Approved – 5/12/20

Hawaii Interagency Council for Transit-Oriented Development

Minutes of Meeting No. 34

Tuesday, February 11, 2020
9:30 am
Hawaii Community Development Authority
Community Room, 1st Floor
547 Queen Street, Honolulu, Hawaii

Members/ Designees Present:	Mary Alice Evans, Office of Planning (OP), Co-Chair Deepak Neupane, Hawaii Housing Finance & Development Corporation (HHFDC), Co-Chair Sara Lin, Office of the Governor Chris Kinimaka, Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS) Robyn Loudermilk, Department of Education (DOE) Darrell Ing, Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) Heidi Hansen Smith, Department of Health (DOH) Malia Taum-Deenik, Department of Human Services (DHS) Russell Tsuji, Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Wayne Takara, Department of Public Safety (PSD) Benjamin Park, Hawaii Public Housing Authority (HPHA) John Fink, Stadium Authority (SA) Harrison Rue, City & County of Honolulu (City) April Surprenant, County of Hawaii Betty Lou Larson, Catholic Charities, Housing Advocate Bill Brizee, AHL, Developer Representative
Members/ Designees Excused:	Jade Butay, Department of Transportation (DOT) Executive Director, Hawaii Community Development Authority (HCDA) David Lassner, University of Hawaii (UH) Representative Henry Aquino, House of Representatives Senator Lorraine Inouye, State Senate Jodi Higuchi Sayegusa, County of Kauai Pam Eaton, County of Maui Cyd Miyashiro, Business Representative Ryan Okahara, U.S. Housing & Urban Development, Honolulu Office (HUD) (Ex-officio)
Other Designees/ Alternates Present:	David DePonte, DAGS Ian Hirokawa, DLNR
TOD Council Staff:	Rodney Funakoshi, OP Ruby Edwards, OP Carl Miura, OP Aaron Setogawa, OP
Guests:	Nathalie Razo, PBR Hawaii

George Atta, HCDA
Lauren Yasaka, DLNR
Franz Kraintz, City & County of Honolulu
Ty Shiramizu, Office of Representative Nadine Nakamura
Abbey Snyder, UNITE HERE Local 5
Veronica Rocha, Essential Leap

1. **Call to Order**
Deepak Neupane, Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

2. **Introduction of Members**
Members and guests introduced themselves.

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes of January 14, 2020 Meeting**
It was moved by Bill Brizee, seconded by Malia Taum-Deenik and unanimously voted to approve the January 14, 2020 meeting minutes as circulated.

4. **State TOD Planning and Implementation Project, Oahu - Project Report**
Presentation by Nathalie Razo and Ann Bouslog, PBR Hawaii
Nathalie Razo went over the purpose of the project, which included coordinating anticipated land use for priority area State agency and major landowners, assessing regional infrastructure needs and costs, identifying funding and financing options and best practices for TOD implementation, and identifying sustainable development and resiliency approaches for TOD and TOD infrastructure development.

The project has two phases. The first phase was to develop a Preferred Land Use Scenario for future TOD for each priority area. This was necessary to determine the infrastructure needs to support State TOD. Phase 2, which focuses broadly on infrastructure financing and delivery options is nearing its completion. A number of Project Coordinating Committee (PCC) and Permitted Interaction Group (PIGS) meetings have been held over the course of the project to get State agency and stakeholder input on regional infrastructure needs, infrastructure costs, and financing options.

The project examined transit-oriented development project plans and opportunities on State-owned lands in three TOD priority areas along the rail corridor: East Kapolei, Halawa-Stadium, and Iwilei-

Kapalama. Based on the development scenarios that were created in conjunction with landowners, proposed TOD development in these three areas has the potential to provide:

- 47,000+ new/rebuilt homes, disproportionally affordable
- New and improved community facilities
- A new stadium and a New Aloha Stadium Entertainment District (NASED)
- Revenues for mission-driven State agencies
- Connection to employment centers
- Reduced transportation costs, congestion, and energy consumption
- Preservation of agricultural lands and the country character of rural Oahu
- Development values in Phase 1 alone could exceed $10.3 billion in 2019 dollars.

