

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE

July 5, 2017

A meeting of the Planning Committee of the County of Kaua'i, State of Hawai'i, was called to order by Mason K. Chock, Chair, at the Council Chambers, 4396 Rice Street, Suite 201, Līhu'e, Kaua'i, on Wednesday, July 5, 2017, at 8:32 a.m., after which the following Members answered the call of the roll:

Honorable Arthur Brun (*present at 8:49 a.m.*)
Honorable Ross Kagawa
Honorable Derek S.K. Kawakami
Honorable JoAnn A. Yukimura (*present at 8:34 a.m.*)
Honorable Mason K. Chock
Honorable Arryl Kaneshiro, Ex-Officio Member
Honorable Mel Rapozo, Ex-Officio Member

The Committee proceeded on its agenda items as follows:

Bill No. 2627, Draft 3 A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 10, KAUA'I COUNTY CODE 1987, AS AMENDED, BY ADDING A NEW ARTICLE 5B, RELATING TO THE LĪHU'E PLANNING DISTRICT (*County of Kaua'i, Applicant*) (**This item was Deferred to the First Committee Meeting in January 2018.**)

Councilmember Kagawa moved to approve Bill No. 2627, Draft 3, seconded by Councilmember Kawakami.

Committee Chair Chock: For an update on this, Committee Members, we deferred this item specifically to work on the islandwide Additional Rental Unit (ARU) approach, and we do have an update from the Planning Department. They have done more of the study. They have completed all of their community meetings. We would like to move towards introducing the new islandwide bill if there is enough consensus from the Committee that is something that can be looked at and supported. I was hoping that we would suspend the rules and have our Deputy Planning Director give us a little briefing of their progress on it. There are some numbers associated with what we can expect and the areas that looks like to be a potential ARU buildout. If there are no questions, I will suspend the rules at this time.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

(*Councilmember Yukimura was noted as present.*)

KA'ĀINA HULL, Deputy Planning Director: Good morning, Chair and Committee Members. Ka'āina Hull, on behalf of the Planning Department. Just as a primer, about roughly one (1) year ago when this body was discussing an additional rental unit policy for the Līhu'e area, there was some discussion about the potential unfairness of that policy, which would allow for this additional entitlement for Līhu'e residents, but not for other areas of the island to participate in the ARU program. The department offered to meet with various members of the community, various stakeholders, to discuss a potential ARU policy. Over the past year, the Department has been meeting with various community organizations, various business organizations, various individuals within the development sector to discuss and ferret out any potential issues for an islandwide ARU policy. At the last meeting, we asked for a little additional time to discuss the policy with the County Council's Affordable Housing Task Force, which we did meet with that group for a considerable amount of time to discuss and go over the potential ramifications of such a policy. At this time, the Department does feel after gathering the amount of information that we have, seeing that there are really...while there are concerns, I will say that it is not a cut and dry, but there is support islandwide for this policy. There are concerns about the further densification of town core areas in order to provide for the housing opportunities. There is the desire for more housing opportunities, but there is concern about impacts that come with that further densification, such as traffic impacts, noise impacts, and changes to the neighborhood character. There is a strong desire as well to answer the call to address the housing crisis that the County is in right now and providing families and residents an opportunity to build an additional rental unit. In particular, if that unit is used for housing *kūpuna* that want to age in place or young families, such as children returning home from college to start their families in a starter home, so to speak, as well as to provide additional rental opportunities. There is a strong desire to have additional entitlements along this line, but a need to take into account the potential impacts and try to mitigate those impacts as they may come about. I can honestly say that after a year of meetings, there is no overwhelming consensus objecting to an ARU policy, but there are some concerns, I will say. At this point, the Department does feel it is prudent to move forward in looking at introducing an islandwide policy. We are working with both Councilmember Brun and Councilmember Chock on the introduction of that policy.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you, Ka'āina. I know we do not have the new bill before us, but I think that there have been some concerns from this body specifically on what we think the impact will be and that is the focus of your studies, so I hope you can address that. I think we have some questions around the table. I will entertain those questions as well as this time. Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Good morning. I was expecting a written report. I think that at the last Committee Meeting, that was the request and I have been asking for many months for the communities that you have met with, which ones you actually told about the infrastructure needs, and what was your process with addressing them. I have been waiting for that.

