

PATRICK K. WONG 5878
Corporation Counsel
CALEB P. ROWE 9520
KRISTIN K. TARNSTROM 9934
Deputies Corporation Counsel
County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793
Telephone No.: (808) 270-7741
Facsimile No.: (808) 270-7152
Email: caleb.rowe@co.maui.hi.us
Attorneys for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

PETITION TO AMEND INTERIM
INSTREAM FLOW STANDARDS FOR
HONOPOU, HUELO (PUOLUA),
HANEHOI, WAIKAMOI, ALO,
WAHINEPEE, PUOHOKAMOA,
HAIPUAENA, PUNALAU/KOLEA,
HONOMANU, NUAAILUA, PIINAAU,
PALAUHULU, OHIA (WAIANU),
WAIKAMILO, KUALANI, WAILUANUI,
WEST WAILUAIKI, EAST WAILUAIKI,
KOPILIULA, PUAKAA, WAI OHUE,
PAAKEA, WAI AAKA, KAPAULA,
HANAWI, and MAKAPIPI STREAMS

CASE NO. CCH-MA13-01

COUNTY OF MAUI, DEPARTMENT OF
WATER SUPPLY'S RESPONSE TO THE
OPENING STATEMENT AND BIREF
OF MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION
AND ITS SUPPORTERS FOR RE-
OPENED HEARING FILED OCTOBER
17, 2016; SUPPLEMENTAL
DECLARATION OF DAVE TAYLOR ON
REOPENING; CERTIFICATE OF
SERVICE

**COUNTY OF MAUI, DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY'S RESPONSE TO THE
OPENING STATEMENT AND BRIEF OF MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION AND
ITS SUPPORTERS FOR RE-OPENED HEARING**

I. INTRODUCTION

This Response to the Opening Statement and Brief of Maui Tomorrow Foundation and its Supporters for Re-Opened Hearing ("MT's Re-Opening Brief") and the Supplemental Declaration

on Reopening of David Taylor, are hereby submitted on behalf of the County of Maui, Department of Water Supply (“MDWS”) pursuant to Minute Order No. 22. All prior filings by MDWS are incorporated herein.

II. MT’S RE-OPENING BRIEF MISCHARACTERIZES THE LAW

Maui Tomorrow spends the bulk of their brief arguing that speculative uses of water cannot be the basis for an IIFS determination, both in terms of MDWS’s request for water to accommodate growth, and for East Maui Irrigation / Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar (EMI/HC&S)’s future operations. Maui Tomorrow’s own citations, however, completely undermine its argument. HRS § 174C-71(2)(D) specifically states that instream values must be balanced against “the importance of present or *potential* uses of water for noninstream purposes.” (emphasis added). The water code not only allows for consideration of non-established speculative use, it specifically mandates that the importance of those potential uses are on equal footing in the balancing test between the two.

Further, Maui Tomorrow cites In re Contested Case Hearing on Water Use Permit Application Filed by Kukui (Molokai), Inc., 116 Hawaii 481, 174 P.3d 320 (2007), and In re Water Permits Waiahole III, 130 Hawaii 346, 310 P.3d 1047 (2010), to presumably argue that the Commission may not allocate water to a closed commercial operation, but this reliance is misplaced and irrelevant. In both cases, the Commission was reversed, but the Commission’s error was *not* that it had allocated water to a closed operation, but rather, that it had not considered the effect of that closure on the operation’s water needs. Id. Clearly, that is not the case here: this hearing was reopened specifically for the very purpose of considering the closure of the sugar plantation and the resulting effects on EMI/HC&S’ water needs.

Furthermore, both Waiahole III and Kukui Molokai dealt with water permits in a water management area, and therefore involved vastly different burdens of proof and evidentiary

requirements on offstream users. In terms of water permits versus IIFS determinations, as Maui Tomorrow admits, the Hawaii Supreme Court has specifically said that:

In the context of IIFS petitions, the water code does not place a burden of proof on any particular party; instead, the water code and our case law interpreting the code have affirmed the Commission's duty to establish IIFS that protect instream values to the extent practicable and protect the public interest.

In re Water Use Permit Applications Waiahole, 105 Hawaii 1, 11, 93 P.3d 643, 653

(2004)(emphasis added). In regards to water management areas, the court has also specifically recognized that Hawaii has a "bifurcated system of water rights." Ko'olau Agr. Co. v. Comm'n of Water Res. Mgmt., 83 Haw. 484, 491, 927 P.2d 1367, 1374 (1996). Under the bifurcated system, different burdens and requirements apply to water rights in a water management area where "the permitting provisions of the code prevail," and water rights in non-designated areas which "are governed by the common law." Id.

III. MT'S RE-OPENING BRIEF MISCITES THE EVIDENTIARY RECORD

Maui Tomorrow begins their argument against MDWS' request for additional water to accommodate future needs on the erroneous premise that "the evidentiary record supports no more than the current recommended allocation." *MT Re-Opening Brief*, p. 9. As stated in MDWS' Reopening Opening Brief, MDWS presented evidence of future needs as reflected by both the upcountry water meter priority list and anticipated population growth from the outset of these proceedings. The record, as reflected in the hearing officer's proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order, is in fact replete with evidence supporting additional allocations of water to MDWS. See Declaration of David Taylor ¶¶ 20, 21, 22, 23, 24; Declaration of Michele McLean ¶ 5; Exhibits "B-001"; "B-002" table 5; "B-016," table 3; "B-017"; "B-018"; "B-058"; Minute Order 16, Proposed Findings of Fact ("FOF") 471-473.

IV. MT'S POSITION ON INFRASTRUCTURE IS CIRCULAR

Maui Tomorrow cites “infrastructural constraints preventing delivery of any increased amounts” of water as the primary reason that MDWS should not be allocated additional water. However, this argument raises the time immemorial question of “which came first, the chicken or the egg,” or, in this case, the “surface water or the infrastructure.” MDWS cannot justify a capital expenditure of several million dollars¹ in taxpayer funds for infrastructure improvements to process and deliver additional water, if there is no additional water for it to process and deliver. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶ 3.

Capital expenditures require the approval of the County Council, and MDWS would be hard pressed to convince the Council to spend millions of dollars on improvements in hopes of a hypothetical future allocation of water that might never materialize. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶ 3. Such an expenditure in the absence of certainty would surely be met with an outcry by community groups (such as Maui Tomorrow), who would decry it as government waste. Even so, Maui Tomorrow appears to take the position that MDWS cannot justify a greater allocation of water in the absence of such infrastructure. This essentially puts MDWS in the impossible position of not being able to improve infrastructure because of a lack of water, which MDWS cannot get because of a lack of infrastructure. This type of circular logic² cannot justify holding existing and future residents of upcountry Maui hostage.


¹ While the cost of expansion at this point is speculative, the cost of improvements to the Iao Surface Water Treatment Plant, which cost nearly \$21 million dollars, is instructive. (“Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec.”), ¶¶ 5, 6, Exhibit “B-073.”

² It should be noted that these arguments are similarly problematic as applied to EMI/HC&S. Maui Tomorrow argues that, because EMI/HC&S are not currently cultivating diversified agriculture, they cannot justify an allocation of water. It should go without saying, however, that without water, EMI/HC&S cannot cultivate the diversified agriculture that it would need to justify an allocation of water. Following this logic, it is hard to see how anyone would ever be able to start any agricultural operation.

In contrast, with an additional allocation of water in an IIFS proceeding, MDWS can easily justify expenditures for infrastructure improvements. One need only look at MDWS' Iao Surface Water Treatment Plant. The parties to the Na Wai Eha IIFS contested case hearing (CCH-MA06-01) entered into a settlement in April of 2014. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶¶ 7, 9; Exhibit "B-073." This settlement (to which Maui Tomorrow was a party), recognized an allocation of an additional 1.5 MGD of surface water to MDWS as useful and beneficial, despite the fact that, at that time, the Iao Treatment Plant could not process or deliver the additional water. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶¶ 7, 8. However, because the stipulation provided MDWS with assurance of increased access to surface water, MDWS was able to secure funding for infrastructure improvements at the Iao Treatment Plant. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶¶ 7,8. Ground broke on the new treatment plant on October 14, 2016, which is expected to be fully operational in 2018. Sup. Taylor Re-Open Dec., ¶¶ 4, 5.

DATED: Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, January 6, 2017.

PATRICK K. WONG
Corporation Counsel
Attorneys for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

By 
CALEB P. ROWE
KRISTIN K. TARNSTROM
Deputies Corporation Counsel

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

PETITION TO AMEND INTERIM
INSTREAM FLOW STANDARDS FOR
HONOPOU, HUELO (PUOLUA),
HANEHOI, WAIKAMOI, ALO,
WAHINEPEE, PUOHOKAMOA,
HAIPUAENA, PUNALAU/KOLEA,
HONOMANU, NUAAILUA, PIINAAU,
PALAUHULU, OHIA (WAIANU),
WAIKAMILO, KUALANI, WAILUANUI,
WEST WAILUAIKI, EAST WAILUAIKI,
KOPILIULA, PUAKAA, WAIQHUE,
PAAKEA, WAIATAKA, KAPAULA,
HANAWI, and MAKAPIPI STREAMS

CASE NO. CCH-MA13-01

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF
DAVE TAYLOR ON REOPENING

SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF DAVID TAYLOR ON REOPENING

I, DAVID TAYLOR, declare as follows:

1. I hereby attest that the statements made in my October 17, 2016 Declaration is accurate and true and hereby incorporate it by reference.
2. The facts recited in this declaration are true of my own personal knowledge and if called upon, I could testify competently thereto.
3. As a government entity under the jurisdiction of the County of Maui, costs associated with any capital improvements come from tax-payers (and, in the case of MDWS, customers as well), and must be approved by the Maui County Council. Members of the Maui County Council have a fiduciary duty to assure that the expenditure of tax-payer dollars are justified.
4. Recently on October 14, 2016, the County of Maui broke ground on improvements to the Iao Surface Water Treatment Plant, which will increase the treatment and delivery capacity of the plant by approximately 1.5 million gallons a day.

5. The contract for these improvements was valued at \$20,733,524.55 and the project is expected to be completed in 2018.


6. Exhibit "B-073" as referenced in MDWS' Exhibit List is a true and correct copy of a printout of the "Current Awards" ledger from County's website, which is available at <http://www.co.maui.hi.us/1766/Current-Awards> (under August 2016). This document was printed on January 5, 2016, and shows the amount awarded for the upgrades to the Iao Surface Water Treatment Plant.

7. MDWS was able to secure funding for these improvements to increase treatment and delivery capacity because its access to approximately 1.5 MGD of additional water was assured by way of settlement in CCH-MA06-01.


8. MDWS was able to secure this additional allocation of water in that IIFS contested case despite the fact that, at the time of the settlement, MDWS did not have the infrastructure to process the additional 1.5 MGD.

