Dear Commissioners

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify on the Kealia development. You’ve heard or soon will hear a litany of objections to this project and they all have validity. It is sad to recognize that so many of those who testified in hopes of finding an affordable home in which to live, will be extremely unlikely to fulfill their dream in this location.

1. Traffic…Kealia will create a mess of traffic in an already growing mess. The backup of cars entering Kapa’a is getting worse and more frequent every day and Kealia Beach is congested with cars trying to enter and exit the area.
2. General Plan…This development is not in the 2018 Kauai General Plan and it defies the spirit of the most recent document. It in we have committed to develop urban areas in favor of rural to prevent further sprawl.
3. Affordable housing…The project pays lip service to our affordable housing needs. The most glaring shortage on Kaua’i is the need for affordable housing. The Kealia development will not help.
4. Quality of life…It would be a terrible place to live because of the ever increasing highway noise and congestion.
5. Agricultural lands…Kealia development robs Kaua’i of yet one more piece of agricultural land. We are already far too dependent on shipments of food from remote places and many individuals and organizations are working hard to increase our farm production. As global changes reduce our tourist flow and our access to outside goods, as it surely will, we will need to be far more self sustaining in our food production.
6. The developers say that this project was on the previous General Plan, so it should still be OK. But times change. How can we frame this situation in the present moment? The events surrounding Mauna Kea come to mind because, as we speak, the protesters across the islands and on the mountain are reminding us that this land is sacred and that we have too often mistreated the host culture and one another for the sake of financial gain. It is time to change our ways and return to the old ways of malama aina and and Aloha for one another. Developers have had their way toward creating ill-advised projects on Kaua’i for many years. Few have been denied and many have been built to the detriment of our island. It is time to reverse this trend. Think of the effects on the residents, whether they be in cars or in need of an affordable place to live and please steer those developers to places that make sense to build. Kealia does not.
7. This EIS is filled of anticipated roadblocks with inadequate or non existent solutions. It is vague and unsubstantiated and leaves many areas wide open, e.g. affordability of the lots, for abuse of the plan.

Please do not approve this EIS.

Aloha
David Dinner
Kilauea
David Dinner
Certified Biodynamic and Visionary Craniosacral Care and Aquacranial
gentlewave@hawaii.rr.com
808 639 7845
Chairperson, members of the State Land Use Commission

Aloha Kaikahiaka,

Due to the time constraints imposed by the chairperson at the LUC hearing on July Thursday, 25 on Kauai, I was unable to complete my oral testimony in full. Rather I only touched upon two areas of concern regarding the FEIS. As such I would to add the following comments and concerns with respect to the FEIS and its inherent deficiencies and lack of specificity.

1. Kealia Road Improvements

   A. The roadway expansion would intrude unto the current County right of way and shoulder. Was there an agreement reached with the County to allow the proposed improvement. When and Who participated in the decision making process. Was the council advised of the Jurisdictional issue?

   B. My (educated guess) estimate is that over 40 thousand cubic yards of dirt will need to be added. (I am certain that this is a gross understatement.) Along with substantial land clearing, grubbing, compacting and requisite road realignment will be needed to extend the shoulders along the hillside, again there is no mention where the fill material will come from, nor the duration of the road expansion project, the impact on existing residential traffic, or the noise and dust component associated with such a proposal. The daily walkers, bicyclist and vehicular traffic will be impacted. Where is this contained in the FEIS.

   C. Extending the roadway will or may impact two or more Monkeypod tress that have been there since the turn of the last century, why is there no reference to these remarkable living treasures in the FEIS. What are the plans, accommodations, or at minimum what considerations has the developer articulated in his document that recognizes that this is all part of what our community considers unique.

   D. The bridge or culvert weight limitation has not been addressed by the developer nor the county, yet the FEIS makes reference to grading and subdivision preparation which would indicate that heavy equipment of various GVW will be traversing the section, again the structural integrity of the bridge has not been certified in the Impact Statement.

   E. If there is an “urban” subdivision as envisioned by the planning director, then access into the proposed subdivision would best be served directly off of Kuhio Highway. It would be fare less expensive to build and would negate some of the concerns and safety issues that the Kealia Community has. (Yet time and time again, the representatives have stated that State DOT will not allow it.) As there are three accesses of the highway leading the Kealia Kai Agriculture Estates and two additional leading to the Kealia Beach Park access why is this even an issue?
State DOT has allowed two accesses into the Anahola Residences Mauka Subdivision. (There are less homes there then in the proposed Kealia Mauka subdivision.) Inequity?.. 

2. Urban Designation

In reviewing some of the older documents that depict the Land Use Designation for the Kealia area, there is no specific reference to the 54 acres that the developer claims was/is included in the future plans for Kealia. Although there is One map showing a possible expansion along Hopoe road heading makai, there is no way any logical person would construe that the area depicted in yellow comes close to the proposed boundaries as articulated by the developer and petitioner. Where is the specific designation, metes and bounds and in what document does it show this?

3. Impact on our Community

The FEIS does not address the quality of life issues and concerns that our families and the community will suffer or be subjected to.

A. No where in the FEIS is there any reference to what impact the noise from the construction will have on the current residents. The planners made an ambiguous reference that they could build a noise barrier during the construction phase, however no specifics was presented as to what this will be. Is this going to be a barricaded wall? How high? Erecting a wall or dust barrier will diminish the trade wind flow which we consider one of the most essential amenities of Kealia living. A wall barrier will also eliminate or view plane that we now enjoy. Placement of a dust barrier does not mean that all airborne particles are contained. Who will be responsible for dust hazards, i.e., dirty walls and having to repaint our houses when we are subjected to months, if not years of construction.

B. For those of us living along Kealia Road, no mention is made in the FEIS addressing the amount, sound level readings, general traffic noise that will become a daily occurrence if the subdivision comes to fruition. Did they do a test specifically along Kealia road? Will they build a barrier to minimize that increased vehicular noise impact? The situation will also be exacerbated with the inclusion of heavy equipment and truck traffic. Where is this contained in the FEIS.

I know that a lot of the other residents living here, share these concerns and have other issues with the proposal as well. I humbly ask that you consider the human cost, impact to our way of life; and the reasons why our parents chose this area to raise their families; not the financial gain that will be reaped by the developer if this FEIS is approved.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to sharing some of my concerns regarding the this proposed project.

Yours truly,

Clayton K. Arinaga,