Several key assumptions were made for the project analysis. Any significant change in these assumptions could change the capacity requirements, cost, and timing of project infrastructure needs and costs developed under the project. These assumptions are:

- There is no change in land use policy as set out in underlying City sustainable communities plans and neighborhood TOD plans. If development densities are increased and more residential development is sought in each area, then the infrastructure requirements will need to be modified.
- Infrastructure needs and costs are based on current technologies. If new technologies enter the market that promote more efficient water usage or increases in sewerage capacity, then the cost estimates will change.

East Kapolei TOD Priority Area. For the East Kapolei priority area, the preferred land use alternative is to proceed with current conceptual land use plans of the various landowners. Rather than increase connectivity, the recommendation for area transportation infrastructure was to improve currently planned connections and intersections. Under the preferred alternative, estimated development for Phase 1 over the next ten years is for over 9,700 residential units, 3.4 million square feet of commercial space, 1.19 million of industrial space, and approximately 180 hotel rooms. Anticipated buildout in 20-40 years will yield over 18,000 residential units, 8.3 million square feet of commercial space, 2.8 million square feet of industrial space, and over 350 new hotel rooms.

Betty Lou Larson asked whether the residential units are single family homes. Razo responded that it is a combination of single-family homes and residential mid- to high-rise based on what each landowner shared. Funakoshi clarified that this analysis included both State and private lands; the Hoopili project is developing single family homes. In response to a question from Franz Kraintz, Razo pointed out that the mixed-use area is located around the UH West Oahu transit station. Ka Makana Alii was included in the existing calculation of commercial space because of its proximity to DHHL properties. Harrison Rue noted that the City's draft East Kapolei Neighborhood TOD Plan does not extend to some of these areas.

Unlike other areas, Razo explained that development is already underway, so the numbers in Phase 1 are higher. In addition, the infrastructure is already master planned and distributed to different landowners, so either allocation among landowners needs to be adjusted to accommodate any new proposed development or additional infrastructure upgrades will be needed if the new proposals increase projected density in the region. While overall population will not change, the assumption is the population will shift closer to TOD areas in the coming years.

In this area, most of the infrastructure planning will be for new development, as opposed to Iwilei-Kapalama, where the effort will be addressing existing deficits like the ongoing power shortage. For example, Honolulu Community College (HCC) cannot build one of its facilities due to the lack of sewerage capacity. Rue added that it has the most deficits because it is an older area with big blocks. Larson asked if district systems can be integrated into the $200 million being considered for appropriation for infrastructure development around UH West Oahu or into this planning study. Razo responded that the numbers were calculated based on current conditions with government or private developers fronting the money. From ARUP's presentation at the last TOD Council meeting, an outside investor might be able to pay for and install a district system and get paid back over time.

Larson wants this Council to focus on changing the way government has been traditionally funding infrastructure investment. For example, the modular approach appears to have more flexibility. She hopes the Council will push for it.

For the East Kapolei infrastructure costs, Razo said they identified projects that only had construction costs without soft costs associated with it. They also included projects that already had funding on a 3-year or 6-year Capital Improvement Program schedule. For Phase 1, the total infrastructure costs will be about $969.4 million with $729.5 million already committed to projects, which includes Farrington Highway widening and regional water system improvements. The overall infrastructure cost for buildout is about $2.6 billion.

Larson asked if the future housing projects in the area are going to be disproportionately affordable: what are the price points, what are projects targeting, and how does this meet State goals for affordable housing. Razo answered that the study did not get to this level of detail. Some assumptions were made as to what percentage of State-owned land would be dedicated to affordable housing, but not what area median income (AMI) group was being served or numbers of units by AMI. Rue explained that the assumption on affordable units is needed because it would not be contributing financially to the State. Razo explained that the financial analysis examined affordable units based on the fiscal impact on State and City tax revenues, i.e., what taxes they might be exempt from, and if construction is exempt from the general excise tax.

