

KAKA'AKO MAKAI COMMUNITY PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL

Meeting #40 Summary
Tuesday, July 13, 2010
HCDCA Conference Room
Meeting Materials as Posted

Preliminary Business

A. Welcome and Introductions

Acting Chair Takamine welcomed CPAC meeting participants and self-introductions followed.

B. Adoption of the June 8, 2010 Meeting Summary

The June 8, 2010, Meeting Summary was adopted by consensus.

C. Announcements and Community Concerns

Kaka'ako Waterfront Park Plan Presentation

Mike Miyabara, ASLA, prime consultant for the Kaka'ako Waterfront Park Plan, provided an aerial site plan of Kaka'ako Makai (See Attachment A) and described the planning and development of Kaka'ako Waterfront Park:

- The Park opened in 1996. The present park is Phase I of a long-range plan.
- The overall scope and main thrust of developing this former landfill site was to extend the Lei of Green as a public open space intended as a passive park. It was not intended for ball fields or other active types of recreation.
- Historically the original coastline was along Ala Moana Boulevard. Over the years the peninsula was created by fill material from incinerator ash and waste material.
- Concerns about contamination resulted in many environmental studies. Removal cost was prohibitive, so the material was retained and reshaped on site into the present usable mounds.
- The aerial view shows yellow boundaries of the two impermeable membrane areas covering the contaminated material, and there is a system of pipes leading to vents for any combustible gas accumulation.
- There were also concerns about offshore pollution from the contaminated material. Some monitoring has been done but there are no known major environmental issues.
- The imported topsoil layer is approximately 3 feet deep. No trees were planted over the contaminated areas because of concerns that the roots would puncture the membranes.
- The amphitheater was designed as a temporary facility within the passive park, and as many shade trees as possible were planted around it.
- The popular promenade along the shoreline is the main feature together with picnic areas. A continuous promenade would be desirable in the future along Kewalo Basin, and to the 'ewa side of Kaka'ako Makai to Aloha Tower.

Answers to questions followed:

- All the material existed on-site as a repository for incinerator ash and construction and demolition landfill, which was reshaped into berms up to 47 feet high.
- Vents were monitored initially and showed no public health concerns.
- Contaminated soil would have had to be carefully excavated and shipped to a mainland treatment facility at great expense to the State.
- Areas outside the yellow membrane boundaries would have less contamination and could be safely re-contoured and planted with trees.

- Ala Moana Boulevard is 6 feet above sea level and the shoreline of the peninsula is 8 feet above sea level.
- Constructing structures within the membrane area would jeopardize the integrity of the membrane, and it is unknown whether containerized trees would be successful.
- No shoreline access was provided on the 'ewa side of Waterfront Park because there is an open drainage canal.
- Parking was not provided on the 'ewa side because the intent was to concentrate parking in certain areas and leave as much open space as possible for the Park.
- Whenever a landfill is closed it is subject to a landfill closure plan approved by federal and state agencies to extend many years into the future, and construction over the membrane would be precluded by the landfill closure plan.
- The membrane covers areas where gasses would be released. This does not mean that other areas in the Park would not contain contaminated material, and there could be consequences if inert subsurface material in these areas is disturbed because the entire area was a landfill.
- The landfill closure plan dictates what can and cannot be done; for example staking into the ground is not permitted.
- The bulk of the contamination is incinerator ash.
- Gateway Park was designed later as a temporary space for future planning.

Additional comments:

- It is unfortunate that the berms were not contoured to allow views to the water at the street level beyond the Park.
- This park is a gem but there is a concern that the contaminated soil could eventually be exposed with all the use over the years.
- The parking lot has only 2 handicapped spaces and the Park is not very accessible to the physically challenged with all the hills. One idea for the Master Plan could be the promenade traversing across the Park. Accessibility on the 'ewa side would be desirable.
- One idea has been to construct a multi-level parking facility adjacent to the berms to create a more usable area.
- There is a need to keep the promenade contiguous along Kewalo Basin.

