1	BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION	
2	CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU	
3	STATE OF HAWAII	
4		
5	In the matter of the) File No. 2017/SUP-2 Application of)	
6 7 8	DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION, CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU)	
9	Ewa Beach, Oahu, State Special) Use Permit - 2017/SUP-2)	
10	Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment) Plan Secondary Treatment) and Support Facilities)	
11		
12		
13		
14	Taken at Mission Memorial Conference Room, Mission	
15	Memorial Building, 550 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii,	
16	96813, commencing at 1:30 p.m., on September 13, 2017,	
17	pursuant to Notice.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

.

1	APPEARANCES:	
2	Commissioners present:	Dean I. Hazama, Chair
3		Cord D. Anderson
4		Kaiulani K. Sodaro
5		Steven S. C. Lim
6		Ken K. Hayashida
7		Gifford K. F. Chang
8	Commissioners excused:	Theresia G. McMurdo, Vice Chair
9		[prior notice given]
10		Arthur B. Tolentino
11		[prior notice given]
12		Wilfred A. Chang, Jr.
13		[prior notice given]
14		
15	Deputy Corporation Counsel:	Rozelle A. Agag
16		(Advisory to the Planning
17		Commission)
18		
19	Planning Commission Staff:	Gloria Takara,
20		Secretary-Hearings Reporter
21		
22	DPP Representative:	Raymond Young, Staff
23		Planner, Community Planning
24		Branch
25		

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman: Okay. Good afternoon and welcome to the September 13th, 2017 meeting of the Planning Commission. At this time I call the meeting to order. First up on our agenda is approval of July 19th, 2017 meeting minutes, as previously circulated. Commissioners, I understand we have received a minor late change from the Department regarding some modifications to the minutes. Any objections to adopting the minutes as amended?

Member Sodaro: None.

Chairman: Seeing none, any abstentions? [no response] Okay. Our minutes for July 19th, 2017 have been adopted.

Next order of business on our agenda is public hearing, Ewa Beach, Oahu, State Special Use Permit, 2017/SUP-2, Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant Secondary Treatment and Support Facilities. Department of Planning and Permitting.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. My name is Raymond Young for the record. I'm the staff planner that worked on the project along with Mr. Jeffrey Lee behind me, who also worked on the project. If I may turn your attention to the map prepared by the DPP. The project is

basically consists of two pieces of land. It's basically this one piece here, which is a portion of Parcel 3, and this other piece here, which is all of Parcel 4. And as you can see on this map the area is kind of like tinted in green are the agriculture districts, where the rest of the area clear is all in the urban district. So, it's pretty much entirely surrounded by urban lands except for this area here, which is partially vacant and partially developed with a golf course. And that's all in the ag district.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, this red line here represents the Oahu Railway right-of-way, which is right at the northern boundary of the northern part of the petition area. And the other roads in the area represent by this TMK lines s Roosevelt Avenue here, which then turns into Geiger Road around the treatment plant. So, you can see the treatment plan on this area photo is existing here with all the different processing facilities. And the expansion area, mainly this one to the north is pretty much vacant. this piece down here to the east is already developed with a pump station and other related facilities. This major road up here is Kapolei Parkway, snakes around here. And we have to the south future Industrial Mixed Use Development down in this area, the Coral Creek Golf Course. Of course, Barbers Point Naval Golf Course here and the Kalaeloa Community Development District located here with the runways kind of

like off the map here.

Newly developed projects in the area include the Ka Makana Ali'i shopping mall located right here. To the north of that is Hawaiian Homelands and, of course, moving on over just mauka beyond the Verona Village area is the Ewa Villages area located in this section here. Access is being provided off of Geiger located here. There's two existing driveways. A third driveway provides access to the convenience refuse center located here and, of course, the applicant is proposing access across the railway right-of-way through Malio Street, which then connects to Renton Road and then gives access to the Kapolei Parkway here.

of course, if there's any questions just stop me anytime. Okay. The Department of Planning and Permitting recommends approval with conditions. But before I proceed, I'd like to make a correction on the Director's report. On page 10, paragraph 10, this is relating to odor control, I believe. Right now the paragraph one states that covers are intended to be used for their processing facilities so that no open standing water bodies associated with the processing of wastewater will occur. In other words, the report says that pretty much they all covered. But after the report was done, we had information clarifying that is not correct and that there will be processing facilities, clarifiers,

aeration tanks, channels and that sort of thing that will not be covered.