Mr. Hull: I apologize, Councilmember. We did get the communication from Councilmember Chock requesting the specific information. We did transmit over, last week, a communication concerning the organizations we met with in the process.

Councilmember Yukimura: Okay. I am sorry, I have not seen that.

Council Chair Rapozo: Maybe staff can pull that up for you.

Committee Chair Chock: Any further questions?

Councilmember Yukimura: So you said there is no consensus of objection; is there a consensus of support, given the considerations?

Mr. Hull: Yes. In the communication we sent over, we listed the various organizations we met with. Only two (2) of those organizations actually took an official action of support or opposition. All the rest of the organizations did not feel it was prudent to move forward on an actual specific action of support or against in those discussions that were had. They would range from anywhere from some groups to just fifteen (15) minutes to some groups three (3) to four (4) hours, quite frankly. There were sentiments of both pros and cons of why the program should be supported or possibly could not be supported, but there was an overwhelming sense of a need to address the housing situation. But only two (2) of those groups took action. The Kilauea Neighborhood Association (KNA) took unanimous action to support an islandwide policy. The Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele Community Association took action to not support an islandwide policy. I can say at the KNA meeting, which I was present and participated in the discussions, even though the vote was unanimous, there were discussions from members and participants on the levels of voicing both concern over potential impacts, as well as the dire need for more housing opportunities. But they ultimately took unanimous action to support the policy. The Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele Association, I cannot actually speak to. I did submit the potential policy bill out to an array of different groups and I offered to speak with each one of those groups and present if they wanted me to. After submitting to the Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele Association, I was subsequently informed that they did not want me to participate in the discussion, but they were going to review it and ultimately took action against it and cannot speak to the reason why.

Councilmember Yukimura: How did you assess where the other communities were if they did not take votes?

Mr. Hull: Well, really the whole reaching out was not an attempt to poll community associations, per se. Some of the community associations do not have official memberships. Sometimes it is just whoever shows up at the meeting. Some allow full groups to take votes and some have an executive committee that will take the vote on behalf of the membership of participants. So it was not looking at it as a clear representative vote of, "Okay, this island sector wants to go here, or this island sector wants to go here." It was really just to ferret out the various

issues that may arise in the regional areas. If there was overwhelming opposition against an islandwide policy...if I went to each one of those meetings and the chorus was, "No, not at all, not in our community," I would feel confident reporting back to this body to say, "Perhaps the communities are not there." But at this point, there was, like I said, at least in the meetings that I participated, no overwhelming opposition to it, as well as there was a strong desire to continue the discussions and provide more input. I will say that some community associations said should it be presented at the public hearing level at the Planning Commission, then subsequently at the County Council, that is when they would anticipate providing specific testimony. Some of them did not feel comfortable providing actual action to the proposition that I was giving to the organization.

Councilmember Yukimura: So how do you know there was overwhelming support for your conclusion to go ahead?

Mr. Hull: Well, I am not saying there is overwhelming support to have an ARU policy. I am just stating that given the amount of input that we have taken in, given the fact that there is no outright overwhelming objection to it, and given that there is a need to put more housing in place, the Department feels confident in moving forward. During the official public noticed meetings at Planning Commission-level, as well as the County Council, which will participate in an official Sunshine Law discussion, then we can also ferret out some of those issues.

Councilmember Yukimura: So how does the Planning Department...well, let me just say that I was at the Kekaha meeting twice, once when you presented it without telling them that they would need sewers or septic tanks in order to qualify for it, and then I was at the second meeting when you did tell them, and there was, to me, by my judgment, a really difference in reaction when they were told that they wanted sewers and in the group that I was sitting in, they were saying, "We do not want sewers in Kekaha. We are fine on cesspools, we do not want that monthly fee that people have to pay for sewers." I think you asked how many would do it and how many supported and there was only a sprinkling of hands. I do not know how you can judge to say...to say that people say, "We need housing," they would like to have an extra unit on their lot—of course, everybody would. When it comes down to a policy where they need sewers or septic tanks, I do not think there was support.

