1	HAWAII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
2	STATE OF HAWAII
3	
4	In re:
5	The Application of)
6	VICTORIA WARD, LIMITED,)
7	a wholly owned subsidiary) of HOWARD HUGHES)
8	CORPORATION,)
9	Applicant,)
10	To request a development) permit, Permit Number)
11	<pre>KAK 18-038, with) modifications, to develop)</pre>
12	a mixed-use project at) 1020 Auahi Street,)
13	TMK Nos. (1)2-3-002: 109,) 110 (portion), aka)
14	"Ko'ula Project."))
15	
16	MODIFICATION HEARING
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
18	
19	Wednesday, June 13, 2018
20	
21	Taken at 547 Queen Street, Second Floor
22	Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
23	commencing at 12:14 p.m.
24	
25	Reported by: LAURA SAVO, CSR No. 347

1	APPEARANCES
2	John Whalen, Chairperson
3	Mary Pat Waterhouse, Vice Chairperson
4	Garett Kamemoto, Interim Executive Director
5	Deepak Neupane, Director of Planning and Development
6	Lori Sunakoda, Deputy Attorney General
7	Max Levins, Deputy Attorney General
8	
9	BOARD MEMBERS:
10	Beau Bassett
11	Wei Fang
12	Jason Okuhama
13	Phillip Hasha
14	
15	ALSO PRESENT:
16	For the Applicant:
17	J. DOUGLAS ING, ESQ.
18	BRIAN A. KANG, ESQ. Watanabe Ing LLP
19	999 Bishop Street, 23rd Floor Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
20	For HART:
21	ROZELLE A. AGAG, ESQ.
22	Department of the Corporation Counsel City and County of Honolulu
23	530 South King Street, Room 110 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
24	
25	

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2		PAGE
3	Call to Order	5
4	Staff Report	7
5	Adjournment	89
6		
7	EXHIBITS ADMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
8	(None offered.)	
9		
10	WITNESSES FOR THE APPLICANT:	
11		
12	THOMAS WITTEN	
13	Examination by: Mr. Ing	10
14	Examination by: Member Bassett	21
15	Examination by: Chair Whalen	26, 31
16	Examination by: Mr. Neupane	30
17		
18	DAVID AKINAKA	
19	Examination by: Mr. Ing	32
20	Examination by: Member Bassett	37
21	Examination by: Mr. Neupane	37
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	<u>INDEX (Cont'd)</u>	
2	WITNESSES FOR THE APPLICANT:	PAGE
3		
4	CHAD TAKESUE	
5	Examination by: Mr. Ing	41
6	Examination by: Member Fang	46
7	Examination by: Chair Whalen	48
8		
9	RACE RANDLE	
10	Examination by: Mr. Ing	56
11	Examination by: Chair Whalen	6 4
12	Examination by: Member Bassett	68
13	Examination by: Member Fang	76
14		
15	PUBLIC TESTIMONY BY:	
16	(None offered.)	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Wednesday, June 13, 2018, 12:14 p.m.

-000-

CHAIR WHALEN: This hearing is held in accordance with Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter -Section 206E-5.6, Hawaii Administrative Rules,
Chapter 15-219, and the vested Hawaii Administrative
Rules, Chapter 15-22. So the nature of this hearing
is to allow the applicant to present the proposed
project to provide the general -- and to provide the
general public with the opportunity to present oral
and/or written testimony. The applicant is Victoria
Ward, Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Howard
Hughes Corporation. Tax map key is 2-3-002, parcel
109 and portion of 110. Project location is 1020
Auahi Street.

The project is a request for a development permit application for a mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial components at 1020 Auahi Street, tax map key 2-3-002, parcel 109 and portion of 110. The proposed project consists of a 400-foot tower and a 75-foot podium and will house a mix of approximately 570 residential units and approximately 58,300 square feet of commercial space and required parking spaces.

The project will provide approximately

10,800 square feet of open space and 58,496 square feet of recreational space. The applicant is proposing to provide at least 64 reserved housing units to be located either within the project or off-site.

So the modification requested is from the applicable vested Mauka Area Rules, Hawaii

Administrative Rules, Chapter 15-22, in order to increase the height of the podium, meaning the structure located at the base of the proposed tower that will house parking stalls, commercial spaces and a portion of the residential units from 45 feet to 75 feet -- 45 feet to 75 feet. The application was submitted on April 16th, 2018.

A public hearing notice was published in Honolulu Star-Advertiser, Maui News, the Garden Isle, Hawaii Tribune-Herald and West Hawaii Today on Tuesday, May 1st, 2018.

So let me explain the procedures for today's hearing. The HCDA staff will first present its report, summarizing the modification request. Following that presentation, we'll receive the presentation of the applicant, and then HART will have an opportunity to make a presentation if it desires. Then we will hear testimony from the

public. Only members of the Authority and the executive director will be permitted to ask questions of the staff, applicant or individuals providing testimony.

Are there any questions about these procedures? Yes, that would include -- HART, as intervenor, will have an opportunity to ask questions.

So we'll begin our proceedings. The Kaka'ako planning and development director, Deepak Neupane, will present the staff's report.

MR. NEUPANE: Thank you, Chair. The project is proposing a building platform that's 75 feet in height with up to 15 percent of the platform roof area to be built as high as 87 feet for accessory uses.

The applicant is requesting the following modifications. Modify section 15-22-62 of the mauka -- the vested Mauka Area Rules to increase the maximum platform height to 75 feet with an allowance of an additional 12 feet in height for 15 percent of the total roof area that would be utilized for the accessory uses.

Section 15-22-62 of the vested rules require that building platform heights not exceed 45

feet in height.

Section 15-22-62 (c) of the vested rules does exclude certain building elements or features and associated screening from the height requirement as long as the restrictions of the subsections are met.

Section 15-22-120(7) of the vested rule notes that platform height may be modified to exceed 45 feet where, A, subsurface constructions is infeasible; B, design requirements for ceiling height clearance require height adjustment; C, industrial, commercial, residential or community services uses are substantially located within the platform, especially along streets or public spaces; or D, significant public facilities or pedestrian features are provided at the street level, especially arcades or publicly accessible open space in excess of the minimum grade level open space.

The master plan decision and order indicates that the applicant would be requesting for modification on a project-by-project basis. The Authority shall consider the modification request pursuant to Section 15-22-22 of the vested rules, which notes that in order for the Authority to consider the modification of a specific provision,

the applicant must have demonstrated that, 1, the modification would provide flexibility and result in a development that is practically and aesthetically superior to that which could be accomplished with regard -- with the rigid enforcement of the vested rules; 2, the modification would not adversely affect adjacent developments or uses; and 3, the resulting development will be consistent with the intent of the vested Mauka Area Plan.

That concludes the staff report, and I can address any questions that members may have.

CHAIR WHALEN: Members, questions? Okay.

Applicant, the show is yours to present your case for the modification.

MR. ING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Once again, Douglas Ing and Brian Kang representing Howard Hughes Corporation and Victoria Ward, Limited. We call as our first witness for the modification hearing, Mr. Tom Witten.

CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Tom.

THE WITNESS: I swear to tell the truth.

My name is Thomas Witten of PBR Hawaii and

Associates, and I'm chairman -- currently chairman of the firm.

THOMAS WITTEN,

having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MR. ING:

Q Mr. Witten, could you please describe the modification requested for this project?

A Yes. As staff noted, Ko'ula's design requires one modification under the Mauka Area Rules. The Ward master plan recognized that an increase in maximum podium platform height from 45 feet to 75 feet for all parcels not directly fronting Ala Moana Boulevard would be necessary to achieve the vision of the Ward master plan.

Consistent with the Ward master plan vision, Ko'ula includes a podium platform height of 75 feet to accommodate the mix of uses, provide additional open space, primarily the ground floor, provide street level retail space that will enhance the walkability of the neighborhood, and activate the edge of the Central Plaza that it abuts.

I put together some slides, some of which were -- most of which were reviewed last time in

the -- in the overall previous hearing, but let me use these as a way to orient the board again on the attributes of Ko'ula's design and walk you through the resultant benefits that are accrued from the overall project design with the modified podium height to 75 feet.

 ${\tt Q}$ ${\tt So}$ just let the record reflect that ${\tt Exhibit} \ {\tt Z} \ {\tt has} \ {\tt now} \ {\tt been} \ {\tt electronically} \ {\tt presented} \ {\tt on}$ the screen.

A Thank you.

Again, this is the context slide that shows the Ko'ula proposed project in proximity of the Central Plaza, and the private drive No. 2 or reference No. 2 is -- we've also been referring to that as Halekauwila Street extension, and then there's a service drive between the Ward Entertainment Center and the project and with the primary frontage on Auahi Street on the makai side of the project.

At the ground floor, additional open space has been achieved, which is colored in green on this exhibit. Additionally, the front yard setback is highlighted, but you'll see the pedestrian open space on both -- the Halekauwila end of the project. There is a penetration -- as was discussed earlier, a

penetration through the central part of the building with an open air/open space that also provides public entry and drop-offs, sort of a public porte cochere with an open space courtyard that feeds into the central core. So those are all key attributes, I think, that have been achieved with the podium height modification.

Looking at the Auahi Street and the vision for Auahi Street to be a pedestrian promenade -- major pedestrian promenade throughout Ward Village, this is sort of the existing condition with the proposed site on the left, on the mauka side, and this is the concept or vision for that transformation both with adjustments on Auahi Street and sort of the Complete Streets attributes with pedestrian and bike included within that corridor.