Okay. So, let me proceed with the basic description of the project. The expansion area being proposed by the petitioner, which is Department of Design and Construction is to address the first amended consent decree handed down by the courts and, of course, in collaboration with the various parties that mandates that the entire wastewater being discharged from Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant be of secondary water treatment quality and that needs to be done by 2024.

Now, in addition to improvements for the full secondary treatment, the petitioner also proposing support facilities for island-wide wastewater treatment functions including laboratory admin. support buildings, maintenance, central shops, warehouses, operations building, odor control and septic receiving structures and, of course, the increase in the recycling facility, the amount of water being recycled through the Honolulu Water Recycling Facility.

Now, Table 1 in the report kind of outlines what all these various improvements and structures that are being proposed for the petition area.

A bit of background, the wastewater treatment plant was constructed in 1978. Upgrades took place in 1996. The water treatment facility, the recycled water occurred in

2000, and the expansion area was acquired by the City in 2011. And, the entire plant including the expansion area just about 100 acres, 72 of it is already urban. So, what's remaining is basically 27 acres that are in ag divided across two parcels, Parcel 3 and Parcel 4. Now, a portion of Parcel 3, in this area here, is already reclassified to the urban district and that was part of the Gentry reclassification that occurred back in 1988. So, that little piece had its own conditions of approval associated with that boundary amendment. Now, the Petitioner proposes to eventually file the request with the Land Use Commission to remove that portion from that boundary amendment so that the conditions that generally apply to housing and that development that was proposed there would no longer apply to the petitioner's wastewater treatment plan proposal.

Now, along with that boundary amendment or whatever process they used before the Land Use Commission, the Petitioner also plans to file for a boundary amendment for the petitionary to take it out of ag and put it into urban which ordinarily this is what we would've recommended in the first place. But, unfortunately, the timing for a boundary amendment which is months longer than an SUP may not allow the applicant to complete their wastewater treatment plant upgrades by the time the FACD or amended consent decree deadline rolls around which is in 2024.

Final Environmental Impact Statement for this project was published and that was back in April of this year. The project will be constructed basically in two phases. Now, Phase 1 will be the full secondary treatment upgraded to be completed by 2023, and then Phase II will be replacing all the existing secondary treatment facilities by 2035.

The applicant proposes various types of operations at this facility including primary and secondary wastewater treatment and also solid treatment from this wastewater, the pelletizing of secondary solids for fertilizer use or disposal at the Waimanalo Gulch Sanitary Landfill. The hauling by trucks of solids from the wastewater treatment plant to Waimanalo Gulch or H-Power. The treatment of septage and liquid sludge from outside sources; increased production of the recycled water, which is R-1 or some of it being reverse osmosis water and continued operations of the convenience refuse collection station. And finally the treatment of sludge from other wastewater treatment plants throughout the island including those located at Wahiawa, North Shore, Waianae, Kailua, Waiamanalo and Laie.

Now, we received various agency comments, and I'll just go through some of the significant ones. The City,

Department of Transportation Services and the State

Department of Transportation recommended an update to the

TIAR, which is the Traffic Impact Assessment Report. 2 And essentially the reason for that is when the original TIAR is developed there was some improvements that occurred 3 4 to the roadways and that needs to be updated accordingly. And DPP recommends that their suggestions be incorporated as 5 by part of the conditions of approval. We received comments 6 7 from the TOD Airports Division which recommends 8 implementation of safety measures associated with aircraft 9 and airport operations. There's Kalaeloa Airport and the 10 Daniel K. Inouye Airport formerly known as Honolulu 11 International are within a 5-mile range which then 12 implements the requirements under the FAA and the DOT 13 airports. And one of the comments related to the open bodies 14 of water and, of course, an avigation easement addressing 15 the potential for wildlife and associated safety concerns with air traffic operations. And also that they be aware 16 17 that if any PV or photovoltaic panels are being proposed, that they be aware of the requirements that are normally 18 associated with those especially with aircraft operations in 19 20 the area. That they be aware of a jet fuel line that occurs

And, finally the DOT Traffic Division or Highways Division mentioned that they are opposed to a crossing of the railroad for the Malio street access. Again, as I mentioned earlier right across here.

