

GROUP 2 - RESPONSES TO ORGANIZATION COMMENTS

Agor Jehn Architects, LLC
119 Merchant Street, Suite 605A
Honolulu, Hi 96813
ron@agorjehnarch.com
909-947-2467

Date: 7-8-2019

RE: HoKua Place
Response to Comments on 2nd DEIS

TO: Rayne Regush, Co-Chair of Executive Committee
Sierra Club Kaua'i Group

We are pleased to submit our responses to the Sierra Club Kaua'i Group's comments on the 2nd DEIS for HoKua Place. The responses to your comments are numbered in concert to your numbered comments. Your questions are attached to this document. Our responses are as follows:

Page 1, Item 1:

The zoning designation has been corrected in the FEIS. The FEIS designates the property as "Neighborhood General"

The Planning Department has designated HoKua Place as "Neighborhood General" during the General Plan Update and the County Council approved the designation.

Page 1, Item 2:

While the Petitioner intends to present designs of the structures for the county entitlement process, it is anticipated that the multi-family structures will be 2-stories above the entry grade with the possibility of garages/carports below the entry grade entering from the back of the structures where the grade drops down.

The design for the single-family lots will be one to two story dwellings.

Page 2, Item 3:

Conceptual Plan Map shows the lots with conceptual proposals of the types of units that may be built on the lots. Figure 2, a proposed site plan, conceptually shows generic indications of where the structures may be placed. This is just a conceptual plan.

Page 2, Item 4:

The "Neighborhood General" designation allows the Petitioner to present mixed densities to design and build 769 units collectively. Currently, there is no designated density for the project.

Page 2, Item 5:

The proposed 769 units amounts to approximately 7.9 or 8 units per acre. The concept site plan, Figure 2 visually shows it as a relatively low to medium density.

Page 2, Item 6;

Again, the Figure 2, the conceptual plan is what it is, a concept. The multi-family structures may have different number of units in each building to achieve the proposed 683 multi-family units.

Page 2, Item 7:

The final outcome of the General Plan Update is summarized in the last paragraph as quoted in Item 7. The Petitioner feels that the HoKua Place will meet the concept of the “Future Land Use Map of the 2000 General Plan.

Page 3, Item 8:

When the community plans are deliberated the Petitioner will be participating. The Petitioner will have to conform to all Zoning and Community Plan requirements.

Page 3, Item 9:

HoKua Place will be a housing project for all. There will be small-scale multi-unit housing of possible duplexes and fourplexes that will integrate with single-family homes.

Page 3, Affordable Housing Needs:

Item 1:

Page 12 of Volume 1 depicts the product sales projection as follows:

183 multi-family units at 125K to 175K Real affordable

500 multi-family units at 250K to 350K Affordable

50 house package units at 650K to 700K Market

36 house package units at 850K to 950K Market

Item 2:

Volume I, Page 13 of the FEIS depicts the price and numbers of the affordable multi-family units. This information was un-deceptively shown on Page 12.

Item 3:

The Petitioner is committed to building the number of affordable units indicated in the FEIS.

Item .4:

Refer to Item 1 above.

Page 5, Item 5:

Refer to Item 1 above

Item 6:

Ian Costa, former planning director, has agreed to disclose his request during the time he served as planning director. You may contact Mr. Costa.

Item 7:

The “Product Sales Price Projection” was updated for the FEIS.

Item 8:

Please refer to the updated Kauai Housing Market Study, Exhibit A.1.

Page 5, Inadequate Roadway Infrastructure & Unresolved Traffic Congestion:

Item 1:

The main issue facing Kauai is housing, especially affordable housing. HoKua Place partially contributes to the solution. Many young people in the area has said that they would stay in traffic a little longer if they could have a home. To ask these young people to wait until government solves the traffic issue is unrealistic.

Item 2:

Traffic congestion is anticipated to be increase at times.

Item 3:

To deprive our young families affordable housing, like now, will be a grievous error.

Item 4:

Kaua'i Long Range Land Transportation Implementation Plan will ease traffic in the subject area someday. In the meantime, let's build affordable housing.

