



City and County of Honolulu Storm Water Utility Formation Stakeholder Advisory Group

April 16, 2020, 4:00-5:30 pm

Q&A Webinar Summary

ATTENDEES

Stakeholder Advisory Group Members

American Council of Engineering Companies of Hawai'i (June Nakamura)
Hawaii Auto Dealers Association (Dave Rolf)
Hawaii Reserves, Inc. (Jeff Tyau)
Honolulu Board of Water Supply (Barry Usagawa)
'Iolani School (Jaron Kawamura)
KUA (Wally Ito & Kevin Chang)
NAIOP (Darlan Chun)
Neighborhood Board #4 (Sharon Schneider)
Neighborhood Board #28 (Dee Dee Letts)
Sustainable Coastlines (Rafael Bergstrom)
The Nature Conservancy (Kim Hum)
University of Hawaii (Roger Babcock)
Fresh Water Initiative (Mark Fox)

Public Agency Staff

Randall Wakumoto (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)
Ross Sasamura (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)
Tonya Ketzka (City and County of Honolulu Department of Facility Maintenance)

Consultant Team

Juli Beth (JB) Hinds (Birchline Planning LLC)
Joan Isaacson (Kearns & West)
Laurens van der Tak (Jacobs)
Jessica Chiam (AECOM)
Ming Ding (AECOM)
Cami Kloster (G70)
Janice Jensen (G70)
Taylor York (Kearns & West)

Members of the Public

Dana Okano (Hawaii Community Foundation)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Joan Isaacson (Kearns & West) welcomed everyone and introduced Juli Beth (JB) Hinds (Birchline Planning), Randall Wakumoto (City and County of Honolulu) and Laurens van der Tak (Jacobs). Randall also welcomed and thanked participants for joining the webinar.

The project team is looking for additional input on key questions including:

- 4 or 8 tiers for the Fee Structure
- "Plan C" Program Budget
- Options for addressing themes from Round 1 Community Engagement

Input during the webinar could be provided by sending a message via chat or by "raising your hand" to be taken off mute. After the meeting, Stakeholder Advisory Group members were invited to send comments via email to Randall by Friday, April 24th.



An orientation was provided on the meeting software features that allow for muting, turning on and off video, “raising a hand”, using the chat function, changing participant’s display name, utilizing the speaker view and adjusting slide viewing area.

2. Agenda Overview

3. Public Comment Process

Joan provided an overview of the agenda for the Q&A webinar and explained the process for the public to submit comments via email or regular mail.

4. Questions and Discussion Regarding March 30, 2020 Meeting Agenda Items (specifically Fee Structure, Program Budget and Plan C, Credit Program and Policy Options, and Additional Options for Addressing Themes from Community Input)

JB provided an overview of the topics covered during March 30th Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting.

Note: Presentation slides and the agenda from the March 30, 2020 meeting are posted at www.StormWaterUtilityOahu.org on the Stakeholder Advisory Group page.

Q&A/Discussion

Please note: The notes with dashes (-) represent comments and questions from the Stakeholder Advisory Group and the notes with open points (o) represent the project team’s responses.

- A member expressed preference for 8-tier fee structure because it provides a higher level of fairness.
- A potential discrepancy was raised as regarding the rates on the slides that present the 8 tiers and the case studies slides.
 - o While both have titles that reference small residential, the impervious areas are different for each example and are in different rate tiers. The tiers refer to land use for convenience but do not have a particular meaning. The titles will be changed for future presentations to avoid this confusion.
- Defining private roads is important, voiced a member. While some private roads are like driveways and serve a few parcels, others serve many properties and are open to the public. Because of this, not all private roads should be charged. It was suggested that if a private road serves six or more properties and is open to the public and paved by the City, then the owners should not be charged a storm water fee. Most of these roads have City service (trash, sweeping). City maintenance may be only at the surface and not the infrastructure under the roads.
 - o Randall noted that for Mililani many of the roads are in the process of being turned over to the City. The City has a database where these roads have been assigned categories and codes.
 - Another Stakeholder Advisory Group member noted that the Mililani Town Association does not own the roads or any of the infrastructure. Castle and Cooke owns the roads and infrastructure and has been working on turning them over to the City for the last 20 years. These roads should therefore be attributed to the City. If the storm water utility tried to charge Castle and Cooke, a lawsuit might ensue.
 - o Project team will look at the examples provided in Mililani.