HCDA Report and CPAC Recommendations

The HCDA report was received and posted prior to the meeting. (See Attachment E) HCDA proceeded to provide answers to CPAC questions:

Piano Lot:

Q. When will a "notice to proceed" be issued to Royal Contracting?

A. Soon. HCDA has a meeting with the contractor tomorrow and will be looking at when they will be ready to begin construction.

Q. Could HCDA explain what happened to the EPA loan application for potential remediation of the Piano Lot?

- There is contentious concern about spending \$3 million for asphalt paving to cover the Piano Lot and setting a precedent for parking with no expansion of the Park.
- It would make sense to wait and apply for the funds in August, secure the funds in November to remediate the area, and determine the public uses prior to a parking lot encapsulation.
- EPA remediation grants are also available.

A. HCDA pursued the EPA loan aggressively specifically for the Piano Lot remediation, but was disqualified.

- Regarding timing, the HCDA is still operating under a NOV (Notice of Violation) from the Department of Health to remediate the lot.

- Information was received before this meeting that it would have cost \$2.5 million to ship 55-gallon drums with contaminated soil from Waterfront Park to the mainland. Assuming the cost was just under \$1 million per acre in 1989 dollars, the cost would at least double to \$15 million today.
 - It is a no-brainer to cap and remediate in place.
- C. This could be disputed because to put the project on hold for full remediation would allow for unrestricted use of this property in the future by using \$15 million in federal Brownfields funds available to HCDA upon application.
- A. HCDA will have to disagree because HCDA has been under pressure to remediate since 2005, and receiving the funding is only prospective.
- C. The CPAC has received information that the HCDA has been disqualified from receiving any grant or loan funds from the EPA because they are not an innocent landowner, and were complicit in contamination from the City's leased land after the land was transferred from the DLNR to the HCDA in the 1990's. The \$1.9 million remediation loan was instead awarded to DHHL for Kalaeloa, where an environmental assessment was undertaken from the outset.
- C. There have been Brownfields remediation grants available to others, and it should not be up to a community group to determine how to secure remediation funds at the end of 5 years with a drastic and unpleasant action becoming imminent because time has run out.
- A community group cannot apply for and operate the large federal grant that is needed.
 - This has to be done by the HCDA and more time is needed to look into this.
- C. The EPA has confirmed that the HCDA cannot qualify for either the remediation loan or remediation grants because the EPA would consider this to be rewarding the polluter.
- Q. The Molokai Community Services Council received a \$55 million Brownfields grant under the Clean Water Act to clean up an oil spill, 400 ft wide x 120 ft long x 18 inches thick, moving under the surface. If a non-profit can do this why is the HCDA unable to get \$15 million to clean up this area?
- C. Brownfield remediation grants have been capped at \$200,000.
- Q. Does the HCDA agree that spending \$3 million on a project can surely wait a year to allow for due diligence?
- A. HCDA can look into the \$55 million grant if the information is provided.
- A. To summarize:
- The HCDA is willing to explore whatever grant opportunities come up, being mindful that the HCDA has been disqualified from receiving EPA loan monies and that grant program proceeds are limited.
 - Would the HCDA be willing to look for money? The answer is yes.
 - Would the HCDA be willing to delay the Piano Lot project? The answer is no.
- Q. Has the HCDA given any thought to covering the Piano Lot with tackifier¹ to stabilize the surface until a meaningful decision on the use can be made? This has been done in other areas.
- A. The short answer is no because the DOH correspondence only provided three options. HCDA is not in a good position influence a change in materials because DOH has told HCDA what needs to be done. If HCDA hears back from DOH the option could be considered.

Cancer Research Center:

- Q. Could the HCDA explain the purpose of the "administrative amendment" reported to have been recently granted by HCDA for JABSOM Phase II and the Cancer Research Center? Could copies of the "administrative amendment" be provided to the CPAC?

¹ Acceptable tackifiers include both plant based products, as well as polymeric emulsion blends. (CA.Gov DOT These products also exhibit good tackifying characteristics and broad compatibility with numerous elastomers, polymers, and other resins. Many of the resins meet FDA regulations.

