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	KAK 18-038, with) modifications, to develop)
12	a mixed-use project at) 1020 Auahi Street,)
13	TMK Nos. (1)2-3-002: 109,) 110 (portion), aka) "Ko'ula Project.")
14)
15	
16	PRESENTATION 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 11:03 a.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	4
4	Adjournment	52
5		
6	EXHIBITS ADMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
7	Applicant's Exhibits V through Z	7
8		
9	WITNESSES FOR THE APPLICANT:	
10		
11	RACE RANDLE	
12	Examination by: Mr. Ing	7
13	Examination by: Chair Whalen 14, 32,	35, 46
14 15	Examination by: Member Bassett 15, 19,	28 , 49
16	Examination by: Vice Chair Waterhouse 22, 28, 34, 37, 47,	
17		
18	Examination by: Member Okuhama	18
19	Examination by: Member Fang 21,	31
20		
21	PUBLIC TESTIMONY BY:	
22	(None offered.)	
23		
24		
25		

Wednesday, June 13, 2018, 11:03 a.m. 1 2 -000-CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. I'd like to call to 3 order the June 13th, 2018, public hearing of the 4 5 Hawaii Community Development Authority. The time is now 11:03 a.m. Thank you for your interest and 6 7 attendance today. My name's John Whalen, Chair of 8 the Authority. 9 Let the record reflect that the following 10 Kaka'ako members are present: Phillip Hasha, Jason Okuhama, Wei Fang, Mary Pat Waterhouse, Beau Bassett 11 12 and John Whalen. 13 So would counsels for the applicant and 14 the intervenor, Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transit, 15 make their appearances at this time, starting with 16 the applicant? 17 MR. ING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIR WHALEN: You have a commanding 19 voice. MR. ING: Douglas Ing and Brian Kang 20 appearing for Howard Hughes Corporation and Victoria 21 22 Ward, Limited. 23 CHAIR WHALEN: For the intervenor, HART? 24 MS. AGAG: Good morning. Rozelle Agag, 25 deputy corporation counsel representing the Honolulu

Authority for Rapid Transit.

CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you. So the purpose of this hearing, actually, is twofold. First, the applicant's requested that the presentation hearing be reopened to allow the applicant to address questions posed by the board at the previous hearing called last week, and there will be a witness, I think, responding to those questions. After which, we will open the modification hearing. So let's start with that, and then I'll open the modification hearing.

MR. ING: So we did prepare additional exhibits to address some of the questions that had been raised by members of the board. So we had those circulated earlier this morning. And the new exhibits include — if you refer to page 2 of the witness list, we've separately identified in that lower section the exhibits that we're asking to be admitted into evidence today. So these include Exhibit W, which is a wind-study diagram — I'm sorry — Exhibit V, as in Victor, a wind-study diagram; Exhibit W, which is a correction to table 5-5 of the Ward Village open space table that is included in the application; Exhibit X, which is a rendering of Halekauwila Street, and Exhibit X-1,

1 also a rendering of the service drive. This is in 2 response to questions regarding the appearance of Halekauwila Street with the modification. And so we 3 will take those two exhibits up during the 4 5 modification hearing. In addition, Exhibit Y, which is a 6 7 supplemental slide presentation, which will be 8 utilized by Mr. Randle in his continuation of the 9 presentation hearing. And, finally, Exhibit Z, which 10 is a modification presentation, which will be utilized by Tom Witten during the modification 11 12 hearing. 13 So with that, I would request that these be admitted into evidence. 14 15 CHAIR WHALEN: Board members, do you have any objections to the exhibits being offered by the 16 17 applicant? 18 So does HCDA staff have any objections to 19 these exhibits being offered by the applicant? 20 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: 21 CHAIR WHALEN: Intervenor? 22 MS. AGAG: No objection. 23 CHAIR WHALEN: No objections. Okay. 24 hearing no objections, the applicant's additional

exhibits, let's see, V for velocity, through Z are

25

1	admitted into evidence.
2	(Applicant's Exhibits V through Z
3	are admitted into evidence.)
4	MR. ING: Thank you. We will call as our
5	only witness during the continuation of the
6	modification (sic) hearing, Mr. Race Randle.
7	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Oh, raise your
8	right hand, yes, and swear to tell the truth.
9	THE WITNESS: I swear to tell the truth.
10	My name is Race Randle with Howard Hughes
11	representing Ward Village.
12	
13	RACE RANDLE,
14	having been recalled as a witness and
15	being first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole
16	truth and nothing but the truth, was examined and
17	testified further as follows:
18	EXAMINATION
19	BY MR. ING:
20	Q Can you state your name and place of
21	employment and position for the record?
22	A Race Randle with Howard Hughes
23	Corporation, senior vice president of development.
24	Q So during the June 6 hearing, Authority
25	Member Fang asked about the wind study and whether or

not that had been completed. Do you have additional information that can be provided to the authority with regard to the wind study?

A Yes. So included in the exhibits that were distributed is a page that represents the initial draft of the wind study. I think in the initial application, it included a letter from the consultant identifying that the wind study would be completed. As these typically go, this image that you have is a first draft of a wind study. It basically provides the information about where there are areas that may need additional landscaping to be planted or other improvements to mitigate wind conditions.

Exhibit V, I believe, in your packet, you'll see dots or circles with different colors on them ranging from the color blue to the color orange. Areas that are identified specifically, such as in orange, are areas that we then go back and refine some of the landscaping plans and other mitigation techniques in order to ensure that all of those areas on the plan meet the wind requirements for different uses. So if an area is identified for sitting, you know, we try to ensure that the wind levels meet that use and so

on and so forth with standing and walking. So as we proceed with design, we use this as a tool to continue to refine our designs to ensure that the wind mitigation is met as necessary.

