

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK
C & C OF HONOLULU

2017 MAR 21 PM 3:43

To: Honolulu City Council

From: Mary Smart, Mililani, HI 96789

Subject: Opposition to Bills: 59 (2016), CD1; 67 (2016); 3 (2017) CD1; 29 (2017)

1. There are many bills proposed for the March 22, 12017 City an County of Honolulu agenda that are objectionable to the residents of this County/Island. Most of these bills address things that are inconsequential to the well-being of the state and residents -- and will continue to push many of your constituents and businesses into bankruptcy.
2. Opposed Bill 59, CD1. How many times are you going to take away the clean and useful bags that companies provide to their customers? It is not any of the Council's business, yet this seems to be a priority to the Council. The preponderance of the littered plastics are caused by those who live on the streets and disregard our laws. If you solve the homeless problem, most of the plastic problem will resolve itself. Your solution is not a solution to the problem and only wastes time, increases costs, and shows a complete disregard for the needs of your constituents. Vote NO on Bill 59, CD1.
3. Oppose Bill 67 (2016). If people want to ride a bicycle to work, that is their choice but they need to find/coordinate their personal needs with a facility that offers shower facilities. It is not up to the commercial enterprise to provide that service. There are fitness centers that can provide this service -- or if the City and County thinks it is a good idea, the City and County can build central facilities (although other "good ideas" have already caused expenses to exceed receipts). The City Council should not mandate companies/buildings accommodate people's choices. People choose to drive, but parking isn't always provided. Bike riders should not be given special accommodation over the needs of other commuters. This mandate will make it even more difficult for businesses to employ our residents. With mandates such as this and minimum wage demands, is it any wonder businesses are looking to robotics to do their labor thus forcing entry level individuals out of the workforce? Vote No on Bill 67 (2016).
4. Oppose Bill B (2017) CD1. We have been promised over and over that the Rail has their management problems under control and just needed five years of additional income. Yet, they are back at the trough for more --even as the 5 year surcharge extension begins. This does not bode well for the future. Council members need to accept the fact that the Rail is not sustainable and that you cannot continue to fuel this losing project. We don't want it and we can't afford it. How long will we pump money into this failed project before we admit to the reality of the situation -- the Rail should never been a proposed solution for Hawaii? Please stop the project and then there will be no need to establish a new zoning classification for Transit Oriented Development. We don't want that either -- it is just an extension of the Rail project and will rely on attracting more people to the urban core -- where many residents don't want to live.

5. Bill 29 (27). The City and County has had refuse collection in their budget that is funded from Property taxes. There is no need to create a new tax. We are already paying for this service. We were not getting it for free. The people working for refuse were paid out of a budget. If there aren't enough funds in the budget, please identify savings to pay for the service. This new tax is being created rather than admitting already existing taxes/fees are being raised. There is plenty of waste that can be cut instead of creating new taxes. Furthermore, there have been advances on refuse sorting equipment that makes curbside recycling/sorting obsolete. The City and County needs to look into methods of being more efficient in the handling of our refuse rather than imposing more taxes on the people. Vote NO on Bill 29 and find budget savings to cover any and all refuse collection services.

Thank-you.