CCH Storm Water Utility Formation Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting

April 16, 2020 | Q&A Virtual Meeting



- There are concerns with old properties in Kaimuki that have issues with lack of ownership. The private roads can have private storm water systems; the City mapping system shows that there are storm drain systems. There should be consideration of this.
 - o Laurens responded that this is a common storm water utility issue and the property owners associated with the roads can receive a credit assuming that they provide the maintenance.
 - o Project team will look at these examples as well.
- Another Stakeholder Advisory Group member reported living on a private road in that will never be turned over to the City. Also, it has no storm water management because at the top of a hillside.
- Why should folks pay into a system that they do not benefit from?
 - o There are other roads that they drive on and benefit from, and there are other programmatic needs for the City and County of Honolulu.
- Many private roads were constructed in subdivisions prior to City Code requirements, said a member. Some are alternate routes to highway closure. Part of the reason they close is there is not a storm water system and flooding is an issue. There isn't anything on the "What do we get" list about flooding.
 - o JB responded that there has not been a master plan created for areas with drainage/flooding issues; however, this was expressed as a desire during the community meetings. Placeholders were put into the budget for grants and partnerships, and these might be ways to look at reinvestment in areas. Milwaukee has an allocation of green infrastructure that can contribute to flood reduction.
- Credits for small residential homeowners seem like they would be too cumbersome and maintenance intensive. E.g. rain barrels would be a manini credit and might not be used or maintained. Wouldn't a better option be a drainage system that is designed for 60% impervious area? If the % impervious area on the lot is less than 60%, an automatic credit should be given the property.
 - o Laurens noted that he has not seen a credit threshold done before. If you have credits, people need to apply for them.
 - o The need for a limit on lot coverage is usually more of a zoning issue rather than a storm water utility issue. Joan reviewed that the community members brought up the issue of on-site storm water.
- A Stakeholder Advisory member noted that Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) for some developments can be restrictive, and some places do not have room for mitigation or will be difficult.
 - o JB shared examples of grants or rebate programs where a community works together on a common site to receive credits.
- There was a request to have information on how much property tax is collected by area for storm water efforts. This information could be used to understand what decrease could be recommended in property tax numbers. It is understood that a revenue neutrality recommendation is not in the purview of either the consultants or the City's Department of Facility Maintenance. It was proposed that the Stakeholder Advisory Group have a discussion regarding this topic and take a vote. This would allow for the record to show what the Stakeholder Advisory Group agreed upon and send that voting record to City Council.
 - o Joan responded that this will be an agenda item for the next Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting. The conversation would then be documented in the meeting summary which will be part of the report that goes to City Council.
 - o Laurens noted that there was a table in the January and March Stakeholder Advisory Group presentations with the weighted tax rate.



Project Team Questions for Stakeholder Advisory Group Members

JB posed the question to Stakeholder Advisory Group Members: what would be a good authority and scale for identifying and funding community projects? Would this be a neighborhood board function? The project team is looking at the revenue that is likely to be generated by each neighborhood board area. She added that one of the first things that may need to be done is to have an island-wide master plan developed with community input.

Comments from the Stakeholder Advisory Group Members were:

- If a large project, the issue was how do projects get elevated to be addressed? In some cases, the storm water issues require big solutions. For example, when highways are paved and elevated, and there is no system to move the water under the highway, flooding can occur.
- Unless there is a requirement to do this, all the money will go into urban areas. This could be via a neighborhood board allocation. There should be a specific percentage to make sure investment geographic investment happens.
- It was pointed out that Mayor Harris had program where there was \$2M for neighborhood boards to determine project priorities in their district.
- Another perspective was that anything done on a large scale needs to be a partnership with scientists and other partners to make it successful. If working to identifying problems, there might be disagreement. Neighborhood boards can gather community input – but not manage projects. For example, a neighborhood board might ask questions and submit preferences. The Storm Water Utility would need to do the actual assessment and report back.
- If there is information, it should be presented to the community, offered another member. Probably need to have consultants interacting with the community and not just in the back of the room.
 - o Laurens shared that storm water master plans typically use experts to make the assessments. Usually, plans come out of the need to meet NPDES permit requirements which are therefore water quality focused.

JB asked if there was a geographic re-investment, does it feel like the neighborhood boards would be the right level.

- Yes, neighborhood boards are good at doing education and could gather input on community priorities. Sometimes there are challenges coming to agreement on priorities such as for the Ala Wai Watershed project.
- Another Stakeholder Advisory Board member noted that they had worked with neighborhood boards to provide project updates and found them to be good vehicles for sharing information and that they are civically engaged.

5. Next Meeting Preview – May 18, 2020

Next Meeting is Monday, May 18th at 4:00 and will again be a webinar. It will be in a more interactive format going forward to promote discussion.

6. Wrap-Up

JB asked the Stakeholder Advisory Group to please keep the feedback coming! Joan thanked everyone for their input and creativity.