

# IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

	improvement themes [items w/dots]	specific suggestions [items w/dots]
<b>DISTRICT STANDARDS</b>	<b>AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT</b>	
	Better use definitions & standards for Ag District [F.6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define in Ch 205 what bona fide ag operation is [F.6.a]</li> <li>• Permissible uses for IAL need to be stronger than in Ch 205 Ag District [F.6.c]</li> <li>• Define bona fide ag as food crops for sale [F.6.a, F.7]</li> <li>• Define bona fide ag as not estate dwellings, tennis courts, pools [F.6.a]</li> <li>• Increase minimum lot size to 10 acres [F.9]</li> </ul>
	County authority to determine permissible uses in Ag District [F.10]	
	Revised standard/criteria for identifying agricultural lands' resource value and lands that can be released for urbanization [F.5]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New benchmarks for judging ag lands that updates LSB [F.4, F.8.a]</li> <li>• Preservation of open space not criteria for identifying as ag land [F.3.a]</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL &amp; RURAL PLANNING</b>	<b>RURAL DISTRICT</b>	
	Redefine Ch 205 / new vision for Rural District with broader uses [G.2, G.2.a, G.3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate Rural &amp; have higher density ag in Ag District OR put higher density ag in Rural [G.1.a]</li> </ul>
	Delegate to counties regulatory authority over Rural District [G.6, G.6.a]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County ability to texturize rural land uses [G.6.a]</li> </ul>
	Identification of lands in Ag District that should be protected for ag & those that are more suited in urban, rural, or conservation district [F.5, F.12]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for counties to complete the IAL process [F.1]</li> <li>• State plans &amp; phasing of implementation to match/complement county LU planning [I.10]</li> <li>• State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12]</li> </ul>
	Process to reclassify lands in the Ag District identified as suitable in other land use classifications (release non-ag lands) [F.5]	
	Greater scrutiny for ag, increased consideration of ag resource concerns, higher threshold [F.2]	
<b>INFORMATION &amp; ANALYSIS FOR PLANNING &amp; DECISION MAKING</b>	Comprehensive set of shared environmental, social, economic indicators [C.11]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State population and economic projections updated/reviewed regularly in consultation with counties [C.10.a] (and other baseline data like housing study)</li> </ul>
	Meaningful analysis of infrastructure planning, development, and environmental impact [C.14]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of thresholds for operations &amp; safety of roadways [C.4]</li> </ul>
	Require state agencies to do Ka Pa`akai analysis on all projects [C.5]	
	Move environmental review to post-LUC decision making [H.7]	

# IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

improvement themes [items w/dots]	specific suggestions [items w/dots]
<p><b>PLANNING FRAMEWORK</b></p>	
<p>Codify in HRS a uniform county land use planning system that reflects state functions, with counties in primary role in LU planning/decision making [I.6], development follows plan [I.13., I.27]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State requirements for county LU plan and consistency required with state policies [I.5]</li> <li>• Requirement for consistency with state policies</li> <li>• State interests inherently statewide [I.2.a]</li> <li>• County plans have phasing and magnitude in land use plans (to direct location and timing of growth)</li> <li>• State and county infrastructure components in county LU plan [I.19]</li> <li>• Better coordination among state and county [I.28]</li> <li>• Coordinate state infrastructure planning and development with county [D.3, I.30]</li> <li>• State participates in county planning process (GPs, DPs) [D.17]</li> <li>• Policies, plans provide specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations</li> <li>• State review of county plans with respect to impact on areas of state concern [D.1, I.27]</li> </ul>
<p>Long-term planning to protect public's interest / public trust resources [I.3], e.g., resource management and infrastructure development plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify what's appropriate/needed to preserve, protect, and develop [I.17]</li> <li>• More frequent boundary reviews (to see if significant resources exist in the districts) [J.2.a]</li> <li>• Boundary review / amendments to: (1) reclassify lands with significant resources in other districts to the Conservation District; (2) undeveloped land within 150 ft of shoreline [J.2]</li> <li>• State plans &amp; phasing of implementation to match/complement county LU planning [I.10]</li> <li>• State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12]</li> </ul>

# IMPROVEMENTS IMPORTANT TO SYSTEM FIX & RE-DESIGN OPTIONS

	<b>improvement themes</b> [items w/dots]	<b>specific suggestions</b> [items w/dots]
<b>LAND USE DECISION MAKING &amp; PLAN IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<p>Eliminate duplication with county issues and processes [I.4] Two levels of review and scrutiny to balance decision making [I.15]</p> <hr/> <p>Development consistent with plans rather than individual petitions—county plans guide land use changes [I.13, I.27]</p> <hr/> <p>State decision making (re: resources and infrastructure) in accord with state planning framework [I.12]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combined (single) county/LUC hearings on individual project (DBA, DPs, community level plans) [D.18]</li> <li>• Better coordination among state and county [I.28]</li> <li>• Allow for orderly land use district changes, while providing specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations [I.9]</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow for orderly land use district changes, while providing specific and reliable milestones for short- and long-term investment backed expectations [I.9]</li> <li>• Coordinate state infrastructure planning and development with county [D.3, I.30]</li> <li>• Fiscal discipline in CIP investment [D.16]</li> <li>• Public (rather than developer) should pay for infrastructure [D.15]</li> <li>• Incentives for desired development (e.g., in designated growth areas) [D.10]</li> <li>• Thresholds for dealing with unplanned or premature projects (not in plan or phasing) [D.13]</li> <li>• State review of county plans and activities with respect to impact on areas of state concern [D.1]</li> <li>• Direct input in land use matters that involves state functions or facilities [D.2]</li> <li>• Enforcement monitored and implemented by county [B.4.b]</li> </ul> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State CIP to implement LU plans and policies (based on state infrastructure component for county plan) [D.5, I.11]</li> </ul>
<b>PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING / APPEALS</b>	<p>Consolidate points of legal intervention in land use process to reduce delays and uncertainty [E.3, I.16]</p>	
<b>STREAMLINING PERMITTING PROCESSES</b>	<p>Speed up processing and ministerial permitting by state/county agencies [E.1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient permitting process for key areas, e.g., affordable housing, fishponds [E.2]</li> <li>• Consolidate points of legal intervention in land use process to reduce delays and uncertainty [E.3, I.16]</li> </ul>
<b>SUB-SYSTEM ISSUES</b>	<p>Mechanisms for truly affordable housing stock [J.1]</p>	