9. Exhibit "B-074" as referenced in MDWS' Exhibit List is a true and correct copy of the above referenced settlement, more properly described as "Commission on Water Resources Management Order, Case No. CCH-MA06-01 Dated April 17, 2014."

I declare under penalty of law that the foregoing is true and correct of my own personal knowledge and that this Declaration was executed on January 5, 2017 in Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.



DAVID TAYLOR, P.E.
Director
Department of Water Supply
County of Maui



Current Awards

2016

	Dec. 2016	Nov. 2016	Oct. 2016	Sept. 2016	Aug. 2016	July 2016	June 2016	May 2016	April 2016	March 2016

Date	Bid No.	Contract No.	Description	Amount	Award Info.
8/18/2016	12-03	WC0880	Iao Surface Water Treatment Plant Upgrades, Dept. of Water Supply	\$20,733,524.55	Bodell Construction Company
8/18/2016	RFP No. 15-16/P-109	C6065	Marketing and Promotion for Small Business Saturday Maui, Office of Economic Development	\$25,000.00	Sae Design, Inc.
8/17/2016	Job No. P15/026	C6069	Fencing Improvements at Papohaku Park, Dept. of Parks & Recreation	\$93,470.00	Kamoku Contracting

Enable Google Translate

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

'Iao Ground Water Management Area)	Case No. CCH-MA06-01
High-Level Source Water Use)	
Permit Applications and)	ORDER
Petition to Amend Interim Instream)	
Flow Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu)	
'Iao, & Waikapu Streams)	
<u>Contested Case Hearing</u>)	

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
ORDER ADOPTING:

- 1) HEARINGS OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE MEDIATED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES;
AND
- 2) STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission on Water Resource Management has reviewed the 1) HEARINGS OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE MEDIATED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES; and 2) the STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER.

Based upon the Hearing Officer's recommendation, the Stipulation of the Parties, the Decision of the Hawaii Supreme Court on remand in this matter, the record and evidence in the Na Wai Eha proceedings, and after deliberation, the Commission on Water Resources Management hereby APPROVES AND ORDERS THE RECOMMENDATION AND STIPULATION ATTACHED HERE.

Dated: April 17, 2014

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ORDER ADOPTING: 1)
HEARINGS OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE MEDIATED AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE PARTIES; AND STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER


Dated: April 17, 2014



WILLIAM J. AILA, JR.



WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR.


KAMANAMAICALANI BEAMER


MILTON D. PAVAO


LINDA ROSEN, M.D., M.P.H.


JONATHAN STARR


TED YAMAMURA

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII


'Iao Ground Water Management Area)	Case No. CCH-MA06-01
High-Level Source Water Use)	
Permit Applications and)	ORDER
Petition to Amend Interim Instream)	
Flow Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu)	
'Iao, & Waikapu Streams)	
Contested Case Hearing)	
_____)	

April 17, 2014

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
ORDER ADOPTING:

- 1) HEARINGS OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE
MEDIATED AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES;
AND
- 2) STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER

APPROVED:



DAVID M. LOUIE
Attorney General, State of Hawaii

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

ʻIao Ground Water Management Area) Case No. CCH-MA06-01
High-Level Source Water Use)
Permit Applications and)
Petition to Amend Interim Instream)
Flow Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu,)
ʻIao, & Waikapū Streams)
Contested Case Hearing)

Hearings Officer's Recommendation on the Mediated Agreement Between the Parties

Recommendation:

Your hearings officer recommends that the Commission on Water Resource Management ("Commission") approve the mediated agreement (the "proposed D&O") between Hui O Na Wai Eha/Maui Tomorrow Foundation, Inc., the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, Wailuku Water Company LLC, and County of Maui, Department of Water Supply ("the Parties") and adopt the proposed D&O as its own Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order for CCH-MA06-01, on remand from the Hawai'i Supreme Court.

Summary:

On June 10, 2010, the Commission issued its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order. The Commission restored 10 mgd for the IIFS for Waihe'e River, 1.6 mgd for the IIFS for North Waiehu Stream, 0.9 mgd for the IIFS for South Waiehu Stream, and no additions for ʻIao and Waikapū Streams. The Commission also held that the amount of water that HC&S would be required to pump from its Well No. 7 was 9.5 mgd.

Your hearings officer, Lawrence Miike, was also the hearings officer for the original contested case hearing and had recommended that 14 mgd be added to Waihe'e River, 2.2 mgd to North Waiehu Stream, 1.3 mgd to South Waiehu Stream, 13 mgd to ʻIao Stream, and 4 mgd to Waikapū Stream. He also had recommended that HC&S be required to pump 14 mgd from its Well No. 7.

At the time of the first decision, your hearings officer was also a member of the Commission, therefore had a vote, and filed a dissent. He agreed with the reduction to Waihe'e River from his proposed 14 mgd to the majority's 10 mgd; to North and South Waiehu's

Rationale:

The issues remanded to the Commission in the Hawai'i Supreme Court's decision on August 15, 2012, are summarized on both page 1 of the stipulation and pages 1-2 of the proposed D&O.

1. **Current and proposed stream flow restorations.**

Restoring 10 mgd to Waihe'e River has resulted in an increase of natural habit units from less than 1% to 11.1%; and restoring 2.5 mgd to North and South Waiehu Stream resulted in an increase of natural habit units from 6.1% to 55.5%.

'Iao Stream has 49% of the total natural habitat units of the four streams. While Waikapū Stream has less than 1% of the total natural habitat units, it is the major contributor of inflow into Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge.

Individual and community groups testified that they rely or seek to rely on each of the Nā Wai 'Ehā streams for their exercise of traditional and customary Native Hawaiian practices.

Restoration of the streams in and of itself would support other beneficial instream uses and values.

2. **Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company.**

¹ The IIFS for North Waiehu Stream has been changed from 1.6 mgd to 1.0 mgd, but this is a reflection of a change of the monitoring site and not a reduction in the IIFS. The 10 mgd for 'Iao Stream is also subject to reduction under certain low-flow circumstances, but only to accommodate the public water needs of the Maui Department of Water Supply and some kuleana users, both of which are court-identified public trust purposes along with restoration of the streams. While private commercial uses must overcome a presumption in favor of public trust purposes, there are no priorities among public trust purposes themselves.

The 300 acres of Fields 921 and 922 are not similar to Field 920, which was excluded from the calculation of HC&S's total acreage, and should therefore be included in the calculation of total acreage.

Well No. 7 as a source of irrigation water for HC&S should be increased from the 9.5 mgd of the 2010 D&O to 18.5 mgd.

A potential 2.95 mgd of wastewater reuse is not an immediately available option.

2.1 at 2.0 mgd in the 2010 D&O should be increased to

is u increases in the IIFS, future viability of its operations
pro economic viability after sugar prices is sugar
irrig of sugar production is the availability of water for

3. Wailuku Water Company LLC.

Reasonable system losses estimated at 2 mgd in the 2010 D&O should be increased to 2.73 mgd.

WWC's business model is sensitive to the volume of water from 'Āao and Waikapū Streams, particularly the former, and it is unable to increase revenue by adding new users or changing the rates it charges existing customers while its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity is pending before the Public Utilities Commission.

4. Maui Department of Water Supply.

The estimate of 3.2 mgd of reasonable uses from 'Āao Stream in the 2010 D&O is affirmed and is preserved even in low flow conditions (see footnote 1, *supra*).

Conclusion:

The proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law have reasonably addressed the issues remanded by the Hawai'i Supreme Court to the Commission, and the proposed Decision and Order is a logical result of these findings and conclusions.

Finally, the parties have stipulated that any factual finding pertaining to water use requirements, alternative water sources, or system losses is made without prejudice to the rights

of the Parties and the Commission to revisit those issues in connection with any proceeding involving a Water Use Permit Application ("WUPA") for water diverted from any of the Nā Wai 'Ehā streams, inasmuch as the burden of proof with respect to such issues in a WUPA proceeding will be upon the applicant rather than upon the Commission.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i April 6, 2014



LAWRENCE H. MIKE, Hearings Officer
Commission on Water Resource Management

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of:

'IAO GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT
AREA HIGH-LEVEL SOURCE WATER
USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS AND
PETITION TO AMEND INTERIM
INSTREAM FLOW STANDARDS OF
WAIHE'E, WAIEHU, 'IAO , & WAIKAPŪ
STREAMS CONTESTED CASE HEARING

Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S
REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER; EXHIBIT
"1"

Hearing Officer: Dr. Lawrence Miike

**STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF
JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER**

The undersigned parties, through their respective counsel, stipulate to the following:

1. On August 15, 2012, following an appeal by Petitioners Hui O Nā Wai 'Ehā and Maui Tomorrow Foundation, Inc. ("Hui/MTF") and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs ("OHA"), the Hawai'i Supreme Court (the "Court") issued a decision vacating the Commission on Water Resource Management's (the "Commission") Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order issued herein on June 10, 2010 (the "2010 D&O") and remanding the matter to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with the decision (the "Remand Order"). The Court, among other things, held that the 2010 D&O did not adequately justify the Commission's decision not to restore streamflow to 'Iao and Waikapū Streams. *See, In re 'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications ("Nā Wai 'Ehā ")*, 128 Hawai'i 228 at 249-54, 287 P.3d 129 at 150-55 (2012). The Court also instructed the Commission to consider the following matters on remand:

- i. The effect that IIFS will have on Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices, and the feasibility of protecting the practices. *See id.* at 249, 287 P.3d at 150.

lmanageDB:2735714.3

-1-

- ii. Instream uses of the Nā Wai 'Ehā streams other than support of amphidromous species. *See id.* at 251, 287 P.3d at 252.
- iii. Whether HC&S's acreage for purposes of its irrigation requirements for fields irrigated with Nā Wai 'Ehā water should include Fields 921 and 922. *See id.* at 256, 287 P.3d at 157.
- iv. Reasonable estimation of the system losses of WWC and HC&S. *See id.* at 258, 287 P.3d at 159.
- v. Whether and to what extent Well No. 7 is a reasonable alternative water source for HC&S. *See id.* at 262, 287 P.3d at 163.
- vi. Whether and to what extent recycled wastewater from the Waiuku/Kahului wastewater treatment plant is a reasonable alternative water source for HC&S. *See id.* at 262, 287 P.3d at 163.

2. The remand contested case hearings were scheduled to begin on March 10, 2014. Shortly before the remand contested case hearings, the Commission chairperson William J. Aila, Jr. requested that the parties consider engaging in mediation to explore whether the remand issues could be resolved so that the Commission could enter a final Decision and Order in this matter without further appeals by the parties. The parties agreed to engage in mediation and Robbie Alm (the "Mediator") was agreed to by the parties and accordingly retained by the Commission to serve as mediator.