21

22

23

24

25

on the site.

Now, the DPP analysis indicates that the SUP is a reasonable permit provided that the petitioner be required to seek a boundary amendment to urban district within a reasonable time frame. And the plant be upgraded to address odor concerns, such as enclosing odor sources. The new Headworks project will be addressing some of the older concerns that the area residents have experienced over the past. The noise sources that does analyze by the agencies are basically short term from construction purposes, and both noise and odor concerns were requirements are established by the Department of Health. So, the petitioner need to comply with those.

Now, we analyze the views of the area, and they do have a large setback and, of course, landscaping along the fence line and so much of those structures or industrial type structures associated with the plant will be screened by landscaping and setbacks.

Now, the Land Use Ordinance limits the height that structures can be up to, maximum of 60 feet. And distant views of the Waianae mountains are not being significantly obscured. There's already existing trees that do that.

Now, on-site drainage basins are handling the stormwater and, of course, stormwater quality would have to comply with the current rules regarding standards of water quality in their discharge. And the applicant proposes

various traffic improvements to Geiger, including left turn storage lanes, accel, decel lanes. And also they've mentioned that their truck traffic will be normally handled by driveways off of Geiger, and they don't intend to have it accessed through Malio Street.

Now, the DPP also recommended a lighting plan, pursuant to the recommendations of the Ewa Development Plan to address environmental and potential wildlife in the area. There are no historic properties on the site and the State Historic Preservation Division already issued a determination of no effect and that occurred back in February of last year.

Now, regarding the DOT airport comments with respect to air traffic regulations and operations. We felt that there's no need for a separate condition for that because our standard condition requires that the Applicant or Petitioner comply with all of other governmental approvals.

Now, I think you just received today is the letter from the State Department of Transportation dated September 12th. It did mention that they want to work towards a memorandum of agreement regarding wildlife. Of course, the Department does not have any objections if you included it in your Order today, language to address that. So, that concludes my presentation. I'm open to questions.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Any questions,

Commissioners of DPP at this time? [no response] The

subsequent or the future recommended boundary amendment

because of the size does the Applicant go straight to LUC or

do they have to go to Council first?

Mr. Young: Yes. It's over 15 acres, so they will apply directly to the Land Use Commission. The City Department of Planning and Permitting is a party to that proceeding.

Chairman: Okay. But they go straight?

Mr. Young: Yes, straight there.

Chairman: Okay. Any other questions,

Commissioners?

Member Sodaro: Can I ask a clarifying question of staff. So, when they get the SLUD BA, the SUP note expires. So the conditions that were attached to the SUP will those roll into DPP's testimony at the SLUD BA or does the LUC create all their own new conditions?

Mr. Young: Because the City Department of
Planning and Permitting is a party to the proceedings.
There's that possibility that some of these conditions may
still be applicable at that time and depending on the
position that DPP takes, they could recommend similar
conditions be applied at the boundary amendment. But the
intent is once the boundary amendment is approved, the

entire SUP and all its requirements become voided.

Chairman: I noticed that the Department's recommendation didn't mention anything regarding a condition for removal of the condition for that small urban Gentry piece. I would assume, though, that the Applicant would go in at the same time to remove those conditions and apply for the SLUD BA as well, right?

Mr. Young: That's correct. They intend to do that, so at this point there's no need for the Department to make that recommendation since they will be already doing that. Because it's really to their benefit to remove those conditions that are applicable to the Gentry project and not applicable to their wastewater treatment.

Chairman: But they need the property, though.

They need the land, right? That portion of properties required for this project.

Mr. Young: Yes. That is correct. They already acquired that piece. It's just a matter of clearing up the land use approvals that are still affecting it.

Chairman: Okay. All right. Any other questions? [no response] No. Okay. Thank you, Ray.

Mr. Young: All right. Thank you.

