

Kāneʻohe Bay Regional Council Meeting
Agenda
April 7, 2021
6:00PM

Online or call-in via ZOOM
(Zoom info listed below)

1. Opening (Introductions)

6:02pm – Meeting convened

Brian Neilson - DLNR-DAR, administrator and Chair of KBRC

Mo Radke - Leading PIG on Kāneʻohe bay master plan, Kāneʻohe neighborhood board chair/representative. (voting member)

Clifford Loo - Kahaluʻu neighborhood board representative (voting member)

Aunty Rocky Kaluhiwa – Aha Moku, Koʻolaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club (voting member)

Liko Kaluhiwa - Community of Heʻeia, Kāneʻohe bay recreational boating association (voting member)

Fred Reppun – HIMB representative and Heʻeia NERR education specialist (voting member)

Letani Peltier – Resident of Heʻeia, representing OHA (voting member)

Cedric Bertelmann – Fisherman, Heʻeia pier user, bay user (voting member)

Rallen Caya- All Hawaii cruises, DBA Captain Bob's Adventure Cruises

Joe Pickard – Kāneʻohe resident

Casey Ching – DAR

Josh Hekeia – Office of Planning representing Mary Alice Evans, spent years in the bay

Keiki Kipapa – Born and raised Kahaluʻu, member of Kāneʻohe bay, canoe club paddler

Justine Nihipali – Office of Planning

Meagan Ostrem – Marine Corps Base Hawaiʻi

Kolea Fukumitsu

Ian Masterson

2. Permitted Interaction Group update on status of the Kāneʻohe Bay Master Plan Update
(Non-Action Item)

Chair Neilson shared that a meeting was held last week facilitated by Member Radke. Member Radke facilitated well and the meeting seemed productive and heading down a good path.

Tonight's meeting is more discussion about the process, rather than getting into the plan itself. Are there any needs that the planning group requires?

Member Radke updated KBRC on the status of the PIG.

- From getting people together and interested, they found ~55 people wanted to participate.
- Conducted a follow-up meeting to get input, then took all their input about issues and concerns about the bay and categorized them for others who wanted to be involved.
- Google form created to sign up for specific groups/committees:
<https://forms.gle/XDxwtihJ5BmRbcbW9>

- Committees include: Recreation/sporting/boating, environmental issues, commercial use, fishing, Hawaiian legacy, preservation/maintenance, education, enforcement, MCBH involvement, climate change issues, and other.
- Contact information with a request to share with the group
- If they are interested in taking a leadership role and/or leading any of the groups
- Facilitation, group collaboration, or leadership experience
- Google form yields a spreadsheet which populates as it gets filled out.
- One person can sign up for multiple groups, if they wish to participate at that level
- Continue to share with any folks who may be interested. We can sort out who they are, where they live, and their interest in being involved.
- Descriptions of these working groups/committees are listed in the notes from the meeting on March 30th, but we want to give the participants the freedom to contribute to where/what committee they feel issues apply.
 - Chair Neilson noted that it would be good to have descriptions to clarify where certain issues fall under. Ex. invasive species under environmental issues or preservation/maintenance?

Member Reppun shared that given this is the first time the plan has been revisited since it's creation, it's important to get the process right.

- Concerns about opening up the discussion with misunderstandings of the plan and having important things undone in the process (referencing discussion around commercial tour permits at the last meeting).
- Are there are boundaries in place so the original intent of the plan stays strong?

Member Radke replied that the outcome of the PIG is only recommendatory and the voting members of KBRC determine how much of it gets incorporated into the plan.

- The revised plan could move forward in entirety, in pieces, or not at all.
- It should be okay for people to have the floor to discuss everything because it goes to KBRC and then to BLNR in the end.
- A lot of checks and balances before approval should stop anything that would negatively affect the bay, the process shouldn't restrict ideas or voices.
- Chair Neilson asked if the update will go as a whole or section by section with each committee.
 - Member Radke replied that he'd like to set a due date, but wants people to take their time to learn and not rush the process.
 - As groups work together to solve issues and make recommendations, they'll complete their part.
 - The first plan took a year and a half, so we do not have to rush.

Member Reppun suggested a presentation about the plan so everyone involved is aware of the original idea and intent.

- Member Radke agreed and stated that as committees form, subject matter experts could attend committee meetings to provide additional information and reasoning and assist in the process. Chair Neilson volunteered subject matter experts from DAR.

Upon questions about how the original plan dealt with controversial issues and who was the decision-maker among disputes, J Pickard shared that commercial recreation was the most controversial.

- It was the main reason why the effort started and sparked a lot of break out sessions to discuss it. Very spirited people on both sides, but reasonable lines prevailed.
- Good folks participated, talked it out for hundreds of hours, and came to a consensus.
- The plan created was not one everyone was happy about, but could all agree to.
- Facilitators were present for the public meetings, but most of the hashing out was at the committee level.

