

Evaluating Components of the Discussion Draft General Plan for the County of Kauai

Sector or Component of Plan: **3.0 Implementation and Monitoring**

Sub-section (if applicable): **3.1 Implementing the Plan**

Please note: These recommendations are not for actions that should be taken between 2017-2035, but rather should be part of the structure of the new General Plan and incorporated into the plan before the plan is finalized.

Additionally, it is suggested that this component of the plan be moved towards the front, right after the “framework, vision, goals and policy section” and before the 10 sectors.

I. BUILDING A SOLID FOUNDATION

a. Describe the **issue, problem or need** based on the current situation (why this needs to be addressed):

By all accounts, the 2000 General Plan represented a body of work that was well supported by and reflected the interests of the community. However, the guiding vision and policies did not come to bear in terms of being reflected in the actions carried out by the County over the subsequent 16 years (2000-2016). This is most evidenced by the fact that the issues identified in the 2000 General Plan have been exacerbated by the lack of directed action, rather than reduced. Basic infrastructure needs and requirements have increased (as have the demands); the need for transportation alternatives have not been met resulting in island-wide traffic congestion; a range of housing alternatives to meet residents’ needs have fallen sorely behind, making the possibility of meeting future population projections even more challenging to meet, etc., etc. As well crafted as the 2000 General Plan might have been, it was missing some of the most basic foundational pieces found in any successful plan – assigned accountability, timelines for implementation, measurable targets to be achieved, and most of all a monitoring plan.

b. Describe the **ideal future state** (aka goal, big picture) specific to this sector or component of plan:

On a timely basis, all short, mid and long-term targets, as articulated in the General Plan, are being achieved. And, when it is clear the targets are not being met, the assigned responsible party makes a course correction to ensure these targets will be met by 2035. The net result is that by 2035 there is a shared sense that key issues have been addressed, growth is being managed and we collectively, as a community, have made wise choices.

c. Describe the **target state** (sometimes called objectives) – what you want to ultimately achieve by 2035 in specific, clear and measurable terms:

The 2017 General Plan is built on a strong foundation that includes specific targets (results) to be achieved, implementation responsibilities that are assigned and plotted against a timeline, and a structured monitoring program. The net result is a results-based General Plan that by 2035 has controlled growth and moved Kauai in the desired direction as expressed by this community in 2016.

II. DEVELOPING RESULTS-BASED ACTIONS

a. Describe **3 “whys”** the current situation exists (or challenges to achieving the ideal future state – these may serve as points of intervention that will make up the actions by sector):

<p>1.a. The GPU loosely uses terms like “sustainability” and “growth”, yet there is <u>no overall framework</u> that we are working under (e.g., “sustainable growth” (including a definition), or “green growth” (including a definition), etc. This would provide a clear direction not only for the sectors, but also the zoning maps and future land use.</p> <p>1.b. There are no clearly articulated <u>targets</u> that have been established for each sector to set specific standards for how we are going to make this overall framework a reality (e.g., “30% of food is grown on island and consumed by local residents” and/or “an increase by 40% in multi-modal</p>	<p>2. The General Plan alludes to the need for accountability “. . . <i>shared responsibility and accountability for implementation are imperative to staying focused on measurable progress.</i>”, yet there is <u>no specifically assigned accountability, no timeline for implementation, nor incremental milestones</u> to know in advance of 2035 whether we are making progress towards meeting our targets. Additionally, the GPU states “<i>Parties responsibilities for implementing actions, as well as monitoring, reporting, and updating the plan are clearly identified in the plan. Beyond that, all County agencies and parties responsible for implementation should</i></p>	<p>3. ---</p>
--	---	---------------

<p>transportation opportunities, and correspondingly a 20% reduction in our carbon footprint"). These are measureable results. With this kind of structure, it would be much easier to prioritize which actions are most likely to give us the intended results (especially important given limited resources). Note: the goals are too general and don't serve the same purpose as targets.</p>	<p><i>be made aware of their roles and timeline so that the needed staff time and resources can be allocated."</i> Again, there is no apparent assigning of responsibilities, only the designation of potential partners.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>		
<p>b. Describe the interventions (actions) that should be taken in order to achieve your target state (specific to each of the 3 "whys").</p>		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Does this come from the plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Has it been modified from the plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is this a new idea? a. Develop a clearly defined <u>framework</u> for the direction we want to move towards. Then, review and align the vision, policies and goals to ensure they complement the framework. b. Develop specific, measurable <u>targets</u> for each sector. These targets will be a de facto way for prioritizing actions as each action must be specifically directed towards meeting the target (right now there are too many actions and it is not realistic to think they will all be implemented).</p>	<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Does this come from the plan? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Has it been modified from the plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Is this a new idea? a. Develop a table that assigns responsibility for ensuring that each action in the General Plan is implemented. This entity may not necessarily be the implementer, but they will have the responsibility for tracking and ensuring the progress. b. Develop a timeline for implementation of each action. c. Against the timeline, develop milestones for each action (short, mid and long term).</p>	<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Does this come from the plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Has it been modified from the plan? <input type="checkbox"/> Is this a new idea?</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>		
<p>c. Who might the implementing partner(s) be for each intervention (action):</p>		
<p>1. The County should take the lead with further input from the CAC, the community and technical experts.</p>	<p>2. The County and those partners who have been designated in the GP for the implementation of each action.</p>	<p>3.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>		
<p>d. Assumptions – what makes you think these actions will address the 3 "whys":</p>		
<p>1. There are a significant number of models of practice in regards to general, strategic and management plans. The most common element for success is a strong and clearly articulated foundation. Without this foundation, there is no clear future direction.</p>	<p>2. There are a significant number of models of practice in regards to general, strategic and management plans. The most common element for success is a strong and clearly articulated foundation. Without this foundation, there is no way to measure results.</p>	<p>3.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">▼</p>		
<p>e. What are the incremental results or change factors you expect to take place:</p>		
<p>1. Short-term Outcome: a. The County works with key CAC and community members to develop the framework. b. The County assembles a group of interested CAC members, community members and technical experts to develop realistic and achievable</p>	<p>1. Short-term Outcome: a. The County assigns responsibility, develops the timeline and corresponding milestones for each activity.</p>	<p>1. Short-term Outcome: ---</p>

targets for each sector.		
2. Mid-term Outcome: Vet framework and targets with public.	2. Mid-term Outcome: Vet milestones with public.	2. Mid-term Outcome: ---
3. Long-term Outcome: Framework and targets are incorporated into final GP before it is enacted.	3. Long-term Outcome: Responsibility for implementation, timeline and milestones are incorporated into final GP before it is enacted.	3. Long-term Outcome: --
▼	▼	▼
III. EVALUATING RESULTS		
a. What will you use as an indicator of change so you will know if you are getting the anticipated results from your actions (meeting your target state in section I.c.)?		
1. ---	2. ---	3. ---
▼	▼	▼
IV. INTEGRATION ACROSS SECTORS		
a. What other sectors will be impacted (negatively or positively) by your proposed actions?		
1. All 10 Sectors, Future Land Use and the Land Use Maps will all be impacted by this action. In fact, this action should help to determine and prioritize which actions are most relevant in terms of being the most results-based and meeting the vision, goals, policies and targets for Kauai.	2. All 10 Sectors will all be impacted by this action. In fact, this action should help to determine and prioritize which actions are most relevant in terms of being the most results-based and meeting the vision, goals, policies and targets for Kauai.	3.