3. The parties thereafter participated diligently and in good faith in confidential mediation sessions facilitated by the Mediator from March 10, 2014 through March 14, 2014. These mediation sessions produced an agreement among the parties through the report of the Mediator of the results of the mediation to propose Interim Instream Flow Standards ("IIFS") for each of the Waihe'e, North & South Waiehu, 'Iao, and Waikapū Streams (collectively, the "Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams") to the Commission for its review and approval.

4. To facilitate the Mediator's Report and the Commission's review, approval and implementation of the parties' proposed IIFS for the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams and consistent with the Commission's public trust duties, as clarified and defined in the Remand Order, the parties jointly prepared proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order in the form attached hereto as Exhibit "1".

limageDB:27357143

-2-

Law
waiv
case
cont

ntly proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of
on, each of the parties, by its signature hereupon,
testimonies submitted for the remand contested
admission of exhibits submitted for the remand

6. Each of the parties, by its signature hereupon, confirms that it is authorized to and has approved the jointly proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order in the form attached hereto as Exhibit "1", that it will support without modification the jointly proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision and Order before the Commission, that it will ask the Commission to adopt the jointly proposed Findings, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order without modification, and that it will waive any right to appeal if the Commission adopts the jointly proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order without modification.

(
I
(
a
p
e

rr
carry out the terms of this Stipulation.


9. Each of the parties, by its signature hereupon, confirms that it will execute such other documents as may be necessary to carry out the terms of this Stipulation.

10. This Stipulation may be signed electronically and in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original and all of which shall be combined into a single document

lmanageDB:2735714.3

-3-

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, April 4, 2014.


ISAAC H. MORIWAKE
D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
SUMMER KUPAU-ODO

Attorneys for HUI O NĀ WAI 'EHĀ and
MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

ANNA ELENTO-SNEED
PAMELA W. BUNN

Attorneys for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

DAVID SCHULMEISTER
ELIJAH YIP

Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL AND SUGAR
COMPANY

DATED: Kahului, Hawaii, April ____, 2014.

PAUL R. MANCINI
JAMES W. GEIGER

Attorneys for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY LLC

STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER; EXHIBIT "1"; In the Matter of 'Āo Ground Water Management Area High-
Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waihe'e,
Waiehu, 'Āo, & Waikapū Streams Contested Case Hearing, Case No. CCH-MA06-01

-4-

lmanageDB:2735714.3

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, April ____, 2014.

ISAAC H. MORIWAKE
D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
SUMMER KUPAU-ODO

Attorneys for HUI O NĀ WAI 'EHĀ and
MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.



ANNA ELENTO-SMEED
PAMELA W. BUNN

Attorneys for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

DAVID SCHULMEISTER
ELIJAH YIP

Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL AND SUGAR
COMPANY

DATED: Kahului, Hawaii, April ____, 2014.

PAUL R. MANCINI
JAMES W. GEIGER

Attorneys for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY LLC

STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER; EXHIBIT "1"; in the Matter of 'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-
Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waibe'e,
Waiehu, 'Iao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing, Case No. CCH-MA06-01

-4-

imageDB:27357143


DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, April 4, 2014.

ISAAC H. MORIWAKE
D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
SUMMER KUPAU-ODO

Attorneys for HUI O NĀ WAI 'EHĀ and
MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.


ANNA ELENTO-SNEED
PAMELA W. BUNN

Attorneys for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS


DAVID SCHULMEISTER
ELIJAH YIP

Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL AND SUGAR
COMPANY

DATED: Kahului, Hawaii, April 4, 2014.


PAUL R. MANCINI
JAMES W. GEIGER


Attorneys for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY LLC

STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER; EXHIBIT "I"; In the Matter of 'Āo Ground Water Management Area High-
Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waiehe'e,
Waiehu, 'Āo, & Waikapū Streams Contested Case Hearing, Case No. CCH-MA06-01

-4-

lmanageDB:2735714.J

DATED: Waiuku, Hawaii, April 4, 2014.



PATRIK WONG
P.E. OANA

Attorneys for COUNTY OF MAUI, DEPARTMENT OF
WATER SUPPLY

STIPULATION RE MEDIATOR'S REPORT OF JOINT PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER; EXHIBIT "1"; In the Matter of 'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-
Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waihe'e,
Waichu, 'Iao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing, Case No. CCH-MA06-01

-5-

imageDB:27357143

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of:

‘IAO GROUND WATER MANAGEMENT
AREA HIGH-LEVEL SOURCE WATER
USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS AND
PETITION TO AMEND INTERIM
INSTREAM FLOW STANDARDS OF
WAIHE‘E, WAIEHU, ‘IAO, & WAIKAPŪ
STREAMS CONTESTED CASE HEARING

Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF
LAW, DECISION AND ORDER;
EXHIBITS “A” - “B”

**FINDINGS OF FACT,
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER**

I. BACKGROUND

1. These Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order are the final adjudication by the Commission on Water Resource Management (the “Commission”) of the June 25, 2004 “Petition to Amend the Interim Instream Flow Standards for Waihe‘e, North & South Waiehu, ‘Iao, and Waikapū Streams and Their Tributaries” (the “Petition”) filed by Petitioners Hui O Nā Wai ‘Ehā and Maui Tomorrow Foundation, Inc. (“Hui/MTF”).
2. Hui/MTF, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (“OHA”), Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (“HC&S”), Wailuku Water Company, LLC (“WWC”), and the County of Maui Department of Water Supply (“MDWS”) participated in this matter. Hui/MTF, OHA, HC&S, WWC and MDWS collectively are called the “Parties.”
3. The Commission, following a consolidated contested case hearing (the “Proceeding”) for the Petition and for certain water use permit applications (“WUPAs”) for

ImangeDB:2737882.1

EXHIBIT “1”

EXHIBIT “B-074”

Page 15 of 56

water from diked, high-level well and tunnel sources in the 'Āo Aquifer System Ground Water Management Area, adopted Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order on June 10, 2010 (the "2010 D&O").

4. On August 15, 2012, following an appeal by Hui/MTF and OHA, the Hawai'i Supreme Court (the "Court") issued a decision vacating the 2010 D&O and remanded the matter to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with the decision (the "Remand Order"). The Court, among other things, held that the 2010 D&O did not adequately justify the Commission's decision not to restore streamflow to the 'Āo and Waikapū Streams. *See In re 'Āo Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications*, 128 Hawai'i 228, 249-54, 287 P.3d 129, 150-55 (2012) ("Nā Wai 'Ehā"). The Court also instructed the Commission to consider the following matters on remand:

- a. The effect that IIFS will have on Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices, and the feasibility of protecting the practices. *See id.* at 249, 287 P.3d at 150.
- b. Instream uses of the Nā Wai 'Ehā streams in addition to support of amphidromous species. *See id.* at 251, 287 P.3d at 252.
- c. Whether HC&S's acreage for purposes of its irrigation requirements for fields irrigated with Nā Wai 'Ehā water should include Fields 921 and 922. *See id.* at 256, 287 P.3d at 157.
- d. Reasonable estimation of the system losses of WWC and HC&S. *See id.* at 258, 287 P.3d at 159.
- e. Whether and to what extent Well No. 7 is a reasonable alternative water source for HC&S. *See i*
- f. Whether and to what ext
Wailuku/Kahului waste
water source for HC&S. lternative

5. Following the Remand Order, the Commission appointed Dr. Lawrence Miike (the "Hearings Officer"), who served as the Hearings Officer for the Proceeding, to serve as the Hearings Officer for the remand (the "Remand Proceeding").

6. The Commission also contracted with Bishop Museum to prepare an assessment report pertaining to the quantification of the impacts of water diversions in the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams on native stream animal habitat. James E. Parham, Ph.D., a research hydrologist and aquatic biologist with the Hawai`i Biological Survey at Bishop Museum, prepared an assessment report dated December 31, 2013, entitled, "Technical Report: Quantification of the impacts of water diversions in the Nā Wai `Ehā streams, Maui on native stream animal habitat using the Hawaiian Habitat Evaluation Procedure" (the "Parham Study").

7. The Hearings Officer in Minute Order 27 set a schedule for the filing of briefs, written testimony and exhibits in the Remand Proceeding.

8. The Parties filed opening, responsive, and rebuttal submissions consisting of briefs, written testimony, and exhibits. Some of the Parties also submitted supplemental opening and responsive submissions to address a January 22, 2014 report prepared by Austin Tsutsumi & Associates ("ATA"), submitted by HC&S, studying the feasibility of using recycled wastewater produced at the Wailuki-Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility as an alternative source of irrigation water for HC&S.

9. On February 19, 2014, the Hearings Officer made the Parham Study a part of the record, supported by the written testimony of its author. See Declaration of James E. Parham dated February 14, 2014 ("Parham Decl.") at ¶¶ 1, 5 and Exh. F-2 thereto.

10. The Hearings Officer, by Minute Order No. 27, set the Remand Proceeding hearings to begin on March 10, 2014.

11. Robert Alm was appointed by the Commission to act as a mediator in the Remand Proceeding.

12. On April 4, 2014, Robert Alm submitted a Report (the "Mediator's Report") of the results of the Mediation which included a Stipulation Re Mediator's Report of Joint Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order (the "Stipulation"), to which was attached proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order jointly prepared by and approved by the Parties.

13. The Commission has reviewed and approved the Mediator's Report, the Stipulation, and the proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order jointly submitted by the Parties, as more particularly hereinafter set forth.

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Flow characteristics of the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams

14. The Commission previously made findings regarding the flow characteristics of the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams in the 2010 D&O. See 2010 D&O, Findings of Fact ("FOF") 80-137. The findings of the characteristics of the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams, which are incorporated herein by reference, were based on evidence in the record of the Proceeding as of October 15, 2009, the date the Commission entertained oral argument from the Parties in the Proceeding.

15. The 2010 D&O findings are supplemented and, where appropriate, superseded in the following respects based on evidence in the record of the Remand Proceeding as of March 10, 2014, the date on which the Remand Proceeding hearing was to begin.

16. In 2010, the U.S. Geological Survey ("USGS") published Scientific Investigations Report 2010-5011 entitled *Effects of Surface-Water Diversion on Streamflow, Recharge, Physical Habitat, and Temperature, Nā Wai 'Ehā, Maui, Hawai'i* (the "2010 USGS

Study"). The 2010 USGS Study, whose principal author was Delwyn S. Oki who testified in the Proceeding, presented the results of its study to characterize the effects of existing surface-water diversions on streamflow, groundwater recharge, physical habitat for native stream fauna, and water temperature in the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams. The 2010 USGS Study is a part of the record of this Proceeding as Exh. A-R1.

17. Among other information, the 2010 USGS Study reports streamflow data for the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams collected from USGS stream-gaging stations for the climate years 1984 to 2007, supplementing the data in the record at the time the Commission issued the 2010 D&O.

18. Data collected from USGS stream gaging station 16604500 on 'Īao Stream at an elevation of 860 feet indicate that during climate years 1984-2007, the median discharge of 'Īao Stream was 25 mgd and the Q_{95} discharge was 11 mgd. See 2010 USGS Study at p. 35.

