

LAND USE COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING

June 25, 2009

Conference Room 405, 4th Floor, Leiopapa A Kamehameha
235 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Duane Kanuha
Thomas Contrades
Kyle Chock
Lisa Judge
Nicholas Teves, Jr.
Reuben Wong

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vladimir Devens
Ransom Piltz
Normand Lezy

STAFF PRESENT: Orlando Davidson, Executive Officer
Diane Erickson, Deputy Attorney
General
Riley Hakoda, Staff Planner

COURT REPORTER: Holly Hackett

AUDIO TECHNICIANS: Walter Mensching
Mikel Humerickshouse

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kanuha called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES-

Commissioner Chock had a correction to page 6 paragraph 1- he asked that "Maui Residential Workforce Policy" be stricken. There were no further additions or corrections to the minutes.

After correction, Commissioner Judge moved to accept the June 4 & 5, 2009 minutes.

Commissioner Chock seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved by voice votes.

TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

Executive Officer Davidson announced that the proposed State furlough plan schedule had been provided to the Commission. The Commission will be meeting on July 15 and 16 (Wednesday and Thursday) for certain, and pending the outcome of the furlough plan litigation, any subsequent changes will require updating this new schedule. The additional hearing day for Bridge Aina Le'a will be on August 27, 2009 in Kona. Mr. Davidson stated that the Waimanalo Gulch Special Use Permit hearing is anticipated to be heard in August.

CONTINUED HEARING & MOTION-

A06-771 D. R. HORTON- SCHULER HOMES, LLC., a Delaware limited liability company, d.b.a. D. R. Horton –Schuler Division Honouliuli, Ewa, Oahu. To Amend The Agricultural Land Use District Boundaries Into The Urban Land Use District for Approximately 1,553.844 Acres Of land at Honouliuli, Ewa District, Oahu, Hawaii, Tax Map Key Nos.: 9-1-17:4,059 and 072 (por.); 9-1-18: 1 and 4 (por.).

MOTION:

Chair Kanuha announced that this was a hearing to consider Petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time for Decision-Making. He acknowledged public letters of testimony received on the petition at the conclusion of his opening statement.

APPEARANCES:

Benjamin Kudo, Esq., Naomi Kuwaye, Esq., and Yuko Funaki, Esq. represented Petitioner

Dawn Takeuchi-Apuna, Esq. represented the City and County of Honolulu, Dept. of Planning and Permitting

Tim Hata, City and County of Honolulu, Dept. of Planning and Permitting

Bryan Yee, Esq., represented the State Office of Planning

Abbey Mayer, and Scott Derrickson- State Office of Planning

Dr. Kioni Dudley, Friends of Makakilo, Intervenor

Yvonne Izu, Esq., represented Haseko (Ewa) Inc., Intervenor

PUBLIC WITNESSES:

There were no public witnesses on the motion.

Ms. Kuwaye argued to extend the deadline for the Petition alleging circumstances of the case that were beyond the control of the Petitioner. The Motion asks for an additional 90 days beyond the 365 day limit that would extend the deadline from September 19, 2009 to December 18, 2009.

The City had no position. OP supported the ultimate outcome of the motion and stated that the 90 day extension was appropriate.

Intervenor Friends of Makakilo- Dr. Dudley stated that he supported the motion but not for the reasons that were stated in the motion. Haseko (Ewa), Inc. had no objections to the motion.

Commissioner Chock moved to grant the motion to extend the time for decision-making. Commissioner Wong seconded the motion.

There was no discussion on the motion.

The commission was polled as follows:

Ayes: Commissioners Contrades, Chock, Judge, Teves, Wong, and Chair Kanuha.

Motion unanimously passed 6-0 with 3 excused.

HEARING

Chair Kanuha stated for the record that the Parties for the hearing had already been identified and called for public witnesses.

PUBLIC WITNESSES

Shane Peters (submitted written testimony)

Mr. Peters stated he was the President of the Hawaii Developers Council and was testifying in support of the Project. He represented that the Project was

a critical piece of the City of Kapolei and would provide jobs, opportunities, and be beneficial to regional development.

There were no questions for Mr. Peters.

Glenn Nohara (submitted written testimony)

Mr. Nohara represented the General Contractors Association (GCA) and testified in support of the Project. He stated that D.R. Horton was an established home-builder that was a good corporate citizen and active in supporting the local community.

