

Mr. Daniel Orodenker **Executive Officer Land Use Commission** Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism State of Hawaii 235 S. Beretania Street, Suite 406 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: A11-791 HG Kauai Joint Venture, LLC

Aloha Members of the Land Use Commission and Staff,

Please accept this book of community testimonies on behalf of many concerned residents of Kauai. As a member of Community Coalition Kaua'i the enclosed is provided to inform you of many of the problems the community has identified with HG Kauai Joint Venture LLC's Hokua Place development.

This collection of testimonies that have been offered, express the community's concerns and underscore the serious lack of confidence in the developer's credibility.

Additionally, before we lose 96 acres of prime agricultural land, we humbly request your consideration of the attached candid comment prepared in our Planning Department on Kauai, December 17, 2019. We appreciate your time in reviewing the attached comment which identifies several areas of HG Kauai Joint Venture LLC's misrepresentations and the contents of the community's testimonies as you consider their Amended Petition for a District Boundary Amendment to TMK: (4) 4-3-003:001.

Thank you for your consideration of these documents. The enclosed has been shared with all parties.

Very Truly Yours,

oe Niezgodzki PO Box 95%

Koloa HI, 96756

Joe@JoeKauai.com

Attorney General for State Office of Planning A11-791 HG Kauai Joint Venture, LLC Hearing before the LUC Department of the Attorney General 425 Queen Street Honolulu, HI 96813

Kaʻāina S. Hull, Director A11-791 HG Kauai Joint Venture, LLC Hearing before the LUC Kauai County Planning Department 4444 Rice Street, Suite A473 Līhue, HI 96766

William W.L. Yuen, Partner Dentons US LLP 1001 Bishop Street Suite 1800 Honolulu, HI 96813

Liko Martin C/O Bianca Isaki 1720 Huna St. 401B Honolulu, HI 96817

Lance Collins PO Box 782 Makawao, HI 96768

## HoKua Place Comments for LUC Tuesday December 17, 2019

FINAL EIS CLAIMS THAT ARE INCORRECT OR FALSE	COMMENTS
"A sustainable community that preserves the rural- like character of Kapa'a"	What does "sustainable" mean here? Need details! By definition, greenfield development does NOT preserve "rural-like" character.
The county's proposed relocation of the Kapa'a county swimming pool	I have never heard of this proposed relocation of the County's Kapa'a pool. Needs verification from County Parks & Rec and/or Mayors.
"A sustainable community"	What constitutes a "sustainable community"? The phrase it used copiously throughout the EIS and is not defined or explained by what standards (i.e. LEED) that this project and/or these proposed buildings/dwelling units will be "sustainable".
	There is no clear explanation of what constitutes "green spaces", nor is there any explanation how the future traffic impacts will be mitigated for – in fact, the traffic analysis provided is now outdated by a few years and offers no solutions to the existing traffic problems.
	There is no effort to form a well thought-out explanation for addressing where all these new homeowners will work. Which means if these future homeowners are indeed working class local families, they will be forced to drive to another town to work. Thus contributing further to the traffic problem. And thus not being sustainable in terms of transportation, health, and land use.
	The fact is, unless this development can create several hundred jobs that pay a livable wage (that can afford to pay these mortgages) and therefore this is not economically sustainable.
	Based on the developer's incorrect assertions of the nonexistent Form-Based Code and East Kaua'i Community Plan, and his decrepit descriptions, it is apparent that the developer is not properly educated on current urban planning theory or social science and does not have a decent grasp of the functions and applications of mixed use development for the benefit of supporting local