Q So in response to other questions, with regard to the Central Plaza, do you have additional information to provide to the Authority regarding the Central Plaza?

A I do, and I have created -- the presentation is also included as Exhibit Y. I'll run through that. It's a few slides, but it does help to have some explanation. So with approval, I'll jump into that presentation.

The questions that we received, I think, were really in regards to what makes up The Commons of the Central Plaza area and then kind of a comparison of where we are today to the original Ward Village master plan that was approved in 2009. The best way to start with that is to look at the decision and order that was approved back in January of 2009. Decision and order No. 8 that's on the screens and included in the exhibit outlines the requirements for this area called The Commons. And I've highlighted the key terms, but basically, The Commons are made up of three types of areas: public

plazas, pedestrian walkways and open space. So those three different types of areas that, under the rules, have different requirements to become considered open space or become considered a plaza or walkway.

Further, the decision and order points to two pages in the master plan in the actual supplemental addendum that was submitted in September of 2008, which I'll walk through in a moment. And then it further goes on to state that at least 150,000 square feet of these areas on Land Blocks 1 and 2 would be dedicated via perpetual easement for public use and gathering. In other words, encouraging that the open spaces that would be provided would not just be private open spaces, but there would be easements placed across them to allow for public use.

What we've done, I think, to help simplify that is we've taken that information and we've created imagery that shows what was represented in the 2000- -- this is the 2008 plan submitted in 2008 of the three different area types -- public pedestrian walkways, plazas and open space -- and then comparing those to where we are today with that overall requirement that The Commons be at least 150,000 square feet dedicated with a perpetual

This is

easement over them.

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 if you look at what was presented back in 2008 and you take pages 18 and 19, which I'll walk through in a moment, and kind of superimpose them on top of each other, you get the image on the left of your screen that's showing Land Block 1 and Land Block 2 and the three different types of areas that are all taken off of the tables that were created in that master plan at the time. It totals 186,000 square feet approximately. And keep in mind these numbers, and I'll refer back to them as we move forward. What you can see is really our change in response to community feedback and board feedback as well as we've modified and updated the plan so that a lot of the Central Plaza and Ward Neighborhood Commons areas, rather than being walkways and plaza space, are now more of an own space type of use. other words, the GGP master plan that was done included a lot of hardscape in the plaza, a lot of hard surfaces, roads and walkways. As we've refined it based on feedback, we've been able to enlarge the area that's actually planted with grass and landscaping and can be deemed as open spaces. So maybe just refer to the actual pages

so you can see where this number comes from.

from the September 2008 addendum, page 18, that was referred to. Remember, it said that the area can be made up of pedestrian walkways and public plazas on Land Blocks 1 and 2. So in order to figure out what that area equates to, if you look at this table, we've actually highlighted the relevant rows and columns that make up all of the public facilities that were presented for the 60-acre project. So the Ward Neighborhood Commons is made up of specifically just the walkways and the plazas that are on Land Blocks 1 and 2. You see that 51,000, roughly, square feet of walkways and 36,944 of public plazas.

Going back to the previous image, you can see where the numbers come from with the 51,000 of walkways and 36,000 of plazas that were in the general growth plan.

Going to page 19 of the supplemental addendum that was provided, similarly, this is — this is a table and an image showing where all of the open space was intended to be delivered across the 60 acres. But as it relates to the Ward Neighborhood Commons, specifically, it's the amount of open space that's on Land Blocks 1 and Land Blocks 2 that are able to be included in this Ward Neighborhood Commons. And if you total those two numbers between

Land Block 1 and Land Block 2, it equates to about 98,000 square feet.

Again, referring to the image I'm providing of comparing 2008 to today, you see the 98,000 square feet of open space and where those areas were presented in the original master plan to be included.

So, again, this really shows where the representations were of the areas and the types of areas that would be dedicated under perpetual easement for public use that make up The Commons and really where we are today. As I mentioned, it's based on feedback and I think the desire to focus on the street level and create a more natural environment. We've adopted a lot of the areas that were hardscape to softscape with landscaping in the Central Plaza.

So I hope this, in response to the question, provides additional information to clarify the 150,000-square-feet requirement and then the different types of spaces that were approved and required to make up that space across the Land Blocks 1 and 2.

CHAIR WHALEN: Just as a matter of procedure, I think after your presentation, you're

covering different topics, I think, of different questions that have arisen, I think, from the previous hearing. So perhaps just continue your presentation and your responses essentially, and then at the end, we can -- board members can ask questions for either clarification or some of the other things.

MR. ING: Actually, this concludes
Mr. Randle's testimony with regard to the
continuation of the presentation hearing.

CHAIR WHALEN: Oh, you're done then.

Okay. All right. Well, there might be other board members that have questions.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

V, the wind study. There were two areas identified as potentially uncomfortable, and those are essentially the areas where space is kind of squeezed out along the sidewalk area. So you mentioned mitigation as a possibility. Could that -- part of that mitigation be the type of planting along those streets? Because I believe the plan had showed all vertical-form trees, which are not going to be too effective for providing some kind of wind mitigation to break up the wind pattern. Is that a possibility

then that canopy-form trees --

A Yes. And that's typically a mitigation recommendation of the consultant. So if you notice on the amenity deck, which is on that exhibit, you'll see rows of trees are provided specifically to help mitigate the wind. So, yes, there are different tree types that are often recommended for that.