There were no questions for Mr. Nohara.

Chair Kanuha noted for the record that the representative of Friends of Makakilo had left the proceedings before Mr. Ramos provided his testimony. (10:03 a.m.)

Rodolfo Ramos, Ho'opili Task Force Member

Mr. Ramos testified in support of the project. Mr. Ramos stated that he was a long-time area resident, had been active in the community and had helped with many citizen planning groups in the area. He stated that D. R. Horton had worked very hard with the community to assure that the Project would be of mutual benefit to Ewa and Kapolei.

Chair Kanuha noted for the record that the representative of Friends of Makakilo had rejoined the proceedings. (10:05 a.m.)

There were no questions for Mr. Ramos.

Ms. Sherry Menor-McNamara

Ms. Menor-McNamara stated she was Vice-President of Business Advocacy at the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii and was testifying in support of the project for the same reasons as the previous supporters.

There were no questions for Ms Menor-McNamara.

John Strom

Mr. Strom stated he was Vice-President and Director of Business Development and Technology for Enterprise Honolulu, the Economic Development Board. Mr. Strom testified in support of the project. He noted that D.R. Horton had worked with his organization for over five years and had done considerable community outreach.

There were no questions for Mr. Strom.

PETITIONER'S WITNESSES

David Shideler

Ms. Kuwaye recalled David Shideler for cross-examination.

The City had no questions. Mr. Yee requested the Mr. Shideler provide a brief review of the State Historic Preservation process for the Hoopili Project. Mr. Shideler described the State's requirements for performing archaeological studies in the Petition Area.

There were no other questions for Dr. Shideler.

Barry D. Neal

Mr. Neal was qualified as an expert in meteorology and air quality. Mr. Neal stated that he had prepared written direct testimony for the proceeding and identified it as Petitioner's Exhibit #80. Mr. Neal stated that he did not have any changes or modifications to make to his written direct testimony. Mr. Neal described the air quality impacts that he anticipated in the Petition Area during the short and long term if construction were within permitted limits and suggested mitigation measures

Mr. Neal stated that in his opinion, the Project would not have a significant negative impact on air quality in the Petition Area after implementing the recommended mitigation measures.

The City had no questions. Mr. Yee asked if Mr. Neal had relied on the TIAR for his analysis and further asked that if the TIAR analysis or assumptions were incorrect, would Mr. Neal need to re-exam his findings. Mr. Neal stated that if the results of the TIAR changed significantly, he would need to do that.

There were no further questions for Mr. Neal.

John Kirkpatrick

Mr. Kirkpatrick was qualified as an expert in socio-economics. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that he had conducted a social impact assessment for the project that was identified as Petitioner's Exhibit #67, and had prepared written direct testimony that was identified as Petitioner's Exhibit #78. Mr. Kirkpatrick represented that he had no changes to his submittals.

Mr. Kirkpatrick described the methodology used in collecting his data and reported that the Project's major social impact would be the development of new housing units, which would address an island-wide social need. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that the Project contributed facilities, schools, shopping areas, offices, a town center, and parks that would serve the larger region as well as the Petition Area. Mr. Kirkpatrick summarized his findings of what the concerns of the regional community were.

The City had no questions. Mr. Yee asked if part of Mr. Kirkpatrick's study included interviews and surveys with residents and stakeholders in the region and referred to Appendix I, page 3-5 of the EIS. Mr. Kirkpatrick explained the details on traffic from his report. Mr. Kirkpatrick represented that there were two separate issues. One was traffic congestion as a quantifiable problem on which the traffic engineers have a great deal to say about what the extent of the problem is, how to respond to it, and how effectively a particular response mitigated it. The second issue was a social one which had been repeatedly heard from Ewa residents that traffic congestion was a problem which was part of their lives and that they didn't like having it as part of their lives.

Mr. Kirkpatrick provided the reasons why he concluded that the Project would not have a significant negative socio-economic impact to the region with the mitigations that were being proposed. Mr. Yee asked if Mr. Kirkpatrick's conclusions were based on the traffic experts' reports and if the traffic experts were wrong, whether his conclusions could be wrong. Mr. Kirkpatrick acknowledged that it was a possibility.