Mr. Hull: I will also say that some of the way I presented, I know you have objections against me not presenting the sewer issue to the Kekaha meeting to the first meeting I attended. Quite frankly, these organizations are their own entity and they have their own rules and procedures. Not just the Kekaha meeting...in other meetings, I was informed in the manner and amount of time I had to present. The Kekaha meeting was made very clear to me...I just had a minimal amount of time because they had other agenda items that had a higher priority than the ARU policy, so all I could present was the bare bones of it, and then when I was able to come back to the second meeting, I explained here is how this thing is really with the nuts and bolts, including wastewater access, work with the policy. At which point, because Kekaha does not have access to a functioning

sewer system at this time...like you mentioned, the vast majority were indifferent to it. There was a sprinkling of people saying that they would be interested or would not be interested in it, just because the Department of Health (DOH) comments that you need access to a wastewater system for the most part. The Kekaha Community Association was a little indifferent towards the proposal.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, it troubles me that you did not think that the minimum presentation required telling them that sewers and septic tanks were required, because it makes a vast difference in how they respond to it. I would hope that you would have spoken up because that is such an essential piece of the picture.

Mr. Hull: Councilmember, it was ultimately presented to them. I understand that you are objecting on my grounds that I felt in given the instructions of the president of that association of what I could present on, I did not feel in that time I could present that information. Ultimately, if you are objecting to me not presenting the information to them, Councilmember, it was presented to them and ultimately they did review the information.

Councilmember Yukimura: Well, I do not know if there were second meetings for other community meetings. There was not any written information sheet that could have been done, that could have told the community the essentials and passed it out. If it is not good input to the community then how can you expect good input from the community?

Mr. Hull: If I could, I would have sat with that community association for two (2) or three (3) hours to get into the real nuts and bolts of it. At the end of the day, Councilmember, there are an array of different information that needs to be presented. I was explained to at the beginning of that meeting that this agenda item does not have priority. They had other issues to take care of on that first meeting, so I had to give a very bare nuts and bolts presentation.

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, and I am sorry that you did not include some essential information. How does the Planning Department reconcile the policies in both the existing General Plan and the General Plan update that we need to keep the growth in the Līhu'e and south Kaua'i areas?

(Councilmember Brun was noted as present.)

Mr. Hull: I would not agree with that statement in either one of the General Plans. Both the 2000 General Plan, as well as the update provide opportunities and explains that opportunities do need to be made in each regional area for providing for housing for additional growth, while I will agree that there is a focus in saying that much of the growth should be focused in Līhu'e because you have much of the commercial hub here, as well as you have much of the infrastructure here. It would not be accurate to state that in areas like

Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele, in areas like Waimea, that we have a no-growth policy, in neither the General Plan or the General Plan update.

Councilmember Yukimura: No one has said that. Your plan has not said no growth and I have not said no growth. You have an allocation of the nine thousand (9,000) units. I am told that there is an error in that plan, which the Planning Department just approved, so I do not know what plan to go by, if that is an error. That is a key factor before the Land Use Commission that is going on.

Committee Chair Chock: Councilmember, let us stay on track and focus with the ARU Bill.

Councilmember Yukimura: I am in focus.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay, get to the question then, please.

Councilmember Yukimura: It is about where the growth will be and how this policy of an islandwide growth everywhere, without good guidelines, could mean that we will have more traffic congestion that we cannot offset. I will go back to the General Plan and pick out those policies, of course that is the problem if there are not clear policies defined in the General Plan. My reading of both the General Plan that is in existence right now, done in 2000, and the General Plan update draft that was approved by the Planning Commission; if we do not keep the major growth and the plan does have growth for every community, but it says that the major growth will be in south Kaua‘i and Līhu‘e, and if you start this policy of islandwide, my question is how are you reconciling that?

Committee Chair Chock: Can you answer it this way, Ka‘āina, and if it is not satisfactory, then she can ask another question: what is the buildout projection for the ARU in each of the areas that you have identified are eligible for the ARU?

Mr. Hull: Well, we can say that with the ARU policy at an islandwide level, because in ninety-nine percent (99%) of the cases you are going to have access to a wastewater system, there are approximately fifteen thousand (15,000) properties that have access in the residential R-1 through R-8 districts to a wastewater system...excuse me, there are fifteen thousand (15,000) total properties. Of those fifteen thousand (15,000) R-1 through R-8 properties, a total of four thousand five hundred (4,500) have access to a wastewater system.