Halawa-Stadium TOD Priority Area. For the Halawa-Stadium priority area, the preferred alternative is to have the stadium redevelopment on site with additional ancillary mixed-use development, maxed out density at Puuwai Momi, and increased public school capacity. It also assumes that Oahu Community Correctional Center (OCCC) relocates to Halawa, and that there are no changes to federal lands and existing single-family homes in the area. The City's draft Halawa Area TOD Plan includes future development at the former Kmart and Ice Palace properties, which were included in the infrastructure needs assessment.

Under the development scenario modeled for the study, Phase 1 could see a net new development of about 1,400 residential units, 0.3 million square feet of commercial/mixed use development, and approximately 230 hotel rooms. Total buildout for the priority area over the next 20-40 years could yield a total of 7,070 residential units, 1.7 million in commercial space, approximately 230 hotel rooms, as well as a new stadium.

One of the big issues for this area is sewer system capacity. The Halawa-Stadium area is at the eastern edge of the Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant (Honouliuli WWTP) service area. When the stadium redevelops, it can only build to the current sewer system capacity. Ancillary development will depend on what remains of this capacity until the sewer lines to the Honouliuli WWTP are upgraded, which is projected to take until 2045 to complete.

Mary Alice Evans asked whether there was any flexibility to consider connecting to the Sand Island WWTP. Rue said that the City's consultants did not think it was possible as they once thought, but he will ask them again. Kinimaka said the cost would be too high. Razo added that there are coordination issues because the pipes will have to go through lands owned by the federal government. In work being done for the Honouliuli WWTP lines, it's taken time to get access to do preliminary work on federal property.

Razo noted that another alternative is to do a district system onsite, which could resolve some of the capacity issues. However, this will need further coordination with the Department of Health and other agencies. Rue emphasized that this is a planning study: to answer these kind of questions, agencies will need to do more engineering studies to examine these issues.

The cost of infrastructure for Phase 1, the first ten years, is $385 million, which is lower than East Kapolei. Since most of the work in this area is in the planning stage, the cost will increase once more development activity gets going. About $271.3 million in funding is already committed to Phase 1 projects. Sea level rise is not expected to be a problem for this area.

Iwilei-Kapalama TOD Priority Area. For the Iwilei-Kapalama area, one of the challenges is sea level rise. Mitigation costs will be higher based on an order of magnitude analysis and adaptation pathway hypotheticals. In developing the preferred alternative, they used the land use development scenario and TOD zoning in the City's adopted Kalihi and Downtown Neighborhood TOD Plans without sea level rise as a baseline. The area will need additional public school capacity. It also assumes that OCCC is relocated to Halawa and the property is rezoned for TOD. The Iwilei-Kapalama area is different because a lot of it will be torn down and rebuilt, so modeling was more complex.

There are currently about 8,810 residential units and 19.7 million square feet of commercial space in the area. Based on the anticipated development plan, it will lose some industrial space. Under the preferred alternative, estimated new development for Phase 1 over the next ten years will add 6,950 new residential units, over 1 million square feet of new commercial space, and over 1.4 million of new industrial space. Total anticipated buildout in 20-40 years would result in 24,870 total residential units, a total of 20 million square feet of commercial space, and a total of 2.1 million square feet of industrial space. The anticipated development numbers were based on plans for identified State properties and major landowners. Public projects in the area include HCC, Kapalama Canal, Mayor Wright homes, and HPHA's School Street Administrative Offices, all of which are currently moving forward.

The cost of infrastructure for Phase 1 will be about $444.6 million. Currently, approximately $240.6 million is already committed to projects. As discussed previously, this area has a number of deficits that need to be addressed in addition to new infrastructure.