J. Hekeia and Chair Neilson brought up facilitation and other needs for this effort.

- 10 committees will require notetakers, facilitators, writers, planning, etc.
- Member Radke agreed that notetakers/recorders would be needed and should be easy to find, but that committees may not need facilitators if they have strong group leaders.
 - If a group is having a hard time, maybe we dispatch a facilitator to them.
- Chair Neilson shared that between DAR and OP, there could be facilitators available for these small group sessions.
- Member Reppun addressed the benefit of lining up professional facilitation with some of the contentious issue that are already coming out.
 - A lot of it can be done in committees without that help, but it would be good to have someone who's impartial to address those contentious issues and have them involved from the beginning to quickly fill that role, if needed.
- Documentation and writer needs
 - Member Radke shared that an administrative committee was formed to take all the information and incorporate it into the master plan with the original effort.
 - A contract went to Jim Maragos to write the final.
 - J. Hekeia noted that they will also require GIS and spatial representation help for these to be incorporated into the final plan.
- Member Rocky Kaluhiwa requested the State provide a recorder for the meetings to track all the changes that may come out of these discussions.
 - Chair Neilson responded that the state could provide support for this, but timing with funding is difficult because of the budget cycle with the legislature.
 - If moving now, pull together available resources for notetakers, recorders, planning support etc.
 - If waiting on state support, need to wait for the whole budget cycle for legislature to appropriate funds – doesn't line up with current timeline
 - Member Reppun suggested pulling together what we can now and getting state funding ready for the final stretch
 - Member Radke suggested making a requirement that all meetings of committees are documented somehow, either recorded or has someone to decipher notes and create minutes.

Since the original plan took 17 months, the group agreed that it would be a good idea to move forward with Member Reppun's suggestion to request to the legislature to appropriate planning funds for the final stages of the plan, while the group moves ahead with working groups and committees.

- Member Rocky Kaluhiwa suggested they start talking to legislators now.
- Member Radke and Member Rocky Kaluhiwa volunteered to bring it up at their respective neighborhood board meetings.

Chair Neilson shared funding opportunities of earmarks from congress.

- There's a call for community projects. Kahele's is due at the end of April.
- Mini proposals ~ 1page for community projects to appropriate funds through congress
- Opening up on the senate side, so we can put something in for Schatz as well
- A way to get funding a bit quicker because they will come through in October.
- Chair Neilson will send around the proposal template to the group and requested that anyone in KBRC with a connection to Kahele's office be involved.
- Not sure about reporting requirements, but speculate it would be similar to their grant reporting process.

J. Hekekie agreed that the group should be exploring funding support from multiple places, state and federal.

- The group discussed which entity should receive the funds (OP, DAR, UH, etc.)
 - J. Hekekie shared that the state has a formal procurement and RFP process with admin costs that make it difficult. A nonprofit would be easier.
- Other grant opportunities to explore:
 - L. Peltier will look into OHA.
 - Hawaii Community Foundation
 - Castle Foundation has funds for coastal marine planning and their next call for proposals is in June.
- Member Rocky Kaluhiwa asked how much funding is needed.
 - J. Hekekie responded that it depends how expansive the project will be. Written documents are expensive, but it's a matter of what you want to do.
 - Member Rocky Kaluhiwa reiterated the need for a legitimate recorder.
 - J. Hekekie recommended funding for a good outreach campaign to gather information from the community and facilitators to gain public buy in, important to grassroots community planning.
- M. Ostrem suggested DOD grants could be put towards implementation of the plan for restoration and resiliency purposes, but that it wouldn't quite fit for the planning effort.
 - There may be other elements of the plan that this could be an option for.
 - Volunteered to help with administrative capacity
- J. Nihipali informed that OP received \$50,000 for the original master plan, which may be worth \$100,000 today.

Nihipali shared the possibility of semester-long urban planning capstone projects from UH students helping with this effort.

- Unsure about cost or timing (continuation of another cohort if needed for longer than a semester), but if it's something the council would like to explore, I can reach out to find out more details.
- Likely their start would be sometime in the fall semester.

- Member Radke stated a preference for having them participate in the process, as part of a committee, and learning, and not within the planning process as a one-off project.

Member Radke cautioned that with funding support, it's important to note where the money comes from in case it raises flags.

- Federal or State sources are okay, but MCBH may cause some conflicts.

Chair Neilson inquired about the process. (ex. Forming the committees will work to identify issues and actions to address those issues. This will be captured in their notes and the notes will feed into..?)

- Member Radke volunteered to start a process document based on what has been said and send to Chair Neilson and KBRC for review.
 - This will be helpful for committee leads to start their groups off.
 - The PIG and KBRC should work collaboratively, and the PIG ensures everyone has the opportunity to contribute.
- Chair Neilson asked about a timeline and Member Radke shared it may be completed in as soon as 6 months once things get moving since they are not starting from the beginning like the original effort.

Chair Neilson clarified next steps are to: Look into funding sources, move forward with committees, see what support we have in terms of notetakers and zoom software and wait on Member Radke's document outlining the process.

Member Reppun suggested putting together a presentation to volunteers from someone who was previously involved, maybe 20 minutes long.

- Member Rocky Kaluhiwa suggested Mike McCarthy, who was senator at the time.
- The group deliberated whether the presentation would occur at a KBRC meeting or at a master plan meeting.
 - Member Reppun affirmed that everyone involved in the PIG should be there and if they don't come to council meetings, it should be at the master plan meeting.
- J. Pickard agreed to help with this as previous chair of the council and volunteered to contact some of the other original members of the task force to get multiple perspectives.
- Chair Neilson suggested Member Radke use the email list to reconvene the entire group via zoom to have a presentation from some of the original members about the plan and process and pose questions as needed.
 - Member Radke agreed it would be a good thing to do prior to the groups breaking out in their different directions to get a good starting point.
- J. Pickard and Member Rocky Kaluhiwa brainstorm some people who would also be good to include (Amy Lewison, Bruce Anderson, other regional members, etc.)
 - Member Radke added that it might not be productive to have too many presenting, but as the committees form, the original members can jump on to share relevant experience from the committees they served on.

3. Adjournment

7:03pm