Committee Chair Chock: Do you know it by region as well?

Mr. Hull: We are breaking those numbers up now. We do not have the specific...

Committee Chair Chock: Do you know where the largest amount is?

Mr. Hull: The vast majority is in Līhu'e. The only areas that have access to a wastewater system are Waimea, 'Ele'ele/Hanapēpē, Po'ipū, Līhu'e, including Puhī and Hanamā'ulu, as well as...Kapa'a does, but you really have to take Kapa'a off of the map because the only Residential district, R1-through R-8 is actually the hospital, which they are not going to be building ARUs quite frankly. So you take Kapa'a out of the picture. Then Po'ipū has roughly thirty (30) or forty (40) Residential lots that have access to a wastewater treatment system. You can kind of take them out. The vast majority, I would say well over fifty percent (50%) is in Līhu'e, and then secondly is in Hanapēpē/'Ele'ele, and thirdly in Waimea.

Committee Chair Chock: Will you have the numbers to support what the projection is for each of these areas?

Mr. Hull: Yes, that have access to wastewater treatment systems. At the end of the day, as we have always been telling the Council, this policy whether it be in Līhu'e or islandwide is giving an entitlement to a property owner. Each one of those property owners then needs to make the assessment financially, commitment-wise, and logistically whether or not they want to construct these ARUs. But it is just giving the opportunity to them. We are not going to ever be able to give you our anticipated projected buildout, because at the end of the day, each property owner needs to make that assessment themselves. In looking at an Additional Dwelling Unit (ADU) policy that was adopted at an islandwide level thirty (30) years ago, in the Residential zoning district, there has been roughly about one thousand (1,000) units constructed over the past thirty (30) years. That comes out to roughly thirty-three (33) units a year. In the first few years of the adoption of the policy, there were not that many that went online. It was only subsequently three (3), four (4), four (5), ten (10) years after when developers, landowners, property owners were getting used to this new regime and being able to buy into it. On average, you are looking at thirty-three (33) units a year in the ADU islandwide policy within the Residential districts that have been constructed. That can be somewhat of a primer as far as looking at what we can potentially do with the ARU policy. But again, each property owner will have to make the assessment as to whether or not they are going to commit and contribute to participating in the program.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Ka'āina was able to share with me some of the maps for each of those sections and I do have a copy here, so I am happy to share that with other members if you need to take a look at this moving forward. Any further questions? If not, I will anticipate us looking at a new bill to be introduced here that would go to the Planning Commission for review, subsequently being looked at alongside this current Bill so that we have choices on the ARU, whether it will stay in Līhu'e or be looked at as islandwide approach. Any further questions? If not, I will call the meeting back to order. Would anyone like to testify on this item?

Mr. Hull: Thank you, Councilmembers.

