

**County of Kaua'i  
Planning Department**

**General Plan Update Technical Studies  
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1  
Thursday, January 19, 2012  
10AM – 11AM in Piikoi Building, Room B**

<b>TAC Members (12)</b>	<b>Organization/Title</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Excused</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Barbara Robeson	Community Representative	X		
Beryl Blaich	Community Representative	X		
Carl Imparato	Coalition for Responsible Government	X		
Dustin Moises	Water Department	X		
George Costa	Office of Economic Development	X		
Imai Aiu	Housing Agency	X		
Keith Nitta	Former Long-Range Planner	X		
Lyle Tabata	Deputy County Engineer	X		
Stanford Iwamoto	State Department of Transportation	X		
Scott McCormack	Princeville Corporation	X		
Susan Tai Kaneko	Kaua'i Economic Development Board	X		
Tom Shigemoto	A&B Properties	X		

<b>Others Present (3)</b>	<b>Organization/Title</b>	<b>Present</b>
Dee Crowell	Deputy Planning Director	X
Peter Nakamura	Long-Range Planning Division	X
Marie Williams	Long-Range Planning Division	X

<b>Summary Minutes</b>
<p>1. <u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>Dee welcomed the committee members to the first TAC meeting. Everyone introduced themselves.</p>
<p>2. <u>The Role of the Technical Advisory Committee</u></p> <p>Peter outlined the TAC's role to review data that will support the upcoming General Plan Update. During the last General Plan Update the technical studies ran parallel to the public process. This time, the Planning Department will conduct the studies prior to the public process in order to establish a factual basis for policy development. The studies will include: (1) a socio-economic forecast/analysis, (2) a land use study and (3) an infrastructure assessment. TAC members were selected because of their ability to critically examine data and methodologies relevant to planning, and to ensure that the process is transparent. He stated that there will be a clear separation between the TAC and the CAC since the TAC will not develop policy.</p> <p>Peter said that there are several ongoing and recently completed studies and plans that the Technical Studies will attempt to coordinate with. The committee expanded upon the list, which includes County projects such as the Important Agricultural Lands Study, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, Multi-modal Land Transportation Plan, Water Use and Development Update, Housing Policy Study, the Kaua'i Economic Development Plan/Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and the Kaua'i Energy Sustainability Plan. The State is also conducting the Long-range Land Transportation Plan Update for Kaua'i. Other studies include the Kaua'i Planning and Action Alliance Community Indicators Report. There are several ongoing planning department projects, such as the East Kaua'i, Lihu'e and Kōloa-Po'ipū-Kalāheo development plans</p>

and the CZO Update.

Tom asked if these plans were being based on the existing General Plan Update. Peter said that the General Plan provides some guidance for most of these studies. Lyle mentioned that there are facility plans that have recently been completed, including a wastewater facilities plan.

### 3. Overview of the Technical Studies

Marie gave a presentation entitled “General Plan Update: Technical Studies Overview” which summarized the purpose and functions of the General Plan. Broadly speaking, the General Plan will answer four questions:

- (1) Where are we now?
- (2) Where are we going?
- (3) Where do we want to go?
- (4) How do we get there?

The focus of the technical studies is to provide a clear picture of where we are and where we are heading given current trends. The last two questions will be answered through the public process for the General Plan Update.

Marie provided some background on how the technical studies, “Future Trends” and “Alternative 2020 Projections”, were conducted during the last General Plan Update process. The last study resulted from the CAC’s decision to use a set of value-driven growth projections in which the visitor population was the most important variable in determining future growth. The final projections for resident population, Average Daily Visitor Census (ADVC), total population and total jobs were adopted in 1999.

The projections were compared to actual growth. Dee observed that the projections were surprisingly accurate given the unforeseen surge in development several years ago. He noted that population growth might flatten since development permits have leveled off. Marie noted that “total jobs” continues to grow despite recent economic conditions. Visitor population has proven to be a dynamic statistic, varying both below and above the projection range. DBEDT has reduced their ADVC projections quite drastically since the last General Plan.

Marie reviewed the scope of each study. The socio-economic forecast and analysis will provide population and socio-economic projections for the County and also at the planning district level. A visitor unit demand study will be conducted. She stated the differences between estimates, projections, forecasts, and “desired scenarios” and gave a brief overview of DBEDT’s methodology for the state-wide projections, including the cohort-component model.