Chairman: Okay. Who is Applicant, ENV--Yeah, come on up, together is fine. [referring to unknown males in the audience] Kind of hard to tell because DDC is on

there. Good afternoon.

Mr. Niermann: Good afternoon, Chair, members of the Planning Commission. I'm Jim Niermann. I'm a planner with R.M. Towill Corporation, and we're assisting the City with the application for the Special Use Permit. And with me is Guy Inouye. He's the chief of the wastewater division. Now, ENV when we started with DDC. That's one of the points we wanted to discuss with you today too as far as process and who will be defined as Petitioner.

So, we did prepare a presentation. So, thank you to Raymond. I think he covered most of it. We do have a couple of things we want to clarify. So, I could run through some of the slides on that.

Chairman: Yes, go ahead.

[At this time Mr. Niermann does a PowerPoint presentation]

Mr. Niermann: So, I'll skip over some of this stuff at the beginning here. But essentially this is our site again showing--Here's our site. Kind of go down through these. This is just the background State Land Use District and zoning. This is the existing site and then the showing the perimeter of--The expansion area includes this piece down here to it. This is all one parcel that extends through and the highlighted areas are the State Land Use Ag District, the subject of the petition. The consent decree,

there's another deadline that we're up against which is why we're doing this kind of two-step process going from an SUP first and then subsequent to the State Land Use Boundary Amendment. And that's January 1st, 2019. The consent decree requires that the City issue notice to proceed for construction of secondary treatment facilities and backing away from that date, that we would want to get into our construction building permit process by the beginning of 2018, which is coming up next January or February and be through the construction, the building permit and construction plan approvals as well as bidding and procurement for the construction, so we can be ready to issue the NTP by that date.

And then 2024, by June 1, 2024, the facilities have to be complete and operational. So, those are the two deadlines we're working towards.

So, essentially this is the facility after completion of the secondary treatment facilities. We have all of the existing facility generally on this Parcel 7. The portion that's in the State Land Use Ag piece here. This is its own parcel, identified as Parcel 4. That's the facility Headworks where all the fluid initially enters the plant and then there is associated odor control system there. But on this side down here, this is the BWS water recycle facility. Currently, there is about 26 million

gallons that come through their facility a day, and about half of it is treated to secondary. With the implementation of 100% treatment that involves the construction of these six additional tanks, these are secondary clarifier tanks and then the other two here are also secondary clarifier tanks but they would only be—that'll be a later future phase, only if required.

But the main components that we're proposing to construct up here is an aeration basin and then the secondary clarifier tanks here. There's also proposed improvements along the side here to put in a new septic receiving facility. Drainage detention basin along the edge here and that's kind of the overview. I'm trying to avoid not, tripping into the rabbit hole and going into too much detail. But any questions you have we can address them.

And the what we're also requesting in addition to the secondary treatment, which is essentially the secondary treatment I just described it as shown in this kind of gold color. All these facilities in blue are the proposed support facilities. Several of these are—they're tied to Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant at present. And to make space at Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant to accommodate the consent decree improvements that are required there for secondary treatment. There is a warehouse basically storing the emergency back—up bumps and equipment

that's used to respond in emergency events. There's a laboratory and then there's also SCADA control system at Sand Island right now that have to be relocated. So, we're proposing to relocate them also to this expansion area. And those all proposed right now, and I think the proposed budget would have those coming on-line in 2022.

In addition to that this isn't scheduled or budgeted yet, but the administration building for ENV is also being contemplated for this location as well. It's shown in the program. It's covered in the EIS. As far as the timing of that program, it's not yet determined.

Just really briefly. On this short-term, long-term entitlement strategy, we met with the LUC. We're going through the SUP application currently to address the zoning concerns like the height, exceedance of the maximum height. We're also coming in for a zoning waiver application. Currently, there's only one building on site that exceeds the 60-foot height limit. That's planned to be demo in the future, but we will get a zoning waiver for that at present. The future improvements are all well under the height restriction.

Currently, both the height restriction both for the industrial zoning as well as for the current agricultural zoning. And the in addition what we plan to do--I'll go back to the exhibit for this. We plan to do a

CUP minor and a joint development agreement. With the secondary treatment, we'll have three separate parcels that will comprise the overall facility. Parcel 7 here, Parcel 4, (inaudible) and then Parcel 3, which is the expansion So, for this first step, we will are going to get a CUP/JDA to combine those parcels into one zoning lot.

