

WAIPIO

E. Bryan (Summary of last meeting on Waipio): The only item of business that was left on the Island of Oahu was the central plain, particularly the section surrounding present Waipio Village concerning the proposed Waipio Town. As I recall when we left Oahu the last time there was a motion to approve a certain area there in conformance with the City's Master Plan; and it was voted on with 4 affirmative votes and no negative votes. But 4 votes are not sufficient to take action by this Commission and accordingly we should take this up the first thing today. I understand the consultants have additional comments to make at this time.

D. Wolbrink: I would like to speak briefly covering 6 points which we think are important for your consideration in examining this particular problem. The first question is that you are considering now, and what you might decide now. This is how we see it as your consultants. The question is whether or not Waipio Town as an entity is to be in the permanent boundaries, or whether what you are going to propose is for the public hearings. The question of whether it will be in or whether it will not be in is something that must be decided after the public hearing by July 11. So that the question at the moment is what will the Commission set up as your proposal for public hearing purposes. In looking at this problem from this standpoint I would like to comment briefly on the approach to the problem and the practical needs which do exist in proposing for public hearings the various interim boundaries. We all recognize that there must be reasonable answers to all problems if you don't want to create any unnecessary problems in proposing boundaries for public hearing purposes. There is often a difference between what might be thought of as a purely technical answer to the problem and an answer which ultimately is accepted by the public for what you might say politically/acceptable answer. This is the first basic in our democratic process. In the final analysis any action by any public body must be politically acceptable or the democratic process will take its due course. This is the purpose of the public hearings which are coming up between now and July 11, and the decisions on all the boundaries, not only on this particular problem, but on all of them, of course, will be made by you.

Between the conclusions of this proposal and the six month period, in doing this, you will recognize, of course, the need for urban lands, the need for diversified agriculture, the need for large scale agriculture, and the need for conservation. With this preliminary comments in mind I would like to speak directly to the Waipio Town problem. This has been with us as a proposal from the very beginning of the work, in fact it was a proposal prior to the passage of this Act. In my own personal opinion I think I consider it the most critical and significant problem this commission will handle, and it is for this reason that I want to speak directly to it. One of your commissioners gave you a review report last week on some very specifics in connection with the proposal, and with your permission I would like to run through this and offer some further comments. I might say that the various items which have been discussed and presented by the property owners, Oceanic Properties, all have been reviewed by us and have been background in the recommendations that we have made to you. I simply will take these in the order in which they are presented. These comments were presented by the attorney of Oceanic to your commission in its presentation to you. [REDACTED]

- In regard to your comments yesterday with relation to the need of Oahu Sugar Company we request with respect that you consider the following:
- a. Oceanic is already leasing 1200 acres of land ~~from~~ <sup>to</sup> Oahu Sugar? Of course this is correct.
  - b. Any need that Oahu Sugar has for additional lands result from conversion of its lands from agriculture to urban use? This no doubt is correct.
  - c. It is pattenly unjust to require one landowner to leave its lands in agricultural use for convenience of adjoining landowner who is urbanizing his lands? We are getting a little out of focus here. You are not proposing to zone any lands on this island for urban for a particular property owner's convenience, but rather you are taking the objective public point of view as to where urban development should occur, recognizing all the requirements of this Act. As far as the unjustness of zoning certain lands urban and certain lands agriculture, this is a process that you have been involved in considering all the lands of the state.. Of course it has been long upheld in zoning that a property owner cannot be denied a reasonable use for his lands. But you cannot assume the responsibility of seeing that any one property owner gets its income on his lands at a higher figure simply because you would like to do it for him and you feel his interest is perhaps a little different or better than somebody

elses. In approaching the classification of land for districting or land in use for zoning purposes, it is very important that the overall needs of the community be your guide and in no case we believe you should consider that property A is good, while property B hasn't been doing so well. The point of view must be overall. Oahu Sugar Company has said that it intends to satisfy its needs by use of other areas. I believe that this is correct. However, I don't think the statement has been made that some of these central valley lands are not good sugar lands or they would not be put in sugar or other agriculture, if they were not used for urban purposes.

The Commission must make a choice between permitting urbanization of Oahu Sugar's lands and Oceanic lands. The matter should be given preference to cost.

(1) Oceanic proposed development is the only one which would offer fee simple ownership to the public. All other developers are offering leasehold. Oceanic offers the public the choice of either. I don't think this is correct. I think there are other fee simple lands on the market on Oahu. However, it is very desirable to have fee simple lands and I might add right now in our recommendation to you all of the commitments and basic concepts of Oceanic Property in terms of good planning and development that can be carried out. (2) Oceanic plans for its development is complete. Other developers plans are only complete as to minor parts of their entire proposed development. Gentlemen: Once you have determined the limits of an urban district, your responsibilities ceases. You have no responsibility or no authority to compare the quality of detail planning within these urban districts. This is completely the responsibility of the city & county. If one developer is carrying out a good idea and another is not, this is the city & county of Honolulu's responsibility. If there are degrees of excellence, if there are degrees of mediocrity, the blame and the credit can be placed with the City. But you cannot in all wisdom in our opinion say we think developer X is doing a great job, so we are going to give him some urban land. We think some of them over here, the planning is miserable, so we are going to hold back on him. But our advice to you is please don't at any point try to become involved in judging the relative merits of technical plans as proposed in the urban district because we believe this is not only your responsibility but we believe you have no authority to do so.