Pulling back, looking across Auahi

Street, looking mauka at Ko'ula, you'll see the

transition with the Central Park -- Central Plaza on

the left with the public open space going up to and

greeting and interfacing with the commercial uses

that are achieved in the ground floor. The green

wall section is the parking structure with a podium

height of 75 feet to the right, but, again, achieving

those mixes of uses --

On Auahi Street, there was -- we were able to achieve a step back from the -- at the second level that provides additional recreation open space at that level also on Auahi. Again, the edge -- the activated edge along Ko'ula with commercial space in the ground floor and that flowing out into the Central Plaza area.

The podium exhibits showing sort of the Mauka Area Rules as if you didn't have the modification and the resultant vision of the Ward master plan that shows with the modification and the ability to integrate the residential-commercial uses and activate and provide more space for the pedestrians and pedestrian environment along the streets and private lanes.

Just another perspective of that, pulling back with -- also with the architecture expressed on Ko'ula.

Again, that edge along the Central Plaza, a contrasting example of what it could be if you didn't have the modification and didn't wrap that ground floor with retail space. It could be constructed with parking structures as illustrated.

This is a service drive rendering that we didn't have last time, but it looks down looking

makai with Ward Entertainment Center on the left and Ko'ula on the right and to the -- to the far right is we're looking across the Halekauwila Street extension. So you're kind of looking down, and along this edge of Ko'ula, you basically have your -- your residential parking entrance. You have where the Ward Village dark brown logo is that pass-through that provides penetration through the project to the Central Plaza with the public porte cochere area, and then there are several service -- service bays beyond that. So a lot of the -- most of the sort of utilitarian, functional access aspects of the building are achieved on this private drive adjacent to the Ward Entertainment Center.

And then on the mauka side, we're able to wrap the ground floor with retail uses as illustrated, and above that, there's actually integrated residential uses along that edge.

Similar to A'ali'i, immediately across the street, A'ali'i also has residential uses that were integrated into that 75-foot podium in that case.

This is a better shot just looking down what's also referred to as Halekauwila Street extension with that activated edge with the retail

and the residential above and the edge of A'ali'i, which also has retail -- was able to integrate retail and also has residential integrated at the podium.

So you get a very nice streetscape, and there's ample -- ample pedestrian movement area and provisions for landscaping.

That concludes the overview of the -- of the related streetscape impacts and how the modification allows for that to be achieved.

Q Okay. Thank you. So with regard to the Mauka Area Rules, Section 15-22-62 regarding heights provides that no portion of the building shall exceed 45 feet in height provided that additional height is permitted pursuant to plan development portions of subchapter 4. So pursuant to Subchapter 4 of the Mauka Area Rules, Howard Hughes is requesting the modification?

A Yes.

Q So modification to the podium platform height may be granted under Section 15-22-120, parentheses, 7, which provides that platform heights may be commensurately modified to exceed 45 feet where, A, subsurface construction is infeasible; B, design requirements for ceiling height clearances require height adjustment; C, industrial, commercial,

residential or community service uses are substantially located within the platform, especially along streets or public spaces; or D, significant public facilities or pedestrian features are provided at street level, especially arcades or publicly accessible open space in excess of the minimum grade level open space.

In the case of Ko'ula, is subsurface construction infeasible?

A Yes. The proposed modification for the project consistent with the Mauka Area Plan avoids subsurface excavation activities associated with the underground parking structure. Keeping the parking structure above ground for Ko'ula where there are potential cultural subsurface sensitivities in proximity of the water table is a benefit that accrues from the modification requested herein.

In addition, as noted in Appendix D,

Figure 1-5, the Ko'ula project is within the FEMA

flood insurance rate map zone AE with base flood

elevations established at 7 and 8 feet. The proposed

-- the proposed finished floor elevation at level 1

for Ko'ula is 8.25 feet to stay above that -- that

elevation and is also a requirement or also a reason

for the -- for the modification.

Q Will commercial and community service uses be substantially located within the Ko'ula platform, especially along streets or public spaces?

A Yes. As previously illustrated on the presentation I made previously, Ko'ula -- Ko'ula includes a courtyard, a drop-off area, ground level, street front retail and dining access along Auahi Street, and the service drive and Halekauwila extension. And the Central Plaza and residential units have been incorporated into that podium. These uses in the platform displace parking, resulting in additional floors -- parking floors being necessary to accommodate the required parking.

Q Will the significant public facilities or pedestrian features be provided at street level, especially arcades or publicly accessible open space, in excess of the minimum grade level open space -- be provided within the podium?

A Yes. I think we've illustrated that on the various -- various plans and illustrations on all street frontages and the Central Plaza. The terraced -- as I mentioned earlier, the terraced podium, proposed modification that was achieved off Auahi Street also creates additional open recreation area and provides an aesthetically pleasing

pedestrian transition into the retail shops and restaurants within the podium. This is referring to Exhibit A, which is the application at Exhibits 20-F and 20-D as previously illustrated in the slides.

The platform modification also allows for interior courtyard, as I mentioned. It provides access to the building, a convenient off-street, drop-off area for the car community and a significant amount of added open space in that courtyard that opens up into the Central Plaza.

Administrative Rule 15-22-22, it provides that modifications are permitted if the applicant can demonstrate that, 1, the modification would provide flexibility and result in a development that is practically and aesthetically superior to that to which could be accomplished with rigid enforcement of this chapter; 2, the modification would not adversely affect adjacent developments and uses; and 3, the resulting development would be consistent with the intent of the Mauka Area Plan.

In your professional opinion, does this modification provide flexibility and result in a development that is practically and aesthetically superior to that which could be accomplished only by

rigid enforcement of the rules?

A Yes. As designed, Ko'ula's podium platform height of 75 feet is consistent with the Ward master plan and provides for inclusion of the street level retail space to greatly enhance the streetscape aesthetics and contribute to the walkable neighborhood as we have illustrated in the renderings.

Q In your professional opinion, does this modification adversely affect adjacent developments or uses?

A No. Consistent with the Ward master plan, the podium platform height and resultant mix of uses will not adversely affect adjacent developments or uses and is consistent with the modification previously approved by HCDA and Ward Village. Ae'o on Land Block 1, Project 2, Anaha, Land Block 3, Project 1, Ke Kilohana, Land Block 5, Project 1, and A'ali'i, Land Block 1, Project 3 have all proposed and had these modifications approved in the past.

This proposed modification provides uniformity with neighboring developments. The proposed podium platform height will also create the recreation deck with an overlook and activate a streetscape with convenient access to retail uses at

the ground level.

Q In your professional opinion, does this modification result in a development that is consistent with the intent of the Mauka Area Plan?

A Most definitely. The mixed use, enhanced streetscape, additional open space, recreation deck are all consistent with the intent of the Mauka Area Plan in that they contribute to achieving the vision of the approved Ward master plan.

As outlined in the approved Ward master plan, an increased platform height to 75 feet for buildings not directly fronting Ala Moana Boulevard allows for retail, restaurant, offices and residential units to be built within the parking podium. The additional height also provides an opportunity to move parking uses up and away from the street, thereby improving the street environment. The streetscape is greatly enhanced with the ground-level retail and dining along the street frontages.

Q In your professional opinion, is this modification necessary to implement the live-work-play vision of the Mauka Area Rules in the Ward master plan?

A Yes, most definitely.

Q So, previously, I believe you had showed us some slides, and what would this project look like without the requested modification?

There were a few images that we presented that showed the conceptual -- conceptual implementation of the Mauka Area Rules with the 45-foot platform height that would consume most of the ground-floor footprint to accommodate the program and number of units proposed. So the -- I think as clearly illustrated and both expressed in the approved Ward master plan, that the intent was to achieve -- integrate those uses into the podium and, thus, the required 75-foot podium height that has been consistently been implemented throughout Ward Village to achieve the desired urban design and streetscape.

Q Thank you. This concludes the direct examination of Mr. Witten.

CHAIR WHALEN: Board members, questions?

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

Q I have a question. So regarding the slides that you added since our last -- the presentation hearing, you did add some of the drawings for the Halekauwila Street view as well as

the view that's, like, on the side of the building that's abutting the theater?

A Correct.

Q That's why I'd like to make sure I'm getting this right. On the service drive rendering, that porte cochere that has the brown above it, is it correct that if I was to stand in front of that and look through, I would see the park?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

A If I could go back to the site plan here, so that -- where it says "Public" -- I'm referring to the detailed site plan of Ko'ula within Exhibit Z, and it's "Public Entry Drop-Off." So that's the driveway and porte cochere area that the public would be able to pull in and drop off, and that green open space is a plaza that connects directly to the Central Plaza.

Q Okay. And then the rendering of the Auahi Street side, the one that was available at the last hearing, do you have that second floor there with the glass?

A There we go. Oh, this one.

Q No. One more. Keep going. One more.

A That's the end of it.

1	Q That one there.
2	A Oh, this one?
3	Q Yeah. So behind the "thank you," there's
4	that second story; yeah?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Where people can walk?
7	A Open recreation area.
8	Q Is that for the public or for residents?
9	A I think the access there is primarily for
10	the residents, that additional open recreation area.
11	I'm not certain on what the flexibility on access is.
12	Q Maybe if someone from Howard Hughes could
13	expound upon that.
14	MR. RANDLE: I'd be happy to.
15	MEMBER BASSETT: Maybe just jump in now.
16	THE WITNESS: Tom was saying it's
17	available for second floor dining from the
18	restaurants. So it would be open to the public as a
19	function of the restaurant uses.
20	BY MEMBER BASSETT:
21	Q So it's intended that same tenant would
22	have an upstairs-downstairs space?
23	A Potentially, yes.
24	Q But potentially could also be limited to
25	residents only? Is that another possibility?