- A. When the UH recently applied for their Phase II SMA permit they were required to provide reports on Lot C, the 5-acre parking lot 'ewa of Keawe Street, and a conditional use agreement, as well as respond to comments from the Office of Planning regarding how that parking situation related to the Cancer Research Center complex planned to be developed on parking Lot A.
- A. There were some changes from the original permit for the cancer research building. For example, there is a 10,000 square-foot area planned to be phased out and revisions to be made to the parking plan within that area. These are taken care of in the permit, and copies will be provided to the CPAC.
- C. One of the CPAC's major concerns about the proposed plan for the Cancer Research Center and its height of approximately 97 feet makai of the JABSOM complex, which is 67 feet in height.
- A. A building envelope of 100 feet is allowed at this location, and building envelopes along Ilalo Street can be up to 200 feet. If JABSOM had built to the present height limit, the JABSOM building mass would be up to 200 feet.
- C. Conversely, a Master Plan is presently underway that will likely change these height rules and lower the building heights in the shoreline area.
- A. It could, but the present development permit for JABSOM Phases I and II was granted with the original construction, and the permit grants a height up to 100 feet on the makai side tiered to 200 feet within the JABSOM complex along Ilalo Street.

Fisherman's Wharf restaurant:

- C. CPAC is happy to see Fisherman's Wharf Restaurant representatives present because there is interest in the renovation's progress.
- A. Work is being done on various concepts, which will not change the traditional look and feel of the interior, and there have been infrastructure issues such as plumbing and electrical challenges,
- Q. There was some mention about the parking in this area being proposed to be moved to the Piano Lot. Could HCDA elaborate on what parking in the vicinity of the restaurant is proposed to be relocated?
- A. The Fisherman's Wharf lease allows for approximately 77 stalls in the parking area just 'ewa of the building. Discussions are ongoing with the Kewalo Basin stakeholders group regarding harbor parking, but changes to the physical layout are not yet defined.

John Dominis Site and Shoreline Promenade Extension:

- Q. Could copies be provided to the CPAC of the HCDA's recent redevelopment permit for the John Dominis site? Why was this permit issued by HCDA one week following the June 8 CPAC meeting and less than 45 days into the 100-day evaluation period?
- A. A copy of the John Dominis site redevelopment can be made available,
- Q. Is the John Dominis site SMA permit hearing date known?
- A. This is up to the Office of Planning.
- C. It was known that the CPAC had prepared a letter to the lessee, yet the HCDA authorized the John Dominis site redevelopment permit a few days following the June 8 CPAC meeting thus precluding the opportunity for the CPAC to communicate remaining concerns.
- C. This issue was expressed at the HCDA board meeting because it appeared that the CPAC's painstaking work was invalidated by HCDA. If this was planned to be rammed through, at least the CPAC should have been notified .
- Q. Why are we here? Is the CPAC collaboration process, with the CPAC represented by a collaboration committee of 12 people, being invalidated?
- A. HCDA board directed staff to communicate with the lessee to request collaboration with the CPAC. A letter was received from the lessee's agent that they had accommodated requested changes to the extent that they could. The timing of the development permit approval may be questioned, but this is a base permit for redevelopment within the existing building envelope rules. The lessee had indicated they had a development timetable, and HCDA was obliged to approve the permit given the discussions, presentation to the CPAC and communication from the lessee's agent.