In the long run our second step on this, and this in again in consultation both with DPP as well as with the LUC. We will come in for State Land Use District Boundary Amendments for the agricultural areas to bring those into urban and then do a subdivision to combine these parcels. Right now a portion of Geiger Road right here enters into the property that's owned by the City that's part of the wastewater treatment plant. So, we will subdivide that road out into a separate road lot for the City. So, that's our long-term.

And then finally on that we would change the zoning. Right now the State Land Use Ag area is all zoned AG-1. So, we go through a zone change, and that'll have some other issues related to that.

I'll go to some of the issues, I think that
Raymond covered. We're happy to answer any questions on any
of these. But we're fine with the conditions as proposed by
DPP.

Completing the Traffic Impact Assessment. I'm

going to go the OR now. DOT recommended against this crossing, Malio Street crossing, OR&L railway line. We understand their concerns. It's going to require a pretty involved federal regulatory process to get the approvals for that. But we still would like to pursue that.

So, we're still intending to--ENV is still intending to pursue this application and has already initiated that with DOT.

I think the planning reviewers on this may not have been aware of those that it had been initiated, and I think they were certainly flagging a good cautionary note on that because of those federal requirements.

But the benefit of having this back up is really in an event of emergency. Right now we have--primary access is right here off Geiger Road. We're also contemplating a driveway. This location off of Roosevelt Avenue. But if in the event of an emergency or where some condition where Geigher Road would be shut down or Roosevelt, we would want to have another access into the facility. So, that's the focus of this location here. So, we're still planning or ENV is still planing to pursue that.

The avigation and wildlife mitigation measure that's what's reflected in that letter from DOT-Air. This is to show how close we're to HNL and then we're about 9,000 feet or roughly off to the end of the runway at Kalaeloa,

about 32,000 feet off of HNL.

We're working cooperatively with DOT Airports on making sure that the concerns about potential risk to airflight from becoming a wild life attractant. Basically attracting birds would be an airstrike that those could be addressed.

We will--proposing to do that through an MOA with DOT Airports. This is just showing where some of the other solar farms and ponds are in the area.

This is what I wanted to focus on. The LUC docket right now, this highlighted blue portion. This is the Urban Industrial-2 area, within our expansion area. And because it's still included in this docket, it's subject to all of the conditions of the docket. So, in discussions with LUC, they said in addition to the State Land Use District

Amendment petition they would like us to also include a separate action to bifurcate that property from this docket. So, the docket will remain but our property will be pulled out of it. It's unclear if it will be subject to the conditions imposed for the rest of the petition area with the boundary amendment. But that will be determined as we go through with that process.

Let' see, and one of the conditions. As far as conditions within the current docket that may apply. Most of them are not applicable but one of them is, the buffer

along the perimeter, and as part of the improvements. In phases, as the various phases of the treatment plant are developed, we would be incorporating the perimeter landscaping.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other is the unilateral agreement that's attached to the zone change. It's a 2011 zone change it was referenced. And there are couple conditions in there they're also not applicable. They're applicable to development of that site as an industrial park, but not the wastewater treatment plant. So, as part of the zone change in that second entitlement step, we will come back and propose to either replace the current unilateral agreement with conditions that are applicable to the wastewater treatment plant. The conditions that are in there that we are complying with so far. There were some comments from BWS to improve the waterline on Geiger Road and ENV is still working or is working with BWS on that, complying with that and then also some comments from fire department on fire protection. So, those are ongoing discussion as part of the ongoing design for the facility improvements. So, these past two items, the docket and UA would be picked up when we get into that second step of entitlements.

And with that, I think--I don't know if for the record if we need to clarify what is open and what is covered or if Raymond's testimony was sufficient or his

report was sufficient. We're happy to go over any other questions that you may have.

Member Lim: You know the FEMA flood zones for the UA?

