

From: [Glen Kagamida](#)
To: [Planning WPC Testimony](#)
Subject: BILL 154 COMMERCIAL PARKING
Date: Monday, June 29, 2026 3:28:33 PM

Aloha,

I am writing in opposition to Bill 154, Relating to Commercial Parking Lots and Garages.

While Bill 154 has merit, I encourage postponement and more deliberation.

If the genesis for Bill 154 is an issue at the Kailua Village Business Improvement District (Bill 132, withdrawn), why not solve that existing issue first rather than attempting this one-size-fits-all proposal for the future of the entire island?

Restricting new commercial parking facilities and garages will restrict competition and enable the very predatory pricing alleged in Bill 132 (*Ban on new paid parking lots mulled*, Hawaii Tribune-Herald, May 10). Bill 154 will protect existing "grandfathered" commercial facilities and garages, giving them the ability to price gouge and may worsen the issue at Kailua Village.

If new facilities and garages cannot charge for parking, they will work the cost into their pricing to every customer. That would penalize customers who are not "automobile dependent."

Perhaps what is needed are MORE parking facilities and garages. Competition is known to stabilize or even reduce prices. People may actually prefer commercial parking if there is a good reason to pay, such as security, shade, protection from bad weather or proximity.

If people can go to an area and find parking reasonably fast, that would lessen vehicle circulation and traffic congestion because they wouldn't be driving around looking for parking.

If you want to restrict options and therefore discourage new commercial parking, what is your plan for more public parking? Growth and parking go hand in hand. It's very difficult to have one without the other. Areas of the island may want more parking facilities and garages, even if commercial.

Mahalo,
Glen Kagamida
Hilo