Page 6, Item 5:

No doubt that at times traffic will be heavy. However, HoKua Place is walking distance to Kapa'a town, a walking and bicycling route to town is planned. It is a detrimental to young family's lives living in poor conditions and doubling up in homes.

Item 6:

Please refer the updated TIAR, Exhibit "H". The burden will be softened by the proposed Road A.

Item 7:

There will be crossing at the two roundabouts. There are safe crossings at roundabouts in the Lihue and Poipu that works.

Item 8:

First responders are trained to reach and transport potential patients all over the State and Country. Kauai is no different.

Page 6, TIAR Update:

Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7:

The Updated TIAR has been done by experts and accepted by government experts. HoKua Place should proceed accordingly.

Item 6:

The neighborhood-oriented commercial center trip generations can be considered as “internal capture” and or “diverted trips”.

Page 7, Wastewater/Sewage:

Item 1:

Sewer for the Project will be piped to the nearest available existing infrastructure in Kapa’u Town. Please refer to Exhibit “G”.

Item 2:

The relocation of the Lydgate Sewage Treatment Facility will not be moved in the very near future. Young families desire to own a home to better their quality of life is at stake. Again, to ask them to wait 15 to 25 years for the relocation of a sewage plant before they can own a home is more detrimental to society than being behind with infrastructure.

Item 3:

Septic tanks could be installed for the single-family dwellings, but it is not the preference of the Petitioner. Public sewer connections would be preferred.

Item 4:

Any design for the wastewater system will be prudent in the use of updated practices and materials. Petitioner will have to comply with government requirement at the time of construction.

Page 7, Water resources & Water Infrastructure Improvements:

Item 1:

The water master plan has been submitted to the County DOW. The Petitioner is committed to implement the plan. The plan has been acknowledged by DOW and is still under consideration. The plan includes dedicating water to DOW for their system. Should DOW not accept the plan, then the Petitioner will go at it alone.

Item 2:

DOW has not withdrawn its position; therefore, the report is still relevant, but subject to change as the project gets closer to realization.

Item 3:

The water master plan entails dedicating the well to the DOW. Again, if DOW rejects the offer, then the well will be private.

Item 4:

HoKua Place is committed to keep the stream free from obstruction and keep runoffs from the Project on site. We do not have base streamflow measurements currently. However, during the final design of the drainage system for the Project, information on the streamflow will be generated.

Item 5:

Currently the preliminary Engineering Report on drainage is adequate to move the Project through the Land Use process. A more in-depth study will be done for the county entitlement process.

Item 6:

The development of the HoKua Place and the Farm Lots will not impact the streams balance, quality, flood, decline in habitat value or increase pollutants in the stream. All run-offs from the project is not intended to reach the stream.

Page 8, Cumulative Impacts:

Item 1:

The direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative impacts associated with the project will be localized or short term, occurring during the construction phase.

Item 2:

The Wailua and Kapa'a is growing with new developments. These developments have been through the vetting system of the county. The impacts will increase as time move forward. Yes, at times traffic will be highly impacted.

Item 3:

Development in the area will create its own area of employment. There are many who want to live and work in the Wailua and Kapa'a area.

Page 9, Historic and Cultural Resources:

Item 1:

Three exploratory trenches were accepted by SHPD. Most likely because the land had been heavily cultivated over a period of many decades.

Item 2:

The Kapa'a Middle School site had an AIS study done per information in Exhibit "L".

Item 3:

The improvement of the bypass road will be the DOT responsibility. During the process and design, it is very likely that an updated archaeological study will be executed.

Page 9, Visual/Aesthetic and Park Resources:

Item 1:

The housing crisis is real. HoKua Place will be well landscaped to help minimize the visual impact. Visual aesthetics of the coast and ocean from the Project will be immensely positive for the occupants of the Project.

Item 2:

The Petitioner feels that Scenic Vistas may bring non-essential traffic to the area.