Mr. Niermann: Yeah. So none within the facility itself, and outside of that I'm not as familiar but we know that Coral Creek next door, right adjacent here, this is essentially what's functioning as the flood, the drainage system for the regional drainage system. How we're tieing into that, can start by saying there will be no net increase leaving the site, per the City's standard. What's being proposed—I don't want to go off answering questions you didn't ask.

Member Lim: Is it zoned X?

Mr. Niermann: It's zoned X; yes.

Member Sodoro: Since you have the site plan up, where's the RO facility?

Mr. Niermann: The RO facility is here. So they actually produce both R1 and RO, and right now they're producing approximately 12 million gallons per day, and that's coming from the secondary treatment. So, overall these are rough numbers but it's about 26 million gallons per day of wastewater that comes in that's treated.

About half of that goes to secondary treatment and that secondary treated F1 then goes to the water recycle

facility. Ten million gallons is R1, is my understanding, 1 2 about 2 million gallons is RO. 3 Member Lim: When the whole project is all 4 finished and producing secondary treatment, is that R2 or 5 R3? 6 Mr. Niermann: No. Actually that's still not at 7 that R--8 Mr. Inouye: I believe it's secondarily treated 9 I believe it's classified R3, and if it's 10 disinfected then it might go to R2. 11 Member Lim: So, you have to get the entire treatment plant to R2? 12 13 Mr. Niermann: To get it to a useable--Because R3 14 is not, wouldn't be suitable for process necessarily, right? 15 [referring to Mr. Inouye] 16 [colloquy between Mr. Niermann and Mr. Inouye] 17 Chairman: Okay. Any questions of Applicant, 18 further questions? 19 Member Lim: You talked a little bit about the 20 Coral Creek Golf Course being like the settling basin for 21 that area. The reason why I asked the question was you've 22 seen what happened in Houston and Florida, got all these 23 infrastructure facilities being inundated by big floods and

if there is a bigger flood, a 100-year storm that overcomes

the golf course. What's the elevation of our treatment

24

25

plant?

Mr. Niermann: If we get up to the treatment plant we're all in a lot of trouble. So, we are in X. I don't know the actual hydrology or how high it would go up. But my understanding is the Oneula Beach Park where they have essentially it's functioning as a forwarder [phonetic], a wear [phonetic], that will disperse or will overtop that well before it will reach the elevations back here or come up to flood. That'll be my initial action. We can certainly provide more information on that.

Member Lim: That's good. I just wanted to put that on the record to consider this.

Mr. Niermann: Okay. It's a good point because this is an essential facility handling third of the island's population.

Member Sodaro: Could you show the timeline for filing the SLUD BA.

Mr. Niermann: Okay. So, I guess it's a recommended condition in here. Our intent is to prepare it and get it underway immediately and file it within a year to 18 months. And 18 months we're comfortable with but we would like to have a little breathing room. So, the proposed condition is three years. Within three years of the LUC action that we have that SLUD BA filed or the petition filed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Member Sodaro: In that same timeline it says that for the full build out it would take to 2030, but the Does that comply with that or is consent decree has 2024. that above and beyond the issue that needs to be--

Mr. Niermann: Kind of above and beyond because by that time we would expect to have the -- the boundary amendment would be in place, and then we we wouldn't have anything hindering completion of those designs other than our own. It'll be all on us. It wouldn't be with a third party entitlement requirement.

Member Sodaro: Okay.

Member Lim: There's one issue that came out of the September 12th, 2017 State Department of Transportation, Airports Division letter. I think the agreement, the fact that DPP wouldn't object to the additional condition to address the concerns. Their concerns were basically that they want to have an agreement that the Department of Environmental Services would address the wildlife issues and any allegation an avigation easement. This is a major proposed condition so suggest you check it out to see if that's acceptable to you guys.

Mr. Niermann: Okay.

It's basically following very Member Lim: closely, the last sentence, page 1, Airports Division matter AIR-EP 17.0101. The new condition would be, "the Petitioner

shall enter into a memorandum of agreement per MOA", between the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Airports Division and the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Environmental Services with respect to avigation and wildlife management requirements to address safety concerns that flight operations at Daniel K. Inouye International and Kalaeloa Airports.

The MOA shall run with the land and shall be recoreded with the Bureau of Conveyances to the State of Hawaii and if appropriate the office of the Assistant Registrar, Land Court of the State of Hawaii.