Q Okay. And then on --

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MEMBER}}$$ BASSETT: Can we just stay with the wind issue first and then, you know --

CHAIR WHALEN: Yeah. Are there other questions?

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

Q So what's the difference between the draft and the final that you expect to get as far as the wind study goes?

A It's -- basically, it's an evolution. So they do an initial study, and then we go ahead and make the recommended changes, including tree species. We make those, and then they evaluate those and provide back, you know, confirmation of whether or not that will meet the requirements. It really depends on the level of what we ask for detail. As it typically is done, they'll give us this and make

recommendations, and we'll just implement them.

There won't be, like, another study that they do and says whether or not they believe it will ultimately, they'll say, "Based on information, add some additional buffer mitigations in areas," and that's really it.

Q So what do you provide them in order for them to come up with this diagram?

A We provide -- it's basically a 3D model of the building. So they create a 3D model of the tower and the neighborhood around it and place it in a wind tunnel and blow wind over it, and they see where areas with sensors are placed that generate basically this information, and then they give their feedback. So they end up having the plans of everything that's going to happen on the property in CAD, and then they use that to build a 3D model.

Q And besides landscaping, what are some other things that can be done to mitigate these undesirable wind impacts?

A It depends on the wind direction. So, typically, it would be landscaping. You know, for wind that's coming from the side, it would typically be landscaping of different heights and types. And then a lot of times in the urban areas, there's

downdraft wind, and for those areas, they'll recommend, like, trellises or areas over walkways or, in general, like on amenity decks that are near a tower. When you exit a tower, oftentimes they'll recommend a small amount of trellis because the wind might be coming down an application.

Q And then because there are certain levels that are identified as uncomfortable, is it your -- I guess in your final, will you ensure that there is no orange area? Is that what your guarantee is? Or are you allowing for certain areas to remain orange?

A As I -- I mean, I hope it's clear. So they -- typically, they do this study and they make recommendations for those orange areas. They say, "Wherever it's orange, we recommend you do X, Y and Z." We then give that information to our either landscape designers or the architects that implement those changes, and then we build the project.

EXAMINATION

BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:

Q And the yellow, it says "walking." Is there a level of uncomfortableness when people are walking? Is that what the yellow represents?

A The yellow represents, I think, different types of use. So blue would be -- you'd want the

people would be sitting. They may have napkins on the table while they're eating, that sort of thing.

And then where people are walking, the studies basically permit a higher wind speed because it could be comfortable for people to walk with higher level of wind than it might be when they're sitting where they would require a lower level of wind.

So, in other words, the way it works is they're saying -- they're using those colors to say, like, for instance on the corner of Auahi Street that's in yellow, maybe No. 22 if you can see that, that's an area that would be comfortable for walking. So if it's not a designated walking area, then the instructions to our designers would be to add mitigation there. But since it is a designated walking area, it fits the use.

CHAIR WHALEN: Yes.

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER OKUHAMA:

Q When you do these wind studies, how far in buildings are you taking into consideration?

Like, how many of these buildings surrounding it also are taken into consideration with the overall wind effect? Do you take what you know you're building,

or are you taking some of the other ones around this general area? Is A'ali'i part of that? Is it, you know, part of the other ones, you know? I'm just kind of curious what's taken into consideration with the wind when you're going to build possibly all around this whole area?

A I mean, it's similar to what we've done in all the projects to date. They take all of the surrounding areas that are in their immediate vicinity that would have an impact on the wind, including maybe an existing building, like in this case, the theater which was built already, and then any projects that we have designed enough for them to build a 3D model. So Ae'o and A'ali'i on the mauka side, they're able to use those in order to ensure the wind study reflects the built condition.

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

Q So the "uncomfortable" in orange means strong wind, essentially, and then the blue is like as least wind?

A Correct.

Q Okay. So if there's no wind, that's a desirable thing for these studies?

A If there's -- excuse me -- no wind?

Q No wind.

every area on here is where they've placed a sensor. So what they try to do is they spread out the sensor locations from the first-floor podium levels and throughout the tower in order to ensure a good sample of wind conditions throughout the entire project. So they don't — they don't have a wind speed at, like, every specific location. For instance, No. 3, that shows an uncomfortable condition on Halekauwila. It's not that that specific exact spot on the street is uncomfortable. It's saying that along Halekauwila on that side, there's a representative area based on this sensor that is uncomfortable. So their recommendation would typically be along Halekauwila Street to do certain things.

I guess my question was more like to me, if there's stagnant air, that's an undesirable thing. But it doesn't seem to be something that's accounted for in this study because the only thing they're identifying as a negative is too much wind. So too little wind seems to be a nonissue for this study, and I was expecting to see something where it's more like a sliding scale of wind being 1 to 10, least to strong, and we could see, okay, where is getting no

wind, where is getting a lot of wind, and that's just what I was expecting. So I wanted to be clear that this study does not -- when it's talking about undesirable effects, it's only talking about too much wind; right?

A Uh-huh, yes. That's been consistent with all of the projects to date, yeah.

Q That's just one -- I'm picking up on these things now.

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER FANG:

Q What's been the feedback on the effectiveness of the wind studies for mitigating undesirable effects on the existing buildings that you folks have already finished?