Infrastructure funding and financing options. For the financing and funding mechanisms, the team focused on tools that could serve all three priority areas to allow a more comprehensive approach to financing infrastructure needs along the rail corridor. Ann Bouslog said the total cost of regional infrastructure investments needed is approximately $5.5 billion with all three phases. The cost of Phase 1 is nearly $1.8 billion with East Kapolei having the highest cost at $910 million. They already have a lot of activity going on compared to the other areas. In the Halawa-Stadium and Iwilei-Kapalama, sewer and roadway and complete streets improvements are the major expenses. For East Kapolei, roadway and complete streets improvements take up the largest share of funding needs.

Some of the infrastructure cost items in Phase 1 are already funded with $1.24 billion from traditional sources like General Obligation and Revenue Bonds. However, this leaves an estimated $560 million that needs to be covered by other sources of revenue. If the amount is broken down further, $170 million would go to fund existing infrastructure deficits and $386 million would go towards new construction. For example, roadway and complete streets improvements need about $365 million and electrical system upgrades require about $60 million.

As a reminder, Bouslog pointed out that 40,000 new homes are planned in these three TOD areas. With the housing demand around 60,000 on Oahu, this could be a large part of meeting the shortage if it is built. A disproportionate amount could be affordable since much of it will be on State lands. The vertical value of the development is approximately $10.3 billion, not including the new stadium, schools, and new facilities at UH-West Oahu or HCC. This is a lot of created value to leave on the table if using value capture is not considered in financing infrastructure needs.

For a project to be financeable now, it needs a clear revenue stream in the future. Financing is raising the upfront capital to pay project costs. Funding is the revenue stream in the future to repay the financing. In selecting a public finance alternative model, they assumed no reduction to existing public revenues. The four types of financing alternatives the consultant team looked at are:

- Value-Capture: One-time State general excise tax (GET) on construction in TOD areas.
- Value-Capture: Allocation of incremental amount of GET resulting from new expenditures or sales from retail sales, commercial/industrial space rents, and hotel room revenues.
- Value-Capture: Capture share of incremental increase in real property tax revenue as a result of the new development in TOD areas.
- Community Facilities District (CFDs): District authorized by property owners and the City to levy special taxes to fund public improvements.

The framework for the financing model used a corridor approach and focused only on Phase 1 infrastructure development needs for TOD projects coming on line in the next ten years (2020-2029). The goal is to fund the unfunded portion of $560 million (2019 dollars). The financing model tested combinations of various alternative mechanisms. East Kapolei is going very strong now with Hoopili set to be completed by 2030. At that point, development may shift to lands owned by UH West Oahu or DLNR. If the development schedule and financing needs of all three areas are considered together across various jurisdictions, each area might be able to help fund infrastructure needs in other areas and vice versa depending on the development cycle. It would be a lot more difficult to make the numbers work if it is done by individual area.

The estimated funding yield from the financing alternatives will be able to cover the $560 million funding gap. A one-time construction GET would be applied as new facilities are developed in the three priority areas. Revenues may start to flow in earlier as construction projects begin. This revenue stream would last only about 10 years or during the buildout. For recurring GET, it is a robust source levied on most transactions. However, it is unpredictable and difficult to bond. Also, the yields will not be coming in until facilities are operational. For incremental real property tax (RPT), the revenue source is more predictable but start flowing once facilities are operational. This funding source can be bonded. Yields are delayed until facilities are operational and assessments updated. Public facilities and affordable housing are exempt from real property taxes. Also, it is important to work with the City to ensure that new real property tax revenues are also directed to provide and maintain many critical City services. The following is the estimated funding yield between 2020-2040:

- Construction GET: $0.3 billion at 100% capture
- Recurring GET. $0.49 billion at 50% capture
- Incremental GET: $0.08 billion at 30% capture

Taum-Deenik asked how the value capture mechanism works for a location. Bouslog responded that the structure and how it would be implemented would still need to be worked out. But as an example, in New York City's Hudson Yards project, the tenant say store owner would pay the sales tax to the developer and the developer would make payments to the City as stipulated in its development agreement with the City.