MR. ING: Mr. Randle can address that in 1 2 his presentation. He'll be coming on. 3 MEMBER BASSETT: Oh, after? 4 MR. ING: Yes. 5 BY MEMBER BASSETT: Okay. Then the other one, try to go back 6 Q 7 to the slide that had the Halekauwila view. 8 Got it. 9 The thing that I am looking at here is I 10 am concerned about the requirement that the 11 modification be aesthetically superior. That's the 12 one thing that I'm asking about that. So some of 13 these renderings, I like the way it looks. I think 14 it does look better than the counter of just a 15 parking lot; right? Even though it's 45 feet shorter, it looks nicer. 16 17 It's not hard to beat the parking lot. 18 Right. But you didn't provide that 19 rendering for the Halekauwila Street under the 20 45-foot scenario. So I don't really have anything to 21 look at --22 Oh, I see. 23 -- regarding, you know, if you didn't do 24 this 75, then it would be this. 25 Well, I think you could -- I mean, I

1 quess you could assume the -- that would be a 45-foot 2 face of parking structure --3 Okay. -- without the residential and without 4 5 the commercial. So I think if you can, you know, 6 visually imagine a parking structure without the 7 retail and residential at a 45-foot height would be 8 the result. 9 Yeah. So I do see that in this rendering from the Halekauwila Street view, it is a number of 10 11 residential floors above the retail floors, and in 12 this rendering, I can see into everybody's living 13 room. So part of that is, like, I like that in a way 14 because it's not just a flat, opaque wall, but I also 15 know that that's likely not realistic, right, that it's going to be that kind of clarity for the 16 17 windows? 18 Yeah. I would defer to the architect or Α 19 Howard Hughes Corporation to address the 20 architectural treatment of those windows and 21 surfaces. 22 Is that person available today? 23 Yeah, they are. 24 /// 25 ///

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q I'd like to ask, you know, that sort of a simulation of what the podium could look like with the 45-foot height limit from the podium. Are you aware of any project that HCDA has approved that has that kind of condition, I mean, with the parking grade at the ground floor? Other than the parking garage that fronts Queen Street, any other street frontage where HCDA has allowed that condition?

A I'm not that familiar with the previous board approvals.

CHAIR WHALEN: Staff that's been around here for a while, if you can think of any project where HCDA has allowed that condition?

MR. NEUPANE: It's just the parking podium at the ground floor. Kauhale Kaka'ako would be one example of an affordable housing project that has a garage that's kind of a podium garage that's separated from the tower where the parking comes all the way down to the grade ground floor.

CHAIR WHALEN: And that was an affordable housing project HHFDC approved?

MR. NEUPANE: That is correct.

MEMBER FANG: What year was that done,

that project?

MR. NEUPANE: I don't know the exact year, but it was somewhere around mid '80s to late '80s, around there.

MEMBER BASSETT: I have a question for staff. So when it comes to, like, these renderings, right, like, for example, I just mentioned how these windows have a certain kind of clarity where it's not just visually flat, but I can see some depth there, these designs are not locked in at this stage; correct? There can be modification from this?

MR. NEUPANE: The design could be modified. There is no specific provision in the rule to control the design except the reflectivity of the glass.

MEMBER BASSETT: But they're not bound by the same reflectivity rules that we encountered with the Symphony tower and 801 South Street; correct?

MR. NEUPANE: Not exactly, but there is a similar provision in the Mauka Area Rules, the vested rules that controls the reflectivity of the glass.

MEMBER BASSETT: I see. What about, like, you know how for the service drive one, how the whole facade of that podium is covered in greenery, are those things that can be decided right now and

locked in?

MR. NEUPANE: There's really no provision in the rule to allow for those kind of design elements to be controlled. But that said, Howard Hughes has submitted his LEED requirements and all. So they could look at it from that perspective to meet the LEED points and come up with a green wall like that.

MEMBER BASSETT: The reason why I ask is for us to determine what is aesthetically superior. It's one thing to be shown a rendering of what is like this beautiful oasis, and then in actuality later on, it would be a flat concrete wall. So that's just the foundation for why I'm asking these questions.

MR. NEUPANE: That could be placed as a condition in the permit where, you know, the applicant follows what was presented to the board, and so that would avoid it from being a concrete wall where a green wall is shown. But I'm not sure if, you know, we could especially find what kind of plants and those kind of things, and that probably would be left to their, you know, landscape designer.

MEMBER BASSETT: Thanks.

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

notice the treatment of sort of the green wall on the side of the parking garage, not all examples of that treatment have worked -- have been all that successful. The green wall on Queen Street for the parking garage, I mean, those plants are struggling. What would you say is the difference between those that are good examples, I guess, of a successful creation of a green wall and what's happened there?

I mean, this is -- it's a significant green wall. It will take special design and design attention to make it successful and the choice of plant materials. I do know there are some very hardy vine materials that could achieve that. I recall that there was that condominium there at Punahou that was probably eight or nine stories and ficus pumila covered the whole thing. Eventually, they took it off because of a maintenance issue.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MEMBER}}$$ FANG: It was a maintenance issue because there were rodents that were nesting in there.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. So there are issues. In this case, a parking structure with ventilation and that length of plant material, I think it will

have to be the actual design solution, which I'm not privy to, will have to be attentive to multiple planter levels to achieve that green wall effect.

CHAIR WHALEN: Or possible irrigation.

THE WITNESS: Definite irrigation. They would have probably planters on every floor, every other floor that would support the plant growth, whether it's a vine or most likely a vine and a lattice work to carry it, but it can be achieved.

CHAIR WHALEN: Any other questions from the board? Because I'll ask staff if you have questions of the witness.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. NEUPANE:

Q Yeah, I have one quick question. What is the width of Halekauwila Street at that location?

A It's approximately -- from building face to building face, it's approximately 66 feet. We're not quite sure. I don't think we have it quite accurate on the A'ali'i side. So it may be a little wider than 66 feet. The travel way is about 32 feet, and then on the pedestrian -- pedestrian landscape zones are about 18 feet on the Ko'ula side and 16-plus on the A'ali'i side.

///

1	EXAMINATION
2	BY CHAIR WHALEN:
3	Q So with a 16-foot sidewalk area,
4	including furniture zone
5	A Yeah. Tree wells, you know, tree grades,
6	planters.
7	Q At least a small to medium canopy-size
8	tree?
9	A Within those planting zones, yes, you
10	could achieve that.
11	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Is there does
12	HART have any questions?
13	MS. AGAG: Please indulge me as I make my
14	appearance for the modification hearing. Rozelle
15	Agag representing Honolulu Authority for Rapid
16	Transportation. No questions for this witness.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIR WHALEN: All right. I guess your
19	next witness, if you have one. I think Race Randle?
20	MR. ING: We call as our next witness,
21	David Akinaka.
22	CHAIR WHALEN: I don't think you were
23	sworn in previously. So please raise your right hand
24	and swear or affirm to tell the truth.
25	THE WITNESS. I swear to tell the truth

MR. ING: I just want the record to reflect that Mr. Akinaka's direct written testimony, which included his curriculum vitae, was submitted on June 6, and he was at that time qualified as an expert in architecture.

CHAIR WHALEN: Right.

DAVID AKINAKA,

having been called as a witness and being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION

BY MR. ING:

Q For the record, please state your name, place of employment and position.

A David Akinaka. I'm a principal with Ferraro Choi and Associates.

Q Going to the modifications for this project, the Mauka Area Rules allow modifications if the applicant can demonstrate that the modification will provide flexibility and result in a development that is practically and aesthetically superior to that which could be accomplished with -- by rigid enforcement of the rules. Second, the modification

would not adversely affect the adjacent developments or uses. And, third, the resulting development will be consistent with the intent of the Mauka Area Plan.

In your professional opinion, does this modification provide flexibility and result in a development that is practically and aesthetically superior to that which would be accomplished by rigid enforcement of the rules?

A Yes. The increase in podium height to 75 feet will allow the volume of parking in the podium along the Central Plaza and Auahi Street be pulled up and away from these pedestrian thoroughfares. It will allow the bulk of the ground floor of the project to be used for street level retail and open space. And making shops, dining and other retail uses accessible from the Central Plaza and nearby sidewalks will make the neighborhood more humanly scaled and more walkable.

In addition, because the parking levels will be offset from the lawful setback and located higher up in the podium, the modification will also offer pedestrians much better visual and safer separation from the garage uses.

If you look at Exhibit 20-B in the DDP application, there's a very helpful diagram showing

the amassing and what's been done to -- what could be done under the Mauka Area Rules and what the building architects have proposed here. So on the very left-hand side of the diagram, this shows what the podium height would be at 45 feet with the tower and built out to the allowable property line and the front yard setback.

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

MEMBER FANG: Can you say that page or table number again?

THE WITNESS: Sure. It's 20-B.

So you see that 45-foot podium contains all of the parking uses and residential tower uses above. The middle and right-hand diagrams show how that 45-foot-high podium -- the parking uses have been pulled -- actually, the podium itself has been pulled away from the property line to create additional open space at the ground level. It's been pulled back -- set back along Auahi Street. And open space at the ground floor for that public courtyard and drop-off area has been created. And the result is this 75-foot-high podium tower -- podium which has a mix of commercial, residential and parking uses contained within it. And because Victoria Ward, Limited, has -- in response to the prior comments from the HCDA, Victoria Ward, Limited, carved, you

know, out allowable building area at the ground level to provide increased open space and additional retail opportunities in this area.