(3) Oceanic plans are for an integrated whole community not merely another bedroom subdivision. This is correct but the whole story must be stated. The proposed urban districts that we have been considering make provisions for what might be called whole communities in places like Hawaii Kai, Waimanalo, Kailua, Kaneohe, Kahaluu, Makakilo, and other areas. Again coming back to my previous point, the quality of planning to see that these are good, complete communities rest with the city & county. Failures in that respect of theirs and any successes should be credited to them. (4) Priority in time of obtaining tentative approval of paper subdivision is not a valid logical or wise criterion to use in making the judgment as to the best use of Oahu's lands. Quality of a plan and the contribution of a proposed development to the welfare of the state are better criterions. Well gentlemen, I think we are all realists and we all know we can't make the hands on the clock turn backwards; we have to begin where we are right now. We have to accept the facts of life as they are and it might be nice to dream about being able to be retroactive. But even legislative action has great difficulty in being retroacted. So the acceptance of what existed on when this work began is simply one of the facts of life. The next point with reference to your consideration about whether Oceanic would be able to carry out its proposed development, may I point out the following:

I think it is the custom of the extent of the plan which Oceanic has prepared as to how it could have been marketed in small subdivision, but rather they chose to prepare a comprehensive plan. It is Oceanic's determination to create a new high quality satellite city that has prompted it to spend more than \$500,000 in planning for this project. This very meritorius in all of the concept which have been developed by Oceanic can be initiated in our recommendation to you. But we feel that we must point out that this is still a paper plan. Current business does undertake expensive and expensive research for the development of plans, for the development of programs, for the marketing of products; how to make the most research automobiles in the history of the automobile industry was in essence the car. The motivation research of what do people want, what do we need; a tremendous amount of research went into it. It was a landmark in research and it cost Ford Motor Company \$200,000,000. My only point is that this is still a proposal or plan as to what needs to be done; it's a demonstration that can become a fact and our recommendation to you provides this opportunity.. The Waipio project has been embodied in the Honolulu General Plan. However, no zoning has been granted. If the project is included in an urban district

by your commission, Oceanic must still obtain appropriate zoning from the city government. This must be done in increments. If the plan fails Oceanic will be unable to obtain additional zoning after the first increment. This would prevent development of any sprawling ordinary subdivision. This is true because Oceanic has pledged this out to the City Council to carry through its plans. Failure to do so would result in denial of further zoning. Oceanic hereby makes the same commitment to you. Gentlemen: we know of no reason why the same objective judgment in extending an urban zone after the initial increment has proven itself could not be expected from this body that is expected from the city and county.

# Despite our inability to foresee what will happen in the future there is no reason to believe that Oceanic Property will fail. It has raised many merits, and again the concepts in it we believe can be applied to the recommendation we are recommending to you. There is further discussion about the need for agricultural lands. I would like to cover very briefly some additional points which we consider as the facts as we see them in this Waipio case. The City and county has adopted the plan basically with adjustment as proposed initially by Oceanic Property. The delineation with the area above the future defense highway. I think the City & County in their discussions (you probably have a letter which requests the commission to adopt the Waipio plan as set forth in the City & County's master plan and the City & County Planning Commission) have commented that they have spent a great deal of time and effort in developing the city & county master plan and they would like you to follow it. You have all seen this large blue book which represents the detail and comprehensive study for the city & county of Honolulu. This is the master plan which was completed two or three years ago. Probably no one is more familiar with the specifics and details that are in that large blue book than our office as we have worked in detail with this Oahu districting problem. We are unable to find in it any reference to the concept which is back of Act 187. It may be there but we have not found it, where there is any declaration of purpose to provide any particular protection of prime agricultural lands. There are many, many cases in developing these boundaries where minor adjustments here and there can be made in order to recognize the multitude of detail needs and interest. But here gentlemen, we are looking at one great, big problem, and one which we believe must be looked at squarely for what it is. We don't know of efforts in the preparation of that plan to protect prime land and it probably would be a fair statement to say that concept in protecting prime agri-