A You know, the good thing here is we know where the trade winds come from. So it's relatively easy to design around it. I think, you know, the feedback we've received is, obviously, on strong, stormy kind of Kona wind days. It's hard to plan for those types because they're so rare. But for the trade wind days and the general wind directions, it's been very successful in helping us to plan and make comfortable space specifically at the retail levels where most of the pedestrians and public members are

gathering. This building benefits greatly because it 1 2 will have buildings that are blocking the wind on the mauka side, and also by angling the building in its 3 current configuration, it actually blocks the wind a 4 5 lot from the plaza to slow that down. So when you're 6 in the plaza, there will be a lot of nice covered 7 area that also protects residents and visitors and 8 public as they're in the space from the general trade 9 wind direction. 10 CHAIR WHALEN: Any other questions, members? 11 12 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: I have a 13 question. 14 CHAIR WHALEN: On wind or --VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 15 No. 16 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Shall we move to 17 the next topic then, which is on the central -- the 18 neighborhood Commons, I should call it. We call it 19 the Central Plaza. There's a confusion of terms, I 20 think, or conflation of different terms. 21 EXAMINATION 22 BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 23 So on this diagram you have for 2018, if 24 we just look at the area that was the focus of the 25 2008 Central Plaza, which is that middle section by

1 Block 1, and then between the Gateway Towers and Land 2 Block 2 --Uh-huh, yes. 3 -- so, you know, it doesn't make sense to 4 5 count the pedestrian walkways outside of those. Did 6 you calculate what the square footage is for the open 7 space as well as the walkways around the open space? 8 I may not be following you 100 percent, 9 but the image does show the square footage that was 10 calculated for those three different types. 11 It's for those whole blocks; right? 12 for the entire block. 13 It's for -- yes, for Land Blocks 1 and 2. 14 Yes. 15 So, you know, the common definition in my -- for Central Plaza or Neighborhood Commons and 16 17 which was diagram master plan, page 31, as -- on page 18 31 of the master plan where it's, you know, more one 19 area and, in fact, it highlighted it in yellow, "Central Plaza." So just focusing on that area 20 21 rather than, you know, counting all the walkways, you 22 know, in the whole Land Block 1 and counting the 23 whole open space in all of Land Block 2, I'm just

Let me -- if possible, I may get back --

looking at that little area.

24

25

MR. ING: Can we get a clarification on the question? I am confused as to which area you're referring to. I'm sorry.

 $\label{eq:VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay. Let me} % \begin{center} \begin{center} \textbf{VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay.} \end{center} % \begin{center} \textbf{VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay.} \end{center} % \begin{center} \begin{center} \textbf{VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay.} \end{center} % \begin{center} \textbf{VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay.$

CHAIR WHALEN: Let the record reflect that Mary Pat Waterhouse -BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:

Q Okay. This is in the original plan, the master plan. So, here, this is designated as the Central Plaza, and this is — it shows a little bit more detail, the trees and the plazas. That's correct. But in your diagram that you've shown where you count up the square footage, it shows the walkways all around here and here. I just want to know, you know, based on your counting instead of 188, basically what area covers this? How much square footage of open space and walkways is in this area? I don't know if you have that. And you can get that; right?

A So --

MR. ING: I just want to look at -- so this is the initial -- final version of the master plan dated April 2, 2008. It says "Final." So this is the original that had been submitted to the staff,

which was later modified?

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: But the addendum is not that much different. The addendum -- because the addendum -- here's the addendum on page 60. So, basically, it's the same. The only thing, you know, this is because they took out the parcel. That wasn't counted.

MR. ING: So you're at page 60 of that addendum?

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yes. Yes.

MR. ING: So is the question does it include the areas that are designated for plazas?

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: So the question is in the diagram that you just presented today, that it includes a broader area. It includes the sidewalk that goes in the whole Land Block 1 -- sidewalks that are in the whole Land Block 1 and Land Block 2. What I'm looking for is just in that area that's designated as Central Plaza on page 31 of the master plan and then it is repeated again on page 60 of the addendum, but just in that area, how much is -- you know, what's the square footage of the open space and

the sidewalks in that area? 1 2 MEMBER BASSETT: And the plazas. VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: And the plazas. 3 4 MEMBER BASSETT: If any. 5 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yeah. And, yeah, it looks like you're adding a plaza that is going to 6 7 be like an L shape, and I'm fine if you include that. 8 But I do have concerns that you're counting up open 9 space as well as sidewalks for the whole land block, 10 not just around the Central Plaza. MEMBER BASSETT: So, basically, you want 11 12 to know what is the square footage of the Central Plaza in 2018? 13 14 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yes. 15 MEMBER BASSETT: That plan, and then you 16 want to break up -- I mean, you want a breakdown of how much of that is open space, Central Plaza and 17 sidewalks? 18 19 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Sidewalks. 20 MEMBER BASSETT: I agree that would be 21 helpful. 22 BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 23 And it looks like -- you know, based on 24 your square footage, it looks like you probably have 25 it, but what, you know, I would like to do is don't

count all these sidewalks that are, you know, in the open space that's here and here. Oh, sorry. The open space that is outside of the Central Plaza area and the sidewalks that are outside of the Central Plaza area. And I'm not too sure if -- if this should really be considered Central Plaza because it's so far removed from -- you know, this area here is so far removed from this Central Plaza area.

A I understand the question.

Q Okay.