There being no one present to provide testimony, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: Further discussion, Committee Members?
Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: Thank you. I did not want to ask Ka'āina any questions at this time since we are going to defer it, because I feel like some Councilmembers may be on a roll after that. I know that I had requested to know how many in the Lihu'e district are already following this ARU policy illegally. I went over some minutes from the early '80s when Eddie Sarita was onboard and he had some concerns. He had brought up that there were a lot in the Puhi and Hanamā'ulu areas that are illegal. I think before we pass a bill, we need to know how many of those houses are illegally already doing it, and then what are the ramifications of passing the bill? Are we going to try and put a lot of effort in to try and get them to comply to become legal? Or are we just going to allow them to continue? I think there is going to be unfairness with those that choose to become legal, they will have to have separate water, separate sewer, while the illegals are allowed to have connections to one sewer, one water. How is that fair? I feel like we need to bring fairness to the whole issue. Yes, I know nobody wants to go after the illegals, but when you pass a bill to allow it legally, I believe then it should be done, some type of action should be done to try and get them to comply. I think the fairness part will sit a little bit better with me. As far as the community groups and the testimony, there seems to be a sentiment that the Planning Department and the Planning Commission is not properly addressing the General Plan, and with the new plan coming up, I know there is going to be a lot of hoopla when it hits the Council. I think the vocal minority sometimes tends to give a picture that things are not well, things are not fair and it is very hard when you are in this seat of decision-making to know, what is the silent majority and what is the vocal minority? For me, I think as the years have gone by, I am getting a better grasp on what the silent majority wants and what the vocal minority wants. When you talk about strong statements by the Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele community association, that gives you an impression that the association is really built-up upon a strong core group of that community. When you dig in and find out that that group is made up of five (5) people, then the reality sets in that maybe this is not the vocal voice of a group or of an area. I think you have to come to that reality that not a lot of the local people do participate in these association groups. They rely on us. They rely on us, it is talking-story out there when we are out there, and telling us how they feel. They do not have time or they do not want to attend these meetings and be involved in every decision. They rely on us here. That is why they elect us to decide what the right thing to do is, and to please do it right. I appreciate having those groups of people who want to attend and want to participate. Yes, it is important, but not to say that whatever that group decides is what the community wants. That is why they elect us. That is why we vote on the laws. They expect us to go out there, and if you have true concerns, get out to the community...you know what the communities are...we campaign in every district. We have to go and do our homework, not only rely on what us group of five (5) says and say, "Okay, no good in Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele." I do not think that is how it is done.

I think there are different sides to every decision we make and I am going to make what I feel is the right decision for the whole bill when it comes down to us. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Any further discussion?

Council Chair Rapozo: I just have a process question as far as the deferral. How long do you anticipate the new bill to take?

Committee Chair Chock: I think in our discussion with the Planning Department, we already have a draft bill. So we would be able to introduce it probably within the next three (3) weeks. If it is approved to move forward, it will be deferred of course to the Planning Commission, of which we are not sure how long it would take. That is why this request here to defer is really open-ended.

Council Chair Rapozo: I guess I would rather see a date on here, even if it is three (3) months. Open-ended, as we saw a few years ago, we had quite a bit of open-ended deferrals and I just want to make sure that there is some kind of date-specific, if possible.

Committee Chair Chock: I would ask for some guidance from maybe the Planning Department, as their process at the Planning Commission so that we can estimate a date and make that formal. I will suspend the rules.

There being no objections, the rules were suspended.

Mr. Hull: Good morning again, Ka'āina Hull, on behalf of the Planning Department. Say a bill was introduced in two (2) weeks, just public notification process and hearing process at the Planning Commission-level would take no less than three (3) months. In all honestly...if we are going to have a specific date, I would request a four (4) month deferral, quite frankly, just to vet it through the process. It could, in all honesty, take longer than that. There could be substantial discussions happening at the Planning Commission level, which would require a longer amount of time, but I think a four-month projection is a fair window and if it does get approved to go from this body to go to the Planning Commission and it takes longer, then we will come back to inform this body of such.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Thank you. Does that answer your question?

Council Chair Rapozo: That would just be my suggestion that we put a date on this so that it does not go into cyberspace.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. I will call the meeting back to order. If we could identify a four-month date at this time.

There being no objections, the meeting was called back to order, and proceeded as follows:

Committee Chair Chock: Committee Members, any further questions about this deferral? They will work on a date. I just wanted to say also that I have not seen the response yet from the Planning Department for Councilmember Yukimura's question, so I just want to make sure that that does get addressed, in terms of the committees or organizations that were presented to, if there is a vote, no-vote, the overall feedback, and the specific questions that were asked at that meeting. I am sure Councilmember Yukimura can collaborate on her request. I will turn the floor over to her for discussion. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: I was just informed by staff that we have not yet received the report. I thought I was the only one who did not read it, but in fact, we have not yet received it. We received one in April listing the organizations that were talked to, but I do not know if that is a complete list. I wanted to know the process and procedure, how the presentation was made, and how the conclusions were arrived at, based on data gathered, although I am not real clear how the data was gathered or whether there was a consistent way of gathering it. Yes, I feel like we should have that report.

Committee Chair Chock: I concur. Thank you. Any further discussion?

Councilmember Yukimura: Yes, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Continue.