Dr. Dudley asked Mr. Kirkpatrick about the effects traffic and traffic conditions might have on residents. Mr. Kirkpatrick acknowledged that traffic

had a social impact but did not have a significant negative impact. Dr. Dudley asked if “latch-key” kids losing time away from their parents was a social problem - Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that a large portion of the expected Hoopili residents were coming from the leeward area and that he did not know of anyplace, with the exception of downtown Honolulu, where kids, schools, parents and jobs were within an hour of each other and that the notion that Hoopili makes “latch-key” kids ignored the evidence of how people lead their lives. Dr. Dudley asked if the additional time of traffic and the corresponding increase in the cost of gas was a socio-economic problem. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that it was.

Dr. Dudley asked if the layoff of the farm workers in the Petition Area would be a social problem. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that he did not know if they would be laid off and that this might be an incorrect assumption. Dr. Dudley asked Mr. Kirkpatrick to describe the loss of open space on the “makai side of the freeway” reference in his report. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that the scenery would change from open fields to the Hoopili development.

Dr. Dudley asked if a proposed 10 foot high sound barrier wall would be a further problem for open space and view plane. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that it would depend on the location and placement of the wall, and that it would be more of an individual aesthetic judgment till he had better information.

Haseko (Ewa) had no questions.

Commissioner Judge asked Mr. Kirkpatrick how he would mitigate the traffic issue from a social standpoint if his report were wrong due to an incorrect TIAR. Mr. Kirkpatrick stated that to mitigate the social impact of traffic congestion, it would require community organization and community goodwill to develop ride-shares, van pools, flex-time, and people talking about and seeking solutions. Commissioner Judge asked how one quantified or measured “significant”. Mr. Kirkpatrick described his perception of how “significant” could be measured.

Chair Kanuha asked for an example of a project or land use that would constitute a significant negative impact. Mr. Kirkpatrick provided an example of a proposed construction project in Hamakua on the Big Island. Chair Kanuha asked for further clarification of what constituted a significant negative social impact and Mr. Kirkpatrick provided additional examples.

Ms. Kuwaye asked Mr. Kirkpatrick to identify responses from the task force group meeting which dealt with issues other than traffic to show that traffic had not been the only focus of the task force group meetings. Mr. Kirkpatrick identified job development, transit oriented development, pedestrian access, bicycle and bus friendly access, new retail, community/civic areas and parks as other topics that were discussed. Ms. Kuwaye asked whether the traffic study changing significantly would lead to the conclusion that the Project may have a significant social economic impact- or would it depend on a variety of factors. Mr. Kirkpatrick agreed with the latter statement.

Mr. Yee asked Mr. Kirkpatrick if the developer had made any commitment to implement all the positive things that could arise from the Project that had been mentioned as well as possible mitigation measures. Mr. Kirkpatrick replied that he could not speak to that.

The Commission went into recess at 11:05 a.m. and returned at 11:20 a.m.

Bruce Plasch

Mr. Plasch was qualified as an expert in agricultural economics and identified Petitioner's Exhibit #21 as his written direct testimony. Mr. Plasch stated that he did not have any corrections or modifications to make to his submittal and summarized his testimony for the Commission. He described the background of his studies to produce his report on agriculture. He referenced Petitioner's Exhibits #27 and 28 during his testimony and reported his findings. Mr. Plasch identified the features of the Petition Area that made it attractive for crop production. He then referenced Petitioner's Exhibit #29 to describe the Land Study Bureau soil ratings for the island of Oahu and identified the surrounding area land uses.

Mr. Plasch stated that the Petition Area was within the County's designated urban growth boundary of the Ewa Development Plan in an area designated for residential development. He asserted that the Ewa Development Plan was part of a broader, long-established County policy with support from the State to direct urban growth toward Ewa as the secondary urban center, and; for future land uses, was consistent with State and County development policy. Mr. Plasch provided his historical account of the State and County effort to direct urban growth while protecting Oahu's prime agricultural lands. Mr. Plasch represented that urban development was directed towards Ewa to protect the prime agricultural lands in Kunia, the North Shore, and other rural areas of the

island and that the County's plan to develop a secondary urban center in Ewa was done with the full knowledge that it would come at the expense of high quality agricultural land in Ewa. Mr. Plasch stated that the designation of Ewa for urban growth was done as the best option to meet the future needs of future generations while preserving as much of the island for farm lands as possible.

