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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Applicant and Approving Agency

The applicant is Cooper Center Council ("CCC"), a Hawaii non-profit corporation. CCC’s membership consists of several groups who regularly use the Volcanic Community Center facility.\(^1\) CCC is responsible to operate and maintain the County-owned Volcano Community Center facility under a Long Term Cooperative Use Agreement ("Agreement") with the County of Hawaii. This Agreement requires CCC to obtain the approval of the County of Hawaii Department of Parks & Recreation for all capital improvements.\(^2\)

The use of County land and/or funds triggers the environmental review requirements under Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343.\(^3\) The scope of this environmental assessment includes the existing facilities and the proposed facilities that are part of an overall phased master plan for this site.

1.2 Agencies Consulted

The following agencies and organizations were consulted in the process of preparing this environmental assessment or during the public review period of the Draft Environmental Assessment:

* Federal
  U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

---

2. Amendment to Long Term Cooperative Use Agreement by and between the County of Hawaii and Cooper Center Corporation, dated ______, section 2.c.
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U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Services
National Park Service, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park

- State
  Department of Education
    Facilities Planning, Hilo Office
  Kekahalani School
  Department of Health
  Department of Land and Natural Resources
    Chairman
    Division of Historic Preservation
    Water Commission
    Division of Forestry
    Division of Land Management
  Office of State Planning
  Department of Accounting and General Services
- County
  Corporation Counsel
  Planning Department
  Department of Water Supply
  Fire Department
  Police Department
  Department of Parks & Recreation
  Civil Defense
- Community & Environmental Organizations
  Sierra Club
  Cooper Center Council member organizations

2.0 LOCATION, OWNERSHIP, AND SURROUNDING USES

2.1 Location

The site of the proposed action is a 10-acre State-owned parcel located at the corner of Wright and Kilauea Roads in Olaa Summer Lots, Puna District, Hawaii (TMK 1-9-3:17) ("Site"). The Site is located approximately 18 miles from Keaau and approximately 1 mile from the nearest boundary of the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park (see Figure 1, "Vicinity Map," on page 3 and Figure 2, "Location Map," on page 4).
2.2 Ownership

Under Executive Order 3056, dated 13 May 1981, the State set aside the Site for "a community center facility and associated activity area" to be under the control of the County of Hawaii. There is a question whether the existing and proposed facilities fit within the scope of the Executive Order. The status of the Executive Order is discussed in Section 3.8, "Executive Order," on page 36.

In 1988, the County entered into a Long Term Cooperative Use Agreement with the Applicant "to provide increased use of and access to County Parks & Recreation facilities, while lowering County costs for operation and maintenance responsibilities and costs to the regular community users, who form an Organization for the purpose of carrying out the requirements of the long term use agreement."4 Under this agreement, which is essentially a management agreement rather than a lease, the Applicant is responsible to operate, maintain, and fund the operation and maintenance of the facilities on the Site subject to overview by the Department of Parks & Recreation. Although initially intended to encompass just recreational facilities, the Agreement is in the process of amendment to include non-recreational facilities that have been or may be built on the Site that would be under the jurisdiction of agencies other than the Department of Parks & Recreation (e.g., Fire Department). The Department of Parks & Recreation would continue to be the lead coordinating agency.

In short, the State owns the Site but has transferred use rights to the County for specific purposes delineated in the Executive Order. The County has entered into a management agreement with the Applicant. Under the Agreement, the Applicant would operate the facilities and is also authorized to plan capital facilities and to construct such facilities with the approval of the County. All facilities constructed on the Site will be owned by the County, exclusive of furniture and equipment provided by the Applicant.

2.3 Surrounding Uses

Ownership and existing uses of the surrounding land include (see Figure 3, "Tax Map and Surrounding Uses," on page 6):

- North: The right-of-way for the Kilauea Road extension borders the northern boundary of the Site. The State owns several parcels along the Kilauea Road right-of-way extension. Presently, the area is undeveloped ohia forest.