This design is particularly significant for Ko'ula because this project faces the Central Plaza. The project also carves out an area for public courtyard and car drop-off that will be used by the entire community.

BY MR. ING:

Q In your professional opinion, does this modification adversely affect adjacent developments or uses?

A No. The 75-foot height -- podium height would be consistent with the Ward master plan and other projects permitted and constructed within Ward Village. Adequate street parking for the commercial and residential spaces contained within the podium are accommodated within the project. The modification does not impact mauka-makai view corridors, the nearby HART guideway nor archaeological resources. In addition, shadows from the 75-foot podium height will not have an adverse affect on the neighboring uses.

Q In your professional opinion, does this modification result in a development that is

consistent with the intent of the Mauka Area Plan? 1 2 Yes. The Mauka Area Rules specifically Α 3 encourage the development of mixed uses, pedestrian-friendly streetscapes, open space and 4 5 recreational space. 6 In your professional opinion, does this 7 modification -- is it necessary to implement the 8 live-work-play vision of the Mauka Area Rules in the 9 Ward master plan? 10 Yes. This project and the modification 11 are integral to creating a neighborhood where 12 residential, commercial and retail uses are 13 incorporated to be mutually beneficial to each other, 14 particularly in the vicinity of the Central Plaza. 15 The project will significantly contribute to the public desirability of Ward Village and continued 16 17 implementation of the live-work-play concepts that 18 are key components of the Ward master plan. 19 MR. ING: Thank you. This concludes his 20 direct examination. 21 CHAIR WHALEN: Board members, any 22 questions of Mr. Akinaka? MEMBER BASSETT: 23 I had some -- you go 24 first. 25 CHAIR WHALEN: No. You go first.

1	EXAMINATION
2	BY MEMBER BASSETT:
3	Q I had some questions about the rendering
4	from the Halekauwila Street side. I asked about the
5	window light transmitability (sic) and clarity. Did
6	you look at that?
7	A I'll defer that to Race Randle.
8	MEMBER BASSETT: No questions from me.
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY MR. NEUPANE:
11	Q I have a question couple questions.
12	What is the required number of parking for the
13	project required by the Mauka Area Rules?
14	A Let me find the exhibit in the
15	application.
16	CHAIR WHALEN: 18, isn't it? Or 17.
17	MEMBER FANG: It should be Exhibit 17.
18	THE WITNESS: Sorry. Bear with me. So
19	the total parking for the residential parking?
20	BY MR. NEUPANE:
21	Q No. The total parking
22	A Total parking?
23	Q provided for the project by Mauka Area
24	Rules?
25	A Okay. Grand total is 782 stalls.

1	Q 782 stalls?
2	A Yes.
3	Q So what is the actual number of parking
4	provided for the project in your design?
5	A Actual parking on-site is 732. There's
6	147 provided off-site for a grand total of 879.
7	Q For the project itself on this location,
8	how many?
9	A On-site parking?
10	Q Yeah. How many stalls?
11	A 732.
12	Q 732.
13	CHAIR WHALEN: Just a couple questions.
14	Is that it? Okay.
15	MEMBER FANG: I have a question for I
16	guess it's more for Deepak related to the parking
17	requirement.
18	So this project was presented to us as
19	requiring 64 reserved housing units, and I know that
20	we recently revised reserved housing rules, which I
21	know do not directly affect this project because this
22	project is already grandfathered into a previous set
23	of rules, but in the newly approved reserved housing
24	rules, is there a requirement for reserved for
25	parking for reserved housing units?

MR. NEUPANE: In the amendment that the board just approved this morning, there is no requirement for parking for reserved housing units.

MEMBER FANG: So I think what I'm trying to get at is the trend is now kind of with what we know in the TOD rules that we'd like to really see be put into effect in the neighborhood, in fact, if this project were to come onboard now and not be subject to the -- and be subject to the new reserved housing rules, then the parking requirement would actually be much less?

MR. NEUPANE: Well, less by the number of units that's required. So 64. And to give you an example, in A'ali'i project, the board required a condition on the permit saying that the reserved housing units should be -- parking should be unbundled. So we could consider something like that. So that may have reduced the number of parking.

MEMBER FANG: Okay. Thank you.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q Mr. Akinaka, you didn't really -- the other thing about this Exhibit 17, it refers to market-required parking, and I'm curious about that term. What does "market required" mean, or is that

1	something that's out of your realm and somebody
2	else
3	A I'd ask I think one of the gentlemen
4	following me
5	MR. ING: We have someone that will
6	address that, Mr. Chairman.
7	CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you. Okay. Are
8	there any questions from the intervenor?
9	MS. AGAG: No questions for this witness.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. So I guess we are
12	ready for your next witness if you have one.
13	MR. ING: Yes. So we call as our next
14	witness, Mr. Chad Takesue.
15	CHAIR WHALEN: Mr. Takesue, raise your
16	right hand and swear or affirm to tell the truth.
17	THE WITNESS: I swear to tell the truth.
18	I'm a senior VP of sales for Locations.
19	CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you.
20	
21	CHAD TAKESUE,
22	having been called as a witness and being
23	first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth
24	and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified
25	as follows:

EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. ING:

Q For the record, would you state your name, place of employment and position?

A Chad Takesue, Locations, and senior VP of sales.

Q What is Locations' experience with sales of new developments in the urban core?

A Our firm has had extensive experience and knowledge of the supply and demand of residential units in the Honolulu urban core, and we are currently involved with the sale of numerous new development units in this area.

Q In connection with the sale of residential units in the urban core, does Locations have experience with different parking options and configurations, for example, one parking stall versus two parking stalls per unit and other configurations?

A Yes. We have -- we have been involved in the sale of numerous types of units within the urban core, including studio apartments, one-, two-, and three-bedroom units as well as other types of units and varying types of parking stall assignments and configurations for these units.

Q In your opinion, is the availability of

parking a factor and potential -- in a potential buyer's decision to purchase a unit within the urban core?

A Yes. While Kaka'ako has easily accessible transit options and is designed to foster a "work, live and play" environment and there's a planned rail station in the area, the availability of the number of parking stalls still remains a significant and important factor in a buyer's decision to purchase a unit in the area.

Q Why is parking a significant factor in a buyer's decision to purchase a unit in Kaka'ako?

that, especially for Oahu households, you have two or more cars in a household and will condition to do so for the reasonably foreseeable future even with the advent of alternative modes of transportation. While the proposed rail line and other transit options, including driverless cars, ride sharing and other transit services, it may ultimately come to fruition and it may be widely adopted in the 10 to 20 years, today's homebuyers are still making purchases and lifestyle decisions on what is practical and available now since they're still faced with immediate transportation needs. It's very difficult

for households, especially families, to abruptly adjust to single-car households overnight, especially when you have two income households. And in our experience, many families never make the transition to a single-car household because of work commitments, childcare, family activities.

Accordingly, the number of parking stalls remains a key factor in the purchase of units, particularly for the potential local purchasers in the Ala Moana and Kaka'ako area. We have seen a significant difference in the sales of units that provide only one parking stall for a two- or three-bedroom unit versus two parking stalls for such units, thus further indicating that parking remains a key factor in their purchasing decisions.

Q What is your understanding of the number of residential parking stalls at Ko'ula?

residential parking stalls for 570 homes with one parking stall allocated for the studio -- for each of the studio and one-bedroom units and two stalls allocated to each of the two- and three-bedroom units. My understanding is that the number of residential parking stalls in Ko'ula exceeds the minimum requirement under the vested rules by

approximately 97 stalls. In my opinion, these additional stalls are reasonable and necessary for this project given the high-market demand for units with sufficient parking in this area, particularly for local buyers.

From a marketing and sales perspective, assigning two stalls to the two- and three-bedroom units and one stall to the one bedroom and studio units constitutes the minimum number of stalls that should be allocated to these units.

The decision to reduce the total number of parking stalls by assigning only one stall to the studios and one-bedroom units for Ko'ula already constitutes a reasonable, yet somewhat risky, accommodation to reduce the number of stalls in the project since it will likely be challenging to market and sell these units because of the strong demand in area for two parking stalls even for studios and one-bedroom units. We know this because recent projects in the Ala Moana-Kaka'ako area have offered additional stalls for one-bedroom unit owners, and the market demand quickly absorbed those additional stalls.

Q In your expert opinion, would the impact -- what would the impact be of reducing the

number of parking stalls in Ko'ula to less than the estimated 732 stalls planned for the project?

A In my opinion, reducing the number of residential parking spaces at Ko'ula from approximately 732 planned stalls to, for example, the minimum 635 parking stalls under the terms of the vested rules would significantly and adversely affect the marketing and sales of the units at this project, particularly among potential local purchasers.

perspective, the approximately 732 parking stalls are reasonable and necessary to support the units within this project. And the viability of the project as a whole and our experience has shown that it will be very difficult to meet market expectations in any fewer stalls — if any fewer stalls are constructed with Ko'ula.

MR. ING: Thank you. That concludes the direct examination.

CHAIR WHALEN: Board members, are there any questions of the witness?

MEMBER FANG: I have a question.

CHAIR WHALEN: Yes.

24 ///

25 ///

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER FANG:

Q So from the counts listed on Exhibit 17, it looks like nearly 70 percent of this project is slated for studios or one bedrooms. What's the typical buyer profile that you're expecting for those studios and one bedrooms?

A I can speak to, you know, past projects that have similar types of setups. You know, we do see for the -- for the studios, you might have that single professional, you know, single person. We've actually seen even couples in those spaces.