A So I think this -- it might be helpful, and bear with me for a moment if I put this back up on the screen, but I think the initial response -- I wanted to make sure the collective board understood that the response is we wanted to provide a definition of Ward Neighborhood Commons, first off, which was the area that was measured in the previous master plan, and we included the imagery. It must be 150,000 square feet, and those areas are -- can be made up of walkways, specifically outlined that it would be made up of walkways on Land Blocks 1 and 2. I mean, that's what this image does is it kind of outlines the three different types of public areas that make up The Commons across both Land Block 1 and Land Block 2. And, yes, they are across all the land

blocks, not specifically in the center.

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER BASSETT:

Q So maybe that's part of the confusion is that what Mary Pat is talking about is when she's referencing the master plan, she's seeing an area that's clearly identified as Central Plaza, and now we're using different terminology that's not the Central Plaza. We're calling it a different name, which is the Neighborhood Commons?

A And the reason for that, if I may, is I'm trying to use the terminology that was in the D & O. So we're referring directly to the requirements that are placed on us.

EXAMINATION

BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:

Q Although, in the D & O, it does have a section in the findings of fact area that those terms can be used interchangeably, the Neighborhood Commons and the Central Plaza. So there is -- yeah, there is a little bit of confusion. And I know what you're saying is that, you know, there is an area that says, you know, we want to talk about public plazas, pedestrian walkways and open space in Blocks 1 and 2, but, yet, in that diagram I showed you where it says

Central Plaza on -- what page was it?

A Page 60 of the addendum.

Q And page 31 where, you know, it highlights in yellow, you know, Central Plaza and there's a red line around it, but that's the Central Plaza and that is what is being referred to in the D & O No. 8 --

A So --

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{\text{Q}}}$ $\,$ -- and then excludes, you know, all the other walkways and stuff like that.

and this image does -- I mean, because they're both to the same scale. It shows that the areas are, in fact, larger by comparison from 2008 to 2018. What we do not have and we would have to do by scaling off of the image, we don't have the information to calculate the exact areas from 2008 that are just within that particular center portion because as you look through the master plan, the tables and the decision and order, refer to all of those three types of areas on Land Blocks 1 and 2. It doesn't -- it isn't broken down specifically in the documentation that was provided in 2008, 2009. We can do it today and say, you know, within -- if you draw a boundary wherever, you know, on the plan, that the planners

and architects can take off different areas within there. But what we can't do is look at the 2008 plan, you know, in a PDF and, with any degree of accuracy, give the exact square footage. That's -- we can do -- and the numbers that are in here are provided directly from the table that was provided in the approved master plan from 2009.

So that's where I -- I understand the question, but we're not able to specifically do a side by side of a smaller section of area because we can't look at 2008 and calculate that area unless it's literally a scale off of what was in the master plan.

Q So how about providing me the square footage for -- in your 2008 diagram of that central area that includes pedestrian walkways around the open space and the public plaza, just the central area of where, you know, it was where the 2008 master -- I mean, Central Plaza was located. What if you provide me -- and I know it doesn't have to be exact, but what if you provide that square footage?

Because, I mean, in my reading of the -- of the D & O from 2009, at least 150,000 square feet is required in the master plan. So -- so if you could provide that. And you know, like I said, it looks you might

not have an issue of coming up with the 150,000 square feet if I, you know, just eyeball it here because you're coming up with -- you've got 194,000.

A Correct. Again, I think what we can

provide is for the 2018 plan, and I think we've already done --

I hear the question, and it's easy to even eyeball. The space is longer. It's wider in the center portion than it was previously.

Q Well, can you provide -- can you -- I mean, would you be able to give us the square footage on that?

A Of the 2018?

EXAMINATION

BY MEMBER FANG:

Q Because you must have the square footages already for Central Plaza, which you guys have already started construction on. So --

A Yes, we have a portion of it. So the way it works is each time -- in order to calculate certain of the areas, we have to subdivide property. So when we create the easements on a subdivision map, that's when we know the specific areas and we include those. But the entire -- even in 2018, the western side of the Central Plaza, we haven't designed those

projects yet. So that boundary is an estimate today.

Q Okay.

A And that's what's in the table of that area of that portion. But as we design what we call Block H that's on the west side, that will be where we actually end up refining the space of the Central Plaza. We -- and I think that's reflected in the decision and order that the exact area will be determined as we design the buildings around it.

Right now, we only have an estimate based off our -- this master plan. And we know it needs to be at least 150,000 square feet in the definition of Commons across Land Blocks 1 and 2. But the image shows our desire; right? It's to make that space as grand as it can be and as green as it can be, which is a stark comparison to where it was previously.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

May I suggest one thing that might be helpful to look at the larger context. It's on page 6 on the application. And I don't want to take this too literally or precisely as far as the layout, but it shows the interconnectedness of public spaces and puts — it shows kind of the intent of that public plaza that connects the Central Plaza that would be

across Ward Avenue at some point and provide a connection to a future Ewa plaza according to master plan so that each of these spaces are not necessarily being isolated. They're meant to be interconnected except for the Diamond Head plaza, which is some distance. And the public plaza is, as I would see it, is kind of a mid-block passageway; right?

Again, I don't want to take it too
literally, but it looks like there's going to be some
future intent as to have some future building above
it. So it would be a passageway through the ground
level of the building for a portion of that
passageway?

- A Correct. That's the intent now, yes.
- Q Okay.

A So it would be a "pedestrian only, basically, no vehicles allowed" space between those two buildings.

Q Okay. For the time being, what's called here the Central Plaza, that term comes up mainly because of its location, really at the center of the master plan area, that this would be the -- this is the area we're talking about right now in terms of where -- it's like the hub of this open space network.