---

4. Long-Term Use Agreement, dated 29 September 1988, by and between the County of Hawaii and Cooper Center Council.
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- East (towards Hilo): The State owns the 27.01-acre parcel to the east of the Site. Presently, the parcel is undeveloped ohia forest. The State has no immediate plans for the parcel.5
- South: A bed-and-breakfast establishment occupies one of the parcels bordering the Site to the south. The owner of this establishment also owns some of the adjacent parcels bordering the southern Site boundary.
- West (towards Hawaii Volcanoes National Park): Wright Road borders the western boundary of the Site. Across the road from the Site are several private residences.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED ACTION

3.1 Existing Uses
The existing uses on the Site include:
- Cooper Center (2,000 s.f.). This single-story wooden structure contains a main meeting hall, several smaller meeting and storage rooms, restrooms, kitchen, and mechanical room. The paved driveway and parking lot also serves as a basketball court.
- Tot Lot and Playground. A tot lot and playground is located adjacent to the facility. Surrounded by ohia trees, the playground has a unique character of being tucked in the woods.
- Fire Station (1,440 s.f.). The fire station, recently completed earlier this year, was designed and constructed entirely with volunteer labor. This 24-hour facility is staffed by volunteers.

The existing Cooper Center improvements and the Fire Station occupy approximately 1.25 acres of the total 10 acres. The balance of the property (88%) is ohia forest.

3.2 Proposed Master Plan
To determine what facilities to include in the master plan, or whether to construct any facilities at all, the Applicant invited the Volcano community to vote

5. Upon consultation with the State Department of Education and the Department of Land & Natural Resources Division of Land Management, it was confirmed that there are no plans for a school on the adjacent 27.01-acre State-owned parcel (TMK 1-9-03:11).
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on the facilities of their choice. Of the over 300 persons who voted, only about 5% voted to not construct any facilities and to keep the Site in its natural state.

The master plan includes those facilities selected by the community (see Figure 4, "Proposed Master Plan," on page 9). These facilities include active recreational facilities, quieter passive recreational facilities that depend on the natural environment, meeting facilities to accommodate a variety of indoor activities, and civic facilities to accommodate governmental services.

Active recreational facilities:
- **Multi-purpose covered court** (100' x 120'). The size is large enough for a basketball/volleyball court. Due to the frequent rains, the court would be covered similar to Mountain View Elementary School.
- **Multi-purpose playfield** (320' x 360'). The size is large enough to accommodate official soccer, football (touch or flag), or baseball configurations (little league, adult softball).
- **Swimming pool** (120' x 100'). The pool should probably be covered, similar to the County pool in Hilo.
- **Tennis courts** (2 @ 60' x 120' each). The two hard-surface tennis courts would be fenced.
- **Additional playground.** The additional playground would be needed in the future to accommodate the growing population in the area.

Passive recreational facilities:
- **Nature trail.** Slightly more than an acre of the existing ohia forest will be left in its natural state with trails established for nature education or a peaceful stroll.
- **Fitness course.** A smooth, possibly paved, course will circumvent the forest, playfield, and tennis courts for jogging or walking. Maintaining a smooth surface is desirable to prevent tripping or twisting of ankles. Fitness stations may be strategically located along the course to do a battery of exercises as part of a varied workout.

6. The voting was held on April 17, 1994 from 8:30am to 5pm at Cooper Center. Anyone ten or older could vote for six choices. The six votes could be applied to one choice or divided. 374 persons voted; 313 were adults over 20 years old.
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Meeting, Gathering, and Entertainment Facilities:

- Community center expansion (2,880 s.f.). The existing Cooper Center community center would be doubled in floor area to provide additional multi-purpose space for gatherings, meetings, youth activities, and other uses.
- Multi-purpose center (11,200 s.f.). This building will be used for dancing lessons, martial arts classes, day care center, and other more active indoor activities that are not appropriate or that cannot be accommodated in the community center.
- Pa hula stage. This covered gazebo-type facility would serve as an outdoor performance stage for hula and other performing arts. The grass lawn fronting the stage serves a double function as a spectator seating area and the subsurface wastewater leaching field (see Section 3.3 below).
- Workshop craft center (3,200 s.f.). This facility will house power tools and other special equipment for crafts and hobbies.

Civic Facilities:

- Police substation. The purpose of the substation is to enable the police officers assigned to the Volcano area to type reports, interview witnesses, or receive complaints without having to travel to and from the Keauhou Police Station. The facility would consist of two witness rooms equipped with telephone, desk, fax and typewriter, a receiving area, and a restroom.

