

**From:** [Tiare Lawrence](#)  
**To:** [luc@dbedt.hawaii.gov](mailto:luc@dbedt.hawaii.gov)  
**Subject:** Olowalu testimony by Tiare Lawrence  
**Date:** 11/18/2015 11:55 AM  
**Attachments:** [Untitleddocument.pdf](#)

---

Aloha LUC Commissioners. My name is Tiare Lawrence. I am from Lahaina, I currently am raising my kids in Pukalani. Olowalu is a very special place to my family. We grew up venturing the old cane roads, swimming at Olowalu landing, fishing and surfing with my cousins, riding our bikes to the store and back to my aunty's house, Olowalu landing is where we put to rest ashes of our ohana that have passed on. Olowalu is where we go to celebrate birthdays, holidays, and celebrations of life. In ancient Hawai'i, Olowalu was a pu'u honua, a place of refuge. Today, many of us still consider Olowalu as our place of refuge. It is where we go to get away from town and enjoy the serenity Olowalu has to offer. Olowalu and Ukumehame is the only places left on the westside without urbanization. Our state laws (HAR 11-200) specify what the content of an EIS needs to be. The law is clear. It says an EIS "shall fully declare the environmental implications of the proposed action and shall discuss all relevant and feasible consequences of the action."

The Olowalu Town Final EIS does not "fully declare" the environmental implications of the proposed project or discuss the "feasible consequences."

Instead, it relies on assumptions that nothing the project does will cause any harm. I am concerned that the FEIS has assumptions about the project's Cultural and wildlife impacts\_\_ that are not meaningfully discussed in the document, or in some cases not even mentioned.

I'm here to oppose the Olowalu Town Development because the EIS fails to address many of my family as well as my own concerns. Although there are many points I would like to bring up, I will address the following to stay in my time limit:

As a kanaka maoli and a cultural practitioner, I do not agree with their use of "ahupua'a" as a development model to urbanize mauka to makai as stated in the EIS. The use of "ahupua'a" as a development model is out of date, completely false, completely opposite. An Ahupua'a was a traditional term in ancient Hawai'i. Hawaiians never "urbanized prime agricultural land" Ahupua'a was developed for the socio ecological well being of a governance system. Ahupua'a was created to service kanaka, primarily near a water source, sufficient enough to support the community. Lack of restoration and revitalization does not allow restoration and by no means can use the term ahupua'a. Using this term for a development model is obscure and inappropriate and has no bearing as far as a traditional ahupua'a system. An ahupua'a system takes into account the land division and also the adjacent shoreline and surrounding reef systems. The priority of an ahupua'a is to maintain and foster its resources. If this community is based on this premise, the impacted shoreline and reefs of the Launiupoko development should be a telling sign of things to come.

Their cultural Inventory Assessment (CIA) acknowledges past and present cultural practice on the lands but concludes that none of these will be affected because a Cultural Reserve has been established. This does not address cultural use outside Reserve boundaries such as fishing, surfing, and gathering along the shore which will be impacted by the Olowalu Town Development. Olowalu is home to NENE goose habitat and nesting areas. DLNR Forestry and Wildlife Division, have been monitoring them for over 6 years now and have also documented nesting sites. I was surprised to find that in the EIS there was no Habitat Conservation Plan. The proposed wastewater wetland will be in their current nesting area and the proposed highway is adjacent to this area as well. Nene are attracted to wetlands and reservoirs, so the fact that the highway will be close to that vicinity will be a major safety concern for the safety of endangered Nene goose. Pursuant to State of Hawai'i endangered species law, codified in Hawai'i Revised Statutes Chapter 195D, it is unlawful for any person to "take" an endangered or threatened species of aquatic life, wildlife, or land plant. "Take" means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect endangered or threatened species of aquatic life or wildlife, or to cut, collect, uproot, destroy, injure, or possess endangered or threatened species of aquatic life or land plants, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct (HRS §195D-2).

When development projects or land management activities cannot avoid take of endangered or threatened species, the landowner may seek an Incidental Take License (ITL) from the Department for take of threatened or endangered species, if such take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity. The ITL must be accompanied by a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that meets the requirements enumerated under HRS 195D, including incidental take measures for minimization, mitigation, monitoring, and provide for a net recovery benefit to the affected species.

No where in the EIS does it mention a Habitat Conservation Plan or an Incidental take license. For the few reasons I stated, I believe that the EIS is inadequate and inaccurate. Mahalo for this opportunity. Aloha

Tiare Lawrence

Sent from my iPhone