cultural lands which is now a very active concept in the planning department staff has become active to a large extent since the passage of Act 187. A second point which we think is important is, we believe, that Oceanic Property can keep all the commitments and all the statements and promises that have been made in accordance with the recommendations we are making to you. One of the points that have received some consideration is the question of utilities. Incremental development of a community in this area undoubtedly will call for incremental utility development. That is sewage treatment plants, water supply development that are developed as required. We would not visualize (you have an engineer on your commission and he might want to comment on this) that a utility would be built in this location to serve beyond the known projected needs. We would visualize an incremental development of utilities. The fourth point that seems important to us concerns the need for zoning 2,000 acres now (I did comment on this briefly before), and it would be our judgment that the same objective evaluation could be expected from this commission based on changed needs. The change need would be approved if the project is going ahead. It is only view project now. The recognition of change needs would logically be as set forth by this commission as it might be from the city. I'll comment briefly on the differences of Oceanic requests and our recommendation to you. On this map we have shown in red the proposed urban districts exclusive of this central Oahu plateau. Not including the urban lands which are military and all military lands which are intensively used such as airfields, etc. are zoned in red; it is an urban type use. But exclusive of those urban lands there is something over 16,000 acres proposed for urban development within those boundaries. In addition there are nearly about 4,000 acres which is within the present urban skin. So there is roughly 20,000 acres of land for urbanization as proposed on these boundaries now. The greatest consumption has been running about 800 acres per year (800, 900 and approximate a 1,000). So on a theoretical basis if future growth is as rapid as past on a statistical basis, that would be enough land for 20 years. Of that, 16,000 acres of additional urban is shown here, something over 6,000 is not prime agricultural lands. Of that 6,000 we have made a very high rough estimate. It has been impossible to get an ample figure but we have made a rough guess that about 4,000 acres is now in intensive cultivation for major agricultural or diversified agriculture, or recently has been in such use. This map that we are looking shows the southern limits, the golf limits, and the defense high<sup>ly</sup> limits of the Waipio plan which is on the wall behind you. That is roughly 2,000 acres, slightly under that. This<sub>A</sub> proposed industrial site which is purple on that map. This is the proposed town site.

So you can see on this map graphically the developing position between the Waipio town site and the other urban areas. We are recommending to you that about 550 acres on the mauka side of the defense highway immediately be zoned for urban and that would be the area which is shown in this piece that I have just pasted on. In recognition of that initial zoning, if that area proceeds successively then the remainder of this flat iron piece of land lies between what would be urbanized. That would be this area. So that from the defense highway to the forest reserve zone ultimately might be a complete planned community. The first increment which would be starting here instead of over here. The basic differences as far as topography is concerned is that this is a much higher elevation than the upper end. This is incorporating the climatic differential which the central plateau has to a better expanse than this area, and on the basis of soil ranges this land is not as good as this land. Above the highway we have about a 1,050 acres between this strategic defense highway and forest reserve boundary of land which is graded by the land study bureau of the university as Class A for pineapple, Class B for general agriculture. Below the highway and within the confines only of the Oceanic Property plans we find approximately 1,850 acres of Class A pineapple land and the same acreage of Class A for general agriculture. The first step which we proposed to you of 550 acres includes about 400 acres of class A pineapple land. In summary when we take the area above the highway and add to it the adjacent properties in Waikele Gulch (which we have recommended to you be included as urban), we have above the highway on this entire flat iron plateau about 1800 acres for the complete urban entity to be developed in increments up the plateau, stage by stage, versus a total about 1,950 acres below the highway which likewise would be developed incrementally of better lands in a lower elevation with less climatic change in the remaining of the islands. A question has come up in some discussions as to whether or not this upper plateau area is as developable and as useable economically as the lower area. I have taken some pictures up there which I will pass around which you might look at. The first picture is standing on the future defense highway line. The area to the right is looking towards Schofield Barracks. The area to the right would be up to the plateau, the area to the left is down. The remaining pictures in this little booklet are all taken in the upper plateau area. (I haven't tried to identify these specific locations but they do indicate the general character), and perhaps (I took some *Kodachrome* slides) the commission would like to see. To show this at a larger scale I'll pass this around. This shows the same basic areas with

which we have been concerned. Here is the future defense highway; this is the lower plateau area; this is the lower golf course area; this is the proposed industrial site. We would recommend to you that you adopt now for public hearing purposes on the maps to be presented, this 550 acres and this 192 acres providing something under 750 acres for immediate urban zoning in the central plateau, in order that in the future this may grow up to the forest reserve incorporating roughly another 1,000 acres in lieu of <sup>coming</sup> the highway and growing in this area. So I would like to conclude my comments with the recommendation that for public hearing purposes the commission adopt these boundaries as shown. One comment I did not make which I intended to pertain to diversified agriculture. These golf areas are readily developable for diversified agriculture under either plan. Oceanic Property and every landowner can within this entity carry out all the concept and acts of planning, develop provisions that have been suggested for the lower area in terms of good design, in terms of large scale programs. Therefore this is our recommendation to you.