Item 3:

Drainage basins are often design in greenbelt areas and many times in parks. The basins will be grassed and may be a recreational area when times are absent of rainstorms.

Item 4:

The Wailua-Kapa'a area has many good parks. The walkways and bicycle path will be connected to the main bicycle path in Kapa'a making the existing parks accessible from the Project.

Item 5:

The designated open space is where no structures are expected to be built for now. The buildable area will not exceed 50% of the land area. There will be open space within the building lots and around the multi-family structures. At least 50% of the total land area will be open.

Item 6:

There is no restrictions to designated open areas or greenbelts because of topography. One should appreciate the more sloped areas of the site that is left Open.

Item 7:

The finalization of the bicycle/walking path will be done for the county entitlement process. Preliminarily, it will be desired to have the path on the property at the higher elevation than the roadway. The approach to the roadway crossing will be gently sloped towards the roundabouts.

Page 10, Commercial Center:

Item 1:

The one-acre parcel is owned by the Petitioner. The site is relatively level and easy to build on. The finalization of the use of this parcel will be determined during the county entitlement process.

Page 10, Errors, Omissions & Discrepancies:

Item 1:

While discussing this issue with planning, we were given the impression that the plan was being worked on. Your insight of this process is much appreciated.

Item 2:

We looked at the county park area and housing projects to east, Kapa'a town to the south, the church site along the south of the bypass, and the Kapaa Middle School to the north all as urban. However, we do appreciate your finding on this issue.

Item 3:

The Petitioner feels that the preliminary studies and site plans are adequate for EIS and the LUC reclassification process.

Item 4:

There is a possibility that a church site may be developed, however most unlikely.

Item 5:

Over the last 3 decades or so, it is evidenced that hurricanes that landed on Kauai were infrequent. Since the reports of climate change over the last 10 years, Kauai has not been directly hit with hurricanes.

Item 6:

Figure 1 in the TIAR report is consistent with the conceptual site plans as far the property boundaries, main roadway and designated areas. Figure 1 does include a concept of unit locations and interior roadways, where the conceptual site plans do not.

Item 7:

Exhibit "O" is now legible.

Item 8:

The crux for the adversity for growing crops is the strong trade winds and salt spray from the ocean, regardless of the soil type. The site has not been in substantial agricultural use over the last two decades is because of the adverse conditions.

Page 12, Topography:

Item 1:

The purpose of the topographic map and survey map is to show the general slope of the site with no details. The maps does show the boundaries and adjacent roadways. The Petitioner believes the extent of the maps are adequate to move the Project forward. More details will be provided for the county entitlement process. A note of the stream location has been added.

Item 2:

The development will use the existing topography closely as is as much as possible following sound engineering practices. There will be areas of the roadways that may be cut and filled. For sure most of the multi-family building sites will require some cut and fill activity.

Item 3:

Areas with high potential of erosion will be mitigated by landscaping, as landscaping tends to stable soil during rain periods.

Conclusion:

The Petitioner appreciates your insightful comments. The Project will develop detailed design of the site, with preliminary grading and drainage plans showing the extent of land alterations, preliminary building plans and elevations showing how the structures fit on the land, detailed preliminary infrastructure plans, detailed landscaping plans, more clarity on public roadways, etc. during the county entitlement process. The public will have ample time to comment on the detailed proposals for the site at that time. The Petitioner hereby submits the Final EIS as written for review by the LUC.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Agor', written over a faint, illegible printed name.

Ron Agor, Architect



December 24, 2018

[By Email: daniel.e.orođenker@hawaii.gov]

Daniel E. Orođenker, Executive Director
State Land Use Commission
235 South Beretania St., Room 406
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: 2nd Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Kapa'a Highlands Phase II (HoKua Place) to Amend the Land Use District Boundary from Agriculture District to Urban District for 97-acres, TMK (4)4-3-03:001

Aloha Mr. Orođenker:

The Sierra Club Kaua'i Group of the Hawai'i Chapter opposes this Land Use Boundary Amendment. There are many unresolved issues in the DEIS and the project will have significant impacts (in spite of the need for affordable housing and the value of siting urban expansion adjacent to the Kapaa town core).

