

RES24-017
Testimony

MISC. COMM. 345

COUNCIL

COUNCIL Meeting

Meeting Date: Aug 7, 2024 @ 10:00 AM

Support: 0

Oppose: 3

I wish to comment: 1

Name: Earl Yamamoto	Email: eyamaj@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: I wish to comment	Submitted: Aug 2, 2024 @ 12:52 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>Resolution No. 24-17</p> <p>10+ years Makiki resident.</p> <p>Position - strong concerns</p> <p>My concern is the valuation and appropriateness of selling Lot 46, otherwise known as Piikoi Mini Park.</p> <p>The Mini Park is zoned P-2 (General Preservation).</p> <p>The Mini Park was appraised at \$112,000 by the Department of Design and Construction.</p> <p>Resolution 24-17 requires the purchaser (RV Venture) to consolidate the Mini Park with its abutting property(ies) to the northeast comprised of single and two-family dwellings and zoned A-2 (Medium Density Apartment).</p> <p>The fifth "Whereas" in Resolution 24-17 states that "...no dwellings or off-street parking may be constructed on Lot 46 and any request for zone change must be processed through the Department of Planning and Permitting." The underscored language indicates that the Mini Park, once consolidated with the purchaser's adjacent property(ies), is likely to be upzoned from P-2 to A-2 and may result in a windfall for the purchaser at the expense of the City and area residents. Even the existing monkeypod tree may be subject to removal despite ordinances to the contrary.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Why does the City's appraised value of the Mini Park consider only what exists and not what the development potential of the property combined with the purchaser's adjacent property(ies)?</p> <p>Is the proposed sale of the Mini Park (caused in large part by the City's failure to maintain it) in synch with the 2004 Primary Urban Center Development Plan and its proposed update?</p> <p>If the City Administration and Council are in the mood for offering windfall deals like at Piikoi Mini Park, why not consider a similar offer for the 6,534 square foot Makiki Street Mini Park at the corner of Makiki and Nehoa streets, you know, where the houseless have been accessing the Makiki Stream drainage box culvert located underneath the house and apartment lots between Makiki and Anapuni streets and makai to Wilder Avenue?</p>		
Name: Adam Strubeck	Email: adam.strubeck@gmail.com	Zip: 96822
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Aug 5, 2024 @ 02:30 PM
<p>Testimony:</p> <p>I am a Makiki resident strongly opposed to the City selling Piikoi Mini Park. Mini parks are critical pieces of public</p>		

infrastructure that serve important functions in our communities.

Rather than dispose of public land, we as a community should come together to steward the place. There is an active adopt-a-park application by community members for Piikoi Mini Park that has been ignored by DPR and the City Council.

If the City must dispose of this land, please attach a deed restriction that would preserve the P-2 zoning, public access, and trees in perpetuity. Otherwise this sale is a windfall for RV ventures masquerading as an attempt to “clean up” the community.

During the most recent budget committee meeting, the representative from RV ventures had no plans for the parcel other than to “clean it up.” Why not keep the park in the public trust and approve the active adopt-a-park application if the goal is to “clean up” the park?

The sale price of \$112,000 is insultingly low to the members of the community and taxpayers. When RV ventures privatizes this park/green space, how much will they be able to raise rents on their tenants? In the long run RV ventures could pursue a zoning change or 201H application, lining their pockets while contributing little to the community.

How will privatizing public space solve drug and homelessness issues in our communities? This sale is pushing the issue onto other public spaces while enriching a private landlord. I respectfully ask City Council to either approve the adopt-a-park application and let the community malama this space, or attach a deed restriction that maintains public access to this green space.

Name: Winston Welch	Email: winston@outdoorcircle.org	Zip: 96814
Representing: The Outdoor Circle	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Aug 7, 2024 @ 02:43 AM
Name: Choon James	Email: ChoonJamesHawaii@gmail.com	Zip: 96762
Representing: Self	Position: Oppose	Submitted: Aug 7, 2024 @ 08:48 AM

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Diane Harding
President

Maureen Murphy
Vice President

Denise Soderholm
Treasurer

Whitney Bosel
Secretary

Cheryl Langton
Branch Representative

Directors:

Gordon Aoyagi

Kathleen Bryan

Mimi Bornhorst Gaddis

Joan Gossett

Stan Oka

Paula Ress

Jonathan Sudler

Scott Wilson

BRANCHES

Hawai'i

East Hawai'i

Kona

Waikoloa Village

Waimea

Kaua'i

O'ahu

East Honolulu

Lani-Kailua

Mānoa

North Shore

Greater Waikiki

STAFF

Winston Welch
Executive Director

Jacqueline Wah
Operations Director

Myles Ritchie
Programs Director

Helping to keep Hawai'i
clean, green, beautiful,
livable and sustainable
since 1912



August 6, 2024

RE: The Outdoor Circle Piikoi Mini Park Testimony for Resolution 24-17

Dear Council Members,

The Outdoor Circle continues to oppose the sale of Piikoi Mini Park for the reasons stated in our prior testimony in April 2024 supplemented by additional information.