Q What past projects are you thinking about when you're --

A Well, there's a variety of -- you have dating back to Honuakaha right here next door to us. They have studio units there, and you have married couples living in those spaces.

Q Are you able to speak specifically to recent projects in the Ward Village area?

A Well, A'ali'i project is selling those units, and we're seeing, you know, a mix of both single and multiple owners for those types of units.

Q What's the price point in the A'ali'i project for studios and one bedrooms?

1 Price points are -- vary because there's Α 2 a mix of reserved and market units. So --3 Sure. -- you know, you're looking at 300 -- 300 4 5 range all the way up to the mid-four range. 6 And what's the percentage of local versus Q 7 out-of-state buyers -- out-of-state or international buyers, roughly, that you're seeing in --8 9 For --Α 10 -- Ward Village projects? I think it's a mix. I mean, you know, I 11 12 don't have that specific number in front of me, but 13 there is a strong demand for the local segment, and 14 they're really just binding to that kind of lifestyle 15 and the convenience factor. You know, that's why we know that they're coming from these two-car 16 17 households from other locations and migrating into 18 the urban core. It's very difficult. We're finding 19 that consumer it's very difficult to all of a sudden, 20 "Hey, you gotta go to one car just for the 21 convenience." 22 And what about the out-of-state and 23 international buyers, what's their demand for 24 parking?

There's still a demand. I wouldn't say

25

that it's less of a demand for additional parking stalls. If they become residents here, they -- they have two cars. And it's just more so for the local market, I definitely see even a higher significance because they're coming from that.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q Have you ever done any sales or rental, I guess, for senior housing projects, I mean retirement homes?

A We've done resales, yeah.

Q Because this is borne out by the actual data. Many people enter retirement homes thinking that they need one or two cars, which they have been accustomed to, but over time, they don't use the cars at all and they become kind of storage yards for cars, the garages, because they find that there's -- it's more --

Depending on the location, senior homes that are located in urban areas where there's a lot of mobility, pedestrian mobility, there might even be a van that takes people to different locations. They don't really need the cars, but it's sort of like a sense from the buyer initially that they must have this car. It's more of a psychological dependence

than anything else.

So realizing that people may not initially think or a buyer might not initially think that they need — that they can do without a car when they actually start living in the area and especially with, you know, a rail transit system coming in 600 feet away from this building, it just doesn't seem very likely that people will be as dependent on two cars per household. I mean, that seems — and it's expensive and adds to the expense of buying the unit. So, you know, I just —

chicken-and-egg situation here. We're planning for a transit-oriented development and still assuming that people are going to be dependent on automobiles to get around. I mean, that's one of the big attractions of Kaka'ako, supposedly. It's a mixed-use area, high density, very convenient to walk around. So why are accommodations made for all this parking which would be very difficult to convert to another use once it's built. You know, it's a big investment when it actually adds to the expense of the unit, and the cars may not be used in the future. I mean, there will be an attrition of the uses of those parking stalls, but they'll be there. So I

don't know if there is really consideration of that.

I mean, it depends on how you pitch the sales for these units. There seems to be so much demand for middle-income housing right now. Would that really defer the sales of these units if they had less parking and two stalls per unit?

A I think there's a couple of things in your question there in regards to the senior housing. If you're talking about ambulatory type of housing, yes, there is not as much of a need for a car for someone living in those types of senior housing projects. There are other senior housing projects, though, that have independent living, and they very much still drive their cars and need that parking stall. So that's two different kind of products.

The other thing is on the -- I mean, on the type of buyer that is looking at a project like these Howard Hughes projects and they're working here and two household incomes, while the future of transit and everything that's come into play is going to help alleviate some of that. We're just --

From a market perspective and what we've seen on these projects in the whole Ala Moana and Kaka'ako area, there's still a strong demand, which tells you there's a need. When they release

additional stalls to the project owners, they're buying up these second stalls because they have a The option is I park on the street second stall. with my second car, or I actually have a dedicated place for it to park. And so if you go to older neighborhoods like Makiki, they're primarily -- you know, you have two bedrooms there with -- a lot of two-bedroom units there with one parking stall. in the day, that's how they built them. If you ever drive through the streets in Makiki, it's pretty bad. It's congested. I mean, people are fighting for I've seen in projects where residents -- two owner residents for the same unit wait for the other person to come home from work, move their car out of the street so they can have a stall, and then they park in their one stall. That's a tough lifestyle choice, but it is a choice some people make. having that option for that need is definitely still, I think, a viable thing.

Q Right. Well, of course, Makiki was built in different periods of time.

A Sure, sure, sure.

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

Q There are some buildings that were built without any parking requirements at all. I mean, even in the gold coast, there are buildings that are

built there without parking -- any dedicated parking, and, yet, it's an attractive place for people to live. They buy units there, and they pay a lot of money for them. There are just sort of a set of assumptions, I think, that are based on past patterns of behavior that may not bear out in the future, but once you built this parking garage, there it is for a very long period of time, especially in a condo building.

MEMBER HASHA: My only statement here is

I think going back to your statements as it relates
to the senior housing, talking about the
psychological effect of they want the parking before
they move in. Once they move in, they realize they
don't need it.

CHAIR WHALEN: Right.

MEMBER HASHA: But they wouldn't have moved in if they didn't have the parking, and I think that is part of what you guys are saying. And I can only speak for myself. I live here in Kaka'ako. I had the two-bedroom, two-bath place with two cars, and I walk to work. My wife walks to work. And I keep telling her we should get rid of one of the other cars and she will not allow it. So I think there still is that psychological effect here that we

have to have these cars even though we never drive them, and I think that's going to take time before that changes.

To your point of what they're saying, I think it is coming, but it's not there yet. And then I think to your other point of once we build it, we can't do anything more with it. I think there are other options for it even if it's turning it into more commercial spaces later on if you were to remove those from being resident spaces.

CHAIR WHALEN: Depending on the design, you know.

MEMBER HASHA: Correct.

CHAIR WHALEN: Parking garages, sometimes it's really difficult to convert or retrofit.

THE WITNESS: I can share a similar story to yours. I was a resident in one of these towers in Kaka'ako, and, honestly, we started off just my wife and I. It had two stalls, two-bedroom unit, two stalls. Before we left that place, we had three little ones. And so with the amount of -- our lifestyle didn't allow for us to operate with one car from driving from this activity to this activity. We have -- even today, we still have to split up, you know, and almost play zone defense with the kids and

their activities. So could we get around with the current transit system with one car and do all those different obligations that we have, including our occupations? No way. No way. Will there be a time when we get to that? Possibly.

MEMBER FANG: It's still a choice,
though. I'm sorry. I just have to interrupt. It's
still a choice. It's quite -- it's a choice that you
guys are fortunate enough to have, but it's a choice
that, you know, may make or break somebody's ability
to even purchase a home or choose to live in a
certain neighborhood. So I think it's just there's
value and just acknowledging that privilege of choice
there in that statement and it's not a statement of
fact that you have to have two cars --

THE WITNESS: No.

MEMBER FANG: -- but you choose to.

CHAIR WHALEN: There are recovery

programs for that. Yes. I'm sorry.

MR. ING: I just want to note that while
I think the discussion is helpful, that the board
members have not been sworn and taken the witness
stand, and so the comments are the comments. I just
want the record to reflect that those are comments
from the board members, but it's not evidence in the

1	record.
2	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. But part of it is
3	to draw out what the witness's response is; right?
4	Staff, do you have any other questions?
5	MR. NEUPANE: No questions.
6	CHAIR WHALEN: Board members, any other
7	questions? Intervenor, any questions? I mean, this
8	is a transit-oriented question.
9	MS. AGAG: For purposes of this
10	modification hearing, I have no questions at this
11	time.
12	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Thank you.
13	MR. ING: Thank you. We call as our last
14	witness, Mr. Race Randle.
15	CHAIR WHALEN: I think we can in this
16	case, you were sworn in previously. So just continue
17	to be sworn in.
18	THE WITNESS: I swear to tell the truth.
19	
20	RACE RANDLE,
21	having been called as a witness and being
22	first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth
23	and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified
24	as follows:
25	///

1 EXAMINATION 2 BY MR. ING: 3 Could you please describe the intent of the Mauka Area Plan and the vested rules under which 4 5 the Ward master plan was approved? Yes. Happy to. 6 А The Mauka Area Plan and vested rules 7 8 recognize the need to provide flexibility for large 9 developments and adopt an approach that departs from 10 the rigidities of lot-by-lot development. 11 allows a community to then receive public amenities 12 that would otherwise not be available. 13 What are the express vision and goals of the Mauka Area Plan? 14 15 Α The vision and goals -- the vision is to create this vertical mixing of uses locating 16 17 commercial at grade, creating pedestrian-oriented, 18 residential, commercial, social and recreational 19 activities. 20 I think we covered earlier the 21 modification rule that allowed modified platform 22 What did the Ward master plan say about the heights. 23 platform modification being requested? 24 The Ward master plan, as we've discussed

earlier, did recognize the need for the increased

25

podium heights. Specifically, it called out for 65-foot-high podiums along Ala Moana Boulevard and 75-foot-high foot podiums mauka of Ala Moana Boulevard throughout the neighborhood. That allowed the building to be built up and away from the street, allowed open spaces that existed and exist in the Ward master plan, and then allowed for the commercial and other uses to be placed at the street level.

Q What were the Authority's significant findings and conclusions regarding the platform modification when it approved the Ward master plan?

A In finding of fact No. 103 of the decision and order, HCDA determined that increasing the podium height would allow for retail restaurants, offices, residential units all to be built within the podium, and HCDA recognized that additional podium height offers the opportunity to move a parking structure up and away from the street, occupying a smaller floor plate and making the room for alternative uses which can then surround the garages.