Mr. Yamabe: You have seen the detail map at the city planning level, however, some of the comments made by Don <sup>would be</sup> are quite interesting. We did study this area extensively; now Don commented, maybe it was not taken into consideration, the preservation of agriculture land. I don't know whether it means the larger agricultural use or whether it is diversified agricultural use. But I have found for myself that very little consideration was given towards the agricultural use on the island of Oahu, mainly, simply because of the type of zoning we have probably because of complacency in reality with the citizens as a whole. We <sup>are</sup> trying to bring about some changes in this area, for example, the agricultural area was zoned and <sup>is</sup> still zoned presently Rural Protective or Highway Protective which did really mean agricultural use. It meant anything from agricultural to 5,000 sq. ft. lots for housing purposes. I personally feel, as the Chairman I can speak for the rest of the commission, that we have discussed this matter and we feel that the plans that we have submitted to you people be our recommendation, and I would like to point out that we ~~have~~ had one advantage over your commission as Don has pointed out. We not only have taken into consideration the actual land use broadly as agricultural or urban but we have taken into consideration the type of development, the actual zoning that came up with the comprehensive zoning ordinance which <sup>d</sup> devises the actual use into



many areas. Residential-I think we have about 70 different types of residential and so on, plus hotel-resort. So considering all this we felt that the recommendation was the best Oahu master plan which is actually projected into 20 years hence. It is not a short term master plan; it is a long term, taking all the little considerations into focus. Now I agree with Don Wolbrink 100% the points which he had pointed out to you people. I think these are very important areas and points to be considered, but I would like to inform you people as far as the city planning commission's concern to the best of our knowledge <sup>have</sup> ~~am~~ considered all the points that were brought up and we came up with this master plan rather than the general plan submitted to you people. I don't think I can say anymore. I'm sure there is difference in opinion in some areas as we said planning is not a stagnant thing, it changes. Many a times it needs matter of opinion and I would like to say that the commission members as a whole support the plans submitted to you people as far as Waipio area is concerned. If there are any questions I will be glad to answer them.

Y. Ige: The comment that I would like to make is that on Oahu there is a real need for intensive prime agricultural land. From this map we can see very well that all the urban areas have been expanding to include those areas with intensive agriculture on the fringe boundary of this urban line that was extended primarily because of the fact that they have a 10 year study, and <sup>the</sup> increase in ~~the~~ population would have to have that much area. Naturally that leaves all the intensive diversified agriculture, on Oahu especially, in no place. We have very few lands for diversified agriculture. This program to increase urban zoning, once it takes over, there will be less diversified agriculture land in the next 10 years. Consequently from the standpoint of diversified agriculture; from the standpoint of economics; and from the standpoint of food prices on Oahu; diversified agriculture has to remain. A considerable amount of diversified agriculture should remain on Oahu otherwise the housewives will retain more on consumer goods. If you were to move all the diversified agriculture to the outside islands, I'm quite sure that the various truck crops and diversified products will increase in prices. Now we have an opportunity here where the Oceanic Properties are willing to let go some of the land for diversified agriculture, in that respect I heartily respect their program it helps diversified agriculture to remain on this island. Oceanic Properties as I understand has lands available on outside islands. Whether they <sup>will</sup> miss 2,000 acres is just a bucket in the bucket so I understand. From the standpoint of efficiency in production, they said they don't have to get lands on

the outside islands to produce the amount of production that they have presently here. Now as far as Oahu Sugar is concerned I understand that they have enough land, they don't need anymore land. They have, on the inspection trips that the commission made and I went along, I find, acquired so much more land which was not available for diversified agriculture. Also Oahu Sugar has made plans to acquire more land from Bishop Estate, I understand, so consequently that land is not needed by Oahu Sugar Company. Furthermore, in Mr. Wolbrink's discussion regarding requirements of land, insofar as the upper area or mauka of the defense highway and the area makai of the defense highway for diversified agriculture is concerned whether they were assuming that they were able to get or not able to get the zoning, it doesn't make any difference to the agriculture because diversified agriculture cannot get that land. They will not sell that land for diversified agriculture. Consequently from the overall standpoint, if we can allow them to go into urban district over here whereby land is sold to the consumers to the general public, and at the same time, agriculture land is made available, I think as far as the economic base is concerned we have a better economic base. So based on those assumptions, because it is more the people who are involved in the actual work who will be doing the work, and people who are doing the work would like to have the makai side of that highway, and because of the City & County General Plan or what little is wholeheartedly behind this plan, I would rather see, whatever I do know of the Oahu picture, the makai side be zoned for urban.

