

Meeting with the Project Advisory Committee

August 7, 2006

Participating:

PAC Members: Eric Crispin, Louie Abrams, Greg Kamm, Donald Fujimoto, Ian Costa, Ted Blake, Wallace Kudo, Lynette Buhk, Barbara Pendragon, Carol Ann Davis, Fred Reyes, Gary Heu, Janine Rapozo, Bernard Carvalho

Charlier Associates: Jim Charlier, Jacob Riger, Jennifer Valentine, Lisa Malde

Also in attendance: Thomas Noyes

Notes:

- Introductions were made and a sign-in sheet was passed around.
- The Mayor opened the meeting with introductory comments.
- Jacob gave a draft of the presentation he prepared for the second public workshop on August 10, 2006 to get input from the PAC.
- During the presentation the following comments were made:
 - Jim pointed out (based on the results of the employee survey and conversations with Kaua'i residents) that traffic capacity is *not* the public's top priority.
 - Carol Ann Davis mentioned that she had a problem navigating the project website and was unable to post a comment. Jim asked her to see Jennifer after the meeting to discuss the problem.
 - Jim highlighted the importance of network connectivity and the pervasiveness of disconnected, auto-oriented systems. This problem is not unique to Kaua'i. When a network is operating efficiently, a two-lane road should be able to handle 20,000 vehicles per day. The Kōloa-Po'ipū area doesn't need more capacity - it needs enhanced network connectivity.
 - The group discussed the 1/8 mile grid concept. We are not proposing a 1/8 mile grid uniformly across the study area because we want to respect the landscape and existing barriers, but the 1/8 mile grid is the standard for good connectivity and should be used as the foundation for identifying and evaluating potential connections.
 - Jim noted that bicycling is also an opportunity in the Kōloa-Po'ipū area, especially with rising fuel costs. Eric pointed out the current safety issues, and the group agreed. Barbara mentioned rain as a reason people may not bicycle,



but Jim pointed out that research has not shown climate to be a significant barrier to active travel. Physical and safety barriers tend to have a greater effect.

- After the presentation Jacob asked for input, and the following comments were made:
 - Eric Crispin: There is too much review of previously discussed concepts. You may want to condense the first part of the presentation and get to the workshop discussion sooner. The presentation took an hour, and you were already speaking fast.
 - Provide more opportunities for feedback and comments from individual community members. Allow time for dialogue and questions.
 - The group exercise sounds good, especially bringing people together at the end to discuss their ideas.
 - Ian Costa: There is some value in providing an overview/review. You shouldn't slow down - moving through the presentation quickly will help set the pace.
 - The survey results are interesting. It might be useful to summarize them (or the prior concepts) in a handout to help shorten the presentation.
 - Eric Crispin: Including an aerial photograph with a development overlay will be critical.
 - Q: Will you have group facilitators?
A: Yes, we hope to have two facilitators for each group (there will be five groups).
 - Q: What about having ten groups? A: We thought about having ten groups (two for each corridor) but there are space constraints in the Kōloa Neighborhood Center.
- Jim then led a discussion about "Fair Share" with the group. He explained that three criteria can be used in these discussions: philosophy, law, and feasibility. We will concentrate on law and feasibility.
- It is important to define transportation needs in multimodal terms and consider modal breakdown. Transit and non-motorized transportation will represent a smaller share of expenditures but are still significant.
- There are three types of funding needs to take into account: initial capital, recurring capital, and O&M (operations/maintenance).
- Similarly, there are three factors contributing to the need for new transportation infrastructure: new development, trend growth, and backlog. Most of the growth in travel can be attributed to people driving more, not an increase in population.



- Jim noted that the Mayor is comfortable with the idea of putting impact fees on the table; however impact fees are typically only appropriate for new development.
- Donald was concerned that the County may not be adequately staffed to complete all the necessary improvements even if the projects were funded by impact fees. He noted that the developers can often do the improvements faster than the County.
- Jim emphasized the importance of leaving room for flexibility in the process, and raised the question of what might be the best way to go back and get impact fees that should have been paid in the past.
- Eric mentioned the “last guy in pays” issue, and Jim agreed that the last guy in cannot be expected to pay for everything.
- Ian explained that because most of the County’s zoning was done in 1972, many properties are not assessed at their current value and are therefore not being taxed appropriately. He stressed the importance of addressing this problem because of the implications for the County’s revenue stream.
- Ted asked how existing properties might be taxed, and Jim explained how a special tax district might be configured for this purpose. He also mentioned that the Mayor expressed concern about affordable housing. Ian said the County has a report from the 1990s he could give to Charlier Associates.
- Barbara asked if new developments have a responsibility for O&M. Jim said that they do, but O&M expenses are not typically covered through impact fees. Greater tax revenue from increased property values can cover some of these expenses if an appropriate tax structure is in place.
- Donald asked if the Charlier plan would explain how to design and implement an impact fee system, and what would be the basis. Jim responded that the plan will provide the nuts and bolts of the system, and would likely be based on a trip-based measure tied to the number of units.
- Eric questioned the use of a fee system based on unit counts. Jim explained the need to create a legally defensible method, using unit count in some way, but reassured him that we will run this concept through a good planning filter.
- Eric suggested that the area needs developers to help solve its transportation problems by increasing connectivity and improving the overall network.
- Donald claimed that impact fees would create a bigger backlog for the County, because even if funding was available, they would not be able to get all the recommended projects built. Jim responded that they obviously disagreed about the extent of the transportation projects needed in the County. He explained that while the County does need a better transportation network that operates more efficiently, the total amount of traffic in the area isn’t that great. Getting a fair share/impact fee system in place is the key.



- Donald noted that until the backlog improvements are completed the County is still at a disadvantaged position. Jim replied that we *will* look at the backlog, but will focus on creating a system to guide future growth and development.
- Jim noted that he would like to move away from the “price of admissions” approach to handling new development and towards a better system for impact fees.
- Barbara asked about the possibility of creating an ordinance to apply the recommended transportation impact fee system to other parts of the island.
- Jim responded that the system recommended in the Kōloa-Po'ipū Area Circulation Plan could be used as a prototype to create similar systems in other areas, but that we are not able to generate the information needed to actually *apply* it to the entire island. He recommended that the county should avoid trying an island-wide approach for political and technical reasons.
- Ian pointed out that Kōloa-Po'ipū is only a small part of the island - there are needs and problems in other areas. Using the example of the Boulder bus system, Jim explained the merit of concentrating on one thing at a time.
- Donald brought up the issue of timing, and Ian noted that the public has been asking the County to deny development requests until the needed infrastructure is in place.
- Jim replied that timing/concurrency is an important consideration, but that the revenues from new development help pay for needed infrastructure.
- Finally, the group discussed creating a liberal credit program to balance fees collected with projects built and a funding mechanism for bus system improvements.