Mr. Plasch identified the four farms operating in the Petition Area- that would need to relocate (Aloun, Sugarland, Syngenta Seeds, and Fat Law) and stated his reasons why there would be little or no loss of agricultural activity. He stated that replacement lands are available due to the contraction of plantation agriculture and described the amounts and locations of the agricultural lands. Mr. Plasch referred to Petitioner's Exhibit #30 and described the loss of plantation acreage since the late 1960's, and the current state of diversified agriculture. He stated that since 2005, there has been an additional release of 21,600 acres and recapped the total loss of acreage in the State. Mr. Plasch represented that diversified agriculture had not experienced any significant growth since around 1995 and described the mitigating measures that were contained in his report regarding the impact of Hoopili.

Mr. Plasch stated that one of the measures was that, to the extent possible, the development of Hoopili should be coordinated with affected agricultural operators and developers of adjacent lands to maintain farming in the area for as long as possible. Secondly, Mr. Plasch recommended that lands continue to be leased at below market rates. Mr. Plasch reported that government should upgrade the Wahiawa Wastewater Treatment Plant to treat wastewater to the State's R1 standard and eliminate the discharge of wastewater into the reservoir. Mr. Plasch represented that the wastewater treatment recommendation was consistent with the consent decree between the County and the U.S. Environmental Services in 1998. This upgrade would allow for R1 water which could be used on any agricultural crop, in any irrigation system. Mr. Plasch stated that until this was done, water availability would be restricted.

Mr. Plasch stated that the current status was the City had already upgraded the treatment system to where it would discharge R1 quality water most of the time, except during heavy rain storms- for this reason, the water was still rated as R2. The current city plans call for an additional investment for improvements to upgrade the discharge rating to R1 by 2011. During the interim, North Shore farmers would be activating ground wells and using irrigation systems for the water drawn from the wells.

Mr. Plasch stated that another concern was the need to perform major and minor repairs on leaks in the Wahiawa system. The leaks prevent the use of certain portions of the mid- to high-level field irrigation systems. Mr. Plasch stated that the current status of the situation was that the owner of the major irrigation components, Dole Foods Co. and the State Agricultural Development Corporation, (ADC) were negotiating terms to transfer the Wahiawa Irrigation System to the ADC for the portion of the system that was situated on Kamehameha School lands. Once ADC owned the system, it would have access to Federal funds to help improve and repair the system. Mr. Plasch reported that based on his findings, he could find little or no adverse impact on Hawaii's agricultural production due to the Project.

Mr. Kudo asked Mr. Plasch to provide a current status report on the four farms mentioned by Mr. Kirkpatrick that were currently on the Petition Area. Mr. Plasch provided an update on Syngenta, Aloun, Fat Law and Sugarland Farms using Petitioner's Exhibit#39.

The City had no questions for Mr. Plasch. Mr. Yee asked for clarification on the existing acreage needed for existing tenants and the suitability of the lands for agriculture. Mr. Plasch provided additional information. Mr. Yee asked Mr. Plasch if he knew what the schedule was for the loss of agricultural lands. Mr. Plasch did not have a specific schedule and stated his understanding of how the gradual loss of agricultural lands would occur, what the available lands would be, and what the expected lease rents were. Mr. Plasch also clarified his explanation of the Wahiawa Water Supply system and described the water needs for different crops. Mr. Plasch described the impact of the loss of the Superferry and stated his perception of how the crop production markets on the Neighbor Islands and Oahu operated relative to each other under different circumstances.

Commissioner Wong excused himself at 12:06 p.m. and returned at 12:10 p.m.

Mr. Plasch stated that what he meant by agricultural operations would be maintained "to the extent possible" in his testimony was that accommodations would have to be made to farming operations during the installation of the core infrastructure-the roads, water and sewer construction would disrupt farming activities. Mr. Plasch stated his understanding of the financing and contract status for the Wahiawa Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Wahiawa Irrigation system.

Mr. Yee asked how lands for “Koa Ridge” were involved in the relocation effort for Aloun Farms. Mr. Plasch described what Aloun Farms had done in its relocation efforts as it related to Koa Ridge. Mr. Plasch stated that he had not explored any other mitigation efforts of this sort to be done by the Petitioner other than what had been suggested.

Mr. Yee asked what the current status was of the relocation efforts of Syngenta, Fat Law and Sugarland. Mr. Plasch stated his understanding of the each farm’s situation.

The Commission went into recess at 12:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:34 p.m.