A And, you know, since you brought it up, if I may, the name "Plaza," you know, was something that was in the original master plan. I think it aligns well the uses, the mix of uses and the intent of more hardscape being provided. As we've refined the design, we've continued to use the name, but it does -- it probably doesn't do the best job of reflecting the green -- the change to grass and landscaping from what it originally was, which was more hardscape.

Q Right. So I'm not sure we can settle all the number issues at this point, but, you know, it's something that needs to be submitted as part of the evidentiary hearing. Is there any way we can do it that we can keep it open for more evidence? But it seems to me we've gotten what we're going to get at this point.

EXAMINATION

BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:

Q So would you be able to provide a little bit -- you know, more specifics just on that central area?

A In the -- you're referring to the image on the right-hand side of the screen?

Q Yeah, yeah, as far as the square

1 footage in those different categories. And, you 2 know, it doesn't have to be exact, but just --3 MEMBER FANG: Like a qualitative 4 description or --5 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: No, no. I would 6 like to see square footage, but, you know, it doesn't 7 have to be, you know, down to the one. It could be 8 in the hundreds. 9 CHAIR WHALEN: Not a precise digit? VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 10 Yeah. 11 THE WITNESS: You know, what is provided, 12 and I can pull those numbers up very quickly, is the 13 two primary areas that are in the dark green on the right-hand side reflect what is in the -- the open 14 15 space table for -- in Table 5.5. So the 53,000 16 square feet number, if you turn to Table 5.5, I can 17 walk through that to get some additional level 18 information. That's probably the easiest way to do 19 it. 20 EXAMINATION 21 BY CHAIR WHALEN: 22 This is the area between Halekauwila 23 Street that extends to Auahi Street all by the green 24 area in between those two streets?

Correct. And that area -- and, again,

25

1	this is based on a current subdivision map. So it's
2	also reflected in the exhibits on the subdivision.
3	We've made an estimate for what will exist on the
4	Block H side, and we've created that space on the
5	subdivision map which equates to 53,251 square feet
6	of just the actual kind of green space that's
7	currently under construction as the Central Plaza.
8	And then if you look at that same table
9	in the amended version which is
10	INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Is that
11	Exhibit W?
12	THE WITNESS: Exhibit W, you'll see
13	under the column of Land Block 2 in the Gateway
14	Towers.
15	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yeah.
16	THE WITNESS: You see the 42,000 square
17	feet?
18	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yep.
19	THE WITNESS: So that is representative
20	primarily of that darker green area between Auahi
21	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: In the center?
22	THE WITNESS: and Ala Moana.
23	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: In between the
24	two towers?
25	THE WITNESS: Correct. So those those

are the two numbers that we have that I can give you now that represent -- and those equate to -- you know, the quick math would be --

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: -- over 90,000 square feet.

MEMBER BASSETT: What exhibit?

INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: That would

be Exhibit W that she just --

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 35.

EXAMINATION

BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:

Q And then as far as -- it looks like the sidewalks would be around those areas or at least around the central -- the upper portion of the Central Plaza; is that right?

MEMBER FANG: Pedestrian walkways.

not reflected in the table, but, you know, those are generally 8 to 15 feet wide, and that's where, you know, it required additional work. And, quite honestly, it's for projects that haven't yet been designed. So it would not be accurate. The most accurate numbers we have are those two I provided which are from the table, 53,000 plus 42,000 in the open space table which are already identified and

have -- we've been allowed to define those by the 1 2 projects as we've designed them. 3 BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: You know on that same page under "Public 4 5 Facility Dedication, " you have "Gateway Plaza" like 6 right in the middle? 7 А Yes. That 34,000, what does that represent? 8 9 So that -- that specifically represents 10 the area that was dedicated under the public 11 facilities agreement and was able to be defined by 12 the easement for public use and gathering of that 13 portion of open space on the Gateway projects. 14 So that's not walkways? That's not 15 necessarily walkways? It's not necessarily all walkways. 16 It's 17 primarily the green open space between those two 18 buildings. In the original plans, it included a 19 large water feature as well. And then that -- then I guess the only 20 21 other piece that could be missing is that green 22 space. So the open space that is on Land Block 1 in 23 the center, that's 53,000; is that right? 24 Correct. Yes.

And then the green space right above

25

1	that?
2	CHAIR WHALEN: Mauka side?
3	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yeah, on the
4	mauka side.
5	THE WITNESS: That one, a portion of it
6	is actually included in the A'ali'i projects PDP
7	application. It hasn't yet been, I believe,
8	subdivided and included in the public facilities
9	dedication. It would be reflected as a portion if
10	you look at Table 5.5, if you look at Land Block 1
11	under the A'ali'i project
12	Can I get the updated version?
13	BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE:
14	Q Okay. 17,000?
15	A Correct. So it's a portion of that
16	17,000 number.
17	Q Okay.
18	A It's the larger portion of open space
19	that's provided by the A'ali'i project.
20	Q Oh, that's right because part of it is
21	private. Okay.
22	A Yes. There is a cultural preserve within
23	that area.
24	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay. Well, this
25	is very helpful, but I would like to request possible

follow-up questions to this.

CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Then we would have to continue the presentation hearing.

provide -- if the applicant is going to be providing additional exhibits in response to the board members' questions relating to the presentation hearing, then what we could do is the Chair could adjourn that, and then we'll come back to it when -- when you're able to provide that at some time today, I guess, and then we can then move to the modification hearing and open that. But that's on the adjournment and then reopening would only be necessary if the applicant is going to be providing additional exhibits in response to the board member's question, and I'm not sure if that's the case. But if there's --

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: I don't know if you can provide that today, but if not, can we have them send it to us within the next week?