3.3 Infrastructure

Access and Parking. The existing access to Cooper Center is from Wright Road. There are currently 17 parking stalls fronting Cooper Center. The master plan proposes an additional 36 parking stalls to serve the playfield and covered court along with an additional egress outlet. When Kilauea Road is extended, the master plan proposes an additional 60 parking stalls with entry and exit points along the Kilauea Road extension. Covered bicycle parking facilities will also be provided within the parking areas.

Wastewater. The existing toilets in Cooper Center discharge into a cesspool. The master plan proposes toilets near the playfield/covered courts area, toilets with showers at the swimming pool, and toilets in the various buildings as needed (e.g., police substation). All future toilets will discharge into septic tanks. The effluent from the septic tanks will drain into two subsurface leachfields--one located under the playfield and the other under the lawn near the Pa Hula Stage.

Water. There are two existing water tanks next to Cooper Center and a third tank under construction to serve the firehouse. The tanks are filled by rain catchment, except for one of the tanks next to Cooper Center which is filled by
treated tracked-in water to meet Department of Health standards for a kitchen that serves more than 25 people. The master plan proposes additional water tanks to meet the needs of the proposed facilities.

**Drainage.** There are no existing man-made drainage structures on the Site. The master plan proposes to use natural features such as grassed swales and retention basins to encourage infiltration and prevent storm runoff from draining off-site into neighboring properties.

**Electrical and Telephone.** The Site is served by overhead electrical lines along Wright Road.

### 3.4 Need and Objectives for the Proposed Facilities

The proposed recreation and civic facilities will serve a dire need for such facilities. Currently, parents and children living in the vicinity must drive to Hilo or Keaau for soccer games. For basketball, the only facility within walking distance of the homes in the community is the basketball "court" in the parking lot of Cooper Center. Besides being a dangerous conflict with traffic entering or exiting Cooper Center, the noise from the basketball activity disturbs users of the meeting rooms. Without recreational opportunities, the youth in the area often loiter. The frequent rain in the area creates the need for a covered all-purpose outdoor facility.

### 3.5 Timetable and Funding

The construction cost for the master planned facilities will be funded jointly by community fund-raisers and the County. Operational costs are the responsibility of the Cooper Center users.

Recognizing the limited availability of capital funds, the master plan proposes to construct the facilities in the following priority:

1. Covered court and toilet facilities
2. Multi-purpose playfield, nature trails, fitness course
3. Police substation (could be interchanged with priority #2 depending on funding)
4. Cooper Center expansion

The timing of the following facilities depend on the timing of the Kilauea Road extension:

5. Swimming pool
6. Hawaiian Civic Club multi-purpose center and additional playground
7. Pa Hula stage
8. Workshop craft center
9. Tennis courts
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A cost estimate is available only for the first-priority facility--i.e., the covered courts and toilets with limited access and parking. The estimate is approximately $180,000, which includes $50,000 for the design and sitework, $80,000 for the covered court structure, and $50,000 for the toilet facilities and septic system. The County has appropriated $25,000 for the design and initial construction.

Design would start on the first-priority facilities as soon as funds are available; construction would take about 6 months to complete. The full build-out of the master plan is projected to take about 10-20 years.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, & MITIGATION MEASURES

The following discussion on the environmental impacts is organized in three major sections--the physical environmental characteristics, the socio-economic characteristics, and the impact on public facilities, utilities, and services. Under each section, the existing environmental setting is first described, followed by an assessment of the potential impacts, and finally possible mitigation measures, if applicable, are suggested.

4.1 Physical Characteristics

4.1.1 Climate

Setting

The elevation of the Site ranges from approximately 3,660' to 3,680' above mean sea level. Located on the wetter windward side of the island exposed to the orographic rainfall, the mean annual rainfall is about 100" (see Figure 5, "Rainfall Map," on page 15). Generally, the wet months occur from October through April. Mean temperature is approximately 65°F.7

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

None--the project will not alter the microclimate of the area.

4.1.2 Topography & Soils

Setting

The topography of this site is relatively level: there are no steep slopes that exceed 20%. 8

According to the Soil Survey of the Island of Hawaii, 9 the soil on the Site is classified as Keel extremely rocky muck (rKGD) and Puhimau silt loam (rPHB) (see Figure 6, “Soils Map,” on page 15).

