

**Stakeholder Focus Groups Meetings
November 18 (Kona) and 21 (Hilo), 2005
COMMENTS**

A. List of Participants

Frederic Berg, Brookfield Homes
Will Espero, DR Horton
Sid Fuke, Planning Consultant
Jacqui Hoover, Hawaii Leeward Planning Conference (HLPC)
Keith Kato, Hawaii Island Community Development Corp. (HICDC)
Kimo Lee, W.H. Shipman, Ltd.
Ken Melrose, Hawaii Leeward Planning Conference (HLPC)
Glenn Miyao, Wilson Okamoto Corp
Bill Moore, Kohala Ranch Development Corp.
Harold Murata, Self
John Ray, Parker Ranch
Skylark Rossetti, Hawaii Island Economic Development Board (HIEDB)
Marianna Scheffer, League of Women Voters
Amy Self, Corporation Counsel
Bob Stuit, Hokulia
Dean Uchida, Land Use Research Foundation (LURF)
Bill Walter, W.H. Shipman, Ltd.
Marian Wilkins, League of Women Voters

B. Written Comments Submitted by Stakeholders:

1. Impact Fees level the playing field for new projects but do little to address the increased stresses on infrastructure based on infill on existing lots. Need parallel source of funds to fulfill government portion of costs.
2. I learned a lot – very interesting. I hope we can follow the suggestions of Duncan Associates. We must get our act together. I hope there will be more presentations open to the general public.
3. Positive: Good Questions and Answers. Handout/powerpoint informative. Negative: Started Late
4. Why is impact fee good for the County of Hawaii? What problem does it solve?
5. Good Presentation. Endeavor to educate the County on a variety of funding mechanisms. Make sure ordinance recognizes previous contributions exacted – credits. Examine county-wide fee calculation.
6. There is a need for a broader look at infrastructure needs and financing to show what is the best or fairest portion of cost should be paid by impact fees.
7. After listening to the presentation yesterday my principle concerns are the impacts on our housing programs for both low and moderate income households. Previously, the County had exempted units from impact fees if the units were part of our program, this appeared in rezoning approvals and in the pre-emption resolutions.

If an impact fee ordinance is to be adopted I would hope that it would similarly exempt affordable housing otherwise it will make the homes more expensive to develop and that in turn will cause less units to be constructed. While funding infrastructure is necessary for the continued development of affordable housing I hope that it doesn't become a burden on such housing while other less regressive alternatives are under-utilized.

8. Hawaii Leeward Planning Conference (HLPC) had a study done that shows tremendous growth/contribution in property taxes by the Kohala Coast resort homes - why can't these funds be used? At very least, need to integrate those revenues into the impact fees/needs assessment. The impact fees are being considered to give the County another funding source but it does not appear that the Administration has really considered other funding sources.

Will County acknowledge that their position on concurrency is contradictory to implementing impact fees?

Substandard lots are purchased at lower rates just by virtue of being substandard, therefore the exemption does not seem appropriate.

9. Thank you for inviting me to this presentation.
10. Need for an overall perspective. Impact fees are one of the many "tools" that government has available. Impact fees need to be fair and predictable. Leveling the playing field and affordable housing.

B. Summary of Key Points Made by Stakeholders (written/verbal)

1. Create of a fair and predictable system
2. Exemption of existing substandard lots does not seem fair nor appropriate.
3. Take a comprehensive approach and expand scope to discuss other infrastructure financing options to supplement impact fees.
4. Government should identify their role and infrastructure financing options
5. Create an inclusive impact fee program - include state highways and schools.
6. Look at the strategic issues/questions - including, how much money we really need.
7. Address how impact fees will affect affordable housing.
8. Larger assessment/benefit districts are advantageous to county agencies.
9. County's position on concurrency and implementation of impact fees are contradictory.
10. Recognize previous fair share assessments and contributions paid by credits.