



## The Senate

STATE CAPITOL  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

May 24, 2017

Honolulu City & County  
Department of Planning and Permitting  
650 s King St, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Honolulu, HI 96813

G70  
925 Bethel Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Honolulu, HI 96813

Hanapohaku LLC  
59-716 Kamehameha Hwy  
Haleiwa, HI 96712

RE: Pupukea Rural Community Commercial Center EISPN

Dear Sir/Madame:

Please accept these comments and questions regarding the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for Pupukea Rural Community Commercial Center EISPN.

### **Section 1.2 Overview of Project Site**

*"The Hanapohaku LLC parcels contain a mix of commercial ocean recreational rental concessions including Seamaids Beach Boutique and North Shore Surf Shop, a real estate office, dentist office and mobile food trucks."*

**COMMENT 1:** The description should include discussion of the existing violations that DPP has cited against the land and its owner. In particular, the ongoing violations regarding illegal grubbing and development without SMA permits should be discussed, as well as the number of mobile food trucks legally permitted and number presently onsite. The new food commissary and the recently installed wastewater treatment system should be noted and identified as permitted, or not permitted. The Overview of Project Site should accurately reflect the existing elements and uses of the subject property.

### **Section 1.3 Proposed Action and Purpose of EISPN**

*The Plan defines the Rural Community Center as a: "small cluster commercial and services businesses located on major thoroughfares that provide a range of goods and services to meet the needs of the surrounding residential communities."*

**COMMENT 2:** Thorough analysis of direct and indirect impacts to residents of the surrounding communities is warranted. Particular attention should be paid to the estimated mix of residential versus visitor commerce and needs. To meet the spirit of the North Shore Communities Sustainable Plan guideline, benefits to area residents should exceed those of visitors. How will this be accomplished?

### **Section 2.1 Existing Conditions**

*The project site currently houses small surfboard rental and swimwear concession, a real estate office, and seven outdoor food truck establishments.*

**COMMENT 3:** Why is this description different from Section 1.2? I restate Comment 1 about the Existing Conditions.

### **Page 10 Proposed Action**

*The planned floor area of the facilities will be approximately 27,500 sf of leasable area.*

### **Page 14 Short Term Impacts**

*The project will include grubbing and grading of the current site, and development of the 29,000 sf (leasable floor area).*

**COMMENT 4:** What is the correct leasable floor area?

### **Figure 4 Concept Plan**

**COMMENT 5:** The visualization indicates parking in the Foodland parking lot over the leech field near the bus stop. Is that permitted? Will Foodland have less, the same amount, or more parking in its own parking lot, if the proposed access points between projects are built? What impacts will the proposed action have on traffic circulation and parking in the Foodland parking lot?

**COMMENT 6:** It looks like lunch wagons are planned for the project, but this is not clear because there is no discussion. There appears to be no provision for lunch trucks other than to locate them in available parking spaces. Is any commitment being made by the developer to have lunch wagons on the property for years to come? If lunch wagons are being contemplated, how much fresh water, electricity, gray water, wastewater, food waste, grease, and other garbage will be consumed or generated; and how will these be accommodated?

### **Section 2.3 Required Permits and Approvals**

**COMMENT 7:** The EIS should clearly describe the status of existing violations, permits and actions required to get into compliance, and timeline to complete requires actions.

### **Section 5.1 No Action Alternative**

*The No Action Alternative would maintain the property in its existing condition, with limited allowed commercial uses per the existing SMA minor permit. The uses include the real estate office, dentist office, surf and clothing store, and one food truck establishment.*

**COMMENT 8:** The existing conditions are not as described. Will Hanapohaku LLC return the property to the "existing condition," as described, before beginning to study impacts? How else can baseline impacts be measured for this alternative, if the actual use and activity on the site are different than stated? Accurate analysis of impacts now and projected in the future for the No Action Alternative is essential for credible comparison with the proposed action. Great care must be taken to accurately describe, measure and discuss impacts for this alternative.

If Hanapohaku LLC will not return the property to the "existing condition," a robust justification must be presented along with clarity on what is No Action Alternative.

### **Section 5.2 Commercial Shopping Center Alternative**

*This alternative would contemplate development of a 45,000 to 50,000 SF shopping center.*

**COMMENT 9:** Page 10, Proposed Action states: The planned floor area of the facilities will be approximately 27,500 sf of leasable area (30,000 sf gross floor area). Are these numbers consistent with each other? Is the size of the shopping center synonymous with the gross floor area or does the 45,000 to 50,000 SF include more than gross floor area? Please clarify.

**COMMENT 10:** Should there be a third alternative? Is there no other contemplated outcome besides the "existing conditions" as described in the No Action Alternative and the Commercial Shopping Center Alternative?

Please include me as a consulted party. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts.

Respectfully submitted,



Gil Riviere  
Senator, District 23  
Oahu's North and Windward Shores