Mr. Inouye: We understand those conditions, and we have no objection.

Member Lim: That's all.

Chairman: Any other questions?

Mr. Niermann: May I just just one other question so that we don't get into trouble later on. Just the issue of the Petitioner is currently DDC but that has now become ENV per the City Charter amendment. Does that present any concerns or issues that we need to then--

Chairman: Still the City--So, I understand the revision to the UA that you mentioned. I guess that's the final--Kind of like the last step of this whole thing. But you're also going in for a zone change. Why do you need to do that, I guess is my question.

2.4

Mr. Niermann: Well, I guess it would be considered at that point, actually wouldn't need one, right. That's a good point. Once we're in the public use-

Chairman: Once you're in the public district--

Mr. Niermann: Yeah, it's allowed in any of the county zoning districts.

Chairman: The zone change is--I mean you still have to do basically almost the same process with the UA change.

Mr. Niermann: Yeah, the only--

Chairman: I'm just trying to find out why you needed a zone change.

Mr. Niermann: I think the only reason is the development standards probably for AG-1 versus the I-2. It will still require a waiver is my understanding if we had anything--

Chairman: Non-conforming structures.

Mr. Niermann: Yeah. Right now we're not expecting any. I think the height limit in AG-1 is 25 feet, and all of our structures are currently proposed to be below that. Other than in the future, the admin. building would exceed that height, most likely exceeded. That was what was being proposed over in this area. So, it would require a height waiver at that point. So, it was mainly just so that everything was more consistent with the intent of the

1 underlying zoning for that use. More of an industrial, I 2 guess that would be an office function, that type of function. 3 Chairman: Okay. 5 Member Sodaro: Can I ask another timeline 6 question. So, is ENV contemplating starting work while the 7 SUP is active. You're not going to wait for the boundary change to then start work. It's all time to actual 8 improvements? 10 Mr. Niermann: Uh-hmm, that's correct. 11 And that's actually one of the reasons we're getting an SUP 12 first rather than a boundary amendment. 13 Member Sodaro: So you can move? Mr. Niermann: Yes. 14 15 Member Sodaro: Okay. So, to Commissioner Lim's, 16 you know, question on the proposed MOA language, is that 17 with the SUP condition and that goes away or does the UTF to 18 come back at the boundary amendment or is the Applicant open 19 to make the MOA binding regardless of what permit or 20 boundary amendment it's operating under. I'm just trying to 21 think, does now make sense or does later?

Member Lim: Or we put it in now, take it up at

24 Member Sodaro: Roll it over--

22

23

25

the LUC--

Member Lim: Yeah, roll it over.

1 Mr. Niermann: We're anticipating it will be a requirement at the boundary amendment as well, that it be 2 3 condition. Member Sodaro: Okay. 5 Mr. Niermann: Yes. If it is not executed by then--Member Sodaro: Can I ask ENV if--Are there any 6 7 educational tours of the plant now? 8 Mr. Inouye: Yes, there are. 9 Member Sodaro: Okay. Thank you. 10 Chairman: [inaudible] 11 Member Sodaro: I mean, this is a pretty 12 significant expansion. So, I wasn't familiar, but I do think with such heavy infrastructure projects, you know, if you're 13 14 not doing open educational tours. I think it'll be really 15 good especially since you're trying to get the 100% R1 16 treatment. So, thanks. 17 Chairman: Okay. Any other questions at this 18 time, Commissioners? [no response] Okay. Staff, Gloria, we 19 have anybody signed up to testify? 20 Mr. Niermann: Just the two of us. 21 Chairman: Oh, okay. Okay. Thank you. Anybody 22 else wishing to testify on this matter before the Planning 23 Commission? [no response] Okay. Seeing none, can I get a

25 Member Lim: So moved.

motion then to close public testimony.

24

Member Sodaro: Second.

_

•

_

Chairman: Okay. So, they will still have to come

Member Bodaro. Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections? [no response] Any abstentions? [no response] Seeing none, public testimony has been closed.

Commissioners, any further discussion either with Department or Applicant or anybody else? DPP.