19. Under undiverted low-flow conditions, the estimated seepage loss from 'Īao Stream downstream of the common intake for the 'Īao-Waikapū and 'Īao-Maniania Ditches is approximately 5.6 mgd. About 63% of the seepage loss takes place upstream of an altitude of 360 ft, and the remaining 37% takes place downstream of an altitude of 220 ft. *Id.* at p. 93.

20. Waikapū Stream flows south and discharges into the Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge. Waikapū Stream would be classified currently as a naturally interrupted perennial stream with perennial flow in its upper reaches and naturally dry lower reaches. Connectivity to Kealia Pond only occurs during and following periods of rainfall, and connectivity to the ocean also requires Kealia Pond to discharge to the ocean. *Id.* at p. 33. During climate years 1984-2007, it is estimated that Waikapū Stream would have flowed continuously to the coast less than half of the time, although this estimate contains much uncertainty. *Id.* at p. 77.

B. Instream Values of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams

1. Fish and Wildlife Habitat

21. The Commission previously made findings regarding fish and wildlife habitat of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams in the 2010 D&O. See 2010 D&O, FOF 63-79, 556 - 598. The findings regarding the fish and wildlife habitat of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams, which are incorporated herein by reference, were based on evidence in the record of the Proceeding as of October 15, 2009, the date the Commission entertained oral argument from the Parties in the Proceeding.

22. In the 2010 D&O, the Commission concluded that: (i) Waihe'e River has the highest restorative potential; (ii) Waiehu Stream showed evidence of recruitment of amphidromous species, and that further recruitment could result if improvements were made to assist amphidromous species traverse the 12-foot drop in the elevation of the South Waiehu stream just below the diversion and the vertical concrete apron located just below the highway culverts in lower Waiehu Stream; (iii) recruitment can occur through the channelized portion of `Tao Stream and the 20-foot vertical drop in the channelized area can be bypassed, but the reproductive (spawning) potential of the channelized, lower stretches is minimal; and (iv) Waikapū Stream may not have flowed continuously mauka to makai prior to the diversions of the stream because of extensive infiltration of streamflow into the lower reaches of the streambed, and even when there is streamflow during extensive periods of flooding, stream water does not travel via a continuous channel through Keālia Pond and into the ocean, but fans out into a big delta. See 2010 D&O, Conclusions of Law ("COL") 214-217.

23. The 2010 D&O Findings are supplemented and, where appropriate, superseded in the following respects based on evidence in the record of the Remand Proceeding as of March 10, 2014, the date on which the Remand Proceeding hearing was to begin.

24. The 2010 USGS Study indicated that native species have been "present" and/or "abundant" in each of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams and provided data regarding the relationship between instream flow and available physical habitat. See 2010 USGS Study at pp. 17-18, v-vi.

25. The Parham Study addressed three broad areas associated with impacts on native stream animals' habitat resulting from water diversion projects in the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams including the loss of habitat as a result of water diversion, barriers to animal movement and migration resulting from the diversion structures, and entrainment of animals in the diversion ditches. Parham Decl. at ¶ 7.

26. The Parham Study used the Hawaiian Stream Habitat Evaluation Procedure ("HSHEP") model to estimate the overall habitat units within an area of concern.

27. The Parham Study modeled six scenarios for eight native species in each of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams.

28. The native species modeled in the Parham Study were: `o`opu nākea (*Awaous guamensis*), `o`opu alamo`o (*Lentipes concolor*), `o`opu naniha (*Stenogobius hawaiiensis*), `o`opu nōpili (*Sicyopterus stimpsoni*), `o`opu akupa (*Eleotris sandwicensis*), `ōpae kala`ole (*Atyoida bisulcata*), `ōpae `oeha`a (*Macrobrachium grandimanus*), and hīhīwai (*Neritina granosa*). Parham Study at p. 10.

29. The six scenarios modeled in the Parham Study were:

- a. Natural: In this scenario, there were no diversions or channel alterations within the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams,
- b. Undiverted: Similar to the Natural Scenario conditions except the impact of the channelized section of `Īao Stream was included in this scenario,

- c. Fully Diverted: This scenario represented stream diversions operating at maximum diversion capacity,
- d. 2010 IFS: This scenario reflected the proposed 2010 IFS standards,
- e. Flow to Ocean: This scenario modeled continuous flow from the upstream reaches to the ocean, and
- f. Flow to Ocean with 'Iao Stream Channelization Improvements: This scenario added habitat improvement associated with a possible 'Iao Stream Channelization improvement project.

Id. at p. 5.

30. The Parham Study concluded that 'Iao Stream and Waihe'e River together make up 87.8% of the total naturally occurring habitat units for native amphidromous species within all Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams combined. 'Iao Stream has 49 % of the total habitat units within Nā Wai 'Ehā and Waihe'e has 37.8%. Waikapū Stream contains less than 1% of naturally occurring habitat units. *Id.* at p. 71.

31. The Parham Study concluded that restoration of baseflows to Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams will increase substantially available stream animal habitat. See Parham Study at p. 99.

32. Under the 2010 IFS Scenario, the improved flow conditions in Waihe'e and Waiehu Streams reflected large increases in combined species habitat. Waiehu Stream gained over 3,500 combined species habitat units and went from 6.1% of natural habitat units under the fully altered condition to 55.5% of natural habitat units under the 2010 IFS Scenario. Waihe'e Stream gained over 2,400 combined species habitat units and went from less than 1% of natural habitat units under the fully altered condition to 11.1% of natural habitat units under the 2010 IFS Scenario. *Id.* at p. 72.

33. While the Parham Study concludes that restoration of baseflows to the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams will substantially increase available stream animal habitat, both habitat and

passage are necessary to enhance the productivity of the stream habitat. A site can only be occupied by a species if that species can reach the habitat. *See id.* at p. 99.

34. As the Commission previously acknowledged in the 2010 D&O, and as the Parham Study recognizes, the channelized segment at the lower end of 'Āao Stream provides little or no habitat. Therefore, joint restoration efforts including return of water and habitat improvements are needed to optimize restorative benefits to this segment of the stream, which has high potential for restoration. *See id.* at p. 101; 2010 D&O, COL 216.

35. Even without habitat improvements to the channelized segment of 'Āao Stream, however, the Parham Study concluded that the restoration of flow to 'Āao Stream would yield passage benefits for upstream habitats for some of the native species studied. For all species combined, the largest increases were observed in 'Āao Stream under the two "Flow to Ocean" scenarios. *See Parham Study* at pp. 72, 98, 101.

36. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") manages the Keālia Pond National Wildlife Refuge, which is habitat for a variety of native flora and fauna, including two endangered Hawaiian waterbirds—the ae`o (Hawaiian stilt) and `alae ke`oke`o (Hawaiian coot). *See Exh. C-R12* (excerpts from Keālia Pond National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan) at p. 1-1. Waikapū Stream is the major contributor of inflow to Keālia Pond during the wet season. *See id.* at pp. 3-12; Exh. A-165 at 6.

2. **Native Hawaiian Traditional and Customary Practices in Nā Wai `Ehā**

37. The Commission previously made findings regarding Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices in the 2010 D&O. *See 2010 D&O*, FOF 34-62. The findings regarding Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices in Nā Wai `Ehā, which are incorporated

herein by reference, were based on evidence in the record of the Proceeding as of October 15, 2009, the date the Commission entertained oral argument from the Parties in the Proceeding.

38. The 2010 D&O findings are supplemented and, with respect to the following respects based on evidence in the record of the Remand Proceeding as of March 10, 2014, the date on which the Remand Proceeding hearing was to begin.

39. In the Proceeding, individuals and community groups testified that they rely or seek to rely on each of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams for their exercise of traditional and customary Native Hawaiian practices, including: kalo cultivation; gathering of native plants for medicine, hula, and martial arts; fishing and gathering in stream, estuary and nearshore areas; religious practices, and cultural education. See, e.g., *Nā Wai `Ehā*, *supra* at 245-248, 287 P.3d at 146-149; Akana WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 1-17; Holt-Padilla WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 1-25; Bailey WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 2-9; J. Duey WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 11-18; Ornellas WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 7-13; Horcajo WT 9/13/07 at ¶¶ 9-16; Pellegrino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 15-37; Soong WT 11/16/07 at ¶ 5; Alboro WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 3-8; Smith WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 6-9; Faustino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 7-10; Higashino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 7; Kekona WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 4-6; Sevilla WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 1-16; Ivy WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 13, 16-17; Ivy WT 3/2/08 at ¶¶ 12-17; Fisher WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 4, 7-23.¹

40. In the Remand Proceeding, Hui/MT and OHA submitted additional testimony in support of instream flows in each of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams to support Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices such as kalo cultivation, cultural education, fishing and gathering. See Sevilla Amended WT 2/18/14 at ¶ 8-11; Piko A`o WT 1/7/14 at ¶¶ 15-20; Lozano

¹ Citations to written testimony submitted by witnesses in the Proceeding and the Remand Proceeding are denoted by the last name of the witness followed by the abbreviation "WT" and the date of submission.

1/7/14 at ¶¶ 8; Ellis WT 2/18/14 at ¶¶ 4, 10; Chavez WT 2/18/14 at ¶ 6; Almeida WT 1/7/14 ¶¶ 6, 9-11; Harders WT 1/7/14 WT at ¶¶ 14, 17.

3. Other Instream Values

41. Restoring flow to the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams would support other beneficial instream uses and values, including but not limited to:

a. aesthetic values and outdoor recreational activities, *see, e.g.*, 2010 D&O, FOF 234; Exh. A-78 (Hawai`i Stream Assessment) at 248, 252, 272; Higashino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 5-6; Pellegrino WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 28; J. Duey WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 19-20; Ornellas WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 14; Horcajo WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 6-7; Alueta WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 9; Piko A`o WT at ¶ 20; Harders WT at ¶ 17;

b. support of non-amphidromous native species, *see, e.g.*, Benbow WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 13; Benbow WT 11/16/07 at ¶ 7; Bailey WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 4-5; Kekona WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 5; Sevilla WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 9; Exh. A-54 (cultural study of Paukūkalo) at 20-27; Faustino WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 8; Fisher WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 12, 22; Exh. A-78 at 182, 186;

c. research and education, *see, e.g.*, Benbow WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 18-21; Pellegrino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 24-28; Alboro WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 4-6; Sevilla WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 10-13; Sevilla 2/18/14 Amended WT at ¶ 7; Bailey WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 2; Fisher WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 18; Piko A`o WT at ¶ 1-4;

d. groundwater aquifer recharge, *see, e.g.*, 2010 D&O, FOF 90; 2010 USGS Report at iv-v; Exh. A-R2 (USGS Ground-Water Availability Report) at iv, 63-66.

e. conveyance of irrigation and domestic water supplies to downstream points of diversion, *see, e.g.*, 2010 D&O, FOF 214-236; *Nā Wai `Ehā*, 128 Hawai`i at 248, 287 P.3d at 149; J. Duey WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 11-14; Ornellas WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 7-8; Horcajo WT

9/14/07 at ¶¶ 12-16; Lozano WT 1/7/14 at ¶¶ 8-10; Sevilla 2/18/14 Amended WT at ¶¶ 7-8; Ivy WT 3/2/08 at ¶ 7; Harders WT 1/7/14 at ¶¶ 10-16; Pellegrino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 15-18; Soong WT 11/16/07 at ¶ 5; Gushi WT 10/26/07 at ¶ 3; Higashino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 1-3; Kahalehau WT 10/26/07 at ¶¶ 1-3; Faustino WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 3-6, 9; Freitas WT 10/26/07 at ¶¶ 4-7; Fisher WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 6, 19, 22;

f. maintenance of ecosystems such as estuaries and nearshore waters, wetlands, and stream vegetation, see, e.g., 2010 D&O, FOF 38, 237, 303, 342; Bailey WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 4; Ivy WT 3/2/08 at ¶¶ 8-10, 15, 17; Kekona WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 3-5; Sevilla WT 9/14/07 at ¶¶ 7-9, 14; Sevilla 2/18/14 Amended WT at ¶ 10; Fisher WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 13-22; Faustino WT 9/14/07 at ¶ 8; Almeida WT 1/7/14, at ¶¶ 6-7; Exh. A-R2 at 69; Exh. A-54 at 20-27.