General Plan "Neighborhood General" Designation.

- 1) DEIS Vol I, page 3 mistakenly lists the General Plan designation as "Urban Center". The correct designation in the 2018 General Plan is "Neighborhood General" as described in Chapter 2.2 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS:

"The **Neighborhood General Designation** applies to the watershed surrounding Neighborhood Centers. This designation is intended for medium intensity mixed-use environments that support the town core with housing, services, parks, civic/institutional, home occupation, and commercial uses. (General Plan, page 56)

"Previously, the Urban Center designation was applied to "centers of government, commerce and transportation that serve the entire County or a large region... The policy addressing Wailua-Kapa'a Traffic and managing growth north of the Wailua Bridge influenced the decision to remove the swath of Urban Center from the area adjacent to Kapa'a Middle School." (General Plan, page 57)

- 2) The DEIS fails to identify the number of stories for the proposed multi-family units. Building height is limited to 1-2 stories for the "Neighborhood General Designation" and it is unclear whether the project conforms with this definition:

Sierra Club of Hawai'i, Kaua'i Group | PO Box 3412, Lihue, Hawai'i 96766 | hi.sierraclub.org

Emailed correspondence reduces paper waste. If you do print this letter, please recycle. Mahalo.

“Buildings in this designation are mostly detached, with some attached, 1-2 stories in height that can accommodate a range of multi-family housing types.” (General Plan, page 56)

- 3) The DEIS Conceptual Plan map (March 2015) cites 683 Multi-family units (with R14 County zoning) in the legend. However, Figure 2-Proposed Site Plan in the DEIS, a color illustration layered onto an aerial map with red and yellow blocks representing units, provides a conflicting information.
- 4) Regarding the proposed 86-single family units, what is the proposed county residential zoning? Is it R6/R8 zoning? This information was difficult to find.
- 5) In addition to Alternative 3 (300 single family units) which is not a helpful scenario if targeting affordable housing, the DEIS should provide reduced density alternatives with combined multi- and single-family units, such as 300 to 400 units, and 400 to 500 units. The proposed 769 housing units on 97-acres is high density for a rural island and other alternatives/scenarios should be presented.
- 6) The conceptual plan fails to include the number of units in the multi-family buildings, the number of stories, and the quantity of multi-family buildings.
- 7) During the County General Plan Update, the designation for this controversial Hokua Place project went back and forth multiple times. In the Department Draft January 2017 version describing Kapaa Town it states:

4-40 | Urban Areas

The area around Kapa'a Middle School proposed for the Hokua Place Development has been changed from General Plan Urban Center Designation to Agriculture.

4-39 | Future Land Use | Kaua'i County General Plan

Kapa'a Town's future growth pattern depends largely upon the intensity of implementation related to a key community policy related to traffic north of the Wailua bridge. The 2000 General Plan does earmark large residential growth at the Hokua Place property near Kapa'a Middle School. The area is designated as Urban Center. However, community opinion remains divided, with strong concerns about the perceived impacts of the proposed development on traffic. Supporters cite the great need for housing and the consistency of the Hokua Place proposal with smart growth principles. Others feel that the proposed traffic mitigation measures won't be enough to counteract negative impacts, that sewer infrastructure is constrained, and that because of the East Kaua'i congestion, affordable housing development should be concentrated in Lihu'e.

In the public consultation process, two map alternatives were developed for Kapa'a Town's future that reflected this dual input. In the first alternative, Kapa'a transforms from a Small Town to a Large Town place type. The existing Town Center boundary is extended mauka along Olohena road with the idea that the Main Street environment at Olohena and Kūhiō could extend mauka to the roundabout and the northeast corner of the Hokua property. Hokua Place would organize medium-intensity residential neighborhoods on the Makai side of the property and lower-intensity neighborhoods to the west. In this alternative, residential growth would be absorbed on the Hokua site as well as on opportunity sites in and around central Kapa'a. In particular, sites around the Baptiste sports complex may need infrastructure investment (such as flood control) to make medium-intensity development feasible.