- C. The priority concern remains. The promenade's public-right-of-way between Point Panic and the Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy was never resolved.
- A. The lessee's plans appear to specify an average of 16 to 20 feet considered for the width of the public promenade from the shoreline building setback line.
- C. The existing promenade is 23 feet including the seawall, and the lessee's last discussion with the CPAC limited this to 11 to 16 feet across.
- This extension is part of the Lei of Green from Waterfront Park around Point Panic and connecting to Kewalo Basin and Kewalo Basin Park.
 - The concern is whether this waterfront right-of way will be retained for the public or if public access will be prohibited. This is where the discussion should have continued. But since HCDA signed the permit it is now more problematic.
 - The CPAC speaks on the part of the public and in the public interest of access.
- A. It is mistaken to think that any prerogatives have been lost to develop a shoreline promenade on that space. The provision is in the lease and the lessee has retreated from the previous building footprint. If all the money and everything else is in place for the shoreline promenade, the HCDA will revisit this and reopen the lease to take back the land.
- Q. Will the HCDA assist the public interest in this matter? The well-paid representatives of the lessee recently objected to taking 22 feet for the public right-of-way because they would lose a few parking stalls.
- Q. An email the CPAC received from the lessee's agent indicated that to recover the public right-of-way at that location, the State would be required to "acquire" it.
- It is unclear whether this would be monetary or compensation in the high lease value of the floor space.
 - Because the HCDA allowed the property line to be drawn to the seawall when the lease was recently restructured, there is only a 10-foot building setback from the wall.
 - Now there is apparently an unwritten agreement to restore a public right-of-way at a cost which may be prohibitive to the State.
- How does the HCDA expect to recover the public right-of-way when the lessee's agents assert that a lanai will be built in this space and it will be fully landscaped until the State can re-acquire it? This maneuver appears contrary to the public interest.
- A. The original 65-year lease included the lands up to the seawall and beyond, so the lessee does have rights.
- They clearly did not promise to build a promenade in that area. The plans show a green space not less than 16 feet wide undulating along the same seawall and contiguous with their patio. This is not foreseen to preclude reopening the lease to hopefully take back the space again by what should be by agreement, and developing the shoreline promenade at the State's cost.
 - This space is included in the lease, so the State will have to re-acquire it by opening the lease for the expressed purpose of taking back that land to develop a promenade. A monetary cost to the state is not expected because the strip from the shoreline wall to their lanai will not be developed.
 - It is the expectation that, when all the conditions and approvals are met, the HCDA will take back this space now in the lease, the lease rent based on square footage will be reduced accordingly, and the promenade will be developed.
- Q. Will the HCDA be able to recover the 20-foot width to match the existing promenade?
- A. The plans will have to be reviewed.
- C. The criterion is a width of 20 feet consistent with the existing promenade, because 16 feet is narrow for a public promenade and will create a bottleneck. This is a plan for the future and should not create obstacles later on. To do this the building should be set back 4 feet, which is less than the width of a parking space, to allow for the promenade.

- A. The lost parking space is somewhat critical for the redevelopment plan because HCDA has on-site parking requirements, and if the lessee were to lose a few stalls they would have to change the design of the building.
- Q. Is the HCDA willing to revisit the provisions of the lease to ensure this public access to the water is in accordance with State law?
- Consistent access is needed for the general public from the KKFC site to Point Panic and to Kewalo Basin Park, regardless of a few parking spaces.
 - Presently the John Dominis restaurant's parking is by valet using the Point Panic parking lot.
- Q. A development timetable imposed by the lessee was mentioned. However it has been reported that the redevelopment has been postponed until December. Therefore what has caused the HCDA's rush to avoid of the CPAC's concerns and approve the redevelopment permit?
- The CPAC was informed at the June 8 meeting that the HCDA was waiting for the CPAC's recommendations to complete review of the redevelopment application.
 - A few days later, without any opportunity for the CPAC to reply, the redevelopment permit was approved by HCDA with more than 50 days to spare.
- A. The timeframe for this was that the existing sub-lease was supposed to expire at the end of April, and subsequent to the end of April they expected to aggressively pursue the SMA and building permits to minimize the facility's downtime. Given a protracted permitting timeframe to secure entitlements, the lessee determined that the redevelopment date would be delayed until December or January and asked for a continuance of the existing sub-lease terms to minimize the downtime.
- C. That did not answer the question.
- Q. Is there a monthly rent where the State benefits from this lease?
- A. There is a flat rate with a negotiated percentage added, which definitely benefits the State.
- Q. Are the terms of the acquisition in the lease?
- A. A reopening of the lease to develop a promenade on the shoreline edge is believed to be described in the lease.
- Q. Should the funding request for the public promenade move forward in 2011 with the Legislature's approval, would the HCDA then inform the lessee that this land will be taken back to proceed with this promenade extension?
- A. If HCDA has an appropriation for design of an appropriate promenade, discussions would be initiated to open the lease to take back that area.