One of the conditions, basically you giving them three years once the SUP becomes active to, I guess file for the boundary amendment, right. However, I guess you're allowing them--There's a provision in here that the Director can actually extend that for another three years.

Mr. Young: That's correct.

Chairman: What are you guys thinking or--

Mr. Young: Well, I guess this brings to mind what happened in our last SUP where NRG took over, First Wind and those guys--PV project, right. They went bankrupt, but I'm not anticipating that to happen here, but unanticipated events could occur in this case, and we we want to be prepared for that so we don't end up going back to the Land Use Commission to ask for an extension. If they want is necessary and they still haven't got it squared away by 2023, then the Director, assuming the Land Use Commission and the Planning Commission goes along with it, will have that authority.

1 back to both LUC and Planning Commission for the extension? Mr. Young: If this condition wasn't imposed as 2 3 worded. The intent is to try to avoid going back to the Land Use Commission and the Planning Commission to allow an 5 extension. In this case it's a one time extension. 6 Member Lim: In other words, the Director can do it 7 by himself. Mr. Young: But for unforeseen circumstances. 8 9 Chairman: They might override you on that one, but 10 they might not like that. Okay. So, it's a one time extension for an additional three years? 11 12 Mr. Young: That's correct. Chairman: Okay. Any other questions for the 13 14 Department? [no response] Okay. You mentioned--The 15 Department doesn't have any objections to entering into the 16 MOA with the Department of Transportation, correct? 17 Mr. Young: No objections. Chairman: Okay. Thank you. 18 19 Mr. Young: Thank you. 20 Chairman: Okay. Any further discussions, 21 Commissioners? [no response] No. Okay. Do we have a motion? 22 23 Member Lim: Okay. I move that the Special Use 24 Permit Application File NO. 2017/SUP-2 with the expansion of Honouliuli Wastewater Treatment Plant on approximately 25

27.807 acres of land, the State Land Use Agricultural 1 2 District at Tax Map Key 9-1-069 portion of Parcel 003 and 3 Parcel 004 be approved subject to the nine conditions 4 proposed by the DPP with the addition of the new 10th 5 condition that I read earlier, which is, I'll try again. Petitioner shall enter into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) 6 7 between the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, 8 Airports Division and the City and County of Honolulu, 9 Department of Environmental Services, is that the correct 10 agency? 11 Chairman: Yes. 12 Member Lim: With respect to avigation and wildlife 13 management requirements to address safety concerns for

Member Lim: With respect to avigation and wildlife management requirements to address safety concerns for flight operations at Dan K. Inouye International and Kawailoa Airports. The MOA shall run with the land and shall be recorded with the Bureau of Conveyances of the State of Hawaii and if appropriate the Office of the Assistant Registrar of the Land Court of the State of Hawaii.

Chairman: Okay. Do we have a motion.

Member G. Chang: Second.

Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any discussion, Commissioners?

Member Sodaro: No.

Chairman: Okay. Seeing none--

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1	Mr. Young [from the audience]: Mr. Chair, excuse
2	me, did the motion mention DDC or ENV?
3	All Commissioners: ENV.
4	Mr. Young [from the audience]: Okay.
5	Chairman: Okay. Any further discussions,
6	Commissioners? [no response] All those in favor, say aye.
7	All Commissioners: Aye.
8	Chairman: Any opposed? [no response] Any
9	abstentions? [no response] Seeing none, the motion is past
10	unanimously. Thank you very much.
11	Seeing no further items on our agenda, can I get a
12	motion to adjourn.
13	Member G. Chang: Motion to adjourn.
14	Chairman: Moved.
15	Member Sodaro: Second.
16	Chairman: Moved and seconded. Any objections?
17	[no response] Any abstentions? [no response] Okay. This
18	meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much. [bangs gavel]
19	[meeting adjourned at approximately 2:20 p.m.]
20	000
21	
22	
23	
24	
2.5	

1	I certify that the foregoing is
2	a true and correct transcription
3	of the proceedings, prepared to
4	the best of my ability, of the
5	meeting held on Wednesday.
6	September 13, 2017.
7	
8	Man
9	Gloria Takara
10	Secretary-Hearings Reporter
11	
12	Adopted on September 27, 2017
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
- 3	