The Outdoor Circle has worked tirelessly advocating for open and green spaces in our crowded city for 112 years and we wish to express our opposition to selling a green space visual passive respite P-2 zoned public asset that should simply remain public and used as a park as it has been for decades.

The main issue is that the park is not being maintained or policed and therefore the City wants to abdicate its responsibility here rather than fulfill its responsibilities to the residents of the area. We owe our residents better. If this is the case here, where does this logically end? Rather than address the underlying issues, we are pretending that this is not a valued public space, even as a passive green visual respite. We retreat further from civic duty and public amenities and we are all smaller for it.

This area is slated for even more densification—how is the public served by taking away an amenity and giving it to a neighbor at a fire sale price? The developer has stated that they would be fine if the City just kept the area clean and safe. Why are we not pursuing that, then, first? Volunteers have applied to adopt the park—should they not be given an opportunity to succeed? Can we not try to make this space better?

The dialogue and discussions seem to be that the property, if sold, would be kept as is with trees, perhaps visible to the public, but probably just made into a private walled park at best, but there is zero guarantee of that in the current resolution—see questions below. We are also putting the cart before the horse.

Even if the city were to sell the property, very serious concerns persist on the conditions surrounding this property and a potential sale. We urge you to read the comments of testifiers again, as well as those who wrote into the Civil Beat newspaper when an article on this came out August 2, 2024. Over 70 people wrote in their comments and it is worth the time to review them. We have excerpted some testimonies and those comments below, especially those that question the value, rationale and need for this park being sold at all, especially to a private developer. Since those voices of the public are crucial in this discussion, you can see that there is sufficient concern to not advance this resolution at this time.

1314 S. King Street #306 | Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

T: 808-593-0300 | mail@outdoorcircle.org | www.outdoorcircle.org

We also would suggest that this be recommitted to the PESCA Committee so that we can work with the City on finding solutions to keep the park, keep it well-maintained and safe, in conjunction with volunteers and other agencies of the city such as police and social services.

There is NO need to sell this unique green public asset at this time and we ask that it not be passed. Salient questions and comments follow my signature.

Thank you for hearing the concerns of those who wish to keep our parks and city clean, green, beautiful and safe.



Winston Welch, Executive Director

Questions that should be answered before moving forward:

- How might the City better enforce its laws to keep this park clean, safe and attractive first, before considering selling?
- How is it in the public's best interests to dispose of public parks as written in the resolution?
- Why is the City wanting to relieve itself of liability and maintenance of this public park as written in the resolution? All parks and City facilities might fall under this same concept.
- Why does the City not instead want to preserve a neighborhood park by enforcing laws and providing proper maintenance as is a core function of the City for its residents?
- If the neighbors RV Ventures have stated that they do not need to buy this, but just want the area to be made clean and safe, why does the City not attempt that solution first?
- Was the Board of Parks consulted on this and if so, what was their discussion?

Questions regarding specifics even if the above questions are answered:

- The resolution states that the land can be rezoned—why?
- How is the value of this land so absurdly low? Even if it were to be a private park, the value of the purchaser adjoining to the neighboring property would significantly increase its worth.
- Why would the city sell this property at this rate? How was this appraised?
- How could we ensure public trust to have this parcel remain P2 as part of the sale condition with a stipulation that it remain an open and visible green park-like area for all rather than a private garden walled off from the public?
- How could we ensure no vehicles, structures, concrete or any other non-green, growing and well-maintained park-like area be required as a condition of the sale?
- Would a buyer be required, if a fence or wall were built, to follow the laws about front yard setbacks, landscaping and trees? Who would enforce this? Who would enforce this after the sale?

- If sold, this land, even if kept under P2, could be used for a wide-variety of uses that may not be consistent with public expectations. After how many years would this sale memory fade and a variance or rezoning be requested?
- What other parks would also fall under this? What precedence do we set by disposing of public amenities because we cannot or will not take care of core functions of the city and its residents? What is the next park or facility to be sold?
- Why has the City not considered the Adopt-A-Park application for the area? If under the supposition that it is possibly for sale, that condition has been in effect since 2009. Why does the City not even want to entertain citizen volunteers offering to help?
- How does the sale of this property contribute to the City's own PUC DP, its Tree Canopy Goals, and the Oahu General Plan's stated need for green spaces and parks?
- Why the rush now?