- **Keel extremely rocky muck.** The Keel soil consists of well-drained, thin organic soils (less than 10") overlying pahoehoe lava bedrock. Rock outcrops occupy 25 to 50% of the surface. The soil above the lava is rapidly permeable. The pahoehoe lava is very slowly permeable, but water moves rapidly through the cracks. Runoff is medium, and erosion hazard is slight. In their natural state, these soils are always moist. When dried, they have high shrinkage but low swelling capacity (unlike the montmorillonite soils which have high shrink and swell capacity).

- **Puhimau silt loam.** The Puhimau soil consists of shallow, well-drained silt loams that formed in volcanic ash and pumice over pahoehoe lava bedrock. The silt loam layer is about 5" thick, underlain by a sandy loam layer about 8" thick, which in turn is underlain by pahoehoe lava. These soils have low shrink-swell capacity. They dehydrate irreversibly into sand-sized aggregates.

The agricultural suitability ratings for these soils are as follows:

- **Land Study Bureau:** The Land Study Bureau rated the Keel soil Class E (very poor) and the Puhimau soil Class D (poor) in a scale ranging from A (very good) to E (see Figure 7, “Agricultural Suitability Map (Land Study Bureau),” on page 16).

- **Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii (ALISH):** The State Department of Agriculture’s rating system has three categories—prime, unique, and other important agricultural land. The area corresponding to the Puhimau soil rated as “Other Important Agricultural Land”; the area corresponding to the Keel soil was unrated.

- **Soil Survey:** The U.S. Soil Conservation Service rated the Keel soil VIIa (very severe limitations that make them unsuited for cultivation), and the Puhimau soil III (severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require

---

8. Island Survey, Inc. Topographic and Tree Survey Map (contours at 2' intervals, scale at 1"=20'). The map is outdated, but was done prior to any construction on the Site.

special conservation practices, or both) on a scale ranging from I (few limitations) through VIII (extreme limitations).
FIGURE 7. Agricultural Suitability Map (Land Study Bureau)

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Agricultural Suitability. According to the agricultural suitability rating systems, the soils on the Site are not considered prime agricultural land.

Fugitive Dust. The predominant northeasterly trade winds will blow any fugitive dust from construction activities towards the residents across the Site along Wright Road. Dust control measures may be necessary depending on rainfall, soil moisture, the buffering effect of existing vegetation, distance of the construction activities to residents, wind conditions, and other factors. The County may impose dust control requirements through the grading permit, if necessary.

Foundations. Typical soil engineering studies will evaluate and recommend proper foundations for the given soil conditions. The County will verify adequacy of the foundations through the Building Permit.

4.1.3 Natural Hazards

Setting

Floodling. According to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the site is located in Zone X (outside the 500 year flood plain). ¹⁰

Volcanic and Earthquake Hazards. The lava flow hazard zone is Zone 3, comparable to Hilo, on a scale of 1 through 9 (Zone 1 has the most severe hazard) (see Figure 8, “Lava Flow Hazard Map,” on page 18). ¹¹

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

None— the proposed project is not located within any hazardous zone.

¹⁰ Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Panel 1100C (panel not printed since the entire area is in Zone X), May 16, 1994.
4.1.4 Flora/Fauna

Setting

The Site is within the windward montane rain forest vegetation zone characterized by a dominance of ohia and tree fern. Based on a plant and bird survey of the Site (see Appendix A), it can be concluded that although the Site is a habitat for several native plants, birds, and invertebrates, the Site is not an intact native ecosystem. The Site has been degraded by the widespread invasion of introduced plant species and the degradation of the native understory most likely by feral pigs. No endangered species were encountered in the survey.

The Site is a habitat for two native forest birds—the apapane and omao. The apapane is abundant on all the main islands, and especially Hawaii island. The omao is not as widespread as the apapane but has a secure population on this island.12
Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Except for approximately one acre that will remain for the nature trail, the proposed facilities will require clear-cutting the existing forest—a direct, unavoidable adverse impact. The adversity of this unavoidable impact, however, needs to be weighed against: the unavailability of viable alternative sites (see Section 6.2, “Alternative Sites,” on page 38); countervailing socioeconomic benefits (see Section 4.2, “Socioeconomic Characteristics,” on page 23); the relative insignificance of the site as a habitat compared to more pristine examples in the vicinity (e.g., Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Olai Forest Reserve); and the governmental land use policies which designated the Site for agricultural (a clear-cutting activity) or community center use (see Section 5.2, “State Land Use Law,” on page 29).