Lin inquired what are the next steps and are there recommendations that the Council can make to lawmaker and what political barriers would need to be overcome. Bouslog responded that it is the team's hope that the TOD Council pursues some of the work resulting from the study and develops recommendations along the lines outline in the study. She anticipates that the final report will outline the steps that need to be taken, but more specific decisions and studies will need to be made in consultation with legal counsel. Rue added that it is going to be complex and take at least a couple of years to set up a structure between City, State, and private entities. Everyone needs to be all in on developing the infrastructure in the early phases.

Lin mentioned that while the group is moving ahead with infrastructure, there is no comprehensive plan like having different agencies take the lead at each station. Ruby Edwards pointed to the State-City collaborative work being done in the Iwilei-Kapalama area around various infrastructure improvement needs. This effort could be a good model for how to do this elsewhere on Oahu and even the Neighbor Islands in terms of how to get State-County collaboration on regional infrastructure issues. HHFDC and the City are developing an Iwilei-Kapalama Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Other financing tools can be added into that discussion. Rue mentioned that the City did 2-3 years of work in researching the use of a CFD in the Iwilei-Kapalama area but ran up against the State-owned lands. Neupane suggested that utility companies will pay a portion of the electricity infrastructure. Also, some of costs can be transferred to landowners through an improvement district type of mechanism. For example, 30 percent of the State's improvement cost in Kakaako was paid by developers since they were going to be benefiting from the improvements. Rue mentioned that the MOU for Iwilei-Kapalama specified that formula can include private land owners. Neupane said that even though the discussion on the MOU started with the City and State, he is talking with Kamehameha Schools and HPHA. Lin said this is very good, but she is expecting that this kind of collaboration will need to happen systematically at all 13 stations.

Bouslog is hopeful that one of the takeaways from this experience has been to reinforce the interagency, interjurisdictional conversation and a commitment to do it throughout the system.

Forty-eight thousand homes and $10.3 billion in development are something the State cannot afford to ignore. While some may not agree with the financing tools, the consultant team tried to offer ones that are viable and work for infrastructure. CFDs are a good tool but not as good for infrastructure. It creates higher taxes in an area and puts a property at a disadvantage from one across the street that may share the same sewer line. It is also complicated because it involves getting approval from the landowners and the City Council.

She also pointed out that GET is harder to bond because it is a little more unpredictable. As far as real property taxes, the revenue source is a lot more consistent once the facility is built. In Hawaii, property taxes are very low compared to other jurisdictions. In order to get a good pool of money, the increase will need to be about 50-60 percent. CFDs are used successfully in areas where schools are funded at the county level.

Based on a cash flow perspective in Scenario 1, revenue from selected value capture tools will not balance out until around 2035. The cost of building Phase 1 infrastructure is $0.56 billion, which is only the unfunded portion. The actual amount is $1.8 billion. Initially, the cash flow from construction GET comes in with retail and other types of GET revenue sources replacing it later on. During the first five years, the project balance sheets are going to be about $250 million – $270 million short. The State and City have already funded $1.2 billion. This would mean that the State would need to fund an additional $40 - $50 million. While the State is capable of using the same CIP funds, she hopes there is some kind of mechanism in place for financing improvements.

Razo noted that this is only dealing with Phase 1 infrastructure. However, if Phase 2 gets started around 2030, then the numbers will be different.

Taum-Deenik suggested that this conversation may need to be repeated every two to four years because leadership changes rapidly and memory fades.

In response to a questions from Wayne Takara, Bouslog explained that maintenance was not factored into the figures, the numbers are just for construction. Based on his experience, Takara noted that paying for maintenance will always come up and he believes it should be given some consideration in the financing plan. She said some of the surplus can be used towards maintenance costs, but it is not enough.