Observations:

- DPR Functional Plan page 12 of Resident Survey indicates 90% of respondents wanted to maintain existing parks over creating new ones.
- DRP Long Term Functional Planning lists Promoting Adopt-A-Park to aid the department in maintaining parks.
- DPR references it wants to have standards in National Recreation and Parks Association. On that website there is an article on "Proof of Worth" of a park that studies Chicago's 585 parks. A whole host of economic benefits accrue when parks are nearby, including increased property values and positive tourism impact. They note that 25% of parks under the Chicago Park District umbrella are considered miniparks one-half an acre or less that typically do not have indoor facilities.
- Oahu General Plan adopted in 2021 has in its 11 key focus areas for social, economic, environmental and design policy objectives reflecting the needs of the people and government. The third policy objective under the area of Culture and Recreation is: "Develop, maintain, and improve urban parks, squares, and beautification areas in high-density urban places."
- In the DPP Primary Urban Center Development Plan home page: Vision through 2035:
 - Protect and enhance Honolulu's natural, cultural, and scenic resources
 - Create livable neighborhoods with business centers, parks, plazas, and walkable streets
 - In Honolulu Revised Statutes 21-3.40 Preservation districts—Purpose and Intent (e) It is also the intent that lands designated urban by the State, but well-suited to the functions of providing visual relief and contrast to the city's built environment, or serving as outdoor space for the public's use and enjoyment, be zoned P-2 general preservation district.
- Under the PUC DP for Makiki being proposed right now:

Page 114: ***Preserve and increase outdoor space as the neighborhood grows.***
Encourage projects located on corners to include courtyards, plazas or other semi-public/public usable open spaces that can serve as conveniences to area residents.

Focus Area Note: Green Streets
Green Streets are streets designed to integrate with storm water best management practices. They are intended to serve as a primary channel for storm water capture, improve water quality by treating runoff, and provide community enjoyment and beautification. Inclusion of large rain gardens, planters, and permeable paving define

this street typology. Bike lanes may also be used to as an opportunity to reduce asphalt and introduce porous surfaces either in the form of pavers or increased landscaping. Dense interior neighborhoods like Makiki should be prioritized for green streets and tree canopy improvements to help mitigate high temperatures and the urban heat island effect.

The plans are to increase units in the neighborhood by 1000-2500 additional units by 2040.

In the earlier Council Meeting held in April on this topic, 12 people submitted testimony against this, none in support and 2 commented. Portions of some salient testimony points are repeated here that bear hearing again and are copied verbatim, separated by bullet point, some with grammatical or spelling anomalies:

- Property owner could use 201H to exempt zoning and allow residential apartments. Covenant should be attached to demand publicly-visible urban green space in same area.
- “Pi’ikoi mini park was an essential greenspace for me during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the park is one of the only open greenspaces left in the area. Living in a one-bedroom unit on Laua way, I received little to no sunlight due to the surrounding structures and density of space. Pi’ikoi mini park was within a walkable distance from me and allowed me to connect with nature which is essential as a Native Hawaiian. I oppose the sale of Pi’ikoi mini park because it is an essential greenspace for nearby urban residents. The park allows nearby residents to have recreational and environmental space which is essential due to the density of the area. The proposed sale significantly undervalues the space and takes valuable resources away from residents.”
- “Let’s not destroy Pi’ikoi Street Mini Park, that welcome patch of greenery in the Makiki neighborhood near the freeway for the benefit of but a single profit-seeking entity. And for only \$112,000? What a loss to the community it would be. That 5,000 square feet of unpaved-over soil absorbs 50% of the rain that falls on it, and half of that infiltrates deep to help replenish our underground water supply. If that land were built upon, 55% of rain would be lost to runoff and only 15% would find its way below the surface.
- I live on the 1500 block of Pi’ikoi Street; when I walk by the park on my way to and from my job I am both uplifted by the sight of that magnificent tree and saddened that we have failed our unhoused brothers and sisters in that area. But “developing” that parcel will not help the homeless; let us address that problem head-on. And let us preserve, cherish, and improve that bit of valuable green space called Pi’ikoi Street Mini Park.”
- “Please do not sell our parks. We have very little green space left in Makiki.”
- “I am opposed to the city selling Piikoi mini-park. The decision to sell this park to a private developer will sacrifice valuable land that is an asset to the public. Green space is essential for our community, environmentally and socially, and it should be retained”
- I was initially supportive upon learning of the city’s decision to sell this property, seeing it as an opportunity to revitalize a space that has sadly become more of a liability than a community asset. However, my enthusiasm was tempered upon reviewing the terms of the proposed sale. I was surprised to discover that the park is slated to be sold for a modest sum of \$112,000 to the potential buyer, who also owns the adjacent property. It is my understanding that the accompanying terms of the resolution could allow for future rezoning and redevelopment. While I acknowledge the need for revitalization, I am troubled by the potential for the new owner to profit substantially from these changes.
- My concern lies in the transparency and equity of this process. While I fully endorse the repurposing of this space for a more beneficial community use, such as affordable housing, I believe the terms of the sale should be revisited. I firmly believe that the sale of public assets, especially those with