C. Noninstream Uses

1. HC&S

42. The Commission previously made findings on HC&S's noninstream uses in the 2010 D&O. See 2010 D&O, FOF 259 – 289, 310 317, and 417 - 506. The findings regarding HC&S's noninstream in the record of the Pr argument from the Pa

43. The 20 based on evidence in f which the Remand Proceeding hearing was to begin, in the following respects.

44. The Commission previously determined that the acreage under sugar cane cultivation by HC&S consists of 3,650 acres in its Waihe'e-Hopoi Fields and 1,120 acres in its 'Iao-Waikapū Fields. See 2010 D&O, FOF 429, 443, COL 227.

45. The Commission also previously determined that HC&S's reasonable daily water use requirements are 21.75 mgd for the Waihe'e-Hopoi Fields and 6.06 mgd for the 'Iao-Waikapū fields. See 2010 D&O, COL 231.

46. In calculating the acreage of the Waihe'e-Hopoi Fields, the Commission included HC&S's Fields 921 and 922, comprising of a total of 300 acres. See 2010 D&O, FOF 429.

47. In the Remand Order, the Court instructed the Commission to consider the issue of whether Fields 921 and 922 should be included in HC&S's acreage for purpose of calculating its irrigation requirements in light of evidence that the soil conditions of those fields are similar to Field 920, which the Commission excluded from the calculation of HC&S's acreage and water duty because of its greater water consumption and the porosity of the sandy soil in that field. See *Nā Wai 'Ehā, supra* at 257, 287 P.3d at 157.

48. In the Remand Proceeding, HC&S presented evidence showing that Fields 921 and 922 contained a different soil composition than Field 920, that Fields 921 and 922 are used for the cultivation of seed cane, that Fields 921 and 922 do not consume more irrigation water, on average, than other seed cane fields cultivated by HC&S, and that Fields 921 and 922 are in the process of being investigated and potentially reclassified by Natural Resources Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture consistent with their actual soil composition. See *Nakahata WT 1/7/14* at ¶¶ 8-13.

49. Well No. 7 is a source of irrigation water for HC&S. See 2010 D&O, FOF 494. The extent to which Well No. 7 is a practicable alternative water source for HC&S is an issue that the Commission was instructed to determine.

50. Since the issuance of the Order, HC&S has upgraded Well No. 7 by installing a second boost pump and the Well No. 7 wellhouse to the wellhead. These upgrades enable HC&S to provide water to the Hew WT 1/7/14 at ¶¶ 10, 13.

51. The Commission previously concluded that HC&S could reasonably claim 2 mgd in system losses. See 2010 D&O, COL 232. The Remand Order instructed the Commission to determine the reasonableness of HC&S's system losses. See *Nā Wai 'Ehā, supra* at 257, 287 P.3d at 157.

52. In the Remand Proceeding, HC&S presented evidence that system loss rates for water conveyance systems generally could range between 5 % and 30 % and that a loss rate of approximately 20 % would translate to 4-5 mgd of losses for HC&S. See *Volner WT 1/7/14* at ¶ 50; Exhs. E-R13, E-R14. HC&S also presented evidence that HC&S's expected system losses, excluding Waiale Reservoir, could range from 2.15 to 4.20 mgd, applying expected seepage rates obtained from the National Engineering Handbook published by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and an average daily evaporation rate of 0.40 acre inches. See *Hew WT 2/18/14* at ¶ 7, Exhs. E-R33, E-R34 and E-R35.

53. The Commission previously found that the County of Maui has no existing infrastructure to deliver recycled wastewater to HC&S's fields and accordingly made no

reduction to its findings regarding HC&S's irrigation requirements to account for possible wastewater re-use by HC&S. See 2010 D&O, COL 108; COL 230.

54. The Remand Order instructed the Commission to provide a more detailed analysis on this issue.

55. Various previous or ongoing studies address potential re-use of wastewater from the Wailuku-Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility ("WWRF"). See, e.g., Central Maui Recycled Water Verification Study by the County of Maui, Exh. C-R20; 2013 Update of the Hawaii Water Reuse Survey and Report by a consultant for the Commission, Exh. C-R21. HC&S retained ATA to prepare a feasibility report pertaining to the use of reclaimed water produced at the WWRF as an alternative to using Nā Wai 'Ehā surface water for sugarcane irrigation (the "ATA Report"). See Exh. E-R31.

56. According to the ATA Report, approximately 2.95 mgd of treated effluent could potentially be reliably made available to HC&S 365 days a year from the WWRF upon construction of improvements at an estimated capital cost of approximately \$16.9 million and a definitive agreement being reached between HC&S and the County of Maui stating the terms and conditions under which the County would provide, and HC&S would accept, reclaimed wastewater, including allocation of the improvement costs, the quality and quantity of water to be delivered, and the water rate charged by the County. See *id.* at 27. Upon completion of the improvements, projected to be sometime in 2020 at the earliest, there could then be an annual operating and maintenance cost to HC&S of approximately \$521,000, which includes \$161,512.50 in fees that the County of Maui could charge for treated effluent at the rate of \$0.15/1,000 gallons as stated in the County of Maui's letter to ATA dated January 15, 2014. See *id.*, Appendix A thereto (1/15/14 Ltr from Eric Nakagawa to Ivan K. Nakatsuka at 3).

57. Based on the ATA Report, HC&S provided evidence that recycled wastewater is not an immediately available alternative to diversion of Nā Wai `Ehā surface water for sugarcane irrigation, and that until the County of Maui and HC&S can reach agreement on the terms and conditions under which recycled wastewater would be purchased and supplied, an assessment of whether recycled wastewater is a reasonably practicable alternative to Nā Wai `Ehā surface water cannot be made. See Volner WT 2/11/14 at ¶¶ 6-7; ATA Report Appendix A (1/15/14 letter from Eric Nakagawa to Ivan K. Nakatsuka).

58. With regard to the impact on its operations of further increases to the IIFS for the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams, HC&S presented evidence that, among other things, its future viability is still uncertain, that the factor most essential to its economic viability after sugar prices is sugar production, and that the most significant driver of sugar production is the availability of water for irrigation. See Volner WT 1/7/14 at ¶¶ 24-25; Benjamin WT 2/18/14 at ¶¶ 6-7.

2. WWC

59. The Commission previously made findings about WWC's system losses in the 2010 D&O. See 2010 D&O, FOF 426. The finding regarding WWC's system losses, which is incorporated herein by reference, was based on evidence in the record of the Proceeding as of October 15, 2009, the date the Commission entertained oral argument from the Parties in the Proceeding.

60. The 2010 D&O findings are supplemented and, where appropriate, superseded in the following respects based on evidence in the record of the Remand Proceeding as of March 10, 2014, the date on which the Remand Proceeding hearing was to begin.

61. The Commission previously concluded that WWC could reasonably claim 2 mgd in system losses. See 2010 D&O, COL 225. The Remand Order instructed the Commission to determine the reasonableness of system losses. See *Nā Wai`Ehā, supra* at 258, 287 P.3d at 157.

62. In the Remand Proceeding, WWC submitted evidence that it has repaired portions of its system, removed reservoirs from service, and terminated use of the North Waiehu ditch system. These measures enabled WWC to reduce system losses to approximately 2.73 mgd. WWC acted to reduce system losses to about 4.97 %.

63. WWC also submitted testimony to the effect that:

a) Sei inf a c shc hat

b) sta pot d a

c) WWC's system losses are within the standards provided by the Soil and Conservation Service and the American Water Works Association. *Id.*

64. WWC estimated that it could reduce system losses by about 800,000 gallons per day by lining the unlined portions of the ditches used to deliver water at a cost of about \$5,026,000. *Id.* at pp. 7-9.

65. Based on the supplemental findings, WWC's reasonable system losses are 2.73 mgd.

66. In the 2010 D&O, the Commission determined that WWC has water delivery agreements with 34 entities in addition to its agreement with MDWS and HC&S. See 2010 D&O, FOF 240; Exh. D-96.

67. On remand, WWC submitted evidence that WWC's business model is sensitive to the volume of water available for diversion from 'Iao and Waikapū Streams, particularly the former, and that it is unable to increase revenue by adding new users or changing the rates it charges existing customers while its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity is pending before the Public Utilities Commission. See Kuba WT 1/6/14 at 3-4, 10, 14-16; Exhs. D-R8, D-R9, D-R10; and Chumbley WT 1/7/14 at pp. 11-13.

3. MDWS

68. MDWS receives water from 'Iao Stream via the 'Iao-Waikapū Ditch, which is treated at its 'Iao Water Treatment Facility for municipal use, including domestic uses, for its water system serving Central and South Maui. See 2010 D&O, FOF 238; Taylor WT 1/3/14 at ¶¶ 6, 8 10-11.

69. Under WWC's agreement with MDWS, WWC must make available up to 3.2 mgd of water from 'Iao Stream to MDWS for the 'Iao Water Treatment Facility, subject to regulatory actions by the Commission. See 2010 D&O, FOF 239; Taylor WT 1/3/14 at ¶¶ 12-13; Exhs. B-14, B-23, B-R1 and B-R 14.

70. The Commission previously concluded that the 3.2 mgd of water for MDWS's 'Iao Water Treatment Facility was a reasonable current and future use of water from 'Iao Stream. 2010 D&O COL 62, 232.

71. This conclusion was not disturbed by the Remand Order and has not been challenged by any of the Parties in the Remand Proceeding.