Q Did the Authority make any determinations regarding the platform modifications?

A Yes, they did. Significantly, after HCDA reviewed the modifications to the platform height that were in the master plan itself, the members of

HCDA determined that the modifications satisfied the standard for granting modifications under 15-22-22. The HCDA, therefore, determined that modifications which provide flexibility are consistent with the rules.

Q Briefly describe the specific modification that is now being requested to facilitate the project's design.

Mr. Akinaka previously and included in the application is the imagery that shows the need to increase the podium height from 45 feet to 75 feet. That modification allows for the parking structure to be moved up and away from the street, providing the spaces as identified, specifically on the first and second floor, for commercial and public access. It also allows for a more aesthetically pleasing facade on its sides. It's wrapped with the green screens that you've seen along the Ward Theater and Auahi Street sides. It's wrapped with commercial space and the tower along the Central Plaza, and it's wrapped with homes along the Halekauwila side.

Q Is the requested modification consistent with the vision and intent of the Mauka Area Plan?

A Yes, it is. I think, as represented by

others, you know, it's actually critical. In order -- we say live, work, play; right, but it's park spaces. It's retail, commercial to work in and the residences. Literally, those are all wrapping this building. And so moving the parking garage up and away from the streets allows for those uses to be expanded and included in this project.

It should be noted that, you know, based on the feedback that we received in the last hearing for the A'ali'i project that we had done, we've also looked at all the ways that we can also step the parking garage back from the street. As was noted earlier along Auahi Street, there's an additional terrace where we brought the parking garage back and created a recreational space, one of which is for the residents along Auahi Street, and other primary space is for the public with restaurants and outdoor seating along the Central Plaza.

Q What would be the impact on this project if the maximum platform height is increased to a level below 75 feet, but higher than 45 feet, for example, 65 feet?

A I mean, simply put, it's a big impact on the number of homes that can be built because we've wrapped the podium itself with homes that front

Halekauwila Street. We've seen to date very strong demand for those types of homes at the A'ali'i project and great success in that. So we're eager to continue to bring those to market. It would be about 18 homes that you'd lose per floor along Halekauwila Street. And then in addition, the loss of parking, which is represented earlier, would have an impact on the marketability of homes in the building.

Q Now I want to follow up with some questions from the Authority members which we had reserved for your testimony. The first relates to the transparency of the window glass along Halekauwila Street. Could you please address that?

A Sure. I think, as staff indicated particular to that question, the building does -- is required to meet certain reflectivity requirements that are in the Mauka Area Rules, which we've done to date on all of our projects. The glass probably in that rendering, I will say, may be a little clearer during the daytime than it will be when constructed. Renderings are, especially ones that are created in a week in response to questions, may not be as accurate as we like them to be in regards to details like that; hence, the flexibility for the design to progress. But it is always our intent, and we've

seen it in our buildings, to really do two things.

You want the glass to be transparent so that people see the natural colors of the outside world, and at night when they're in their home, it's not a mirror.

You know, in some buildings that were very opaque and tinted, at night in their homes with their lights on, you can't see out. So it's a balance that we go through to make it as transparent as possible while still giving some level of privacy to the owners when they are in their homes.

Q There was another question from Authority
Member Bassett with regard to the second story on the
Auahi Street side and the corner which showed, I
believe, some tables and umbrellas, and he was asking
if the public would have access to that level.

A Yes. So on the -- on Auahi Street, there's an outdoor seating area on the second level for the commercial spaces, and there's -- as you've seen, there's a significant amount of commercial space located on the second floor. In addition, we were able to terrace the parking garage back on the Ward Theater side where it's shown covered in a green screen, and in that area, we're able to provide a recreational space for the building owners that would be more not in a public -- it's not as easily

accessed by the public because it's off the Central Plaza and access by the tower. So that area would be recreation space for the owners.

Q Did you have anything else to add, Mr. Randle, with regard to the modification or questions that had come up earlier?

A I think the one other comment was about sustainability, I think, from Director (sic) Bassett. So it's a priority for us, in addition to each building, targeting LEED certification. We are targeting a LEED Platinum certification throughout the neighborhood. So questions and comments about things like canopy trees on the sidewalks, those are a requirement that we've placed on ourselves under the LEED Platinum for neighborhood certification. So as we move forward, we do have an additional requirement to ensure there is shading on the sidewalks which encourage people walking throughout the neighborhood.

There was another question about market need for parking, and, you know, I'll offer my feedback on that if it's applicable. And simply put, this building is based on one stall for every one studio, for every one bed and one studio, and two stalls for every two bed and three bed. And as we've

seen to date with well over a thousand homes sold in the neighborhood and recent sales at A'ali'i, that is in direct response to today what people need in order to make a buying decision.

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

We are in full agreement and, you know, that if the future changes, you know, and we see less demand for parking with the homes, that we would love to respond to that. I think as currently indicated in the rules, the parking requirement by HCDA is a It's a minimum parking requirement. It's not a maximum. And we are in alignment that we will give -- deliver the right amount of parking to meet the market. We don't want to deliver more, but what we're seeing, as was represented by I think the previous witness, that demand continues to be there and it's really a need for a lifestyle. personally, again, another example, live in a two-bedroom home with my wife and one child, and I have two cars. It is a privilege, you know, and I wish I used them more by having them, but I also still can't see myself living without them in the near term. But, hopefully, in the coming years and decade, that will change, and with transportation and additional uses like the commercial spaces that we're building -- the pharmacy that's about to open is a

perfect example -- when those types of uses are within walking distance and when other forms of transportation can easily get us beyond that, you know, I anticipate that will start to evolve.

MR. ING: Thank you. That concludes the direct examination of Mr. Randle.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q Thank you. I have a question maybe partly for staff and partly for you.

Actually, it looks like the modification request, I mean de facto request is like 87 feet in height because there are some structures that are built on top of the parking roof deck. Is that — the master plan says it can be — the height can be modified up to 75 feet. So I'm not sure whether this even can be entertained going up to 87 feet. I mean, it wasn't part of the notice. So it may be because there's no roof area there. I think there's a trellis up there. You know, just looking at the plan, I don't really get a sense of —

MR. ING: I think Mr. Randle can address the extensions above the 75 feet. They are allowed by rule. There are certain requirements that you have to meet, however.

CHAIR WHALEN: Yeah. Okay.

I think to explain is in the projects that have been done to date. So it's mainly triggered by elevator needs. So if you look at -- Anaha is a perfect example where it has a 75-foot-high podium. In order for an elevator to serve that top floor of homes, the elevator needs to then overrun that floor already -- BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q Right.

A -- and go beyond the 75 foot.

In addition, to allow those homes in, say, the Anaha podium to get to the amenity deck, that elevator needs to open on that floor, the 75-foot-high level. So as you've seen on Anaha, on Ae'o and you will in A'ali'i, there's a need for certain elements to extend above 75 feet, primarily elevator overruns. But as was brought up earlier, what we've also found is the need for covered areas to protect from the wind. So on all of these decks where you have these amenity levels on the 75th --75-foot-high level, there's a major focus on wind protection and rain protection so that they're functional, recreational spaces.

You see them really across all of the

buildings that have been built if you look down even on the older buildings that were built in the '90s and early 2000s where on top of the decks themselves, if there's a barbecue area or a kid's play area, there's a covering that is required so that it can be used functionally kind of day and night for its intended purpose. And as we've seen in our projects, it's been very successful encouraging people to be outdoors, using the barbecue, for example, with their friends and family.

So those are the elements that are actually above the 75 feet are those limited amount of covered areas as accessory cover to really serve the uses that are sitting on top of the deck that are recreational in nature.

CHAIR WHALEN: So, Deepak, I guess the question for you is I'm aware of certain height exceptions, I mean, that's similar to the city's zoning code too. Do these all qualify for those exceptions, all of that -- I mean, I know the overrun is an obvious one. The stairwell opening is another kind of thing. But, really, there's not a lot of detail in the plans. So I'm not trying to get it down to the nitty-gritty, but I just want to make sure that --

1 MR. NEUPANE: Yeah. For the, you know, 2 additional 12 feet that's been asked, we're just looking at the concept in the Mauka Area Rules where 3 Mauka Area Rules currently allows for 75-foot podium 4 5 height, plus another additional 12 feet for 6 accessory, such as elevator --7 CHAIR WHALEN: So it's embedded in the 8 rules? 9 MR. NEUPANE: It's embedded in the rules and also allows for trellises and architectural 10 11 elements that are up to 12 feet from the podium 12 height. So we are just taking that same concept, and 13 the podium height gets raised to 75 feet. Then that 14 additional 12 feet is allowed, but putting a 15 restriction that it shouldn't be allowed for all over the podium, but only limited to a total of 15 percent 16 17 of the podium area. 18 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. So there is a 19 standard --20 MR. NEUPANE: Yeah. 21 CHAIR WHALEN: -- limiting standard? 22 Any questions from staff or board members 23 have questions? 24 MEMBER BASSETT: I have questions. 25 CHAIR WHALEN: Yeah.

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

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

So getting back to this idea of aesthetic superiority, the way I see it is back when A'ali'i came before us, I voted against the increase. -- I don't know if I was the only one. But as far as meeting the requirements for 15-22-120, subsection 7, because we already approved A'ali'i, I don't see based on those grounds why I can disallow on those grounds. But regarding the aesthetic superiority, that's my concern now. So I know that you provided us some mock-up of a garage at 45 feet and this retail space of 75 feet, which I understand that. Aesthetically, I agree that the retail space of 75 looks better than the 45, but, still, the 45 feet, which I understand is like Ko'olani is a condo in our jurisdiction where the rec deck is 45 feet, and then I see the one at Anaha, and I see the one at Waiea where the podium is -- is it 65 feet?