Councilmember Yukimura: I want to thank you, Chair, for helping condense my question down to a very concrete question. I will be reading both General Plans again, because it seems to me that in both cases, and it is an idea that has endured a long time, there is an awareness that if we spread out growth to just evenly across the island that the kind of traffic that will be created will be debilitating to the operations and functionality of this island. We are also seeing it in Wailua/Kapa'a where the bypass idea was dropped because it will cost six hundred million dollars (\$600,000,000) and there is no way we were going to get that kind of money. If we start a second city in Hanapēpē/Ēle'ele as it seems like, the General Plan update is moving toward without real discussion about the implications of that. The kind of traffic that is going to be created from the west side is going to become like Wailua/Kapa'a traffic and there is going to be issues about Kalāheo town having a four-lane highway in it and what that is going to do to the town, the same discussions we are having about Kapa'a town. That is not planning for our island so that it can be a thriving, functional, wonderful community that it presently is and we want it to continue to be. So I would hope that the Planning Department will give us an analysis of this particular proposed policy as it relates to the overall development of our island, as it fits or does not fit with our General Plan.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Further discussion?
Councilmember Brun.

Councilmember Brun: This islandwide bill—this is the same thing that happened last week at the Land Use Commission. We are anti-building on the west side. Living in Waimea, there are five hundred (500) students at Waimea High School. It is just crazy. When we were there, there was eight hundred (800) to nine hundred (900) students. I do not understand why we are so against building on the west side. In Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele, there is not one (1) person who came up to me and said, “Do not do it. Do not do this area.” I had people come to me and say that this is a great idea and it is going to help them out and why only Līhu‘e could do that. That was the main thing with the first one, was why only Līhu‘e? What about us? This is giving them a chance to build. If you do not want to build, then do not build. This will help bring housing and this will help families so the kids can come and stay with the parents and do what we can do to get them back home, instead of moving to the mainland. We need to push this through and we are going to introduce that new ARU bill for the whole island, probably in two (2) weeks. Thank you.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Further discussion?
Councilmember Yukimura.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you. I am really thankful, Councilmember Brun, for the points you have made, because my position is not against development on the west side. In fact, I supported the first phase of Lima Ola, which is about one hundred thirty (130) units, I believe, and added to Habitat for Humanity’s one hundred twenty-five (125) units—that is two hundred fifty-five (255) units that will be additional already to Hanapēpē. My advocacy has been for actually affordable housing in Waimea town, where there are presently water and sewer...actually, more infrastructure exists in Waimea than in ‘Ele‘ele/Hanapēpē at this point and their kids can just walk to Waimea High School and Waimea Canyon School. In fact, the families that live there can walk to almost any place there. It is closer to the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) and my position has been that we should distribute the five hundred fifty-five (555) units that are proposed for Lima Ola to other parts of the west side, including Hanapēpē Heights, where there are four hundred (400) lots. It would be wonderful if our Housing Agency could partner with the Department of Hawaiian Homelands (DHHL) and try to bring some housing there, which would be more convenient for agricultural workers who are working west of that. It is not a question of for or against housing on the west side; it is a question of where is it best and where can it best function? The other reason is not putting all affordable housing in one place. I think if we have mixes of incomes and backgrounds, we have a more vital community, socioeconomically. So that is what I am advocating, good planning and more housing for the west side.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you. Councilmember Kagawa.

Councilmember Kagawa: The other thing, having lived in the west side my whole life, I know what the traffic is about. A lot of the traffic from the west side occurs because of the development in Po'ipū and Kōloa. So to say, "Well, if we build on the west side, you are going to mess up traffic"—if you build more in Po'ipū and Kōloa, you are adding more to the west side traffic. Let us not just pick on Hanapēpē/‘Ele‘ele or Waimea or what have you. I think you are just ignoring the fact that there are other areas that are contributing, like Po'ipū/Kōloa, which you are advocating for that are causing the traffic. You cannot solve the traffic problem by just picking on one (1) area and just eliminating that area. To me, it is not fair.

Committee Chair Chock: Okay. Any further discussion? I would like us to move away from the back and forth on perspective. However, I will allow you to discuss further, given the amount of time you have.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you. The back and forth is part of a discussion that makes for more informed decision-making.