potential for significant redevelopment, should be conducted through a competitive bidding process. This would ensure fair market value for the property and offer an opportunity for a range of community stakeholders and developers to contribute their vision for the space.

- I am strongly opposed to selling out land that is currently a public resource for our community, to a private entity whose main line of business is investment/rental properties.

From testimony submitted for this council meeting also bears repeating (copied verbatim):

- Position - strong concerns
My concern is the valuation and appropriateness of selling Lot 46, otherwise known as Piikoi Mini Park.
The Mini Park is zoned P-2 (General Preservation).
The Mini Park was appraised at \$112,000 by the Department of Design and Construction.
Resolution 24-17 requires the purchaser (RV Venture) to consolidate the Mini Park with its abutting property(ies) to the northeast comprised of single and two-family dwellings and zoned A-2 (Medium Density Apartment).
The fifth "Whereas" in Resolution 24-17 states that "...no dwellings or off-street parking may be constructed on Lot 46 and any request for zone change must be processed through the Department of Planning and Permitting." The underscored language indicates that the Mini Park, once consolidated with the purchaser's adjacent property(ies), is likely to be upzoned from P-2 to A-2 and may result in a windfall for the purchaser at the expense of the City and area residents. Even the existing monkeypod tree may be subject to removal despite ordinances to the contrary.
Questions:
Why does the City's appraised value of the Mini Park consider only what exists and not what the development potential of the property combined with the purchaser's adjacent property(ies)?
Is the proposed sale of the Mini Park (caused in large part by the City's failure to maintain it) in synch with the 2004 Primary Urban Center Development Plan and its proposed update?
- I am a Makiki resident strongly opposed to the City selling Piikoi Mini Park. Mini parks are critical pieces of public infrastructure that serve important functions in our communities.
Rather than dispose of public land, we as a community should come together to steward the place. There is an active adopt-a-park application by community members for Piikoi Mini Park that has been ignored by DPR and the City Council.
If the City must dispose of this land, please attach a deed restriction that would preserve the P-2 zoning, public access, and trees in perpetuity. Otherwise this sale is a windfall for RV ventures masquerading as an attempt to "clean up" the community.
During the most recent budget committee meeting, the representative from RV ventures had no plans for the parcel other than to "clean it up." Why not keep the park in the public trust and approve the active adopt-a-park application if the goal is to "clean up" the park?
The sale price of \$112,000 is insultingly low to the members of the community and taxpayers. When RV ventures privatizes this park/green space, how much will they be able to raise rents on their tenants? In the long run RV ventures could pursue a zoning change or 201H application, lining their pockets while contributing little to the community.
How will privatizing public space solve drug and homelessness issues in our communities? This sale is pushing the issue onto other public spaces while enriching a private landlord. I respectfully ask City Council to either approve the adopt-a-park application and let the community malama this space, or attach a deed restriction that maintains public access to this green space.

Excerpts From Civil Beat Article *Honolulu Faces Opposition Over Sale of Public Park on August 2, 2024*
<https://www.civilbeat.org/2024/08/honolulu-faces-opposition-over-sale-of-public-park/>

"Chang says her main objective in buying the park is to make a private, clean, safe space for her tenants. She wants to debunk the rumor that RV Ventures is out to make money on the deal. RV

Ventures has no intention of building units on the lot or tearing down any trees wider than six inches. And if the sale doesn't go through that's fine, Chang said. But she wants a solid plan from the city about how and when they will maintain the park on a regular basis.

Council member Calvin Say, who represents Makiki, said Kirby could potentially stop the sale if her adoption paperwork is approved.

"It probably would," he said. "Because it would be in the jurisdiction of parks and recreation as a community park."

Budget director Kawano agreed.