In the second alternative, Kapa'a would maintain as a Small Town place type, concentrating growth in and around 3 nodes of existing development along the Kūhiō Highway rather than at Hokua Place. In this alternative residential growth would be absorbed on opportunity sites in and around central Kapa'a. This alternative would require more intense development patterns in order to accommodate a similar amount of growth as the first alternative. Given the community sentiment after these map alternatives were presented publically, the land use maps have been adjusted to reflect the second alternative, in which the Hokua Place site is assigned an Agriculture land use designation rather than Urban Center. The community comments received on the General Plan Discussion Draft support this direction.

However, the Final General Plan revision replaced just the last paragraph quoted above, with the following:

The Future Land Use Map moves forward the 2000 General Plan's higher-intensity designation for the area, but also updates and refines the designation based on the first alternative map scenario and new population projections. The previous Urban Center designation is changed to Neighborhood General, which will require a mix of residential building types and a walkable, compact form where connectivity to the school and Kapa'a Town is emphasized. The size of the future Urban District boundary amendment should consider walkshed boundaries and accommodate future housing projections.

- 8) Please keep in mind that East Kaua'i is one four planning districts that does not have recently-adopted community plans. Community testimony strongly recommended that the General Plan explicitly state that no land use designations related to "neighborhood center/neighborhood general/neighborhood edge," and none of the proposed actions should be considered to be anything more than un-vetted preliminary proposals, unless and until they have been endorsed by the community associations in the affected planning districts.

"Henceforth when Community Plans are developed and adopted, each Community Plan shall establish an Urban Edge Boundary to delineate the extent of future town expansion. In the process of identifying a boundary, the Planning Department shall conduct a buildout analysis of the existing urban footprint and use the principles of smart growth to ensure that there is enough room within the boundary for growth desired by the community in a pattern that will make efficient use of scarce resources." (General Plan, page 61)

- 9) Regarding General Plan guidelines for new communities and/or infill, this project does not align with the description that follows:

"Missing middle" housing is characterized by small-scale, multi-unit housing types such as duplexes, fourplexes, bungalow courts, and mansion apartments, and can be integrated into communities with single-family homes." (General Plan, page 119).

- 10) Housing should be the product of carefully laid plans to direct smart growth for the families today and for their children. The preferred planning model is to put homes where jobs are located. The General Plan, Section 2.1 Future Land Use, Objective #7 states: "To encourage the development of Lihu'e as Kaua'i's primary urban center." (General Plan, page 51) And, "Lihu'e is widely seen as the appropriate urban center for the island." (General Plan, page 53)

Affordable Housing Needs.

- 1) The proposed project claims it will provide much needed affordable housing in the East Kaua'i region. However, of the proposed 683-multi-family units and 86-single family lots and homes offered at "market and affordable prices" the DEIS fails to provide the number of "affordable" units. What is that number?
- 2) In the DEIS Vol. I, page 13, the actual number of "affordable homes" is deceptively omitted. All that is stated is that: "Affordable multi-family units would be sold in compliance with the Kaua'i County Housing Code."
- 3) The affordable housing element of the Project will conform to Kaua'i County Ordinance No. 860, Kaua'i's new housing policy. This ordinance requires developers to sell or rent up to thirty percent (30%) of the total residential units for affordable housing. However, the Kaua'i housing policy provides incentives to developers who provide the required affordable units on-site. HoKua Place will be providing all of its affordable units on site. Does this mean fewer affordable units?
- 4) Since the project "seeks to fill the housing needs of Kapa'a" and the DEIS claims that housing will "conform to Kaua'i County Ordinance No. 860" the DEIS should include the calculations to substantiate this.