DEPUTY AG SUNAKODA: Would it take that long to prepare? I'm not sure -- it would be -- it would be -- to streamline the process, it would be ideal if they could provide it --

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Today?

DEPUTY AG SUNAKODA: -- sometime today.

1 MR. ING: So the request is for the areas 2 beyond what Mr. Randle has already explained? 3 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Yeah. Just to make -- you know, it looks like we're good with -- it 4 5 looks like, you know, I'm fine with the 53,000 and 6 the 42,000, but then there's that 17,000 that needs 7 to be split up so we know, you know, how much is that going to be for public use and how much is going to 8 9 be not open to the public. Is that --10 I think that 17,000 -- yeah, okay. 11 That's for the A'ali'i. So I mean, if you can 12 provide, yeah, those -- that one number, then we can 13 add it up. 14 CHAIR WHALEN: You'd have to estimate it, 15 right, because it hasn't been defined by metes and 16 bounds? THE WITNESS: It hasn't yet because a 17 18 portion of it is on a future project. So I'm going 19 to have to try to explain it. So like I said, if 20 you're referring to -- as you can see my --BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 21 22 Yeah. 0 23 You're referring to this area? 24 Correct. 25 So the portion of this is in the 17,000

number for A'ali'i's open space, but another portion of it is part of the future Block N west tower that will be delivered here. So it actually is a straight line down the middle that's with A'ali'i. So I can't, unfortunately, break down that 17,000 number. It wouldn't reflect the area that you're asking for us to measure. It will be --

I think at the end of the day, we know it needs to hit 150,000 across it. It's the direction we give our designers. At the end of the day, that exact area will be defined as we design this building next at the ground level. It's not -- I can tell you an estimate of what that space is today in total, but I can't, again, with a varied -- with great accuracy tell you exactly what it is.

Q I don't expect you to do great accuracy, but, yeah, just an estimate is good.

And then also that pedestrian walkway there, in the 2018, so that's 29,000. Okay. So, yeah, if you can give us an estimate, and it just can be a rough estimate on how much would be included in the Central Plaza.

- A So we've provided, I think, this number.
- O Yes.

A We've provided this number.

1	Q Yeah.
2	A We can get an estimate on this, and I'll
3	do that before the testimony in the modification
4	hearing today. So we can do that.
5	Q That would be good. Thank you.
6	CHAIR WHALEN: Total open space, there
7	must be some way to calculate that.
8	THE WITNESS: Yes. It's just where you
9	draw the line. So we'll try to get that again today
10	as part of that so we can close it today.
11	CHAIR WHALEN: Thank you.
12	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Thank you.
13	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
14	CHAIR WHALEN: All right. Does HCDA
15	staff have any questions of the applicant's
16	witnesses witness?
17	INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: Nothing
18	additional.
19	CHAIR WHALEN: No?
20	INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: No.
21	CHAIR WHALEN: And does HART have any
22	questions of this witness?
23	MS. AGAG: Not with regards to what this
24	applies to. Thank you.
25	CHAIR WHALEN: All right. So is there

any public testimony?

Okay. All right. So that closes the -it adjourns -- I'm sorry. Not closed. It's
adjourned until, I guess, that additional information
is received. We can proceed now with the
modification hearing, and this is a hearing on
Development Permit No. KAK 18-038 held in accordance
with Hawaii Revised Statutes --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. When we end, we need to close out and start again, if you don't mind repeating all that.

CHAIR WHALEN: Yeah, why don't we take a five-minute break to make other adjustments as needed.

(Off-the-record discussion from 12:03 p.m. until 12:13 p.m.)

CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. The hearing is resumed at 12:13. There's a little procedural correction. I had adjourned the presentation hearing, but to complete that, the applicant will be providing the requested information later today on the area — areas involved in the Central Plaza. So we are closing the presentation hearing and will reopen that hearing for receipt of the additional information after we've finished the modification

request hearing. So we'll proceed now with the opening of the modification hearing.

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

(Hearing adjourned at 12:14 p.m. and resumed at 2:15 p.m.)

CHAIR WHALEN: I'll note it is 2:15. We're reopening the presentation hearing.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. So as per the request, I put on the screen, again, the images that show the comparison of the Neighborhood Commons from 2008 to 2018. The request was for an estimate of the screen, the dark green area here that's shown as open space on that portion. And forgive me for having to pull up another email from someone working on it. That area is 12,400 square feet. That's of the open space. However, approximately 800 square feet of that, just 800, will need to be in a protected preserve of a cultural area. So it comes out to about 12,000 square feet that would be dedicated for public easement.

And I think that -- you know, I hope that this does a good job of at least explaining this master plan requirement and how it's being met as we build out all of the projects. We'll, of course, continue to look at areas that we can maximize the functionality and the scale of the open spaces to the

extent we can fit them within the master plan.

And I think as -- I hope we get a chance to come back and actually present the updates because you -- you know, you probably saw on the news in the updated renderings that we presented, that's really our focus is looking at the streetscape and finding ways to make it feel like a more natural environment. So, you know, hopeful that as we advance the projects on the west side of the Central Plaza spaces, that we can be coming back in soon and showing how those are shaping up and what that will look and feel like at the street level and at the park level in the coming want months.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIR WHALEN:

Q Is the intent to reopen the master plan permit?

A Not at this time unless it's necessary. I can't say.