Carl mentioned that the “Alternative 2020 Projections” study was initiated because the CAC was uncomfortable using DBEDT’s projections. Therefore, heavy reliance on DBEDT’s current figures may be unwise and their assumptions regarding in-migration should be carefully evaluated. He stated a case for expanding the scope of the technical studies to develop a projections that cover a range of “what if” scenarios. This will provide policy makers with the necessary data to support their decisions. Marie mentioned that the other Counties use DBEDT’s population projections as the official forecast and that perhaps the economic projections can more easily be adjusted since DBEDT utilizes an econometric model.

Dee said that the DBEDT numbers will form a baseline from which scenarios can be developed. Tom mentioned that DBEDT provides projections based on the official data that they have at the state level and are not necessarily trying to predict the future. Peter pointed out that DBEDT has proven fairly accurate regarding their population and economic projections. Imai noted that scenario modeling is more appropriate

for the next stage of the planning process and that the TAC can focus on how outside events will affect Kaua'i's growth.

Carl said that a range of projections, not necessarily a forecast, will be the most important outcome of the studies. He reiterated that the projections should be based on a range of assumptions in order to better support rational decision making.

Scott said that alternative projections will require analyzing historic data and previous statistics to reveal what conditions are necessary to achieve different scenarios. For example, there are outside forces like tourism that affect population growth, but the County has limited influence in determining the world economic climate which affects tourism. Peter said that TAC will provide the basis for policy decisions and that there is a line between baseline and policy-driven projections.

Marie summarized the scopes of the land use and infrastructure studies and said that both will be based on data from the first study. The intent of the land use study is to analyze existing land uses and forecast Kaua'i's future needs based on expected job growth and demographic change. The infrastructure study will assess if current capacity is adequate and also explore "green infrastructure" alternatives.

More questions arose regarding the timing and funding of the General Plan Update. Dustin pointed out that the Water Use and Development Plan won't be finalized until the General Plan Update is complete. Peter said that timing is an issue since there are many ongoing studies and plans, including regional development plans that will run parallel to the technical studies. He noted that there will be three different consultants and that selection process is underway. The Planning Department intends to complete the technical studies within 18 months of executing the contracts and \$525,000 was allotted in the current budget for the studies.

Various components of the technical studies and the TAC were discussed. Concerns were raised regarding how the County's Parks and Recreation Master Plan will interface with DLNR's plans and who will represent the State on the TAC. It was pointed out that Stanford Iwamoto represents the DOT and that several TAC members are part of ongoing State planning processes and can help coordinate the various plans and studies.

The ongoing DOT Long-range Land Transportation Plan Update (LRLTP) was mentioned. Keith said that the LRLTP has heavily influenced much of the County's long-range planning and that the traffic analysis zones (TAZ) have refined data regarding population, commercial square footage, jobs, etc. Another question arose regarding how the landowners will be consulted during the land use study and if the TAC will have to agree with the landowner's plans. Peter said that the group's role is not to mutually agree on a landowner's future plans, but to examine the methodology used.

Keith mentioned that the definition of "developable land" is subjective and should be carefully addressed in the land use study. The standard approach is to consider zoned but undeveloped lands and then lands designated for urban growth by the General Plan. Barbara noted that a buildout analysis was not conducted for the existing General Plan Update, but should be completed given the improved GIS capabilities of the Planning Department.

Scott mentioned that Kaua'i's resident population base includes multiple subgroups, such as those in the timeshare vacation club group and part-time residents, who should be accounted for in the socio-economic study. Peter said that by accounting for these groups, we can better assess their impact on land use and infrastructure.

#### 4. Logistics

Marie said that the next TAC meeting might be held in March, but the schedule must first be coordinated with

the consultant(s). Peter mentioned that the TAC might meet more often once all three consultants are on board since their work will overlap. Beryl noted that the land use and infrastructure studies are premised on the first study and that the consultants should work with each other.

Carl shared his concern that if the project scopes do not include a range of scenario-based projections, then the consultant might refuse to explore those alternatives. Peter said that project scopes have been completed. It was raised that other studies, such as the Important Agricultural Lands Study, will examine alternative scenarios.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10am.

Recorded by: Marie Williams, 1/24/2012