Although the following mitigation measures will not reduce the magnitude of the clear-cutting impacts, they will minimize the impact on the remaining one-acre forest and hopefully foster an awareness and appreciation of the native forest that would in a sense compensate for the loss of the forest resource:

- Develop the nature trail with a boardwalk or other all-weather surface to prevent the widening of the trail that would otherwise be caused by detouring pathways around muddy areas;
- Monitor the invasion of introduced species and aggressively weed them;
- Restore the remaining forest as much as possible with a replanting program of appropriate native species;
- Initiate a nature education program for youths and adults, possibly with the assistance of Keakealani School, to understand and appreciate the native forest ecosystem;
- Landscape with appropriate native plants as much as possible;
- Use the fallen logs for woodworking or firewood, rather than disposing at a landfill; compost as much as possible the other cleared vegetation.

4.1.5 Historic/Archaeological Resources

Setting

The project site is not listed nor eligible for listing on the National or State Register of Historic Places based on field observation (to determine presence of piled stone features or other structures indicative of potential archaeological or historic sites) and consultation with the Division of Historic Sites.¹²

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

None—however, the construction contract should contain a standard clause to require the contractor to stop and inform the Division of Historic Sites and/or the Planning Department in the event possible archaeological remains are uncovered during the course of construction.

4.1.6 Water Resources

Setting

Streams. Based on the U.S. Geological Survey topographic map and field observations, there are no known streams on or within the vicinity of the Site.

Wetlands. Based on the wetlands inventory map prepared by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and field observations, there are no known wetlands on the Site.

Wells and Groundwater. The groundwater is part of the Olaa aquifer system of the Southeast Mauna Loa sector with the Kilauea rift zone as its southern boundary causing the groundwater to move northeast. The basal groundwater underlying the Site is not a developable drinking source due to its depth. There are no production wells located within 1000 feet of the Site as confirmed by consultation with the Department of Land and Natural Resources Division of Water and Land Development. The nearest wells are three non-production wells (2 observation wells, 1 sealed) located approximately 5,000' to the north of the Site and County drinking wells approximately 17 miles to the southeast.


14. U.S. Geological Survey topographic map, Volcano quadrangle (scale 1:24,000). Field observations did not detect any defined bed or channel nor any aquatic indicator species that meet the definition of “stream” under the State Water Code (Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 174C).

15. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, Volcano quadrangle. The field observations did not detect any of the features included in the following criteria used by the Fish & Wildlife Service to identify wetlands: 1) at least periodically, the land supports predominantly hydrophytes, 2) the substrate is mainly undrained hydric soil, and 3) the substrate is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year. Cowardin, et al, 1977. Classification of Wetlands and Deep-Water Habitats of the United States.


17. Telephone conversation with the Water Resources Management Information Center on June 16, 1994 who checked their Wells Inventory Map for the Volcano quadrangle.
Recognizing the pollution potential of subsurface wastewater disposal to groundwater, the State Department of Health (DOH) has identified vulnerable areas on their Critical Wastewater Disposal Areas Map where cesspools are controlled. The Site is located in a zone that prohibits cesspools on lots less than one acre. DOH also controls subsurface disposal of wastes via injection wells by designation of an underground injection control (UIC) line. A common type of injection well is a deep drywell for stormwater disposal. The Site is located inland of the UIC line, meaning that if drywells are used for stormwater disposal, and these drywells are designed to be considered injection wells, then the impacts of these drywells on the groundwater would be evaluated under the Department of Health’s underground injection control (UIC) permit program. For injection wells located inland of the UIC line, the DOH regulations require public notice of the UIC application.\(^{18}\)

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Since there are no streams or wetlands in the vicinity, there will be no impact to these resources. A potential groundwater pollution source is the onsite wastewater disposal system; however, potential impact to groundwater quality would be mitigated by compliance with the DOH regulations relating to the design and operation of wastewater systems.\(^{19}\)

### 4.1.7 Air Quality

**Setting**

The entire State of Hawaii is located within an attainment area (meets federal ambient air quality standards), as defined in the Clean Air Act, in accordance with the State Implementation Plan.\(^{20}\) The project is not exposed to any significant pollutant source such as a power plant, sugar mill, or major traffic thoroughfare.

**Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

No impacts--the project will not have any stationary sources of air pollution nor will it generate significant additional traffic to increase the automobile-related emissions (SO\(_2\)) in the vicinity.

---

4.1.8 Noise

Setting
Potentially noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the Site include several residences along Wright Road and a bed-and-breakfast establishment on the neighboring property nearest to the proposed location of the playfield.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Construction Noise. Noise from construction equipment will occur during the day and is a short-term, temporary impact that will cease upon completion of construction. The construction documents should contain working time limitations to mitigate disturbance to the neighboring residents.

Operational Noise. Compared to the quiet of the existing conditions, the noise from the outdoor facilities, particularly the playfield and covered court, will be significant. Proposed mitigation measures include: 1) maintaining a minimum buffer of 20' between the property line and the edge of the playfield and covered court; and 2) restricting activities to daytime hours and not installing lights. These measures should mitigate impacts to acceptable levels.

4.1.9 Scenic Resources

Setting
The General Plan did not identify any significant natural beauty areas in the vicinity of the Site.21 The existing ohia forest, characteristic of the area, is a scenic resource. Because of its ubiquity, however, and the existence of finer examples (e.g., Hawaii Volcanoes National Park), ohia forests in general are not specially protected under law as a scenic resource.

Impact and Mitigation Measures
Since the ohia is a signature characteristic of this area, the landscaping plan should retain as much of the existing trees as possible. The ohia trees bordering the existing playground should be preserved to retain the special woodland character.

4.2 Socioeconomic Characteristics

Setting
The 1990 Census defined an area called the Volcano Census Designated Place ("CDP"), which roughly corresponds to the service area of the proposed facilities. This CDP straddled the Puna and Kau Districts and included the following subdivisions: Volcano (including Cymbidium Acres), Royal Hawaiian Estates, Hawaiian Orchid Isle Estates, Ohio Estates, Mauna Loa Estates, and Country Club Estates. Only the Country Club Estates is within the Kau District. The discussion within this section discusses the portion of the Volcano CDP within the Puna District.

Selected 1990 Census population and housing characteristics for the Volcano CDP (Puna District) are summarized, respectively, in Table 1 on page 24 and Table 2 on page 25. From these tables, the following characteristics pertinent to the proposed project are noted:

- The total population in 1990 was 1,474. This population is approximately 10% of the potential population of this area assuming 100% occupancy of all existing lots at 3 persons per lot. According to building permit statistics, growth is over 5% per year, indicating a doubling every 10 years.22
- At a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 population,23 the existing population could justify 75% of the full 10-acre build-out of the proposed community park. The proposed facilities would not be adequate for the potential future population.
- The average household size is 2.44 persons, which is slightly smaller than the Countywide average of 2.86 persons.
- Nearly half of the households (49%) are married-couple families; the Countywide percentage is 57%. The other households are single-parent families or persons living alone. Recent new residents are predominantly young families.
- Minors under 18 years of age comprise 28% (415 persons) of the total population. The median age is 36 years. The elderly population (over 65 years) comprises 12% of the total population.
- Approximately 67% of the households own their own home; the other 33% are renters. The relatively high proportion of homeowners is indicative of the stability and commitment of the population to the area.

- Approximately 16% of the total housing units (857 units) are for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use. This transient portion of the population are not likely users of the proposed facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>1990:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17 years</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 20 years</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 24 years</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 64 years</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 years</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 1: Selected Population Characteristics for the Volcano CDP (Puna): 1990 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other races</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households by type:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in households</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per household</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per family</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households (families)</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple families</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total households</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family, male household</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family, female household</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total households</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder living alone</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table 2: Selected Housing Characteristics for the Volcano CDP (Puna): 1990 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy &amp; tenure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent owner-occupied</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per owner-occupied unit</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. Selected Housing Characteristics for the Volcano CDP (Puna): 1990 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner vacancy rate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental vacancy rate</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified owner-occupied units</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (dollars)</td>
<td>88,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract rent:

| Specified renter-occupied units paying cash rent | 160 |
| Less than $250                                  | 34  |
| $250 to $499                                    | 101 |
| $500 to $749                                    | 23  |
| $750 to $999                                    | 2   |
| $1,000 or more                                 | 0   |
| Median (dollars)                                | 377 |