Due to time constraints, it was requested and agreed that the remaining questions be sent to HCDA for written replies.

CPAC Master Plan Update

Acting Chair Takamine summarized the CPAC's evaluation of the Master Plan Public Workshop #2:

- While the CPAC has made efforts to keep communications open with the HCDA, it was clear that the trigger point of public contention at the workshop was the promotion of housing that is prohibited in the Kaka'ako Makai shoreline area.
- The CPAC began receiving emails immediately following the workshop. Comments specific to the workshop were organized by subject into a composite survey of CPAC participants. (See Attachment C)
- The CPAC held a special meeting the following week to discuss the workshop's shortcomings and determine what improvements could be made to move the master planning process forward toward completion.
- From this meeting the CPAC Executive Committee developed a position statement for the Steering Committee's review prior to the July 7 HCDA board meeting, (See Attachment D)

- Also following the workshop a petition was circulated among shoreline stakeholders and park users. The petition advocates expanding Kaka'ako Waterfront Park and limiting structures. On the 4th of July, 400 signatures were collected at the Park. Many of those signing the petition wanted to learn more about the Master Plan and talk at length about keeping the area green.
- The CPAC Executive Committee's Position Statement together with a copy of the petition to expand the Park with 573 signatures and the workshop survey composite were submitted to the HCDA board at their July 7 meeting.

Lead consultant Goeff Miasnik was invited to speak but deferred his comments to HCDA. He noted the HCDA's formal receipt of the petition and requested a copy, assuring the requested confidentiality of the signatories' information.

HCDA Executive Director Ching reported the following:

- At the July 7 HCDA board meeting he took responsibility for the outcome of the workshop and indicated that he would develop a strategy for moving forward, based on good intentions and what is presently in place, to present to the CPAC and the HCDA board.
- He would have a personal role in ensuring that the implementation is as good as it should be.
- The Master Plan Project Team is comprised of CPAC representatives, HCDA staff, and project consultants serving a technical role. The HCDA Master Plan sub-committee will remain a part of the Project Team to witness the planning process. The process will also include the public and stakeholders with no exclusion of the CPAC.
- The ultimate requirement is to produce recommendations to the HCDA board.
- The Vision and Guiding Principles will continue as the cornerstone of the Master Plan's context, and it will be demonstrated how this will happen as the process moves forward.
- The Master Plan also has to function according to Legislative instructions to include a cultural public marketplace, the Kewalo Keiki Fishing Conservancy, and clearly the statutory prohibition on housing in Kaka'ako Makai.

HCDA Executive Director Ching referred to an early planning process flow chart in his "Moving Forward Plan" (See Attachment F) and reviewed each page of his proposal, including a summary of Public Workshop #1 and the consultants' interaction with stakeholders, focus groups, and the Project Team for the purposes of gathering information. He additionally noted the following:

- Workshop #2 failed in some respects because a plan was not communicated for the public to respond to.
- Clarity is important in what is presented to the public if good responses are expected.
- Steps 6 and 7 on the current planning process diagram represent the implementation and monitoring process to ensure the Master Plan is maintained following its adoption.
- Prior to presentation of a composite plan to the public, for consensus purposes the CPAC and Project Team will validate each plan component with the Vision and Guiding Principles and comments received.
- It is the HCDA board that will make the decisions. The CPAC, stakeholders and landowners, and the general public will have an opportunity to advocate and weigh in on whatever individual development project is proposed in context with the Master Plan. If an individual development project does not fit into the Master Plan, the CPAC can recommend that this should not be done; or if a project has not been considered but makes compelling sense, it can be included.
- The finite elements of cost, feasibility, desirability, compatibility, and acceptability with the community will then be taken up in the implementation.
- The result will be a blueprint that seeks to accomplish particular elements in a particular manner.
- It is hoped this concise process will produce support and understanding from the public, and that the public comments will be known from the open house prior to the workshop so the workshop can be the public stamp of approval.