...There are 32 mini parks on Oahu and it's unusual for one to be sold by the city.

"I've never seen anything like it come across my desk," Kawano said.

From Comments Section in the Civil Beat Article—over 70 comments were written. Portions of some salient testimony points are repeated here that are generally against any sale and want the City to look again, and are copied verbatim, separated by bullet point, some with grammatical or spelling anomalies:

- The City's Budget and Fiscal Services Deputy Director Carrie Castle states "It's a remnant property, there is no use" per KHON2 interview posted April 3, 2024. This land has a use, which is why it is called Piikoi Mini Park. Mini Parks account for 33 of the 300 parks on Oahu. This land use, as seen in tax documents, google maps, City and County funding is a P-2 Preservation Mini Park. That is its use. Department of Parks and Recreation state on their homepage of their website "Everyone in our department is dedicated to keeping our island green, our residents and visitors happy and our facilities operating. Enjoy the outdoors and remember, "We Add Quality to Life!" The Department of Parks and Recreation are going directly against their Government mandated responsibility if they believe selling a public park is in the community's best interest.
- I am a resident of Makiki opposed to the city selling Pi'ikoi Mini-Park to the abutting landowner. Publicly accessible green space should be maintained in high-density urban neighborhoods, not sold off to private parties.
- Res. 24-107 identifies the subject lot as both "Pi'ikoi Mini Park" and "Road Remnant Lot 46." A previous resolution pertaining to "Mini-Parks" defines them as follows;
"WHEREAS, mini parks are small landscaped areas established to provide passive or pedestrian-oriented recreational needs in high-density neighborhoods." (RES. 19-250)
Conveniently, this definition of Mini-Parks is left out of Res. 24-017.
- The Pi'ikoi Mini-Park is located in census tract 34.06. Except for the Makiki Shopping Village (zoned B-1 commercial) and Pi'ikoi Mini-Park (zoned P-2 preservation), the entirety of census tract 34.06 is zoned A-2 (medium density apartment district). This census tract alone has 452 housing units without vehicles, suggesting there is a significant amount of pedestrian circulation in the area (Food Research Atlas, 2019). This statistic indicates a need for pedestrian-oriented, publicly accessible green spaces. Furthermore, the median household income (~\$66,000) is below the county average, while the poverty rate (11.7%) is above the county average (Food Research Atlas, 2019). Communities with these characteristics should be prioritized for publicly accessible green spaces, not viewed as candidates for the disposal of public property.
The high level of urbanization in the vicinity of Pi'ikoi Mini-Park presents a challenge of managing urban heat (Heat Watch Report, 2019). The O'ahu Community Heat Map shows the area occupied by Pi'ikoi Mini-Park as 5-7 degrees cooler than the surrounding area, which has a dangerously high Heat Index (see Figure 1). The coincidence of a highly developed neighborhood with a socially

vulnerable population indicate the importance of Pi'ikoi Mini-Park as critical public infrastructure for managing urban heat.

While the trees larger than 6-inches in diameter are protected via the Punchbowl Special District Section (Sec. 21-9.50) of the Land Use Ordinance, the trees could still be removed if "Appropriate development of the site cannot be achieved without removal of the tree." (Sec. 21- 9.50-4(E)(8)(b)). The City and County of Honolulu Urban Tree Plan (2019) highlights the myriad benefits of municipal trees, from environmental to social and economic benefits. Environmental benefits include improved water quality, improved air quality, stabilized temperatures, and wildlife habitat. Social benefits include aesthetics, active and passive recreation opportunities, educational opportunities, and physical/mental health. Notably, the plan states:

"Trees reduce mental fatigue, help people relax, and reduce aggression. They also bring people together outdoors, increasing surveillance, and discouraging criminals. Trees also provide educational opportunities and value. Parks with trees and other environmental features can function as an open classroom where children and adults can learn about different plant and animal species, ecosystems, and the natural environment (p.8)." Even if the trees are preserved, removing public access to this green space will limit the public benefits received.

In summary, the Pi'ikoi Mini-Park provides a multitude of environmental and social benefits to the community as a publicly accessible greenspace. These greenspaces are critical pieces of public infrastructure and should be valued as such. It would not be in the best interests of residents or the county to sell the park to a private landowner, whose motivations for the future of the park are unclear.

- After reading the article and readers' comments, this is really a drug and homeless problem. Selling the park is not the solution. It is just an attempt (again) by our policy makers to not address Hawaii's drug and housing crisis.

Once this park is sold the homeless and drug users will simply move to another park. What will the city do then? Keep selling parks till there are none?