F. Sunn: Mr. Chairman, on the basis of reports we received from consultants, and from reports that we have read from the University of Hawaii, we have been informed that diversified agriculture needs on Oahu from the starting stage can be met by just about doubling the present use of some 1,000 acres. I suppose this is pretty close. <sup>with</sup> An addition of 1,000 acres of land this would meet and satisfy all of State of Hawaii's needs as far as diversified agriculture other than the prime crops. This doesn't seem like much in the way of land area requirements when you are thinking of providing 16,000 acres for urbanization. From that basis, this commission in <sup>deciding</sup> whether or not we should use certain prime lands for ~~agricultural~~ urban uses, the Act prescribes that we minimize this to the greatest possible extent. Now the propose rules and regulations reiterate this. However, we are faced with the problem that the only suitable urban lands <sup>(request on this)</sup> as shown by the consultants, something more than 6,000 prime agricultural lands have to be urbanized in order to meet the growing needs of our community. This does not quite conform with the Act that this have to be because these are the only economical and practical areas for development.

As far as Waipio area is concerned Oceanic has seen fit to propose the development of prime agricultural land for their magic city. The City & County wholeheartedly approve of their concept and go along with this deletion of prime agricultural land from central Oahu. Our consultants have recommended that there is a need for urban lands within central Oahu to meet the growing pains of the other communities on Oahu. The difference is now rather or not we should zone an area that is mauka of this propose highway or conform with the City & Oceanic proposal for zoning of an urban area makai of the highway. Now I am still uncertain as to how vital this agriculture land is or whether you are taking prime agriculture land versus B or C lands. Now the City and Oceanic feel different. They feel that there is a lot of agriculture land available and that they can give up other lands for agriculture uses in other areas. I am just wondering if we can make a determination from the overall public understanding standpoint whether we should follow the consultants recommendation or follow the city & county's recommendation, this is what we are faced.

E. Bryan: It is a cinch we have to put something up for the public to look at.

R. Darnell: Mr. Chairman, we have another record of recommendation or partial recommendation from the staff. <sup>that</sup> The question there is sufficient urban pressure to warrant any additional urban area in central Oahu. In other words if the problem does not exist as the need for urban land in central Oahu, than you would not be faced with the choice-which of the areas should be developed. It is unquestionable/cut to up the agricultural lands in both of these areas. The staff does not necessarily agree that there is urban pressure to warrant any of this addition that is proposed by either the consultant or the city. I want to state on record as questioning whether any additional urban areas are required in central Oahu to satisfy the urban pressure on all Oahu or any part of Oahu. The vacancy occupancy ratio in Waiahua--I do not completely understand it. I understand you've got a 5%, is that correct.

E. Bryan: The statement I think was made by the city & county, about being the lowest in the state, something like that.

R. Darnell: In other words Waiahua is about filled up. I agree that is undoubtedly correct. Whether there is additional land needed is my point. I cannot say that it is or it isn't. I question that it is however. If a small amount of additional land is needed in central Oahu, my first recommendation would be to use the plans for the area which is immediately south of Leilehua Golf Course and as closely adjacent to

Wahiawa on the south as you can get. This is proposed neither by the city & county nor the consultants. As a second choice if a considerable area is needed I then would agree with the consultants.

D. Wolbrink: The only thing that would be little more effective would be watching those pictures.

E. Bryan: The commissioners would like to see those slides. Go ahead.

W. Gregg: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a couple of questions. When you talked ( I assume you talked to Oceanic Properties) was the question ever raised, "Why they picked below the Defense Highway in preference to mauka for their original plan?" I mean basically we're almost talking about the same acreage, why did they pick down below in place of above? You say it would not cost anymore to develop one or the other, I assume they must have had some reason, does anybody know?

although

D. Wolbrink: However incidental, I cannot speak for Oceanic Properties, the initial plan<sup>which</sup> was prepared by Oceanic Properties encompasses I believe virtually all of this,

both side of the property. From about here, the makai side, up across the defense highway and going on up the spur to the extent of the gulch. <sup>that</sup> I presume right up to the forest reserve boundary as shown on this map. I believe in discussions of the plan with the City Planning Commission and with the City Council it was proposed that they delete the upper area from their plan and develop the lower area. In our conversations with them the indications have been made, <sup>that</sup> after the lower area is developed, if the project is successful, they would then come back to the <sup>upper area</sup> and this

is the understanding I believe was in the discussion. After the lower area is developed, they would then proceed with <sup>the</sup> upper gulch. The difference to Oceanic Property right now as I see it is simply this. The lower area is bisected by an existing highway. In their plans I think they have provided three connections: one at a mid point and one at each end of that plateau on to the present highway. So the initial development can proceed with access off the present highway, adjacent to the present highway. The defense highway is scheduled for construction sometime in the future. We can fairly state that five years from now when the first comprehensive review is made of <sup>the</sup> entire

state under ~~the~~ Act 187, the defense highway will either be a fact or will be so eminent it will be scheduled ~~to~~ <sup>be</sup> construction or about to go under construction, or it will be completed, it will <sup>be</sup> one those. So five years from now there will be access from the defense highway and in the meantime if Oceanic Property develops the area above the defense highway site, they will be obliged to build about 1 mile of roadway