During the PIG and Project Coordinating Committee meetings, a GET surcharge for Oahu was suggested in order to enhance Scenario 1's financing gap and long-term funding. Both visitors and residents will pay for the ongoing infrastructure needs. However, it can be regressive to certain populations. Factors to consider are:

- Allocate these monies to public/regional infrastructure needs of the TOD Priority Areas.
- 0.10% of State GET revenues on Oahu for ten years meets goals.
- If implemented as a surcharge, it will not impact revenues available to State general fund or other uses, but it will represent a rate increase to taxpayers.
- Surcharge could sunset once initial gap funding needs are met.

Using this method (Scenario 2), David Taussig and Associates (DTA) analysis showed a very robust revenue source over a period of ten years. The surcharge would generate about $50 million a year or $500 million over 10 years. There would be no deficit and a $300 million surplus will develop around 2030 assuming that the State is coming through with existing CIP funds. It will be difficult to sell the idea to the public, but TOD is of island-wide interest. The surplus can also fund future phases of infrastructure implementation.

In addition to being unpredictable, the State GET on construction projects comes early and GET on operations comes later, especially in Phase 1. GET on construction is exempt on affordable homes and other types of public facilities like schools, the prison, and stadium. The TOD areas are more publicly oriented compared to places like Kakaako. Under the current real property tax rules, if a multi-family high rise building is built with 20 percent affordable housing and 80 percent market, then the entire building gets a real property exemption depending on how long it remains affordable. The models did take this into account.

Neupane added that affordable rentals are exempt from GET too. In response to a question, Rue explained that for-profit enterprises on State land do pay GET.

The consultant team believes that a new value capture tool can be accomplished through a Payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT) model, using a P3 and/or a public agency with a special fund that collects revenue from PILOTs or other means to pay debt on infrastructure. The team did not believe CFDs would be a worthwhile tool to use in this type of development.

Other types of revenue sources suggested by PIG members included legalizing and taxing marijuana, lotteries, and gambling. These were not studied because they involve changing State law and the creation of new taxes.

5. TOD-related Legislation

Funakoshi reviewed TOD-related bills being considered by the Legislature this session. A handout of the list of bills being monitored was distributed. The bills are summarized below.

1. <u>HB 2252</u> Appropriates funds for certain transit-oriented development projects; not heard and is dead.

2. <u>HB 2284</u> Establishes a three-year innovative procurement pilot program through the State Procurement Office and Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS); not heard and is dead.

3. <u>HB 2495</u> Requires HECO to install underground utility lines for affordable housing in TOD; deferred.

4. <u>HB 2542</u> Omnibus Housing bill to fund infrastructure for housing is still alive.

5. <u>HB 2589</u> Appropriates funds for planning a mixed-use residential development, including 1 or more parking structures, on the land currently occupied by the Waipahu Civic Center; dead.

6. <u>HB 2617</u> County of Kauai's CIP Package, which includes funding for the Mahelona Hospital EIS, which is a Strategic Plan TOD Project; alive.

7. <u>SB 2054</u> Proposes a surcharge on property taxes for infrastructure development in TOD areas, requires a constitutional amendment to enable surcharge; alive.

8. SB 2074 The predecessor to SB 2054 which allows the legislature to place a surcharge on real property taxes; passed with amendments.

9. SB 2205 Establishes Important Housing Lands similar to Important Agricultural Lands. Tsuji expressed concerns whether the bill's intent is for all of the State lands within a half-mile of the station or just a parcel. Funakoshi noted that it excludes all urban lands. All of the lands along rail are urban except for drainage and wetland areas; alive.

10. SB 2210 Gives HHFDC the right of first refusal for State lands within a half-mile of a rail station. It is deferred until this afternoon.

11. SB 2214 Requires State and County agencies to issue ministerial permits for housing development projects that meet certain requirements within 60-days. Possibly problematic from the City's standpoint. Affordable housing oriented, but it has not been heard yet.