Dr. Dudley requested clarification of Mr. Plasch’s written testimony, question #38 and on the amount of available agricultural lands. Mr. Plasch described how he had arrived at his conclusions and identified areas where agriculture could be relocated to on the island of Oahu. Mr. Plasch described the growing conditions and expected crop yields; and also the required farming practices to prepare and test agricultural fields for production. Mr. Plasch described the difficulties involved with relocating agricultural operations and identified the agricultural landowners on the North Shore of Oahu and the status of the agricultural land soil conditions.

Mr. Plasch stated that he had talked to Dole and ADC to obtain the information on the water irrigation system last week and found that the costs and insurance problems still need to be resolved by the parties. He described the water quality issues in the area based on information provided to him from the Dept. of Environmental Services. Mr. Plasch stated his understanding of the status of Aloun Farms and Larry Jetts replacement lands searches and disclosed his source of information for the number of agricultural jobs stated in his report. Dr. Dudley noted the differences in numbers stated for jobs in Mr. Plasch’s report and asked for clarification of how the numbers were determined. Mr. Plasch explained how he determined the figures for his report.

Haskeo (Ewa) had no questions. Chair Kanuha noted that with the relocation, there would be a difference in the distance to the local market place to deliver the produce and Mr. Plasch described how he perceived the impact of distance to the market.

Mr. Kudo noted that 3 of the 4 farms with operations on the Petition Area had been able to relocate with the exception of Aloun Farms.. Upon further

redirect, Mr. Plasch stated that Aloun Farms sub-leased approximately 100 acres to Fat Law and provided the lease rent amounts charged to Aloun Farms, and the lease rents Aloun charged to Fat Law.

There were no further questions for Mr. Plasch.

Ann Bouslog

Ms. Bouslog was qualified as an expert witness in market analysis and economics and acknowledged that she had submitted written direct testimony for the hearing identified as Exhibit # 82. She stated that she would not be using the visual aid that was noted in question #33 of Exhibit #82.

Ms. Bouslog testified on the market studies and assessment conducted by her company, Mikiko Corp. She described the data collection and analysis methodology used preparing her report and stated that her data was based on information provided by state and county agencies. Ms. Bouslog described how she had compiled the data for her forecasts and explained the economic conditions that she anticipated.

The Commission went into recess at 2:14 p.m. and reconvened at 2:17 p.m.

Ms. Bouslog referred to Petitioner's Exhibit #35 to describe her findings for the projected demand for housing. She indicated that the ideal situation would be to have the difference between market supply and demand to be zero, and explained the scenarios depicted in the exhibit.

Ms. Bouslog stated that her findings indicated that Hoopili would provide significant positive economic and fiscal benefits for the County and the State, and complement the lifestyle and career opportunities that were promoted by other area developments like UH West Oahu and the Kapolei region. Ms. Bouslog stated that there might be some synergistic benefits with the transit system, but these were not specifically factored into her model.

Mr. Kudo asked what kind of impacts the State might anticipate if Hoopili were not developed. Ms. Bouslog replied that agricultural uses might be retained onsite, population and economic growth might be constricted, and displacement of development away from the Kapolei region into other areas of the State might occur. She explained what housing demand and price level situations she expected would occur and how the transit system might be

affected. Ms. Bouslog explained Petitioner's Exhibit #35 in further detail in regards to the "build-out" of entitled properties and future housing deficits.

The City had no questions.

The Commission went into recess at 2:35 p.m. and reconvened at 2:45 p.m.

Mr. Yee requested further clarification on the factors which were considered in determining the demand model illustrated in the exhibit. Ms. Bouslog testified to various details on how she had established the basis for her study and analysis of data. Ms. Bouslog clarified her figures for demand for housing and the anticipated housing deficits. Ms. Bouslog explained how she perceived Hoopili's role in providing for substantial commercial development in the area and how she had calculated the net economic value for the Project. She referred to Petitioner's Exhibit 36, pg. 48 to explain her methodology and stated that population growth was expected irregardless of Hoopili and would still need to be accommodated.

Dr. Dudley noted that the Petitioner's Exhibit #35 chart ended at the year 2030 and asked what was expected to occur after 2030. Ms. Bouslog replied that the State had projections to 2035 for population growth on Oahu. Dr. Dudley asked what would be done if the Urban Growth Boundary is full. Ms. Bouslog replied that projecting beyond 2035 was beyond her study.

Ms. Bouslog stated the expected market for Hoopili buyers and the anticipated jobs that the Project would create.

Dr. Dudley had no further questions. Haseko (Ewa) had no questions.