from the present highway over to the location of the defense highway. That could very well be a roadway which would ultimately be incorporated in the plans 15 to 20 years from now, far beyond the requirement that you are thinking, lest it could be developed more rapidly. So there is one mile of roadway to be built. The distance from the ~~tower~~ <sup>ALPHA</sup> tower to the ~~point~~ <sup>TURNOFF</sup> point is about 17 miles. So the distance from Aloha Tower to the area which we have recommended to you for public hearing purposes for consideration on these maps will be  $1/17$  longer in travel time than the area which Oceanic Property wants to initiate for its development. The actual construction of this highway I don't believe is serious, but this one mile of roadway seriously bothers Oceanic in their overall picture. So what the advantage to them is as I visualize it in developing their own defense highway first is the immediate adjacency to a present road, a condition that will be gone 5 years from now, a condition that can be solved by the building of about one mile of road.

W. Gregg: So it is a matter of economics to start with.

F. Sunn: That's another point. The reason that they have selected this is apparently that where they have their proposed civic center located from high ground which has a very prominent effect. This probably is one of their considerations, I don't know for sure. Mr. Lee would probably know.

F. Lee: In confining myself to this proposed development the reason why it was selected and one of the reasons why we chose makai of the roadway is this. (1) it is a matter of time. You have an existing road there and an existing urban development there. From the existing road they can start developing right away with utility<sup>185</sup>. You have a 10 inch waterline that runs down to the Waikakalaua Gulch. Also in the gulch you have an existing sewage treatment plant. Right above there on the little plateau above the area also you have an existing school plan. So immediately you have a source of water, you have a sewage treatment plant, you have a school facility. So we asked them if it would be feasible for them to develop on their first increment around this existing area, then the City would not have to put up a brand new school plan, it would not have to worry too much about water; actually the developer would be the one who has to develop a new well if he intends to serve all of this area. So it would start off with maybe approximate 500 homes (something like that later on). They would

have to go ahead (and if they started off in the reversing area) drill a well, put in a sewage treatment plant, put in roadways up to there and then the city of course would put in a school. These are their considerations as far as the City is concerned and economically as a test it makes more sense I feel. Now, one of the other points that Franklin mentioned, Frank looking at this prime agricultural land, perhaps this might help you. When Mr. Ige was talking about diversified agriculture, he must realize that here we can plant such things that are predominant vegetables that we have on the table. To raise the other kind or type of crop on this arid land without adequate water with the wind that is over in that area I think you would find it extremely costly; in the shelter areas within the Kipapa Gulch area water may be gotten from the Waihole Ditch. These are the areas that go for diversified more agriculture. Another factor in our selection of the lower area is we felt that in view of coming up here, as your staff suggested, we would like to keep this an individual entity and not tied to Wahiawa. Wahiawa is a town which was oriented for us by Schofield Barracks as an employment center. People living here largely work in this area. Some of them work in the city and this is where Don and I both agree - that there is a need for this type of development here in this climatic area, but we felt if we kept it apart from Wahiawa, it would give this community a new character. You see the overall design of your city here. We are looking far ahead in which we feel we should have clusters of developments. Each cluster has its own individuality, and not just a mass urban sprawl just like Los Angeles where there is no individuality. By isolating this piece here and by stopping development here, with greenbelt in this area (we have a little greenbelt in here), will give this an entirely new character. The plans drawn by the developer of this area are excellent. We think as far as the quality of their work, there can be no doubt as to their actions and those are the following reasons that we have recommended this development.

W. Gregg: When we are speaking of prime agricultural land below the road is better than makai the road, or mauka of the road, what type of intensive agriculture are we talking about? Sometimes crops will grow in the mauka area better than they would down in the lower area, depending on what kind of crops you're talking about. If it is intensive agriculture the cooler or higher climate may be better than the lower plains as Mr. Lee has pointed out. But that bothers me. What is prime agriculture land and what type of crops are we talking about, if you are going to save it.

Mr. Yamabe: I note what Fred Nunns is doing up at the University concerning prime agriculture land. Here he is talking about soil. He refers it to the aridability of the land. As far as the industry is concerned and I do not speak as one of the commission members of the city planning, but as a member of the Farm Bureau, the prime agriculture identification of a land is not hinged upon the actual soil condition itself, but also on the possibility of acquiring that land, the cost of development, and taking into consideration the many different crops and commodities that you mentioned. Out in Waianae area we were told that it was not prime agricultural land; but it is considered one of the best animal husbandry, and the ownership is individually owned. It is fee simple, and it is about the only area we have animal husbandry operation allowed by the city planning zoned actions. So it is quite difficult to say what is prime. But the points that I have pointed out to you, I think, should be considered. When we acquired this land; what is the value of the land here today; if it were put into diversified agriculture what must we pay for that land; what would be the cost for developing water which is needed. These things are taken into consideration as far as the industry is concerned in determining what we consider prime agriculture land.