72. Any factual finding herein pertaining to the water use requirements, alternative water sources, or system losses of a Party to the Proceeding or of a person who may apply for a water use permit or may apply for a water use permit in the future is made without prejudice to

the rights of the Parties and of the Commission to revisit those issues in connection with any proceeding involving a WUPA for water diverted from any of the Nā Wai `Ehā Streams inasmuch as the burden of proof with respect to such issues in a WUPA proceeding will be upon the applicant rather than upon the Commission.

73. If any of the foregoing findings of fact shall be deemed a conclusion of law, the Commission intends that every such finding be construed as a conclusion of law.

III. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. General Principles

1. In the context of IIFS petitions, the State Water Code, HRS Chapter 174C, does not place a burden of proof on any particular party; instead, the State Water Code and case law interpreting the State Water Code affirmed the Commission's duty to establish IIFS that "protect instream values to the extent practicable" and "protect the public interest." *Nā Wai `Ehā, supra* at 253, 287 P.3d at 154.

2. "Instream use" is defined as:

[B]eneficial uses of stream water for significant purposes which are located in the stream and which are achieved by leaving the water in the stream. Instream uses include, but are not limited to:

- a. Maintenance of aquatic life and wildlife habitats;
- b. Outdoor recreational activities;
- c. Maintenance of ecosystems such as estuaries, wetlands, and stream vegetation;
- d. Aesthetic values such as waterfalls and scenic waterways;
- e. Navigation;
- f. Instream hydropower generation;
- g. Maintenance of water quality;
- h. The conveyance of irrigation and domestic water supplies to downstream points of diversion; and
- i. The protection of traditional and customary Hawaiian rights.

HRS § 174C-3. The public trust doctrine recognizes that resource protection constitutes a "use." *In re Waiahole Ditch Combined Contested Case Hr'g*, 94 Hawai'i 97, 140, 9 P.3d 409, 452 (2000) ("*Water Use Permit Applications*").

3. "Noninstream use" is defined in the Code as "use of stream water that is diverted or removed from its stream channel and includes the use of stream water outside of the channel for domestic, agricultural, and industrial purposes." HRS § 174C-3.

4. "In considering a petition to adopt an interim instream flow standard, the commission shall weigh the importance of present or potential instream values with the importance of the present or potential uses of water for non-instream purposes, including the economic impact of restricting such uses." HRS § 174C-71(2)(D).

B. Analysis of Instream Uses and Native Hawaiian Practices

5. The Commission concludes that restoration of baseflows to Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams will substantially increase support and protection of instream uses and Native Hawaiian practices. See FOF 21-41. 'Āao Stream and Waihe'e River have the greatest restorative potential in terms of increasing habitat for native fauna because the two streams together comprise 87.8% of the total naturally occurring habitat units for native amphidromous species within all Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams combined. Of all the streams, 'Āao Stream has the highest restorative potential. See FOF 30.

6. The return of flow to Waihe'e River pursuant to the 2010 D&O has already yielded significant gains in terms of increased species habitat. The Parham Study observed that Waihe'e River gained over 2,400 combined species habitat units and went from less than 1% of natural habitat units under the fully altered condition to 11.1% of natural habitat units under the 2010 IFS Scenario that was modeled by the study. See FOF 32.

7. Waiehu Stream has similarly experienced substantial benefits to habitat for native fauna as a result of the amended IIFS established in the 2010 D&O. The Parham Study observed that Waiehu Stream gained over 3,500 combined species habitat units and went from 6.1% of natural habitat units under the fully altered condition to 55.5% of natural habitat units under the 2010 IFS Scenario. *See id.*

8. The restoration of stream flow to 'Iao Stream and an upper reach of Waikapū Stream, along with existing restoration of flow to Waihe'e River and Waiehu Stream, would increase habitat for native fauna as well as provide passage benefits for upstream habitats for native amphidromous species. *See FOF 30-35.*

9. The restoration of stream flow to 'Iao Stream and an upper reach of Waikapū Stream, along with existing restoration of flow to Waihe'e River and Waiehu Stream, would provide positive effects and enhanced protection of Native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices in each of these streams, including but not limited to gathering, fishing, spiritual practices and values, and downstream kalo cultivation. *See FOF 39-40.* This conclusion is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA for water from Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams, in which proceeding the applicant will have the burden of justifying its water use, to the extent required by law, *see, e.g., HRS § 174C-63.*

10. The restoration of stream flow to 'Iao Stream and an upper reach of Waikapū Stream, along with existing restoration of flow to Waihe'e River and Waiehu Stream, would support other beneficial instream uses and values including but not limited to: aesthetic values and outdoor recreational activities; support of native non-amphidromous species; research and education; groundwater aquifer recharge; conveyance of irrigation and domestic water supplies

to downstream points of diversion; and maintenance of ecosystems such as estuaries, wetlands, and stream vegetation. See FOF 41.

11. Based on the foregoing, the Commission concludes that maintaining the existing restoration of Waihe'e River and Waiehu Stream and restoring stream flow to 'Iao Stream and an upper reach of Waikapū Stream, would benefit and protect instream uses within each of the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams.

C. Analysis of Noninstream Uses

1. HC&S

12. The Commission previously determined that the acreage under sugar cane cultivation by HC&S consists of 3,650 acres in its Waihe'e-Hopoi Fields and 1,120 acres in its 'Iao-Waikapū Fields. See 2010 D&O, FOF 429, 443, COL 227.

13. Based on the actual soil conditions of HC&S Fields 921 and 922, the Commission affirms its previous decision to include those fields in calculating HC&S's cultivated acreage and the reasonable water duty for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. See FOF 48. This conclusion is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by HC&S, in which proceeding HC&S will have the burden of justifying its water use in general, as well as for these fields, in particular.

14. The Commission previously determined that Well No. 7 is a practicable alternative source of irrigation water at an annual average rate of 9.5 mgd. The Commission now concludes that Well No. 7 is a practicable alternative source of irrigation water of up to 18.5 mgd on a sustained daily basis for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. See FOF 50. This is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by HC&S,

in which proceeding HC&S will have the burden of justifying its water use in general, including the amount of water that should be deemed available from Well No. 7 as a reasonably practicable alternative to Nā Wai `Ehā stream water.

15. The Commission concludes, at this time, that it is not practicable for HC&S to use reclaimed wastewater from the Wailuku-Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility as an alternative to using Nā Wai `Ehā surface water for sugarcane irrigation for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. See FOF 53-57. This is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by HC&S, in which proceeding HC&S will have the burden of justifying its water use in general, including the amount of water that should be deemed available in the future, if any, from reclaimed wastewater from Wailuku-Kahului Wastewater Reclamation Facility.

16. The Commission concludes that HC&S's reasonable system losses are estimated to be 2 mgd for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. See FOF 51. This is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by HC&S, in which proceeding HC&S will have the burden of justifying its water use in general, including its rate of system losses.

2. WWC

17. The Commission now concludes that it is not practicable for WWC to further mitigate its system losses below the 2.73 mgd to which it has reduced system losses for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. See FOF 59-65. This is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the

context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by WWC, in which proceeding WWC will have the burden of justifying its water use in general, including its rate of system losses.

3. **MDWS**

18. The Commission reaffirms its prior conclusion that the 3.2 mgd of water for MDWS's 'Āo Water Treatment Facility is a reasonable current and future use of water diverted from 'Āo Stream for purposes of the restoration of stream flows under an amended IIFS. This is without prejudice, however, to the rights of any party and of the Commission to revisit this issue in the context of any proceeding involving a WUPA by MDWS, in which proceeding MDWS will have the burden of justifying its water use.

D. **Balancing of Instream Uses and Native Hawaiian Practices and Noninstream Uses**

19. Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and the evidence in the record of this Proceeding, as supplemented following the Remand Order, the Commission concludes that the amended IIFS set forth below in the Decision and Order, both individually and in the aggregate, represents a reasonable and equitable resolution of the Petition and balance between protecting instream uses and Native Hawaiian practices and accommodating reasonable beneficial noninstream uses, consistent with the Code and the public trust. As explained above, the amended IIFS substantially increases instream flows and protection of instream uses and Native Hawaiian practices in the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams compared to the pre-Petition "status quo" IIFS. The amended IIFS also takes into account the impacts to present and potential noninstream uses and practicable alternatives and mitigation.

20. The Commission further recognizes the public policy in favor of settlement of litigation, including the Petition, which has been pending since 2004. The Commission concludes that the amended IIFS will enable the earlier interim protection of instream uses and Native Hawaiian practices without further delays in litigation, including appeals, and that this

benefits the interests of the Parties and the public and furthers the purposes of the Code and the public trust.

21. The public interest, as well as the Parties' interests, support the voluntary resolution of the Petition on terms agreed to by all the Parties, rather than continued litigation including potential appeals, particularly given this Proceeding involves the amendment of interim standards.

E. Miscellaneous

22. Any legal conclusion herein pertaining to a particular party's water use requirements, alternative water sources, and system losses is made without prejudice to the rights of any party and the Commission's to revisit those issues in any proceeding involving a WUPA for the use of water diverted from any Nā Wai 'Ehā stream.

23. If any of the foregoing conclusions of law shall be deemed a finding of fact, the Commission intends that every such finding be construed as a finding of fact.

IV. DECISION AND ORDER

The Commission issues this Decision and Order in accordance with the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law based on 1) the evidence in the Proceeding and 2) the evidence in the record of the Remand Proceeding, as supplemented following the Remand Order. Each IIFS set forth below, both individually and in the aggregate, represents a reasonable and equitable resolution of the Petition and balance between the need to protect instream uses and the accommodation of reasonable beneficial noninstream uses, consistent with the Code and the public trust.

A. Amended IIFS

The Amended IIFS is exclusively to establish the interim instream flow standards for the Nā Wai 'Ehā Streams as follows:

-25-

lmanageDB:2737882.1

1. Waihe'e River

The IIFS for Waihe'e River at both the Waihe'e Ditch and the Spreckels Ditch intakes shall remain at 10 mgd per the 2010 D&O.

2. North Waiehu Stream

The 2010 D&O established an IIFS of 1.6 mgd for North Waiehu Stream just below the point where the stream was then being diverted by WWC into the now abandoned North Waiehu Ditch. The IIFS for North Waiehu Stream shall be relocated to a lower elevation to reflect the fact that the Upper North Waiehu Diversion has been abandoned. The new IIFS location shall be just below the existing North Waiehu diversion structure located just above the Waihe'e Ditch. The new IIFS amount will be 1.0 mgd, which is intended to reflect the approximately 0.6 mgd of seepage loss in the streambed between these two points. In connection with the relocation and the amendment of the IIFS, WWC will:

- a. provide water to the kuleana property that previously was provided water from the North Waiehu Ditch;
- b. in consultation with Commission staff, modify the existing North Waiehu diversion structure located just above the Waihe'e Ditch to facilitate the upstream and downstream passage of native stream species; and,
- c. continue to service the Waiehu kuleana users from the Waihe'e Ditch.