- The consultants are contracted to activate outreach to create a public record, incorporate history and cultural sensitivity, calculate economic feasibility strategies, and illustrate design concepts.
- The consultants do not tell HCDA what to do, HCDA tells them what to do, and there is a seat at the table for the CPAC for collaboration that the HCDA is obliged to do.
- The Project Team was created to give CPAC a seat at the table as these things move forward and this is intended to continue.
- Once the Master Plan is adopted the collaboration shifts to a different focus as development projects are reviewed.

HCDA Executive Director Ching invited the CPAC to review the proposed process and make suggestions to be clear about the process for a calendar to include validation by the Project Team of all the land use elements and activities to be depicted, consultant assignments and deliverables during the process to support the decision-making within the process, the public open house, and ultimately Workshop #3

Comments, questions and answers followed:

- C. The approach has changed with the CPAC being heard and the HCDA wanting the CPAC to support the Master Plan. But spending \$2.5 million on Piano Lot parking lot, although interim, does not fit with the Master Plan in the spirit of collaboration. A pilot project that is green and functional with parking and a farmers market would demonstrate collaboration - if the CPAC;s consensus is needed on what is being done to fit with the Master Plan.
- A. The elements will be discussed based on the Vision and Guiding Principles and documentation, and will be taken forward for consensus.
 - The planning process will describe, discuss and come to some conclusions on the appropriate permanent uses supported by the community for the Piano Lot as well as other sites.
 - The next workshop will include discussion on permanent activity such as art and culture, park expansion, etc., and development of the Piano Lot. The paved parking lot on the Piano Lot is not a permanent and final use.
- Q. Is there a plan to follow up on the Workshop #2 Master Plan presentation? How long will it take to establish feasibility? Will the CPAC be included in the final consideration of priorities?
- A. There is a Public Participation Protocol to follow to give CPAC an opportunity to participate in review of planning and development projects in the Makai area. The protocol is followed as a minimum requirement, and as long as we work toward and in concert with the Master Plan and with what the HCDA is required to do, HCDA is willing to raise the bar on the participation protocol with the CPAC.
- C. To build on the question, it appears everything is left open-ended at the end. There would need to be the necessary step of continuing the dialog on how the Master Plan is brought together with priorities and costs. Piecemealing the Master Plan after-the-fact would continue contention and protests that can be avoided with better closure on the priorities and fiscal projections.
- A. The park expansion and enhancements have been heard as a priority that should come first. Particular sites in Kaka'ako Makai will have a range of possible uses and connections to other features, and the consultants will determine costs per linear foot in sufficient context to solicit RFPs.
- C. The effort is appreciated, but the up-front dialog and display of concepts should have better results than the last workshop.
- A. The need to improve is acknowledged.
- C. There is some serious concern that people will need to learn more about the Master Plan process through the CPAC meetings prior to the next workshop.
- C. The message is to get the public to the CPAC meetings as the process progresses.

- C. The CPAC's responsive plan to bring in new audiences is commendable. People need to work out the things they don't agree on, or the points of difference will never be settled and this is why things go wrong. Competing interests must come to the surface in order to work out the things not agreed upon and reach consensus. There is an inherent duty to bring out different ideas on the use of this land and bring any differences to the table, and knowing our differences will be where the consensus will come from.

Comments, questions and answers arose concerning the Limehouse online Master Plan portal:

- Q.. Initially over a long period time 12 or 13 comments came in slowly to the Limehouse portal, and up to about 33 before the workshop, but none since. Is there an explanation on why no comments have been received, or have they been received but not posted?
- A. All comments are posted directly to the portal by the user and HCDA has no control over this.
- Q. Could this be because the portal may not be user friendly, or because people don't want to go there?
- A. This could be a number of things. The system works because General Growth Properties Plan received over 200 comments.
- A. People respond to things that are known to be planned, and there may not be enough context on the Master Plan portal for people to have opinions about yet.
- C. There are questions on what role the CPAC will have in this, and one idea is to organize the stakeholders to generate comments.
- A. The CPAC will be involved in outreach and review and analysis of a compilation of priorities expressed for the Master Plan to date.