- If they ever have urban renewal around that area there gonna wish they never sold that pocket park. I lived I San Francisco for 20 years and green spaces tucked in between those victorian's are so valuable to the community. Honolulu is not thinking about the future, or the fact that this is a public park. Just like the other article in here on commercial use of beaches, the concept of "public" gets lost with these people.

I don't agree with Serotas assessment. It could easily be transformed into a botanical beauty with a dog run and a few benches. Just the picture at the top with Kirby standing in it suggest it's plenty big enough.

I don't buy the homeless issue either. You could have park hours like 5AM to 9PM if you wanted to. Having them maintain it as a public park would do more for RV ventures property values, then selling it to them. In San Francisco pocket parks lift the value of the homes all around them and are very desirable.

- "A City Public Park," meant for the use of the Public, being sold to a private entity?
Ms. Amanda Kirby is correct in her assessment, that the Park should remain as an "Public Asset" for the citizens of Hawaii.
"Selling Public Parks" to private owners, would set a "Bad Precedence" that every time their are Issues w/Parks (Crime, Homeless, etc.) the first thing the City Coucil wants to do is sell it!
That's what are Taxes are paying for: HPD, Parks & Recreation, etc. to handle those issues.
Public Parks are open areas for citizens to enjoy w/their pets, Ohanas, recreation, etc. into perpetuity and Not be deemed as "Land Patcels" for the City Council to sell!

\$112,000 for a quite large property which the adjacent landowner can make into a private common area is ridiculous. Even though RV Ventures may not develop the area, having a common area there will significantly increase the value of their existing property.

- It's malicious incompetence and a breach of fiduciary duty towards the people of the City of Honolulu. Feels contemptful of the general public and our intelligence. It's so blatant.
- Honolulu can use all the green space it can get. Don't get rid of green space!
- I'm with Kirby! She's taking lead on maintaining land that we all own. Her willingness to step-up is to be commended & supported by all who pay taxes. The community should've had first choice of best use of the space.
- We have a Parks & Rec Department that has failed to maintain the park. We have a City Council that wants to dump anything that can't have a concrete tower built on it. We have a former Neighborhood Board chair who makes all homeless people seem aggressive, scary & dangerous to children. We have an adjacent landowner prone to melodrama about the goings-on. And we have zero photos of any of the nefarious deeds or crowds of spitting homeless criminals threatening anyone.

I've walked through there daily for nearly 20 years with no problems. Never saw more than 3 people in that park.

Do you remember when it was okay for anyone to nap under a tree? Do you remember teaching kids to have empathy & compassion for people who are "down on their luck?" Also a great chance for a little "safe walking" training that's needed globally.

Sometimes the purpose of a park is to have a green space that's pleasant to look at. That's its quiet job (not the sound of pickleball-slamming).

- How can anyone see this as anything but some kind of huge sweetheart/insider deal for the prospective new owner?

The resolution doesn't guarantee that the property will remain undeveloped. It cutes the current zoning restrictions and other existing impediments to development, all of which are subject to change.

Considering there's no contractual obligation to guarantee it remains undeveloped and the huge disparity between the sale price and the value of comparable property that can be developed, it's ludicrous to expect that the new owner wouldn't aggressively work to remove the existing obstacles to development.

As for the City wanting to sell prime real estate for cheap, where did that number come from? Public trust of our levels of government is not at its highest levels. One has to raise an eyebrow when the City is willing to sell real estate at a loss to the citizenry. We lose revenue, we lose the use of a public park, and we are served another reason to doubt the elected agents that represent the people. In today's environment of decisions driven by data, what numbers were used to price that property? This is just like the park that was closed earlier by the City because people would hike from it to the Haiku stairway. In what world is it okay for the City to abdicate its responsibility? I mean should the City sell off all of its facilities so it will not have to ensure law and order is maintained at them? I humbly "Advocate" the City do its job and maintain public property as it should be one of its priorities!

- If there were an HPD kiosk, Ms. Kirby might be able to entice the older classes at Kaahumanu School nearby, and the A+ Afterschool program, to help upkeep the mini park once a month. Kids really are proud to do things for the community, as Make a Difference Day shows. And there could be a sign each month on an HPD kiosk thanking them for their Good Deed which they'd be so proud of. There are possibilities.
- Would an HPD kiosk plus setting up motion sensor lights on a kiosk also help deter illegal uses at night?