- 5) Again, the DEIS, Vol I, page 14 reiterates that: "Affordable multi-family units on site (The number & pricing will be in compliance with Kaua'i Housing Code)." but no data is given.
- 6) There are undocumented claims in the DEIS that the County requested this extremely high density of 700-800 units. Please provide documentation from the County Planning Dept. and/or the County Housing Agencies to substantiate the claim.
- 7) It appears that the "Product Sales Price Projection" was not updated in the DEIS Vol. I, page 12.
- 8) The evidence is lacking that this project is a solution to Kaua'i's low income housing deficit. The island needs affordable housing for moderate and low income people who are current residents, rather than attracting off-island buyers and increasing the island's population density.

Inadequate Roadway Infrastructure & Unresolved Traffic Congestion.

- 1) The timing of the Hokua Place is not in sync with projected short-term roadway improvements. The 2018 General Plan states in the section called Guidance for Community Planning for East Kaua'i that:

"The build-out phasing of new communities should be coordinated with the implementation of priority projects in the Kapa'a Transportation Solutions Plan."
(General Plan, page 85)
- 2) Having served on the State Department of Transportation's Citizen Advisory Committee for the Kapa'a Transportation Solutions report (August 2015) it is clear that the solutions will not be implemented any time soon. Therefore, the additional vehicles from this high density project will increase the existing congestion.
- 3) Development and population growth has been outpacing transportation infrastructure improvements since 2005. Hokua Place will intensify this problem. Allowing such a burden to continue would be a grievous error. (See Hawaii Business Magazine Cover Story: "Kauai in Crisis-Mayor Bryan Baptiste deals with a garden of gridlock" by Jacy L. Youn, September, 2005. <http://www.hawaiiibusiness.com/kauai-in-crisis//>)
- 4) The 1997 Kaua'i Long-Range Land Transportation Implementation Plan has not met its 2000 and 2006 deadlines for Kapa'a roadway widening in areas affected by the proposed boundary change. And, recommendations in the 2035 Transportation Plan for the Kaua'i District (July 2014) have not been implemented.

- 5) Traffic congestion in Kapa'a is near gridlock during daytime hours and to travel a short 3-mile stretch along Kuhio Highway between Kuamo'o Rd and Lehua Street can take 25-minutes or more. Adding a high density development in Kapa'a when existing roadway capacity is inadequate, will intensify the detrimental impacts to our quality of life.
- 6) It is not sufficiently proven in the DEIS that the burden of additional density will be alleviated by the addition of Road A.
- 7) The DEIS claims that the project is "substantially within a 10-minute walk to Kapa'a Town". However, this is misleading considering the lack of information about how Hokua Place pedestrians or cyclists will reach Kapa'a Town when there are two daunting obstacles to cross -- the Kapa'a Bypass Road and the Kapa'a Roundabout, and there is no overpass. Please explain.
- 8) This high density project within a congested high traffic corridor will have adverse impacts on the availability of first-responders such as firemen, police and paramedics to reach their destinations. Ambulance transport of critically ill patients can also be impacted by gridlock conditions.

TIAR Update.

- 1) The "Peak Hour Traffic Volumes" analyzed in the TIAR encompassed only brief one-hour span during the "commute" hours of the day (7-8am and 4:15-5:15 pm). Yet, the data shows for example, that 3:45 p.m. is just as busy at 5:15 p.m. The TIAR conclusions are not representative of the dreadful congestion that occurs regularly during mid-day.
- 2) Why doesn't proposed Road A join the 4-way intersection of Olohena, Ka'apuni, and Keahulua Roads instead of intersecting just Olohena Road?

"Based upon the TIAR Update, the intersection of Olohena Road and Road A is not expected to warrant all-way stop controls or traffic signals. Therefore, a roundabout intersection was not considered. However, a reassessment of the traffic operations at the Road A intersection at Olohena Road may be considered after the project is fully built out and occupied. A roundabout intersection was considered at the intersection of Olohena Road, Ka'apuni Road, and Keahulua Road."

- 3) Please include more discussion/documentation to substantiate the following statement in the TIAR: "Preliminary assessment of the horizontal and vertical alignments of the intersecting roadways, it was determined that a roundabout intersection would not be feasible." Did the assessment include Road A joining that intersection?