A request was made for the public outreach consultant, Bruce Tsuchida of Townscape Inc, to share his views as a respected community-based planner and communicator with a genuine approach and insight to this community. He commented briefly that his role has been and will continue to be to do his best to translate all of the stakeholder ideas into workable master plan elements.

HCDA board member Dexter Okada reported that the HCDA had agreed at the July 7 board meeting to provide the CPAC with reporting time on the HCDA's monthly meeting agenda. Acting Chair Takamine confirmed that the CPAC has been interested in increasing communication with the board.

Next Project Team Meeting

Acting Chair Takamine asked if the Project team would be meeting the following Tuesday. Secretary Matson noted that weekly Project Team Meetings had been discussed previously and were listed on the meeting agenda under "Next Meeting Dates."

- HCDA suggested that the CPAC study the Executive Director's plan on "Moving Forward."
- Lead Consultant Miasmic stated that the consultants would have overlays prepared in two weeks.

Consideration was given to the CPAC moving forward with separate planning meetings to develop information to present to the Project Team.

Additional Comments:

CPAC founding member Dexter Okada asked if the CPAC is seen as an extension of the HCDA or as a truly community-representative group. He suggested that the CPAC begin independent official communication with the Legislators, who are now hearing from special-interest promoters of uses for Kaka'ako Makai such as a Hawaiian music and dance museum. He noted that the Legislators should consult with the CPAC first, instead of the CPAC having to continue to react to premature piecemeal proposals.

CPAC founding members Bill Feltz and Bob Crone AIA agreed that the master planning process should not be so shackled by streets and leases and, instead of focusing on incremental portions and funding for various elements, the focus should on a great Master Plan over the long term for the larger area, and once the plan is defined the funds to support it could be better determined.

CPAC Position Statements

Four CPAC Position Statements (See Attachment B) had been developed and circulated to CPAC participants to clarify and document CPAC concerns and recommendations on the following issues discussed, deliberated and collaborated upon by the CPAC:

- Piano Lot Public Use and Benefit
- John Dominis Site and Shoreline Promenade
- Cancer Research Center Development
- Park Improvements Project Plan

CPAC founding member Nancy Hedlund stated the following in support of endorsing the CPAC Position Statements:

- The CPAC Position Statements are effective in applying and extending the Vision and Guiding Principles, and are thoughtful and clear in the arguments that need to be made.
- It is absolutely crucial for each of the 3 proposed developments, the John Dominis site, Piano Lot and Cancer Research Center, that the CPAC continue to expect the HCDA to honor the principles of *sense of place*, access, and public use embedded in the Guiding Principles.
- So far, the design of each of these proposed developments and the methods by which they have been advanced have violated the public trust and the principles of collaboration and transparency supposedly endorsed by the HCDA, as well as the potential of master planning to create a viable and compelling Kaka'ako Makai for the future.

She pointed out that the CPAC had been faced with many challenges and HCDA roadblocks to make the CPAC appear ineffective during excessive time consumed meeting challenges instead of effectively moving forward faster, and expressed appreciation for the continuing strong stands taken by the CPAC and commitment to the CPAC's work. She added that these things should be made known to the community.

Secretary Matson noted that the CPAC Position Statements are integral to the CPAC's commitment to move forward in the public interest, and if the HCDA chooses to continue their practice of avoidance by ignoring the CPAC's clear messages, the Legislature's attention should be sought.

Discussion followed with adjustments and additions to the draft Position Statements emailed to CPAC participants. It was agreed to post the final drafts for review by CPAC participants not present at this meeting, and to move the Position Statements forward.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.

July 13, 2010, CPAC Meeting Attendance

Curtis Crabbe
Kanekoa Crabbe
Bob Crone
Bill Feltz
Scott Furushima
Jack Hamada
Nancy Hedlund
David Hilea

Jack Levin
Michelle Matson
Bob Miller
Dexter Okada
Doug Palama
Wayne Takamine
Lainie Tamashiro
Fumiko Wellington
Elton Wong

HCDA Staff
Tony Ching
Deepak Neupane