Commissioner Judge referenced Mr. Yee's question regarding State expenditures in relation to page 4 of Ms. Bouslog's market study (Petitioner's Exhibit #32) and asked how the conclusions would be affected if the State and County did not perform as expected. Ms. Bouslog represented that the items which were noted were currently in progress, some by the private sector and provided her perception of how they were being accomplished. Commissioner Judge noted that the report had been done in March, 2007 and that economic conditions and population data may have changed over time. Ms. Bouslog explained that it was a long term analysis and that population growth was what drove the market for residential, commercial and industrial real estate. Ms. Bouslog stated that it was anticipated that 2012 might see better market

conditions and provided her opinion on what could happen in the future that might impact demand.

Mr. Kudo asked Ms. Bouslog to clarify how the line on the bottom of Petitioner's Exhibit #35 should be interpreted. Ms. Bouslog explained the relationship between population growth and the bottom line during the short to medium term.

The Commission went into recess at 3:25 p.m. and Chair Kanuha departed the proceedings at this time. Commissioner Wong as Acting Chair reconvened the hearing at 3:30 p.m.

Bryant Terry Brothers

Mr. Brothers was qualified as an expert witness in traffic engineering and identified Petitioner's Exhibit #84 as his written direct testimony. Mr. Brothers had additional information regarding interim TIARs mentioned in his summary.

Mr. Brothers testified on the methodology and roadway assumptions used to prepare his transportation impact analysis report (TIAR) and described the types and locations of the mitigation efforts being proposed to handle area traffic and reported the findings of his research. He stated that in addition to the studies of traffic in 2030 with or without the Project, studies were also conducted to forecast conditions with or without the transit system. Mr. Brothers described how the Oahu Metropolitan Planning Organization (OMPO) forecasts for the regional transportation plan were used to calculate traffic without the Project and the process used to calculate traffic with the Project. Mr. Brothers also described how he conducted his studies for determining the conditions with and without transit service to the Petition Area and referred to Petitioner's Exhibit #43 to identify existing and proposed roadways in the area and their current status. Mr. Brothers stated that the Exhibit did not show a future proposed widening of the H1 from the Makakilo Interchange to the Waiawa Interchange that was in the OMPO long range plan to accommodate an HOV lane in each travel direction.

Mr. Brothers referred to Petitioner's Exhibits #44 and 45a to clarify details of his report and described the key findings of the impact of Hoopili and the mitigation measures he had recommended. Mr. Brothers testified that he was in the process of producing another TIAR since the Department of Transportation, after review of the original TIAR and the EIS wanted an interim phase development report for construction completed by the year 2020 in Hoopili and

the adjacent areas. Mr. Brothers stated that the Petitioner and the DOT had agreed on the methodology and key assumptions for the 2020 TIAR and that this study was underway with an estimated completion date of late August or September for a draft submittal for DOT review and comment. Mr. Brothers testified that the Petitioner would also be submitting additional TIARs besides the interim 2020 report and was currently negotiating a transportation agreement with the DOT and the County Dept. of Planning and Permitting (DPP) which requires subsequent interim TIARs each time the Petitioner identifies a certain specified amount of additional residential or commercial development. He stated that the interim TIARs would need to be prepared and submitted for approval prior to each phase of development

The City had no questions.

Mr. Yee asked if Mr. Charlier had reviewed the TIAR. Mr. Brothers stated that Mr. Charlier had made some comments regarding the assumptions and understood that Mr. Charlier had concurred with the analysis. Mr. Yee referred to the last 2 sentences on page E1 of Appendix L, the executive summary and asked Mr. Brothers to explain what these sentences were trying to communicate. Mr. Brothers stated that it appeared the wording was reversed and should read “reports of the intersections external to the Project”.

Mr. Brothers was asked to refer to page 3-3 and identified that it listed a set of assumptions of traffic improvement projects which would be done, but not by the Petitioner. Mr. Yee asked which Projects had been funded and were moving forward and Mr. Brothers identified that 8 of the 21 projects listed were not funded.

Mr. Yee asked Mr. Brothers to comment on how the widening of Farrington Highway might be more difficult if parking were allowed on the existing Farrington Highway. Mr. Brothers replied that he did not think it would be more difficult and clarified various other portions of the TIAR regarding trip generation counts, a H1-Kunia loop around, and a North-bound triple left onto Farrington Highway.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.