Committee Chair Chock: Hold on, I understand that. I think it is the approach that matters. Please, be cognizant of what that approach is from around the table. I am not just speaking to you, I am speaking to everyone. Thank you.

Councilmember Yukimura: Thank you. I appreciate Councilmember Kagawa's point, because the very idea is to have some affordable housing close to jobs, which would then cut down on the traffic. That is why I am really glad that we are breaking ground on the one hundred thirty (130) affordable homes in the heart of Po'ipū, but that is what would cut down on traffic a lot. A lot of people on the west side work in Līhu'e and south Kaua'i. Not everybody wants to live there, but to the extent that people are looking for affordable housing, having some affordable housing in these areas is very critical.

Committee Chair Chock: Further discussion? Councilmember Kawakami.

Councilmember Kawakami: I just have one point. I think we tend to look at things in silos and I think this ARU Bill is just a small piece of the puzzle in solving the housing crisis. When we take a look at past history, we tried to help out with farm worker housing and there was a great fear that all of this Agricultural land was going to be turned into Residential, and it has not. Even with the current ADU policy, it has not been maximized. So I think when I am listening to the Planning Department, it is hard for them to forecast, because like what they said, it comes down to basic economics, whether a homeowner or landowner is going to be willing to invest in the infrastructure that is required or whether it makes sense for them to build another unit? Maybe they do not want to, maybe they have no kids, and maybe they have no interest in taking away some of their greenspace on their own property, but it is a small piece of the puzzle. The traffic issue is a symptom of our zoning. When we decided as a County and as a nation to cut up our zoning and put all of the commercial in one area and all of the residential in one area, that is what it is. If we

want to address traffic, maybe we should talk about rezoning some of our Agricultural lands so that we can have mixed-use, smart growth communities, live, work, and play areas. Let us not try to get stuck on just the ARU Bill and look at it in this one little silo when it is only a small piece of the puzzle. I think we need to look a few steps back and holistically see that this is just a small piece. I totally agree—when you take a look at where we should be developing, it should be in Līhu‘e. We have a lot of potential in Līhu‘e, but in no means should it be the sole focus. Lima Ola is great. When you talk to west side communities, they are not interested in moving to Līhu‘e. They are interested in living next to their moms and dads so that the kids can run over next door. I think we are getting stuck at times on the small pieces that solve the whole problem, so I think I am very interested. I would like to note that it is hard to put a timeline when we go out for community feedback because we cannot predict, but at the end of the day—and I think Councilmember Kagawa hit the nail on the head—as elected officials, we have to make those tough decisions because the hardest thing to embrace is change. Whether it is good change or bad change, just any type of change is hard to build advocacy behind, even if it is for a good purpose. I think moving forward, getting the community involved is going to be a key component. We also have to realize that what we present at the end of the day, if they are not willing to hear it, how are we getting good feedback? If the organization is saying, “Hey, you only have one (1) minute and that is it,” how do you actually sell the program and take that into account when they say, “Now, we do not want it.” I look forward to this journey. I am seeing an islandwide policy. I think it is the right way to go. I do not think it is fair for other communities to be left out of this opportunity. I think it is part of our job and incumbent upon us to go push forward if we believe that this is the right solution. Thank you, Chair.

Committee Chair Chock: Thank you very much. Anyone else? I just wanted to acknowledge that I did get a response here from the Planning Department, so if you have further questions in regards to this response, please send that in writing and we can anticipate the next bill coming forth. Can I get a deferral to the first Committee Meeting in January 2018, please?

Councilmember Kagawa moved to defer Bill No. 2627, Draft 3 to the First Committee Meeting in January 2018, seconded by Councilmember Kawakami, and unanimously carried.

The Committee proceeded on its agenda item, as shown in the following Committee Report, which is incorporated herein by reference:

CR-PL 2017-08: on Bill No. 2655

A BILL FOR AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 8, KAUA‘I COUNTY CODE 1987, AS AMENDED, TO ALLOW FOR THE CREATION OF A NEW UNIVERSITY DISTRICT (*County of Kaua‘i Planning Department, Applicant*) **(Approved.)**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Codie K. Yamauchi
Council Services Assistant I

APPROVED at the Committee Meeting held on July 19, 2017:



MASON K. CHOCK
Chair, PL Committee