	business and multimodal connectivity within a community.
Prevent housing sprawl into Open and Agriculture lands	By definition, this project is considered urban sprawl into agricultural lands. This is a false statement.
Thereby preserving the rural-like character of the surrounding area. (page 10)	This justification is not accurate and makes no sense. This is a false statement.
The affordable housing element of the Project will conform to Kaua'i County Ordinance No. 860, Kaua'i's affordable housing policy.	Need comments from Housing to verify accuracy of this statement.
	The fact is that this is NOT an affordable housing development.
	86-Single family homes, 500-Multifamily (apartment) units, 183-Multifamily (apartment) Affordable units = ONLY 183 affordable apartments out of 769 proposed homes Total = 24% proposed units will be "affordable".
A remnant parcel of 1-acre on the Makai side of the Kapa'a Bypass Road is also proposed as commercial use or for sub-stations for the police and fire departments.	Need comments from KPD and KFD. I have also heard proposals for a Police substation at the new Mahelona redevelopment.
The Developer recognizes that the County Planning Department is in the process of updating the Kapa'a-Wailua Development Plan.	This statement is currently not true. The Planning Department is not currently in the process of updating the Kapa'a-Wailua Development Plan, as of December 2019.
as well as the proposed Smart Code (Form Based Code) (Page 21)	This statement is also not true. There is currently no Form Based Code for East Kaua'i.
Orientation and scenic enhancement.	This statement is both vague and untrue. Adding development in this corridor will be detrimental to orientation and scenic enhancement.
The County would not have a location for its County pool and residents in Kapa'a would not have the opportunity for pool use.	This statement is not entirely true. The potential relocation of the Kapa'a swimming pool is not dependent on the HoKua Place project.
Additionally, the "no action" alternative will be contrary to the updated Kauai General Plan in that the General Plan specifically designates the property	Although the GP does designate this land in Neighborhood General, this statement is not entirely true, particularly since this project is greenfield

as Neighborhood General and discusses the need for housing in the area.

development. Furthermore, this project does not incorporate mixed-use building types that could potentially offset the need for leaving this new suburb for food, services, and jobs.

The climate and soils at HoKua Place are not ideal for the growing of most commercially viable crops due to the poor soil, strong trade winds and the salt spray from the ocean. Additionally, due to the generally poor soils and harsh climate, the commercial crops most suited to the area are sugar and pineapple.

The State Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawai`i (ALISH) established three classes of agriculturally important lands to assist decision makers in assessing the long-term implications of various land use options for production of food, feed, forage and fiber crops in Hawai`i. The three classes are Prime Agricultural Land, Unique Agricultural Land and Other Important Agricultural Land. The HoKua Place land is not listed in any of these categories. See the attached ALISH Map. (p. 203)

This statement is false. For this property, ALISH soils are predominately "Prime Lands" (value = 1) with a smaller percentage being "Other Lands" (value = 3) (See map below). If you can grow sugarcane and pineapple successfully in this soil, then there are definitely other crops that can be grown and harvested successfully on this land. The developer should not ignorantly discount the value this property has in agricultural production. Also, let it be known that local food production, food security, and agricultural sustainability are also goals in the Kaua'i General Plan. Furthermore, just because an AG property does not meet all the criteria for being designated as IAL (Important Ag Lands), it does not mean that it is not suitable for successful farming.

From the State HDOA metadata file for Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawai'i (ALISH) shapefile:

"The classification of agriculturally important lands does not in itself constitute a designation of any area to a specific land use. The classification should, however, provide decision makers with an awareness of the long-term implications of various land use options for production of food, feed, forage, and fiber crops in Hawaii."

"PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND is land best suited for the production of food, feed, forage and fiber crops. The land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops economically when treated and managed, including water management, according to modern farming methods.

PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND meets the following criteria:

1. The soils have an adequate moisture supply. Included are:

- a. Soils having aquic or udic moisture regimes. These soils commonly are in humid or subhumid climates that have well distributed rainfall or have enough rain in the summer that the amount of stored moisture plus rainfall is approximately equal to or exceeds the amount of potential evapotranspiration. Water moves through the soils at some time in most years.
- b. Soils having xeric or ustic moisture regimes and in which the available water capacity is great enough to provide adequate moisture for the commonly grown crops in 7 or more years out of 10.
- c. Soils having aridic or torric moisture regimes and the area has a developed irrigation water supply that is dependable and of adequate quality. Also included are soils having xeric or ustic moisture regimes in which the available water capacity is limited but the area has a developed irrigation water supply that is dependable and of adequate quality.
- d. Soils having sufficient available water capacity within a depth of 40 inches (1 meter), or in the root zone if the root zone is less than 40 inches deep, to produce the commonly grown crops in 7 or more out of 10 years.