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The project will have significant beneficial socioeconomic impacts:

- Recreational opportunities will be significantly expanded for residents of all ages in the area;
- Facilities and programs for the youth will provide physical outlets, athletic opportunities, and learning/growing opportunities that would keep them occupied and away from drugs and crime;
ENVIROMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, & MITIGATION MEASURES

- Limited County funds would be minimized and leveraged by community fundraisers;
- Public safety would be considerably improved with the new firehouse and the proposed police substation;
- The presence of a fire station within five miles may influence the availability and premium rates for property insurance of the residents and businesses in the area.

4.3 Public Facilities, Utilities, and Services

The following discussion evaluates whether the proposed facilities will require expansion or improvements to public (or quasi-public) facilities or services.

4.3.1 Roads

Wright Road is a County-owned, 2-lane road with a 50' right-of-way. This road has adequate capacity to accommodate the projected traffic volume generated by the project. No improvements to the road or intersections would be required. The location of the proposed ingress/egress points would require a driveway permit from the Department of Public Works to ensure safe exits and proper construction.24

4.3.2 Water System

The County's Keana-Mt. View water system services Keana Village to Glenwood. There are no plans to extend the system to the Volcano area.25 Since the County water system does not extend to the Volcano area, the project will not have any impact on the County water system. Adequate water catchment tanks would be provided for domestic and fire-fighting purposes.

4.3.3 Wastewater System

Since the County sewer system does not extend to the Volcano area, the project will not have any impact on the County wastewater disposal system. Individual on-site septic systems with leachfields will be used.

4.3.4 Drainage System

Any increase in stormwater volume resulting from the project will be disposed within the property boundaries by retention basins or drywells; there will be no increased discharge to neighboring properties or County roads.

24. The requirements for the driveway permit can be found in Hawaii County Code §§22-59 to 59.
25. Megumi Kon, Inc., see note 16 on page 20, at p. 2-8 and Fig. 1.2-1.
RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

4.3.5 Solid Waste
Cooper Center presently serves as a drop-off area for recyclable materials. This practice beneficially impacts the County solid waste facilities by diverting waste that would otherwise be disposed at the transfer station and ultimately at the landfill.

4.3.6 Electrical/Telephone
HELCO and Hawaiian Telephone have adequate capacity to service the proposed project from the existing overhead lines along Wright Road.

4.3.7 Recreation
The project will have a beneficial impact by expanding the inventory of County recreational facilities in a cost-effective manner since the community will partially fund the capital costs and totally fund operations.

4.3.8 Police and Fire
The project will expand the capabilities of the County police and fire services by providing a police substation for the convenience of the police officers at minimal or no cost to the County. The expanded fire protection services is made possible by the community-built firehouse and volunteer fire-fighting force.

4.3.9 Civil Defense
If deemed necessary by the County Civil Defense, the proposed facilities could be designed to also function as a public shelter.

5.0 RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

5.1 State Plan
The project conforms with the following State Plan objectives and policies:

Objective and policies for socio-cultural advancement–leisure:

(a) Planning for the State's socio-cultural advancement with regard to leisure shall be directed towards the achievement of the objective of the adequate provision of resources to accommodate diverse cultural, artistic, and recreational needs for present and future generations.

(b) To achieve the leisure objective, it shall be the policy of this State to:

(1) Foster and preserve Hawaii's multi-cultural heritage through supportive cultural, artistic, recreational, and humanities-oriented programs and activities.

(2) Provide a wide range of activities and facilities to fulfill the cultural, artistic, and recreation needs of all diverse and special groups effectively and efficiently.
(3) Enhance the enjoyment of recreational experiences through safety measures, educational opportunities, and improved facility design and maintenance.

(4) Promote the recreational and educational potential of natural resources having scenic, open space, cultural, historical, geological, or biological values while ensuring that their inherent values are preserved.

(5) Ensure opportunities for everyone to use and enjoy Hawaii’s recreational resources.

(6) Assure the availability of sufficient resources to provide for future cultural, artistic, and recreational needs.

(7) Provide adequate and accessible physical fitness programs to promote the physical and mental well-being of Hawaii’s people.

