Aloha State Land Use Commission,

I am writing in very strong opposition to the Makila EIS.

There are serious flaws contained in the EIS.

1) This plan does not conform to the Maui Island Plan's requirement for Open Space. How will it be changed to conform?
(http://www.co.maui.hi.us/index.aspx?nid=1503 see plan Chapter 8 page 8-62 for info on the Maui Island Plan)
The Maui Island plan includes a minimum of 50% of this development to be designated parks and open space. Makila Land Co. is achieving this 50% by including parts of lots they intend to sell. So yes, they are counting people's backyards in the 50% number. Open space belongs to everyone and should not be part of someone's backyard. This inclusion of people's yards in the 50% was publicly confirmed to us by a consultant to Makila Land Co. You can bet it was not the intent of the Maui Island Plan to include portions of private lots in the open space designation! Misleading and non-conforming.

2) This plan has an urban core of 40 acres. This urban core was not in the Maui Island Plan. Problem.

3) The development will have a detrimental effect upon the coral reefs below it. Dr. Eric Brown and many other marine biologists and researchers voiced their concerns before the General Plan Advisory committee and the Maui Planning Commission in 2008 and 2009 (regarding the development of Olowalu). They asked that the mauka lands not be urbanized so that the reefs and water quality are not put at risk. The same inherent problems face the reefs below the Makila Rural Development. Urbanization leads directly to reef destruction. West Maui’s reefs are already in dire condition and rank among the worst in the state for damage. It is an easily observed fact that any development near the ocean will impact the reef. We cannot afford more loss/destruction of precious reef.

4) Endangered Species: Monk Seal Habitat. The beaches of West Maui are designated Monk Seal Habitat. It is imperative this be included in your statement where you state there are no known species that will be impacted. I have personally observed many pueo (Hawaiian short eared owl) in this area hunting and nesting. They will be driven out as they are a lowlands species and nest on the ground.
They are an endangered species on Oahu because of overdevelopment. A little foresight will prevent them suffering the same fate on Maui.

5) Sewage treatment plant adjacent to the ocean. This will impact the reef and endangered species. You cannot use all the reclaimed water. Where does the surplus go? Solids? More truckloads/traffic on the Pali going to the dump? Anyone living West Maui is familiar with the foul smells emanating from our overloaded sewage treatment plant in Ka'anapali with its illegal injection wells. Are you planning to copy this poor model? Just because it will be included on property does not relieve you of the legal ramifications of environmental impact.

6) Highway impact. Access to Lahaina is still one lane highway which is subject to flooding on high tides and countless closures with traffic accidents and fatalities. Now is not a good time to propose more thoughtless development to add to the already dangerous mess.

7) Beach usage. Clearly these homes will want to be able to get to the beach. Launiupoko and Puamana Park are very heavily overwhelmed with traffic already. No more parking available. If parking is found, it will result it more “hits” on the traffic light crosswalk. This will add more stop/go to a critical area of the already jammed highway. Critical bottleneck.

8) AG designation: Except for the drainage gulches (and only the drainage gulches!) this area has been designated as "good soil", having the 2nd highest productivity rating classified by the state. It is state policy NOT to take good soil out of AG use. So in this plan, why are they taking "good" soil out of agricultural use? PLUS only 10% of AG land falls into the top two productivity levels. Why are we taking some of this best quality land out of AG? Maui needs to work harder on its sustainability, which requires working AG lands be preserved for producing crops/food for feeding our ever growing current population with the ultimate goal of becoming less dependent on mainland imports.

9) In addition, in the EISPN, Makila Land state that the current use of the land is undeveloped and vacant and not currently used for agriculture. This land is not being used for agriculture because they have chosen not to use it, not because it is inferior or poor AG land.

10) Other than the dubious gift of bringing more people to a bottleneck area is there anything about this proposal that benefits West Maui? It is glaringly apparent that West Maui Land Development is the only one to gain ($$$) in this heavily flawed proposal.

These are simply the most obvious errors that jump out of this EIS. I could easily come up with more. I would seriously question the authors of this EIS as they seem to be in the back pocket of the developers on this poorly written document. To approve this EIS would be turning a blind eye to these troubling and critical issues. I respectfully request you consider rejecting this proposal for countless reasons.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Janet Spreiter