- After reading the article and readers' comments, this is really a drug and homeless problem. Selling the park is not the solution. It is just an attempt (again) by our policy makers to not address Hawaii's drug and housing crisis.
- Once this park is sold the homeless and drug users will simply move to another park. What will the city do then? Keep selling parks till there are none?
- You said it better those who want to preserve it should buy it. it shouldn't be publicly subsidized with tax dollars if there's little public benefit.
- If it's really available for \$112K, I'll buy it.
- A HPD kiosk there is not a bad idea: To monitor and sometimes help the homeless that are always under the overpass, to keep the park from being used for illegal activities, and to cite the motorists that often block the intersection as they try to squeeze into the lane feeding into the interstate on-ramp despite a sign that states to not block the intersection.
- If they ever have urban renewal around that area there gonna wish they never sold that pocket park. I lived I San Francisco for 20 years and green spaces tucked in between those victorian's are so valuable to the community. Honolulu is not thinking about the future, or the fact that this is a public park. Just like the other article in here on commercial use of beaches, the concept of "public" gets lost with these people.
- Slap an HPD kiosk there which, even if only occasionally manned or stopped at, would help reduce crime and increase values for residences either side. RV can help subsidize the cost. If we can build kauhale for the homeless, surely we can put one for HPD; given all the bad descriptions, sounds like a little kiosk would be smack in the middle of a busy patrol beat...
- Besides, unless we suppose that the many homeless programs we're paying for will never succeed, someday one of them will work, no ? Then the park can be viable again. (Many NYC parks are Instagrammable these days, but in the 70's no one went without taking a big risk.) Wait it out: conversely, you can be sure that C&C won't be acquiring more land for parks & rec this century, if ever.
- This story gets worse when you actually look at the costs.

Loss of park access alone would put a depressive value on property tax assessments within walking distance that would collectively lower assessed value of thousands of units, and thus in turn lower tax collections and recurring revenue streams to the city.

- "A City Public Park," meant for the use of the Public, being sold to a private entity?
Ms. Amanda Kirby is correct in her assessment, that the Park should remain as an "Public Asset" for the citizens of Hawaii.
- Adopting a park is a great way to take care of nature and involve the community. In 2017, Civil Beat wrote about Lo'i Kalo Mini Park, most recently adopted by Robert Silva. His example shows that a committed individual, able to put time and effort and resources into a park, and involving the community, has been the best way to "clean up" a park.
- So the C&C now wants to sell off our precious public park lands for just pennies to help pay for the failed Rail? Or because the C&C won't do anything about homeless and addicts taking over our public parks?
- What exactly is happening here? This is like a bad dream. No - strike that. It's worse.
- 5,000 square feet zoned A-2 in Makiki is worth a whole lot more than \$112,000. What is the City thinking?
- City Council members are doing the lazy way out. Shame. Adoption is the best solution.
- How can anyone see this as anything but some kind of huge sweetheart/insider deal for the prospective new owner?
- The resolution doesn't guarantee that the property will remain undeveloped. It

Cuts the current zoning restrictions and other existing impediments to development, all of which are subject to change.

Considering there's no contractual obligation to guarantee it remains undeveloped and the huge disparity between the sale price and the value of comparable property that can be developed, it's ludicrous to expect that the new owner wouldn't aggressively work to remove the existing obstacles to development.

- As for the City wanting to sell prime real estate for cheap, where did that number come from? Public trust of our levels of government is not at its highest levels. One has to raise an eyebrow when the City is willing to sell real estate at a loss to the citizenry. We lose revenue, we lose the use of a public park, and we are served another reason to doubt the elected agents that represent the people. In today's environment of decisions driven by data, what numbers were used to price that property?

Go on the real property tax records website. The tax assessment for the parcel is:

Assessed Land Value \$15,200

Assessed Building Value \$0

Total Property Assessed Value \$15,200

Assessed and actual values are completely different things. It's a meaningless comparison.