3. South Waiehu Stream

The 2010 D&O established an IIFS of 0.9 immediately below the Spreckels Ditch Diversion on South Waiehu Stream. The IIFS for South Waiehu Stream below the Spreckels Ditch diversion shall be set in accordance with the Fourth Stipulation and Order of the Parties filed with the Commission on January 3, 2012 (attached hereto as Exh. "A"), to wit: the sluice gate on HC&S's South Waiehu diversion structure has been set to allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch during low stream flows to result in approximately 250,000 gpd to flow from

the diversion ditch to the kuleana intake, with the remainder of the low flows being returned to the stream.

4. ʻĪao Stream

The IIFS just below the diversion operated by WWC on ʻĪao Stream above the ʻĪao-Waikapu and the ʻĪao-Maniania Ditches shall be 10 mgd; provided, however, that when the average daily flow measured at USGS stream-gauge station 16604500 on ʻĪao Stream is between 15 mgd and 10 mgd and has continued in that range for three consecutive days, the greater of one-third (1/3) of the stream flow or 3.9 mgd may be diverted for noninstream use until the flow returns to 15 mgd or above.

When the average flow for any day falls below 10 mgd, commencing the next day and continuing until the average daily flow returns to at least 10 mgd, 3.4 mgd may be diverted for noninstream use.

The intent is to provide adequate water to accommodate MDWS's 3.2 mgd for its water treatment plant and the estimated 0.2 mgd used by kuleana users served exclusively by the ʻĪao-Waikapū Ditch. This is nonetheless without prejudice to the rights of the Parties and the Commission to revisit allocations of diverted water in any proceeding involving a WUPA for water diverted from ʻĪao Stream.

In lieu of setting an IIFS at the Spreckels Ditch diversion, a new IIFS of 5 mgd shall be established at or near the stream mouth. No water may be diverted at the Spreckels Ditch intake operated by HC&S except when the stream flow is adequate to allow the IIFS of 5 mgd at the mouth of ʻĪao Stream to be satisfied.

5. Waikapū Stream

The IIFS for Waikapū Stream shall be 2.9 mgd, measured below the South Waikapū Ditch diversion (Reservoir 1 diversion) return, as shown on Exh. "B" attached hereto.

At the Waihe'e Ditch diversion, the current status quo will continue, which is that water remaining in Waikapū Stream at that point is diverted into Waihe'e Ditch except during periods of high flow, when most of the flow of Waikapū Stream passes or tops the diversion and flows toward Kealia Pond, and excess ditch flow is discharged into Waikapū Stream. The intent is that the frequency and amount of intermittent flows that pass this diversion during rainy periods will not be diminished by any change in the manner in which this diversion is currently operated.

B. Implementation

The Commission retains jurisdiction to oversee the implementation, monitoring and compliance with the terms of this Decision and Order and to resolve disputes concerning such implementation, monitoring and compliance.

C. Effective Date

This Decision and Order shall become effective upon issuance by the Commission.

The foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND DECISION AND ORDER ARE HEREBY ADOPTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: HONOLULU, HAWAII, _____.

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
STATE OF HAWAII

By:

WILLIAM J. AILA, JR., Chairperson

LINDA M. ROSEN, M.D., M.P.H., Commissioner

WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR., Commissioner

KAMANA BEAMER, Ph.D., Commissioner

JONATHAN STARR, Commissioner

TED YAMAMURA, Commissioner

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

2012 JAN -3
Electronically Filed
Supreme Court
SCAP-30603
04-JAN-2012
02:09 PM
RECEIVED

'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-)	Case No. CCH-MA-06-0
Level Source Water Use Permit Applications)	
and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow)	FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER
Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu, 'Iao, &)	(ORIGINAL STIPULATION FILED
Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing)	AUGUST 30, 2010)
)	
)	

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER

The Parties to the above-entitled contested case, by and through their respective attorneys, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, the Commission on Water Resource Management ("Commission") issued its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision and Order on June 10, 2010 ("6/10/10 D&O"); and

WHEREAS, the 6/10/10 D&O amended the Interim Instream Flow Standards ("IIFS") for Waihe'e River, North Waiehu Stream, and South Waiehu Stream; and

WHEREAS, the 6/10/10 D&O required implementation of the amended IIFS to occur in no more than two months from the date of the 6/10/10 D&O unless the existing diversions require re-engineering; and

WHEREAS, the release of water to Waihe'e River, North Waiehu Stream, and South Waiehu Stream to implement the IIFS commenced on August 9 and 10, 2010; and

WHEREAS, some Parties raised concerns that full implementation of the amended IIFS for South Waiehu Stream would result in certain offstream users who use water from the ditch system on their kuleana lands to cultivate kalo or for other agricultural or domestic purposes ("kuleana users") being harmed due to the loss of or a serious reduction in their water supply; and

WHEREAS, these certain kuleana users did not appear in these proceedings, but have contacted the Parties and the Commission with their concerns about the impacts of implementing the IIFS for South Waiehu Stream on their kuleana water uses; and

WHEREAS, Petitioners HUI O NA WAL 'EHA, MAUI TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC. and OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS ("Petitioners") requested the other Parties and the Commission to enter into a series of Stipulations and Orders suspending full implementation of the 6/10/10 D&O with respect to South Waiehu Stream to facilitate the gathering of more data to assess and address the impact on certain kuleana users; and

lmanageDB 1913041.4

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT "B-074"

WHEREAS, the Petitioners requested the other Parties and the Commission to enter into the Third Stipulation and Order filed on January 3, 2011, which suspended the full implementation of the 6/10/10 D&O with respect to South Waiehu Stream for a period of one year and provided that, during that period (a) the entire flow of South Waiehu Stream would be diverted into the diversion ditch, which would allow Commission staff to gather stream flow data and assure the kuleana users of sufficient water, (b) Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) would proceed with the repair of the concrete apron of the South Waiehu Stream diversion structure, and (c) the Parties would continue to explore improvements to the stream and kuleana diversion structures; and

WHEREAS, South Waiehu Stream flow has been measured continuously for eight months, HC&S has completed the concrete apron repair and the Commission staff and Parties conducted a site visit in which they met with the South Waiehu kuleana users and inspected the kuleana 'auwai from its intake in HC&S's ditch to its return flow into South Waiehu Stream; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is currently in the process of determining the appurtenant rights of kuleana users in Nā Wai 'Ehā, including South Waiehu Stream, after which it will quantify those rights; and

WHEREAS, the Parties and the Commission staff have met several times and consulted with the South Waiehu kuleana users to discuss improvements to the kuleana intake to make delivery more efficient; and

WHEREAS, the Parties and the Commission staff have discussed a provisional ditch modification to maximize the amount of water diverted from South Waiehu Stream that can be delivered to the kuleana users during low ditch flows, and the kuleana users on the parcel designated as TMK No. 3-3-2-9 have been informed of and approve the ditch modification notwithstanding that they may need to clear the grate of debris more than is currently required; and

WHEREAS, it may be premature to attempt the development of a longer term engineering solution until the appurtenant rights and any associated surface water use permits of the South Waiehu kuleana users are determined and quantified;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties stipulate and the Commission orders as follows:


1. Full implementation of the 6/10/10 D&O with respect to South Waiehu Stream shall be suspended until January 3, 2013 (the suspension period);
2. During the suspension period the Parties will undertake measures designed to achieve the delivery of 250,000 gallons per day, during low flow periods, to the kuleana users through the South Waiehu diversion ditch, with stream flow in excess of that amount needed to deliver 250,000 gallons per day during low flow periods to remain in South Waiehu Stream.
3. To implement that goal, as soon as practicable HC&S will modify the diversion ditch as discussed on December 5, 2011, to channel the diverted water in the ditch toward the grate of the kuleana users' intake to minimize the flow that bypasses the grate during periods of low ditch flows (the "ditch modification"). HC&S shall provide the kuleana users, either directly

or through the Parties or Commission staff, with as much advance notice as practicable before the kuleana water is cut off to implement the ditch modification.

As soon as practicable after the ditch modification is completed, HC&S, in coordination with the Commission staff, will reset the sluice gate on the South Waiehu diversion structure to a point (the "baseline setting") that will allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch to result in approximately 250,000 gallons per day being delivered to the kuleana intake during periods of low stream flows, and the remainder being returned to the stream.

5. The baseline setting shall be maintained during the suspension period subject to temporary adjustments as may be necessary to facilitate system maintenance and the periodic taking of stream and ditch flow measurements and to otherwise insure that the goal set forth in paragraph 2 hereof is met.

DATED: ~~December 30, 2012~~^{F.M.}
December 30, 2011


ISAAC MORIWAKE/D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
Attorneys for HUI O NA WAI 'EHA and MAUI
TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

JANE E. LOVELL
Attorney for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

PAMELA W. BUNN
Attorney for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

PAUL R. MANCINI
Attorney for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY, LLC

DAVID SCHULMEISTER/ELIJAH YIP
Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL &
SUGAR COMPANY

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER, *'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waiehu, Waiehu, 'Iao, & Walkapū Streams Contested Case Hearing*; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

lmanageDB:1913041.4

3

or through the Parties or Commission staff, with as much advance notice as practicable before the kuleana water is cut off to implement the ditch modification.

4. As soon as practicable after the ditch modification is completed, HC&S, in coordination with the Commission staff, will reset the sluice gate on the South Waiehu diversion structure to a point (the "baseline setting") that will allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch to result in approximately 250,000 gallons per day being delivered to the kuleana intake during periods of low stream flows, and the remainder being returned to the stream.

5. The baseline setting shall be maintained during the suspension period subject to temporary adjustments as may be necessary to facilitate system maintenance and the periodic taking of stream and ditch flow measurements and to otherwise insure that the goal set forth in paragraph 2 hereof is met.

DATED: ~~December 30, 2012~~
December 30, 2011. *JEL*

ISAAC MORIWAKE/D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
Attorneys for HUI O NA WAI 'EHA and MAUI
TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

Jane E Lovell
JANE E. LOVELL
Attorney for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

PAMELA W. BUNN
Attorney for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

PAUL R. MANCINI
Attorney for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY, LLC

DAVID SCHULMEISTER/ELIJAH YIP
Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL &
SUGAR COMPANY

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER; 'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu, 'Iao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

lmanageDB:1913041.4

3

or through the Parties or Commission staff, with as much advance notice as practicable before the kuleana water is cut off to implement the ditch modification.


4. As soon as practicable after the ditch modification is completed, HC&S, in coordination with the Commission staff, will reset the sluice gate on the South Waiehu diversion structure to a point (the "baseline setting") that will allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch to result in approximately 250,000 gallons per day being delivered to the kuleana intake during periods of low stream flows, and the remainder being returned to the stream.

