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PURPOSE: To gather public input on the draft plans and proposed guidelines for the various neighborhoods within the Lihu‘e Town Core.

The main discussion points, comments and questions that followed the presentation are summarized below:

1. Funding Sources: B. Tokioka wanted to verify that part of the project will include potential funding sources for any improvement projects. PBR affirmed that a list of potential funding sources will be included in the report.

2. Closing ‘Eiwa Street: C. Kawakami is still opposed to closing ‘Eiwa Street. He wondered why no one else was complaining or showing up at meetings. PBR noted that the public survey was distributed at the previous public meeting and was posted up on the County’s website for over a month. Meeting announcements and the draft plans were sent to the Lihu‘e Business Association and the Kaua‘i Chamber of Commerce memberships. He acknowledged that if people were not coming out, either they are okay with it or do not care. PBR also added that the closing of ‘Eiwa would not happen alone nor in the first phase of the Civic Center project. Other roadway improvements would need to be implemented before ‘Eiwa Street could be closed, such as a traffic signal at Hardy and Kūhiō and the roundabout at Hardy and ‘Umi Streets. C. Trembath did not think that closing ‘Eiwa was a good idea and that it should be made right-in, right-out only to improve it. He added that the parades use that street to park all their vehicles and horses. PBR responded that access for special events like the parades will still be allowed via the wide pedestrian path.
provided in the plan that matched up with the current location of ‘Eiwa Street at Rice.\(^1\)

3. D. Zachary asked if we could take a step back to talk about the plan. She really liked the proposed improvements [of the Urban Design Plan] and the excitement it could generate for Līhu’e. She liked the pedestrian-friendliness of the plan and suggested that canopies should be provided along sidewalks to shelter people from Kaua‘i’s rainy weather. Her main concern was that with the cost of improved parking lots and structures she was afraid that people would have to pay for parking. She felt parking in Līhu’e should remain free to the public. PBR responded that that would be a County decision based on the financials of the improvements, but that they will take that into consideration.

4. In its presentation, PBR recommended emphasizing “green” building design as one of its core principles and C. Trembath asked what was meant by “green” architecture. PBR responded that there are several ways architects could incorporate sustainable design into their buildings including energy efficient lighting and mechanical systems, use of renewable resources and recycled building materials, using rainwater catchment to irrigate landscaping, and so forth. There is a national organization called the US Green Building Council that certifies projects based on meeting certain standards. The more green the building, the higher the LEED rating. Mr. Trembath responded that those were good ideas and that Kaua‘i should try to become more energy self-sufficient. Kaua‘i used to be but with the closing of the mills like the Līhu’e Mill that used to burn bagasse to make energy, Kaua‘i has become much more dependent on oil for electricity.

5. A participant inquired as to why a wider build-to line requirement is provided on the mauka side of Kūhiō Highway as opposed to the makai side of the roadway. PBR explained that the 20-foot build-to line requirement for the mauka side is based on a precedent set through earlier design requirements

---

\(^1\) It should be noted that earlier in the presentation, results from the public survey were presented and that 17 of 53 respondents (32 percent) had positive comments for the Civic Center draft master plan, 10 (18.8 percent) had negative comments and 26 (49 percent) provided neutral comments or did not comment on the plan. The main concerns of the negative comments were the amount and maintenance requirements of the landscaping, the homeless, no need for bike paths, too much green space/not enough parking, and better ties to culture/history. Three respondents specifically noted that they liked the idea of closing ‘Eiwa Street, while none specifically opposed it in their written comments. In a survey of the County staff, Līhu’e Business Association, and Kaua‘i Chamber of Commerce done at the beginning of the Civic Center project, 22 of 46 respondents supported closing ‘Eiwa Street, 9 opposed, 2 supported a partial closure, 1 thought it should be realigned with ‘Akahi Street, and 10 did not know/needed more information.
established for this side of the roadway. Because of this, the buildings on the mauka side of the roadway have already been setback farther in comparison to the makai side. For the makai side, there is more private ownership of lands and less land available in the public right-of-way. As a result, the planning team tried to provide a consistent build-to line on both sides of the roadway that does not encroach too much into private property, yet allows for providing a more comfortable walking environment along the road.

6. C. Trembath recommended that the plan should create a Hawaiian sense of place. Examples would be using Hawaiian words on informational and directional signs (‘akau, hema, etc.). He also was not sure about the idea of using quilt patterns in the streets for crosswalks in order to portray a Hawaiian sense of place. P. Griffin stood up and noted that it was a small group of the CAC that came up with these ideas about the quilt pattern design for the pedestrian crossings. More thought and feedback from the community should be held with regards to this during the design stage of the project.

7. A participant noted that visibility is very bad coming out of the side streets along Rice Street. The street trees are becoming a visibility problem with the trees getting bigger.

8. Another participant suggested that perhaps there could be some type of trolley system to eliminate some cars.

9. Many participants remarked that the sketches presented were helpful in illustrating the vision for Lihue’.

10. Timeline: The following estimated timeline for the project was provided:
    Planning Commission = 2 – 3 months
    County Government= 6+ months
    Total time is estimated= 1 year

11. A participant asked if cost estimates will be provided. PBR responded that order-of-magnitude costs would be provided and that they would work together with the County and CAC on prioritizing any public expenditure.