W. Gregg: It is the matter of what can you grow to make a living or to develop. And as you pointed out prime land for raising cattle one place, prime land for vegetables, truck farming, and others. So if you want to grow vegetables it probably will grow better below the road and down below because of the cooler climate. I would judge the soil might not be good from a soil analysis basis for pineapple and sugar, but it might be better below as a pig farm.

Mr. Yamabe: I would say there is a possibility there. More important is the development cost of this land itself.

D. Wolbrink: The proposal has been made that the Kipapa Gulch area be used for diversified agriculture. I believe that can be used for such a purpose. Whether this upper plateau is urbanized or the lower plateau, in either event the landowner refuses do so. I believe that area could go into diversified agriculture. In addition this lower plateau area does have developed irrigation water; so that where there is a crop which requires irrigation, you could irrigate in this area and I believe the upper plateau does not have equal leverage to solve the water problem.

W. Gregg: But isn't it true the reason the upper area doesn't have water is because it doesn't need it as much, because it gets more natural rain which make it cheaper.

D. Wolbrink: Shows picture slides and explains.

F. Sunn: Mr. Lee in connection with your remarks on Waipio, the State's consultants have recommended that ~~the~~ area mauka of the proposed highway - actually if you were to develop either that area or the area proposed by Oceanic as far as water supply and water facilities are concerned, I doubt that you would service that area with the water facilities from Wahiawa, you probably would have to develop something new. In either event it would be comparable. Also for the sewage disposal facility you cannot expand the present plan now servicing Waipio because of its location and its size.

Mr. Lee: There is one point here. You have a 10 inch main coming down there which terminates that; you also have a sewage treatment plant which is owned and operated by the **golf course**/~~there~~ - I think they finally turned it over to the city & county, I'm not sure.

F. Sunn: Is it adequate for anything else?

F. Lee: Here you have a possibility. You have a school and facilities there. You have the possibility of taking some water from the **gulch** in servicing this area. I realize it will not be for the overall development. The overall development you will have to develop your own water source. In the overall development you will have to develop your own sewage treatment plants. At least there is a start here. Within that gulch area there may be room enough to expand sewage **treatment plant** - they can go makai or mauka to put in additional tanks. But this is a possibility from the stamping of existing utilities that are there. This is where we ran into this problem here, and why we want to stop here. For developing a water source up in here we had to dig all that water on this side to help this area because we are pulling all the water out to feed this area. This is what we are trying to avoid. We are trying to centralize so that they all come to one source and prevent this urban **sprawl**. In doing that we are going to force the developer to put his own utilities in - you might say feed his own plant here. Whether they do it up here or down here it is entirely up to them as you say. But what we would like to do is see



them developed around the existing facilities. Now, in the way with water we admit would probably be inadequate to service this area. But at the development of this source I think we can then use the 10 inch main as more less an emergency in case anything does happen. Without asking them to start off developing that water source I feel they could pull enough water from here to start the initial development. In other words we don't intend to overload because of facility. We don't intend to ask them to put in their master sewage treatment plant and water source right away. We feel that there might be enough of surplus here for them to start off initially with their demonstration project. Now I haven't investigated thoroughly and haven't pulled out dollars and cents, and I haven't done any preliminary feasibility study for it. But I do know that these facilities are available and do know that here is a possibility for them to start here. If they started here, this would require them to put in their water source, their sewage treatment plant, and more than likely we would have to program a school facility in the upper area.

F. Sumn: From the location of the future defense highway it is immaterial from the city's standpoint as to whether this community is makai or mauka.

F. Lee: Well with the defense highway we face some problems there. Inasmuch as we have nothing to say where the line goes, as far as the city is concerned we are working on this principle of trying to get together with the State and working on a joint study with them for a <sup>transportation</sup> conservation system. In this case we would not like to see the transportation system bisect the proposed development. We would like to see this transportation system be on the edge of it at the very beginning. Now as far as whether it should be on the top of one edge, I think economics dictate here that it must be on an existing roadway. I say economics dictate because we are talking of this road five years from hence, if we are lucky. When you say five years from hence your own planning program is limited to five years. So how would you plan a facility or urbanize a facility entirely depended upon the roadway five years from hence. So logically, economically, it would be better for the development to start around the core of the existing development. Those are my views on this.

Y. Ige: On the question of assurance - what assurance do you have from this Oceanic Properties in regard to carrying their plans in motion to follow the master plan which

is suggested by your city planning commission. What assurance does this commission have that your commission will carry out the plans that is being put forth by this Oceanic Property.