- Understood, but properties are never sold at the City's assessment figure. Rezoning the parcel would greatly enhance its value.
- I'm not a Honolulu resident anymore but I 100% support the park remaining open for the public to enjoy. Privatizing public spaces because of county mismanagement is a punishment to current and future citizens. If it was sold off the owner would likely cut down a beautiful tree. The fact that a few homeless people sleep there can't be used as a reason to sell it. If that was a valid reason half of Honolulu's streets would be sold and gated off. The county DOES need to find housing for its unhoused folks, but that's a separate matter. Keep public lands in public hands!
- We've already lost bus stop benches; unfettered use of sidewalks; nearly every shaded picnic table or bench in all of the other parks; and hundreds upon hundreds of shopping carts and flatbed wagons, bicycles, and broken down mopeds to the homeless, now the C&C finds it easier to just sell a neighborhood park for pennies on the dollar rather than actually solve the problem. I suppose turning over the beach parks and large swaths of State land to groups of homeless is next...why not? They are building tiny homes in Makaha and other areas without need to meet building codes that the rest of us are held to. Much easier to give away the responsibility...much like clearing fallen trees on public roads such as Tantalus; either completely ignoring, or fining property owners for trash and debris left by others all across the state in commercial areas, residential areas; and illegal dumping in many of the same areas year after year; giving away clean needles, and opening the revolving doors at HPD and the courts. Less than a block from the subject park is a half burned out home piled with rubbish that has sat for several years at this point. C&C doesn't care about that either. Shibai.
- This is just like the park that was closed earlier by the City because people would hike from it to the Haiku stairway. In what world is it okay for the City to abdicate its responsibility? I mean should the City sell off all of its facilities so it will not have to ensure law and order is maintained at them? I humbly "Advocate" the City do its job and maintain public property as it should be one of its priorities!
- Less concerned about selling this than the price it is being sold for. \$112k for 5,000 feet is \$22 per foot. That is an absurdly low price and deserves explanation. Nothing anywhere in the urban core is selling less than \$100/ft unless it has some significant deed restrictions that would diminish value. Can RV Ventures build anything on this property or is it restricted to being open field? The only way it is worth the \$112k is if it has to be maintained as an empty lot, albeit with a fence around it to keep vagrants out.

Maybe, if practical or feasible, lease the property so the City does not lose valuable real estate?
Works fine for Bishop Estate. Never sell the land.

Where's the "rest of the story ?" Even then... how did this giveaway price get past without notice ? Community garden, HPD outpost*, ANYTHING gotta be worth at least the \$112k.

- RV could pay \$112k for an HPD kiosk which, even if only occasionally manned or stopped at, would reduce crime and increase values for residences either side.
- \$112,000 for 5,000 sq ft of land in the urban core? Are you kidding??? That is absurdly low, even at prices 10+ years ago, let alone in today's dollars.
- That is a sweet heart sale that **anyone** should be questioning the reason for why. While the City can say "we reached out to neighbors & no one wanted it", I guarantee no one knows it was available for sale until this article came out. This was never put on the market, as this price is nowhere near market value.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS
REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
24TH SESSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 2024
10 A.M.**

OPPOSE

Resolution 24-17

**Approving the sale of the Pi'ikoi Mini Park, Road Remnant Lot 46,
1409 Pi'ikoi Street, Honolulu, Hawai'i, Tax Map Key: 2-4-020:056.**

Aloha Chair Waters and City Council members:

I'm cognizant that you have a lot of Bills and Resolutions that need thorough vetting and this may be one of those that have fallen through the cracks, so to speak.

You may have deemed this action as an administrative decision and trusted the administrative decision to sell this Pi'ikoi Mini Park - *" with an area of 4,981 square feet, is a City-owned road remnant parcel which resulted from the Pi'ikoi Widening Project,"* for \$112,000 to adjacent owner RV Ventures.

However, I strongly encourage you to **RECONSIDER** and **TABLE** this Resolution 24-17.

I made a quick visit to the park yesterday. This parcel is a beautiful park with much potential for public enjoyment and use. Once you sell this parcel, you will never get it back.



As the population of Oahu becomes more dense, it's imperative for the city to keep as much green space as it can for the children and public.

Keep public land in public hands. (A \$112,000 purchase price for this parcel is peanuts for the potential best and highest use of this parcel.)

The City must not make public policies based on the bureaucratic status quo that this Mini Park is a "surplus" property. (It's interesting to note that Chinaman's Hat aka Mokoli'i in the Windward is also deemed a surplus parcel.)

A 5,000 square feet green space with a beautiful Monkey Pod tree in a middle of a "concrete jungle" must not be deemed a "surplus" property. It's a treasure!

Pi'ikoi Mini Park is a valuable piece of inheritance for public use and enjoyment.

"The sale of Lot 46 is in the public's best interest as it would relieve the City from further liability and maintenance of the parcel" cannot be a good public policy for the city.

It also implies that the administration is giving up Oahu's valuable resources because it has no confidence nor will to maintain and upkeep its basic amenities. This is not the right direction or mindset to take.

Let's envision a clean, green, safe, and thriving Oahu for our residents.

Please table this Resolution 24-17 for good. Please allow Oahu's residents the opportunity to opine and further contribute to this valuable Little Park's potential.

Thanks for all you do,

Sincerely,

Choon James
808 293 8888

ChoonJamesHawaii@gmail.com