5. The baseline setting shall be maintained during the suspension period subject to temporary adjustments as may be necessary to facilitate system maintenance and the periodic taking of stream and ditch flow measurements and to otherwise insure that the goal set forth in paragraph 2 hereof is met.

DATED: ~~December 30, 2012~~
December 30, 2011. *1008*

ISAAC MORIWAKE/D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
Attorneys for HUI O NA WAI 'EHA and MAUI
TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

JANE E. LOVELL
Attorney for COUNTY OF MAUI
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY


PAMELA W. DUNN
Attorney for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

PAUL R. MANCINI
Attorney for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY, LLC

DAVID SCHULMEISTER/ELIJAH YIP
Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL &
SUGAR COMPANY

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER: *Low Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Instream Instream Flow Standards of Waiehu, Waiehu, 'Iao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing, Case No. CCH-MA-06-01*

manageDB 1913041.4

3

or through the Parties or Commission staff, with as much advance notice as practicable before the kuleana water is cut off to implement the ditch modification.

4. As soon as practicable after the ditch modification is completed, HC&S, in coordination with the Commission staff, will reset the sluice gate on the South Waiehu diversion structure to a point (the "baseline setting") that will allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch to result in approximately 250,000 gallons per day being delivered to the kuleana intake during periods of low stream flows, and the remainder being returned to the stream.

5. The baseline setting shall be maintained during the suspension period subject to temporary adjustments as may be necessary to facilitate system maintenance and the periodic taking of stream and ditch flow measurements and to otherwise insure that the goal set forth in paragraph 2 hereof is met.

DATED: ~~December 30, 2012~~ ^{12/30}
December 30, 2011.

ISAAC MORIWAKE/D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
Attorneys for HUI O NA WAI 'EHA and MAUI
TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

JANE E. LOVELL
Attorney for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

PAMELA
Attorney


PAUL R.
Attorney

DAVID SCHULMEISTER/ELJAH YIP
Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL &
SUGAR COMPANY

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER; *Yoo Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waiehu, Yoo, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing*; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

ImmgcDB:1913041.4

or through the Parties or Commission staff, with as much advance notice as practicable before the kuleana water is cut off to implement the ditch modification.

4. As soon as practicable after the ditch modification is completed, HC&S, in coordination with the Commission staff, will reset the sluice gate on the South Waiehu diversion structure to a point (the "baseline setting") that will allow sufficient water to enter the diversion ditch to result in approximately 250,000 gallons per day being delivered to the kuleana intake during periods of low stream flows, and the remainder being returned to the stream.

5. The baseline setting shall be maintained during the suspension period subject to temporary adjustments as may be necessary to facilitate system maintenance and the periodic taking of stream and ditch flow measurements and to otherwise insure that the goal set forth in paragraph 2 hereof is met.


DATED: ~~December 30, 2012~~
December 30, 2011. 

ISAAC MORIWAKE/D. KAPUA'ALA SPROAT
Attorneys for HUI O NA WAI 'EHA and MAUI
TOMORROW FOUNDATION, INC.

JANE B. LOVELL
Attorney for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

PAMELA W. BUNN
Attorney for OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

PAUL R. MANCINI
Attorney for WAILUKU WATER COMPANY, LLC



DAVID SCHULMEISTER/ELIJAH YIP
Attorneys for HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL &
SUGAR COMPANY

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER; *Yao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waiehu, Waiehu, Yao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing*; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

ImnagaDB:1913041.4

3

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO ORDERED.


WILLIAM J. AILA, JR., Chairperson

WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR., Commissioner


SUMNER ERDMAN, Commissioner

NEAL S.

LORETTA J. FUDDY, Commissioner

LAWRENCE H. MIKE, M.D., J.D., Commissioner

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER; *Tao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waihe'e, Waiehu, Tao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01*

ImageDB:1913041.4

4

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO ORDERED.

William J. Atla, Jr.
WILLIAM J. ATLA, JR., Chairperson

William D. Balfour, Jr.
WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR., Commissioner

Slimmer Erdman
SLIMMER ERDMAN, Commissioner

Neal S. Fujiwara
NEAL S. FUJIWARA, Commissioner

Loretta J. Fuddy
LORETTA J. FUDDY, Commissioner

Lawrence H. Mike, M.D., J.D.
LAWRENCE H. MIKE, M.D., J.D., Commissioner

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER, Waikato Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Pollution Avoidance Interim Interim Flow Standards of Waikato, Waikato, Waikato & Waikato Streams Consent Case Hearing: Case No. CC11-MA-03-01

Date: 12/19/2011

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO ORDERED.


WILLIAM J. AILA, JR., Chairperson

WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR., Commissioner

SUMNER ERDMAN, Commissioner

NEAL S. FUJWARA, Commissioner


LORETTA J. FUDDY, Commissioner

LAWRENCE H. MIKE, M.D., J.D., Commissioner

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER: 'Iao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waialeale, Waialeale, 'Iao, & Waikapu Streams Contested Case Hearing; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01

ImageDB:1913041.4

4

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO ORDERED.



WILLIAM J. AILA, JR., Chairperson

WILLIAM D. BALFOUR, JR., Commissioner

SUMNER ERDMAN, Commissioner

NEAL S. FUJIWARA, Commissioner

LORETTA J. FUDDY, Commissioner


LAWRENCE H. MIKE, M.D., J.D., Commissioner

FOURTH STIPULATION AND ORDER; *‘Iao Ground Water Management Area High-Level Source Water Use Permit Applications and Petition to Amend Interim Instream Flow Standards of Waiehu, ‘Iao, & Walkapū Streams Contested Case Hearing; Case No. CCH-MA-06-01*

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

ʻIao Ground Water Management Area)
High-Level Source Water-Use) Case No. CCH-MA06-01
Permit Applications and)
Petition to Amend Interim Instream)
Flow Standards of Waihe'e River)
and Waiehu, ʻIao, & Waikapū)
Streams Contested Case Hearing)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this date a copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. mail, postage pre-paid or via State Messenger to the following parties addressed as follows:

DAVID SCHULMEISTER
Cades Schutte LLP
1000 Bishop St., Ste. 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813
ATTORNEY FOR HAWAIIAN
COMMERCIAL & SUGAR
COMPANY (HC&S)

MR. PAUL R. MANCINI, ESQ.
Mancini, Welch & Geiger LLP
33 Lono Avenue, Suite 470
Kahului, HI 96732
ATTORNEY FOR WAILUKU
WATER COMPANY LLC

GILBERT S.C. KEITH-AGARAN
Takitani & Agaran, Law Corporation
24 N. Church Street, Suite 409
Wailuku, HI 96793
ATTORNEY FOR WAILUKU
WATER COMPANY LLC

PAMELA W. BUNN, ESQ.
Paul Johnson Park & Niles
American Savings Bank Tower, Suite 1300
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
ATTORNEY FOR OHA


JANE E. LOVELL, ESQ.
BRIAN T. MOTO, ESQ.
Department of the Corporation Counsel
County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, HI 96793
ATTORNEYS FOR COUNTY OF MAUI
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

D. KAPUA SPROAT, ESQ.
ISAAC H. MORIWAKE, ESQ.
Earthjustice
223 S. King Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, HI 96813
ATTORNEYS FOR HUI O NA WAI EHA

DAVID LOUIE
Attorney General
DONNA KALAMA
Deputy Attorney General
JULIE CHINA
Deputy Attorney General
State of Hawaii
Department of the Attorney General
Land/Transportation Division
465 South King Street, Room 300
Honolulu, HI 96813
(Via State Messenger)

JON M. VAN DYKE
2515 Dole Street
Honolulu, HI 96822
ATTORNEY FOR COUNTY OF MAUI
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

Dated: Honolulu, HI January 3, 2012


KATHY YODA, Commission on Water Resource Management




EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT "B-074"

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

STATE OF HAWAII

PETITION TO AMEND INTERIM INSTREAM
FLOW STANDARDS FOR HONOPOU,
HUELO (PUOLUA), HANEHOI, WAIKAMOI,
ALO, WAHINEPEE, PUOHOKAMOA,
HAIPUAENA, PUNALAU/KOLEA,
HONOMANU, NUAAILUA, PIINAAU,
PALAUHULU, OHIA (WAIANU),
WAIKAMILO, KUALANI, WAILUANUI,
WEST WAILUAIKI, EAST WAILUAIKI,
KOPILIULA, PUAKAA, WAIHUE,
PAAKEA, WAIAAKA, KAPAULA, HANAWI,
and MAKAPII

CASE NO. CCH-MA13-01

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this date a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was duly served, via email to the following, with hard copies to follow via U.S. mail, pursuant to the Minute Order, upon the following individuals as follows:

COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, HI 96809

(via U.S. Mail and
email to: kathy.s.yoda@hawaii.gov)

LAWRENCE MIIKE
c/o the Commission on Water
Resource Management
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, HI 96809
Hearings Officer

(via email to: lhmiike@hawaii.rr.com)

ALAN T. MURAKAMI, ESQ.
CAMILLE K. KALAMA, ESQ.
ASHLEY K. OBREY, ESQ.
SUMMER L. SYLVA, ESQ.
Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation
1164 Bishop Street, Suite 1205
Honolulu, HI 96813
Attorneys for NA MOKU AUPUNI O KO'OLAU HUI

(via email to: alan.murakami@nhlchi.org)
(via email to: camille.kalama@nhlchi.org)
(via email to: ashley.obrey@nhlchi.org)
(via email to: summer.sylva@nhlchi.org)

LINDA L.W. CHOW, ESQ.
Deputy Attorney General

(via email to: linda.l.chow@hawaii.gov)

Department of the Attorney General
State of Hawai'i
465 South King Street, Room 300
Honolulu, HI 96813
Attorney for the COMMISSION ON
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

DAVID SCHULMEISTER, ESQ.
ELIJAH YIP, ESQ.
Cades Schutte, LLP
1000 Bishop Street, Suite 1200
Honolulu, HI 96813
Attorneys for
ALEXANDER & BALDWIN, INC. and
EAST MAUI IRRIGATION COMPANY, LTD.

(via email to: dschulmeister@cades.com)
(via email to: eyip@cades.com)

ROBERT H. THOMAS, ESQ.
Damon Key Leong Kupchak Hastert
1003 Bishop Street
Pauahi Tower, Suite 1600
Honolulu, HI 96813
Attorney for HAWAI'I FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

(via email to: rht@hawaiilawyer.com)

ISAAC D. HALL, ESQ.
2087 Wells Street
Wailuku, HI 96793
Attorney for MAUI TOMORROW

(via email to: idhall@maui.net)

JEFFREY C. PAISNER
403 West 49th Street, #2
New York, NY 10019

(via email to: jeffreypaisner@mac.com)

DATED: Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, January 6, 2017.

PATRICK K. WONG
Corporation Counsel
Attorneys for COUNTY OF MAUI,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY

By



CALEB P. ROWE
KRISTIN K. TARNSTROM
Deputies Corporation Counsel