F. Lee: The map that you see on the wall is a general plan which was passed by the City Council and adopted. What is adopted by the City Council is law. So the developers will have to follow that. It is a legal requirement that is a legal document there. Our zoning also dictates and is another legal document which he will follow in order to develop this plan. Now as far as actual assurance as to whether he will ever build houses or ever will put in a capitol site on that node of his overlooking the civic center, or overlooking the development, the only assurance we have of that is this good thing. After putting I don't know how many thousands of dollars in their development plans and their models and everything, we feel that they are very sincere about the development of that area. Now of course if overnight we have a major economic change whereby it is no longer feasible to rely on people in the lower income bracket with \$12,000 home that may change the entire picture. Immediately that would probably be wiped out. Because they are shooting for the lower income group and as far as we are concerned they have our blessings on it. We think they can make it a success.

E. Kanemoto: Mr. Lee what will happen in case the Land Use Commission went ahead and approved the upper area instead of the lower area as far as city planning commission is concerned.

F. Lee: Well if you approve the upper area it would put us in a very embarrassing position because we have one legal document which is at the city level saying that this is an urban area and if we have another legal document on the state level saying that the urban area should be mauka therefore we have to go back to the planning commission and rearrange our thoughts as to whether or not we can justify the upper area.

E. Bryan: What is your pleasure gentlemen? I would like to ask the commissioners from Oahu to suggest a solution to this, either Commissioner Sunn or Commissioner Ige.

Y. Ige: Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion to move that this commission adopt the city's general master plan recommendation as presented for the Waipio Section for presentation at the public hearing to be held for agricultural district zoning purposes after January 11. E. Kanemoto seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

S. Friel: I would like that pointed out on that map there. Does that include the green area?

E. Bryan: Yes. That is the question we raised the last time. It also is the existing development and the starting development which we have left this whole puka on the island of Oahu. So any motion covering this would have to decide what we are going to do. You have a description of the existing Waipio urban area?

Y. Ige: That is the general master plan.

R. Darnell: As I understand the motion that includes the colored area, which includes the existing Waipio acres here and starting at the defense highway alignment according to this map. As far as I know it does not refer to any of those. The City's master plan considers all of this residential development along the defense highway alignment and does not include mauka of that.

Y. Ige: It also includes that industrial district.

R. Darnell: That existing subdivision is a nonconforming subdivision at present which the consultants did not recommend it be included in urban.

D. Wolbrink: We recommended that it simply be a nonconforming use as a subdivision, thereby not having a basis for future expansion. But the city's master plan shows that as urban.

F. Lee: Because it is an existing thing.

D. Wolbrink: If you follow our recommendation on that particular point it would not include the area according to plan.

R. Darnell: Don, would you please go over your recommendation as far as Waikakalaua. I believe you had the recommendation that this area be retained in urban.

D. Wolbrink: Our recommendation is that this upper golf area be put in the urban classification for the public hearing along with this 550 acres.

R. Darnell: Did the motion include leaving the area that is already in urban, in urban district.

D. Wolbrink: This is in the temporary urban district. The city's master plan does not have it in urban.

E. Bryan: I think it would be wise to include that area also in the motion as it is already in the urban district.

R. Darnell: The motion includes placing approximately all the areas that is in red and the industrial district.

S. Friel: Mr. Chairman may I ask Mr. Ige a question. Mr. Ige, I wonder if you could change your motion to include that area which is already in the urban area above the highway to include Waikakalaua Gulch.

F. Sunn: The motion included something about agricultural which I don't understand. Would you reword your motion so there will be no doubt as to what we are voting on.

E. Bryan: Mr. Mullahey, did you get that motion?

W. Mullahey: Yes. I have adopted city master plan as shown by this ordinance and as the X0 pointed out to us exclusive of the diversified agriculture, but including the industrial district and interim urban district in Waikakalaua Gulch. I didn't get the original motion.

E. Bryan: Does that answer your question.

F. Sunn: Yeah, that is what he meant.

Y. Ige: That Waipio plan includes the agricultural district?

E. Bryan: The urban area would exclude the agriculture, the diversified agriculture, which stays in the agricultural district. Is that what you said Mike?

R. Darnell: It would exclude this area from urban.. It would add all the rest of the urban that is shown on this map: this industrial, the Waipio town area, the existing Waipio Acres area, and the Waikakalaua Gulch almost up to the forest reserve boundary. The only difference between the motion and this map is that this area will go into urban instead of diversified agriculture, and this area will go into agriculture instead of urban. This is shown as diversified agriculture, this wedge up here is shown as agriculture; this is shown as a golf course and a possible airport which is allowed in an agriculture district.

Y. Ige: I thought that section up there was in urban?

E. Bryan: It is.

Y. Ige: Why does Darnell says it is in agriculture.

R. Darnell: The City's plan shows this as diversified agriculture. It is presently in an urban district, however.

E. Bryan: It is on our temporary maps shown as urban. This is the place where that fella had graded all of the valley. Any further questions on this motion, if not Mr. Mullahey will you poll the commission, please.

Approved: Commissioners Kanemoto, Williams, Friel, Ige, Gregg; Abstained: Commissioners Sunn, Chun & Chairman Bryan. Disapproved: None. Absent: Commissioner Cook.