A Uh-huh, yes.

Q So already when I go to your development and I go to those areas, the 70- -- the 65 feet of Waiea is very imposing. I feel kind of a little bit trapped when I get to that area as opposed to when I go to the park area by Ko'olani and I walk to

Foodland over there, it feels more like a community.

So when I envision this Halekauwila space with the 75-foot podium on one end of A'ali'i and then this sidewalk, road, sidewalk and then another 75-foot podium here, to me, it feels a little bit not welcoming. It doesn't feel like a friendly community vibe. So my question is what is Howard Hughes ensuring will happen to make sure that the 75-foot podium of Ko'ula is going to be aesthetically superior?

A The imagery in the -- I think the best way to understand what would need to happen at 45 feet and to contrast that with, you know, whether or not it's aesthetically better is the set of imagery that looks at what the building would look like along Auahi Street. With a 45-foot-high podium, literally, to fit the required amount of parking for the market, you'd have a parking garage directly to the street, and that same thing would exist on Halekauwila Street.

So, I mean, from my perspective, the measure of whether or not it's aesthetically pleasing is comparing shops at ground floor with homes above it to a parking garage. I mean, that's, at the basic level, the most aesthetically pleasing.

In response to the question of what we're doing to make sure the 75-foot-high podium itself is as aesthetically pleasing as it can be, I mean, quite frankly, it's the extent — the expense and the time and effort that we focus on to make the building beautiful. I mean, we hire and work with some of the best designers in Hawaii and around the world to deliver these buildings, and we also live in the neighborhood. So we're always focused on trying to find a way to make it a place where people want to walk.

The green wrap that you see that wraps the parking garage, that's a very complicated, as you heard, and challenging additional expense that we will go through to make sure it's as aesthetically pleasing as it can be at 75 feet. And, in fact, hopefully, it will feel like a more natural environment to have a green wall that high that you're walking down.

And then along Halekauwila Street with the homes, the best example is Anaha right now along Kamakee. You know, I personally live there in that podium. So I can say both from inside and out, I think it's -- it is not very imposing and it is very residential in nature. But the primary way we'll do

it for those who may not live in the building that
may be driving or walking through is the landscaping
and focus on the street level. You know, ensuring
that we do have the canopy of trees that you can walk
under where we can fit larger trees, and where we
can't, making sure that first 10 feet of planting is
a very welcoming and natural environment.

Q So you used the example of Anaha and the podium there, and I agree that that podium, it doesn't look very imposing compared to what I experience when I walk along Waiea, which is just straight parking -- I think it's a parking structure. It's that kind of like meshed grid that you have as the wraparound. But a part of that has to do with how the condos in the podium in Anaha have decks, I believe; right?

A Uh-huh.

Q So there is a little bit of intrigue and depth in that wall of condos. So I like that. I feel like it does feel more like a community there even though the tinting is very dark. When I look at the mock-up here, I see a sheet of condos, no depth, no decks. And I see clear glass, which to me is unrealistic because it's likely going to have to be tinted because no resident there is going to want me

sitting here in my cafe looking at what they're doing. So it's going to be a darker tint. So I'm thinking the darker tint and no depth, it could look like there's a black wall is my concern there, which doesn't really feel like a welcoming, aesthetically superior design. So what is your plan for that to address that?

A I mean, the key comparison would be, and I agree with you, the Waiea parking structure, which, say stainless steel, relatively flat surface with -- you know, both day and night is very uniform. It is -- it does have a much different feel; although, you know, we attempted to create a design, and the trees haven't yet grown in. The canopy trees are still very small.

I think where this project benefits along Halekauwila Street is that you already have an articulation of the facade that may not be appropriately recognized in that rendering, but you can see it in some of the plan views that are included or the elevations where we actually have the structural elements on the outside of the building, which are solid concrete, are going to be a stark contrast to the clear glass.

Q There is some depth there.

A There's going to be a very big change from whether it's clear glass, or even if it was clear versus an opaque concrete surface, that change as you go down will really help to break it up. I think in the rendering because the glass is shown reflective clear with white walls behind it -
Q I see that here now and I like that, but

my concern is that what you're providing here is not guaranteed to come out in the final plan; right?

A Yes.

Q So I'm trying to figure out what kind of certainty can we establish here of its conditions as to what we can impose to make sure that these details that are in these renderings that make them aesthetically pleasing will occur in the final product? And that's the question that I have for our staff.

So, Deepak, that's my question.

MR. NEUPANE: Yeah. The challenge there, Member Bassett, is that the rule doesn't govern any of the design elements.

MEMBER BASSETT: But the rules do require that my decision-making is based on my determination that it's aesthetically superior. How do I deem that superior without having certainty that -- right?

MR. NEUPANE: That's a challenge, and I agree with you that the rules don't provide any guideline on that.

MEMBER BASSETT: So can we do something as far as -- you mentioned maybe we can make a condition in the permit stage.

MR. NEUPANE: I believe we can put a condition saying that, you know, in the final design to be reviewed by the ED, to make sure that the -- you know, that the executive director gets to review the design before it gets built and use that as a judgment to see how much it reflects what was presented at the hearing. But more than that, I'm not sure if we can put any condition saying that the design has to meet certain aesthetic criteria.

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

Q Can't we characterize these aesthetic elements in a way that is broad enough for them to have some flexibility, but to ensure that these kind of details do exist at this stage? For example, you talked about the structural concrete elements that are going to be there no matter what; right?

A Uh-huh. And I can actually refer, if I may, to one of the exhibits that was provided that does help. I think it's Exhibit 18-C in the package.

This is the elevation along the Halekauwila side of 1 2 the building. So those white vertical lines --3 What I think is very innovative on that building is that the architects have actually 4 5 extended the structure out. So you'll have a nice 6 variety from a white structural column that has 7 movement to it that actually twists and extends to 8 then the flat glass next to it, and that will change 9 as it goes down the street --So that's nice. 10 11 -- and that's represented here. 12 That's something that you would be able 13 to change after we approve this --14 Well, I'll tell you --Α 15 -- design? -- it's in the designs now, and it's, you 16 17 know, pending approval. Then we'll go to sale of the 18 project with this design included. But we're happy 19 to work, I think, with staff, you know, as we've done 20 in the past to ensure that the condition language 21 accurately reflects what we need to support the 22 design that's been presented. 23 Okay. CHAIR WHALEN: All right. If there are 24

25

no more questions --

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER FANG:

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

I have a couple of questions. So I know we've been hearing a lot about live, work, play, live, work, play, and this -- we're starting to see, you know, some of that as the existing buildings are opened and commercial spaces be put into use. a lot of dining, retail. I'm not yet seeing a lot of commercial uses that either provide for childcare for all these gold and young families that are looking for studio and one-bedroom apartments to purchase in the neighborhood and also not seeing a lot of commercial spaces dedicated to the types of uses that would, you know, pay the kinds of salaries to afford mortgages in the neighborhood. So can you talk a little bit about what sort of plans Howard Hughes or what sort of projections you have for any of those types that kind of shift from strict dining, you know, minimum or 15, \$20 an hour jobs to jobs where people really can truly -- the majority of people can walk to work, walk their kids to childcare or their activities in the neighborhood.

A Sure. Couple of questions there. But I think David Akinaka and Joe Ferraro, if I may use them as an example. They actually live -- they work

in the neighborhood. They work in our building, our IBM building, which is one of our kind of prime office locations with a little over 50,000 square feet. We are seeing and hopefully will be responding to this additional trend for co-working and more flexible office space uses closer to where people live. I think today, the reality is the price for rents in the central business district here in Honolulu are extremely low by comparison of what it costs to build a building, you know, and that is very much a challenge for those that are looking to develop office space elsewhere because the returns do not support the cost of construction for office spaces. But we're seeing that start to change, especially with people demanding office space very close to where they work. For example, like co-working in the area, I can't say now, but we've had interests from co-working tenants, and we're seeing more of that. We do have one co-working space on property that's been in operation now for a number of years with some success there. But we continue to always look at that.

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

I think for this particular project, you know, our second floor that's shown as commercial space, it could be a prime candidate for co-working

or office use, and we're not restrictive in the design. I mean, when we design, as I represented at the last meeting, we design all our commercial spaces to be very flexible because they will change guaranteed. And so we make sure that they can function as an office use or something else if that demand is there.

Since I used David and Joe as an example, you know, we have had a number of residents that have moved into just our first two buildings that have approached us with a similar request, "You know, we'd love if there was office space that was in existence." They don't want to move their whole company here yet, but they want something for them and maybe a few employees, and I think that trend will continue to change.

What you'll see from us on future projects is a response to that demand. So as that demand starts to increase for people to work closer, we will no doubt come in with modified plans that support delivering that supply.

Q But there's no way we can get a commitment to delivering a little bit of that supply now --

Or I guess, again, it's a question that's

either for both staff and for you, Race.

-- as a gesture towards making Kaka'ako
more -- or Ward Village more of a work, not just
play?

don't know how the world of retail continues to change, and specifically with office, you know, I will say again with the current vacancy rates and the rent rates in the central business district, I think -- I don't think it would be appropriate to plan for something that could only be office or only be one use. The key is to design the spaces to be flexible that they could be either, and then we ultimately respond to the market demand for that.

