or more of the people can have some chance of living in this vibrant place and making it better for everybody.

I'm happy to answer any questions. And I'll just remind us that, again, median income is already area relative. So it doesn't make sense to say, "Well, in a high-cost-of-living place, we really need to target to 140 percent." It's already relative. So when we talk about 100 percent median, we're talking about if we say below 100 percent, that is half -- by definition, half of all households. And so we're talking about your service workers. We're talking about county workers. We're talking about teachers. And we need to -- we need to bring our policies down.

Other localities have reserved housing 1 2 that are very robust at the 100 percent, 120 percent 3 level. I've personally never seen policies pitched 4 to the 140 percent median income level. So I'm 5 surprised that we would do that in such a special 6 area where there is so much demand, and, yet, so much need for an inclusive society. So thank you. 7 8 CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you. 9 Any questions of the speaker? 10 Anyone else? 11 Yes. 12 MEMBER SOKUGAWA: I don't think it's a 13 disrespect to the Authority, but there is a competing 14 hearing on affordable housing at the legislature in, 15 like, 20 minutes. So some people may have had to 16 choose which hearing to attend. 17 CHAIR WHALEN: Well, I would say in terms 18 of relative importance, the legislature gets more 19 attention than the HCDA. It's not always the case. 20 But in this instance, yeah, I think the timing of the 21 hearing -- well, we set our hearing date first. 22 MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Yes, we did. Yes, we 23 did. CHAIR WHALEN: So, anyway, yeah, sorry 24 for, I guess, divided attention on those two things. 25

But are you -- are you attending that one, the legislature?

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: Well, it depends on when this meeting adjourns.

CHAIR WHALEN: So I think you're sort of a command performance over there; right? Don't you have to go?

MEMBER SOKUGAWA: No.

CHAIR WHALEN: Anyone else like to speak at this point?

Well, okay, we had -- you know, as I say, we've gotten a lot of testimony. We have already been reviewing our second draft of the rules. We have tried to listen to the suggestions that were made. Our next meeting will be a decision-making hearing on the rules, but I just want to thank everybody who has participated. We've learned a lot. We know that there are lots of challenges that we can't rely on just rule-making and requirements; that there needs to be also financing to support affordable housing and make it affordable for the long term. And it's a very complex area that requires looking at what the private sector does and what their needs are, but also what the demands are in terms of the public's need for affordable housing.

The next public hearing will be for decision-making on Wednesday, September 6th, at 1:00 p.m. So on behalf of the HCDA Authority members and its staff, I thank you for your attendance today. The hearing now stands adjourned. The time is now 10:04 a.m. Thank you. (Hearing adjourned at 10:04 a.m.) 

1	CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF HAWAII
3	CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU )
4	
5	I, LAURA SAVO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Hawaii, do hereby
6	certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me in machine shorthand at the time and place herein stated, and was thereafter reduced to typewriting under my supervision;
0	typewilting under my supervision,
9	That the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of said proceedings;
10	I further certify that I am not of counsel
11	or attorney for any of the parties to this case, nor
12	in any way interested in the outcome hereof, and that I am not related to any of the parties hereto.
13	Dated this 20th day of August 2017 in
14	Honolulu, Hawaii.
15	/S/ Laura Savo
16	LAURA SAVO, RPR, CSR NO. 347
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	