12. SB 2396 Requires a certain percentage of affordable housing units. Allows the Office of Planning to make exceptions to the affordable housing requirement. It is a carryover bill. It targets 80 percent and below AMI. OP has recommended amendments in consultation with HHFDC to have the option of assessing the feasibility of doing this; alive.

13. SB 2616 Exempts affordable housing from the school impact fee requirements for affordable housing developed by HPHA, a 50 percent discount; alive.

14. SB 2640 Amends the State Plan to require streamlined approvals for high density housing near rail stations. Both OP and City expressed concerns over regulatory and permitting issues; deferred.

15. SB 2645 Requires 20,000 housing units at the stadium. No hearing has been scheduled. Lin suggested that the City's Department of Environmental Services meet with Senator Chang.

16. SB 2809 Appropriates $1.5 million for TOD projects. The bill was introduced at OP's request to give funding to Neighbor Island TOD projects. Will be having a meeting with the WAM Vice-Chair tomorrow to discuss the bill; alive.

17. SB 2840 Authorizes DAGS and the State Procurement Office to set up a ten-year pilot innovative project delivery program with funding for a position in DAGS. The bill is supported by the two entities; alive.

18. SB 2964 Requires HECO to pay for and install underground utility lines in TOD areas planned for affordable housing; no hearings scheduled.

19. SB 3015 Provides funding for staff and program expenses for innovative project delivery such as P3 within DAGS; alive.

20. SB 3104 The is the companion Omnibus Housing bill. Decision making will be this afternoon. The proposal is supported by both chambers and the Governor. It provides $275 million in infrastructure funding with $200 million going to the UH-West Oahu area and $75 million for the neighbor islands for infrastructure improvements. Rue said the City offered comments, but they were concerned with the 140 percent affordability. Larson added there are good things in

the bill, but the 140 percent was their concern too. She said the 99-year leases are fine and should get that in place, but the 140 percent affordability needs further study and is also concerned about the provision for Land Use Commission process. Funakoshi said most of the group is providing some kind of comments in support; alive.

21. SB 3108 Appropriates $3 million in funding for master planning a mixed-use development on State lands in the Waipahu Civic Center area. DAGS, HHFDC, HPHA, and the Hawaii Public Library System have facilities on State property in the area; alive.

22. SB 3143 Establishes a ten-year pilot innovative project delivery program and a coordinator position in DAGS; alive.

23. SB 3167 Changes the authority to develop and manage Stadium Development District lands from HCDA to the Aloha Stadium Authority; deferred, but SB 2940 is alive. Chris Kinimaka said that SB 2940 should be added to the list for monitoring. She explained that SB 2940 is very similar to SB 3167.

6. Additional TOD-related CIP Requests to be Considered for the 2020 Legislative Session
Evans said that the handout lists three additional CIP requests. The Council already discussed the bills earlier - Neighbor Island TOD Projects, Samuel Mahelona Memorial Hospital, Waipahu Civic Center TOD Master Plan, Omnibus housing infrastructure funding for UH-West Oahu. For the Waipahu Civic Center TOD Master Plan, Neupane said they had some discussions with agencies on the number of housing units and the parking structure. This bill was not requested by HHFDC. Evans asked the Council members whether they wanted to act on including these CIP requests in those being recommended to the Legislature for consideration. There being no motion, no action was taken.

7. Next Steps - Future Agenda Topics
Evans announced that the TOD Council meetings for March and April are being rescheduled to the second Wednesday of the month during the legislative session. This change is only for two months.

Wednesday, March 11, 2020 -	State TOD Planning and Implementation Project, Oahu—Permitted Interaction Group Reports: East Kapolei, Halawa-Stadium, and Iwilei-Kapalama
Wednesday, April 8, 2020 -	TBD

8. Announcements--none

9. Adjournment
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Note: All meeting materials are posted at http://planning.hawaii.gov/lud/state-tod/hawaii-interagency-council-for-transit-oriented-development-meeting-materials/.