We are aligned that we want to provide a place where people don't have to get in their car and drive away because it will be a more desirable place to live, ultimately. And so if there is enough of that demand, especially from residents in the area, to have office space, we'll respond to it. And it may not be in a new project. It may very well be in the IBM building that's completed, right, or it could being in the first floor of Anaha. It could be in another project other than just the new ones that we find the best place to respond to that need.

Q What about childcare or education-type uses?

A I think that's a good example. We have two preschools; right? We have one at the base of Kauhale Kaka'ako. We have one on Queen Street -- on the mauka side of Queen Street next to Ae'o, and we're actually a big supporter of that one and we've donated in the past to the foundation.

I think those are, obviously, good needs for the neighborhood. And, similarly, as we see the people that live in the neighborhood and what their needs are, we will respond to that with services.

Whether they already exist outside of our perimeter, that's great, and if they don't exist, we're the first ones to hear about it because the owners are telling us, "I need X, Y and Z," whether it's daycare or preschool. If and when we start to receive those requests, then we respond either repurposing an existing space for it and trying to find a tenant or perhaps building it in a new project.

Q So I guess the approach is always going to be reactive instead of being proactive?

A I think for certain things, yes. I mean, for some, we obviously knew ahead of time the huge needs, like a grocery store that doesn't exist, a

drugstore that didn't exist. You know, for things that may already exist right outside of our boundaries, like you said preschools, those are key things to understand whether the need is really there before we go down and build it from scratch. But, again, some areas will be a little more reactive and some areas where we have a little more information to design and build, we will.

Q Okay. My second question is -- goes to back to parking. I think the last time when we looked at A'ali'i, the case for making a modification on the podium height was also driven largely by parking. We hear a lot about parking. You know, the lease that we just went through with the medical schools, also a lot of -- a lot of emotion around parking. So I get it.

My question is with this project, at any point did you guys consider alternative types of parking, like stacked parking or other ways of parking giving you the number of parking stalls that you want without having to raise the podium height?

A Yes. So -- and we -- we continue to look at whether it's mechanized or other forms of parking to give the amount of parking stalls required in perhaps a different envelope. The ultimate result

here is based on that feedback between what the market needs and really what the scale and size of the building will support is that self-parking format at 75 feet. I think we continue to look at it as opportunities for maybe doing more technologically advanced parking structures, and, you know, hopefully, we'll be able to implement one of those in our future projects. It didn't fit for this for a number of reasons, and this is ultimately where the designers landed with something that would meet the needs of the market and the buyers and not provide anything more than necessary, but also do it in a more -- in a way that buyers are used to and accustomed to that will help them make that buying decision to help them live in the neighborhood.

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

Q Is there an opportunity -- not knowing exactly where you guys are in your design, your plans or structural, but is there an opportunity that these parking spaces could be converted to some other use in the future, like an actual opportunity, or is that just a concept at this point?

A I think -- you know, we've been through this a number of times with our different garages.

You know, there's always the potential that something could be demolished or repurposed. The parking

stalls themselves are separate from the tower in some ways, but in many ways, it's integrated. And with residential projects, it's probably the most challenging to repurpose at a later date. However, with our commercial projects, I mean, for instance, the garage over Whole Foods, I mean, that's an area where we will own it and we do own it now. We own that space above the parking — above Whole Foods. So there's kind of one owner that would be participating in a repurposing.

With condominiums, it does become more of a challenge because individual owners own those spaces, which is something they need, as you heard, you know, to feel comfortable with their buying decision.

So I don't want to represent that it's very easy. It would be a challenge, but technically, it's possible, and there are a lot of flat areas in the garage that could be repurposed into other uses in that space. What we've seen in garages throughout the neighborhood is sometimes, you know, areas being used as storage as in this garage in A'ali'i. It's very prevalent. At Ae'o throughout the garage, we included storage. So I see personally if that ends up being a demand where people require less stalls,

that maybe they can very easily be converted to additional storage area for their own items, either personal or otherwise, within the garage.

proposing is instead of the 635 required spaces, that you'd be providing around 732 spaces. Again, you've been telling us that what you'd like to do is provide more spaces than what's required for the residents. That's roughly about 97 extra spaces, which I think when we look at the floor plate of the parking concepts here, there's about 90-some parking spaces on a floor plate. So has there been discussion internally with you guys about maybe not selling those extra 90-some spaces and retaining ownership of them, perhaps unbundling them and renting them, so that later on you have -- you can retain control of that floor space and convert it to something else if we don't need the parking?

A I think the short answer is we're going through that process right now on the A'ali'i project. That's a part of that process. We launched sales on the reserved housing. We'll be selling those in the next week, and it does offer the opportunity for those buyers to basically purchase a home without a parking stall, and they're priced with

and without the parking stall. And we'll have good information really in the next month of whether or not that's -- you know, even given the opportunity for more income-restrictive buyers to have that choice of whether or not they, in turn, need the stall or not. In that project, if they give those stalls back, you know, we will know kind of the take rate, I guess you can call it, or the need. At this time in this project, we're using the similar ratios as we did with A'ali'i with one for a studio, and that's really where the basis is for the market demand. But we will have more information from A'ali'i soon which could indicate if studio buyers for the more affordable homes, studios and one beds, can live with no stall.

Q Another question that may be more directed for Deepak and staff, is there a mechanism or is it possible for us to request or require that some of these excess parking spaces be dedicated towards car share?

MR. NEUPANE: There is nothing in the rule right now, you know, in Chapter 22 that was written on car-sharing concept. But because the board is considering modification and cars can certainly be seen as --

MEMBER FANG: A condition?

MR. NEUPANE: -- I would say, a public facility or a public benefit, so it could certainly be put as a condition.

MEMBER FANG: Okay. And then my last question is I know the proposal is to relocate the 147-some stalls that are allocated for commercial uses to the parking lot that's at the Whole Foods building right now. I just wanted to bring up a concern that for -- if there's events or things going on in the Central Plaza, then the -- is the expectation that people going to those things or coming from outside of the neighborhood would be parking over in the Whole Foods parking lot or some other parking lot and then making their way over to the Central Plaza for those events?

A It's a two-part answer. Number 1, yes, people driving to events would primarily park in our district garages, like Whole Foods where we put in the system that tells them exactly which floor to go to and it makes it very convenient to get vehicles up and away. And then, secondarily, within Block I, Ko'ula, when you look at the first floor, you'll see it's designed as kind of the public drop-off area. We're seeing a lot of people, especially for events,

traveling for food and beverage, for movies and for 1 2 events coming in Uber and Lyft. So it created that gracious drop-off area for the public. 3 4 So, again, two parts. A lot of people 5 who will be driving will park nearby in one of our 6 district garages, and those that are coming with Lyft 7 and that sort of thing would get dropped off closer. 8 What's the approximate distance somebody 9 would travel if they need to park at the nearest 10 parking area -- public parking area to get to the Central Plaza? 11 12 I could probably have -- I don't have 13 that off the of top of my head unless it's identified 14 in one of the exhibits. But it's within 400 feet or 15 600 feet is the requirement in order to have a parking agreement that has off-site commercial 16 17 parking. 18 Q Okay. 19 So I know it's within that requirement under the rules, but the exact number, I don't know 20 21 off the top of my head. 22 Q Okay. Thanks. 23 CHAIR WHALEN: Any other questions? 24 Staff, do you have any questions of the witness?

MR. NEUPANE: No questions, Chair.

25

1	
1	CHAIR WHALEN: HART?
2	MS. AGAG: No questions. No questions.
3	CHAIR WHALEN: Now we get to I guess
4	that's the end of your witnesses?
5	MR. ING: Yes, it is.
6	CHAIR WHALEN: So we get to public
7	testimony. Is there any testimony from the public?
8	Okay. Oh, yes. So before actually, I
9	have a question for HART. I did receive or we did
10	receive testimony written testimony from HART
11	dated June 7th. So I don't know whether this is
12	their intent to submit this as evidence or part of
13	the intervention or is it just to comment?
14	MS. AGAG: I don't have a copy. I'm not
15	sure what you're looking at. May I approach and take
16	a look at it?
17	CHAIR WHALEN: Yeah.
18	MS. AGAG: Thank you.
19	MEMBER BASSETT: This is not part of the
20	parking notification?
21	MR. NEUPANE: No. That's just for the
22	project itself.
23	(Off-the-record discussion.)
24	MS. AGAG: Chair, are you waiting for my
25	response to this?

1	CHAIR WHALEN: Yes.
2	MS. AGAG: I will just I have nothing
3	to add to the comments.
4	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay.
5	MS. AGAG: I will let the comments stand
6	as they are, and I have nothing further to add to
7	this, but I appreciate you bringing this to my
8	attention.
9	CHAIR WHALEN: So you're not submitting
10	that as intervenor?
11	MS. AGAG: No, Your Honor
12	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay.
13	MS. AGAG: or Chair.
14	CHAIR WHALEN: So we'll proceed with
15	closing the record for the hearing unless the
16	applicant's counsel is requesting that the record be
17	kept open.
18	MR. ING: We are not.
19	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. So the public
20	hearing on the applicant's requested modification is
21	adjourned. The time is now 2:15 p.m.
22	(Hearing adjourned at 2:15 p.m.)
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE.
2	STATE OF HAWAII)
3) ss. 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;
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 in any way interested in the outcome hereof, and that
12	I am not related to any of the parties hereto.
13	Dated this 18th day of June 2018 in Honolulu, Hawaii.
14	
15	<u>s/s Laura Savo</u> LAURA SAVO, RPR, CSR NO. 347
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	