A dependable water supply is one in which enough water is available for irrigation in 8 out of 10 years for the crops commonly grown.

- 2. The soils have a soil temperature regime that is isomesic, isothermic, or isohyperthermic. These are soils that, at a depth of 20 inches (50 cm), have a mean annual temperature higher than 47 degrees F (8 degrees C), and the difference between the mean summer and mean winter temperature differ by less than 9.0 degrees F (5 degrees C).
- 3. The soils have a pH between 4.5 and 8.4 in all horizons within a depth of 40 inches (1 meter) or in the root zone if the root zone is less than 40 inches deep. (Soils which have a pH of less than 4.5 in

surface soil because of use of fertilizers are excluded). This range of pH is favorable for growing a wide variety of crops without adding large amounts of amendments. 4. The soils have no water table or a water table that is maintained at a sufficient depth during the cropping season to allow crops common to the area to be grown. 5. The soils can be managed so that in all horizons within a depth of 40 inches (1 meter) or in the root zone if the root zone is less than 40 inches deep, during part of each year the conductivity of saturation extract is less than 4 mmhos/cm and the exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) is less than 15. 6. The soils are not flooded frequently during the growing season (less often than once in 2 years). 7. The soils have a product of K (erodability factor) x percent slope of less than 2.0. That is, soils having a serious erosion hazard are not included. 8. The soils have a permeability rate of at least 0.06 inches (0.15 cm) per hour in the upper 20 inches (50 cm) and the mean annual soil temperature at a depth of 20 inches is less than 57 degrees F (14 degrees C). Permeability rate is not a limiting factor if the mean annual soil temperature is 57 degrees F (14 degrees C) or higher. Less than 10 percent of the surface layer in these soils consists of rock fragments coarser than 3 inches (7.6 cm). These soils present no particular difficulty in cultivating with large equipment. Must not be thixotropic and have isomesic 10. temperature regime." How will this project accomplish these two things? protect natural resources and culture (page 26) No details or further information. Need DOW comments pertaining to details about Water Sources (page 79) the proposed well, the location, the water quality

data, the capacity, and the long range viability of the well as a potable water source for thousands of residents. What is the contingency plan if/when the well runs dry or is negatively impacted? Are there any other water sources that can provide the capacity for this development? Furthermore, the potable water demand for intensive agriculture may be comparable to, if not less than, the demand for residential use. Employment & Income (p. 106) This section is vague and very generalized. The applicant does not dive into any detail in terms of current and future viable employment opportunities in the Kapa'a region. Stating that the unemployment rate in the state (and the County of Kaua'i) is the lowest in the nation is not an indicator of a favorable job market or a healthy economy. Many economists would argue that a super low unemployment rate in Hawai'i is reflective of working class desperation and many parents and young adults working multiple jobs just to make ends meet. The Technical Study for the Kauai General Plan The disparity in the projected increase in East Kaua'i indicates that the current job count for the Kawaihaujobs (~700 total by 2035) and the increase in housing units needs to be addressed. Even with the additional Kapa'a (East Kauai) is approximately 5,073 with an increase in jobs to 5,724 in the year 2035. The study estimated 500 jobs due to the new Wailua resorts, it should be acknowledged that the majority of service does not consider the three large resort projects in the Wailua area that are slated to be completed industry jobs that resorts and restaurants supply do not pay sufficient wages that enable employees to within the next 2-5 years. It is estimated that the resort projects will generate at become home owners. least 500 jobs. Alternatives and Final Comments (p. 24) The proposed alternatives, like the entirety of this Final EIS, are vague, glib, and show minimal effort. The developer is obviously not from the community and is either woefully unaware or deliberately lying about the fact that the first two alternatives mentioned are both preferred alternatives for many local residents already living on the eastside and experiencing the traffic congestion regularly. From an economic standpoint, the negative externalities taxed to those communities (i.e. traffic, flooding, distance to work and services) may very well outweigh the potential profit of the developer. The difficulty of putting a fixed price tag on those

externalities (i.e. quality of life) makes for a challenging task of reconciling the two.