Q Okay.

A I mean, the master plan does allow for the flexibility to do many of the things envisioned. I think the goal would just be where there may be requirements for that, we would obviously present them, but at this time, we don't anticipate any

1 changes that would warrant that. 2 Well, it's early, and I realize that you're still doing your outreach effort. 3 Correct. 4 5 We'll see what happens. 6 EXAMINATION 7 BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 8 So based on -- I just did a rough 9 calculation, if I did it correct, and coming up with about 130,000? 10 11 Okay. 12 Is that what you're coming up with too? 13 For the areas that were identified? 14 Yes. So I got 42 for the Gateway; 15 Central Plaza, 53. The red plaza that was just changed, that's 12 and a half. So I got 13. 16 17 then the additional space you just mentioned was 12, 18 and then I just threw in, like, an additional 12 for 19 the walkways around the Central Plaza. I mean, I 20 I'm just coming out with that because don't know. 21 I'm assuming you're going to put walkways in in 22 addition, or are you going to replace the open 23 spaces? 24 I think they're shown in this mutually exclusive. So walkways outside the open space that's 25

delineated here.

Q Okay.

A So I think, roughly, that number feels accurate based on the 193,000 in total. You're saying you're coming up with around 130 so far that's within the center area. That feels appropriate.

And, again I, mentioned, hopefully, we're able to increase that as we design the buildings that surround the west side, but that seems similar to that, what you would scale off based on the areas you provide.

Q Because the nunc pro, you know, it's pretty clear that it's 150, and I would really like to see that for the community, and I think it will benefit you folks too.

A Yeah. And, again, I'm hopeful because we're beginning to embark on the re-master planning and design of the new projects on the west side that we can compress the podiums a bit more from what's shown here and open up that open space even more. So I think there's a potential for it. Time will tell, but we're at the phase right now where we're beginning that concept design. So we'll be focusing on that as a priority.

VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Deepak -- I was

1 talking to Deepak about this earlier. Do you have 2 anything that you'd like to add or ask? 3 MR. NEUPANE: On the public facility? VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 4 The Central 5 About the Central Plaza? Plaza. 6 MR. NEUPANE: I don't have anything. 7 VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay. 8 CHAIR WHALEN: Are we pau? 9 EXAMINATION 10 BY MEMBER BASSETT: 11 Actually, this is a little bit off from 12 what we continued for, but it's still related to the 13 purpose of the hearing that we're in. We got some 14 testimony from Sharon Moriwaki, and one of the 15 matters that she brought up was some confusion as to 16 the canopy trees. I'm trying to find here, and maybe 17 you can help me to find it, the part of your 18 application that had to do with the trees that were 19 going to be planted. It was one of the exhibits? 20 Yeah, there is a landscaping plan. Α 21 Yeah, yeah. Where is that? Oh, Exhibit 22 5. 23 Yeah. Α 24 So she's talking about the part of Ko'ula

that is fronting Auahi Street. In Exhibit 5, it

25

1 shows these canopy trees. 2 Α Yes. But in her testimony, she recalls hearing 3 at the prior hearing that your witness said that that 4 5 would be palm trees instead of canopy trees. So I just want to clarify that on the record. 6 7 I think, you know, it's our intent and 8 it's in the renderings as well that they're canopy 9 trees along Auahi Street. And right now we're 10 showing species such as kou and milo along Auahi 11 Street. 12 Okay. So maybe she got it wrong. Okay. 13 That was the only thing. 14 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. That's the end of 15 our questions. 16 EXAMINATION 17 BY VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: 18 You know, speaking of trees, as far as 19 the Central Plaza, will you be putting in trees 20 there? 21 Yes, yes. So as shown in a few of the 22 images, there's a coconut grove that's going in 23 initially in the Central Plaza. And then as we've represented before, as we define the western boundary 24 25 of the Central Plaza, we may look at opportunities to

1	come in and in-fill and appropriately space and
2	design the trees throughout the space but
3	MEMBER BASSETT: It's in Exhibit 5,
4	Mary Pat.
5	THE WITNESS: And there's another one
6	towards the end.
7	MEMBER BASSETT: They show you the trees
8	in that exhibit.
9	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: I was looking
10	more in the Central Plaza. This is just at the edge.
11	MEMBER BASSETT: Yeah. It's just the
12	corner of the Central Plaza.
13	THE WITNESS: There's an image on
14	exhibit it's page 20 of the application. There's
15	kind of a view that shows both the Central Plaza and
16	the amenity deck and tower and rooftops.
17	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Page 20?
18	THE WITNESS: Page 20.
19	VICE CHAIR WATERHOUSE: Okay. I
20	missed that one. Okay. That's good. Thank you.
21	CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. Since this seems to
22	be I'd just like to bring this to closure if we're
23	at that point.
24	HART, do you have any any other
25	questions of the witness?

1 MS. AGAG: No questions based on the new 2 testimony. CHAIR WHALEN: All right. Applicant, I 3 believe that the evidentiary portion is closed. This 4 5 is for the presentation hearing. 6 MR. ING: Yes, it is closed. 7 CHAIR WHALEN: Okay. So the record for the public hearing closes for the presentation 8 9 hearing. The evidentiary record is closed. So thank 10 you for your attendance. And counsel for the applicant and intervenor shall have until the close 11 12 of business June 20, 2018, to file any proposed 13 findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision and 14 order with the Authority. The time is now 2:26 p.m. 15 (Hearing adjourned at 2:26 p.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 2.2 2.3 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
8	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	