(8) Increase opportunities for appreciation and participation in the creative arts, including the literary, theatrical, visual, musical, folk, and traditional art forms.

(9) Encourage the development of creative expression in the artistic disciplines to enable all segments of Hawaii’s population to participate in the creative arts.

(10) Assure adequate access to significant natural and cultural resources in public ownership.26

The proposed master plan conforms with the State Plan policies:

- The proposed facilities provide for the leisure needs of all ages—from children (tot lot, playground, civic/day care facility), to youths (athletic opportunities provided by the playfield, covered court, swimming pool, tennis courts, as well as other programs carried on in the multi-purpose community center), to the elderly (e.g., multi-purpose civic club facility, workshop facility, fitness course).

- The proposed facilities provide diverse opportunities including physical, cultural (pa hula stage), educational, passive (nature trail), and artistic (e.g., workshop facility).

- The nature trail and landscaping will promote the recreational and educational values of the rain forest habitat.

5.2 State Land Use Law

The State Land Use classification for the Site is Agriculture. The State Land Use Law permits “open area types of recreational uses including day camps, picnic grounds, parks, and riding stables, but not including dragstrips, airports, drive-in theaters, golf courses, golf driving ranges, country clubs, and overnight camps” in the Agricultural district.27 The playfield, playgrounds, and nature trails are clearly permitted uses. The other more structural recreational facilities are partially or entirely enclosed and arguably not “open area” types of recre-

TERNAL USES (i.e., covered court, swimming pool, pa hula stage, community center and expansion, civic club building, workshop).

For non-recreational public uses, such as a police substation, the State Land Use Law permits:

Public, private, and quasi-public utility lines and roadways, transformer stations, communications equipment buildings, solid waste transfer stations, major water storage tanks, and appurtenant small buildings such as booster pumping stations, but not including offices or yards for equipment, material, vehicle storage, repair or maintenance, or treatment plants, or corporation yards, or other like structures. 28

Whether a police substation and firehouse fit with the general intent of the above provision is open for interpretation by the counties. Hawaii County permits public buildings in all zoning districts, provided that the use conforms with the General Plan. 29

If the County Planning Department determines that the proposed recreational and civic buildings are not specifically permitted in the Agricultural district under the State Land Use Law, then these uses would require a Special Permit. 30 Special Permit applications that involve less than 15 acres, such as the subject project, are approved by the County Planning Commission; if greater than 15 acres, the final decisionmaker is the State Land Use Commission.

5.3 Hawaii County General Plan
The General Plan Land Use Policy & Guidance (LUPAG) Map designation for the Site is Intensive Agriculture (see Figure 9 on page 31). Although the proposed project is not an agricultural use, the project nevertheless is consistent with the following policies espoused by the General Plan:

**Recreation**

**Goals:**

*Provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities for the residents and visitors of the County.*

*Maintain the natural beauty of recreation areas.*

*Provide a diversity of environments for active and passive pursuits.*

**Policies:**

29. Hawaii County Code §25-51(c).
- Recreational facilities in the County shall reflect the natural, historic, and cultural character of the area.
- Facilities for compatible multiple uses shall be provided.
The County shall provide facilities and a broad recreational program for all age groups, with special considerations for the handicapped, the elderly, and young children.

The County shall coordinate recreational programs and facilities with governmental and private agencies and organizations. Innovative ideas for improving recreational facilities and opportunities shall be considered.

The County shall develop local citizen leadership and participation in recreation planning, maintenance and programming.

Standards:

Community Parks

Community recreation area serving a 1 mile radius in urban areas, and entire community in rural areas. Provide active and passive activities.

Between 4 and 8 acres, within the center of the community or several neighborhoods.

Facilities include: recreation building with multi-purpose room, office, storage, restrooms and parkkeeper’s room; swimming pool; gymnasium (where not serviceable from a district park); courts for basketball, volleyball and tennis; ballfields for softball/ baseball, soccer, football; play area and equipment for young children; walking and jogging paths; picnic and passive area; night lights and adequate defined parking area.

Community Center

Major center for spectator sports and for cultural and social activities.

Size depends on facilities proposed and accessory uses.

Facilities include: multipurpose building; auditorium; gymnasium; facilities for spectator sports; swimming facility; and adequate and defined parking area.\(^{21}\)

The proposed project conforms with the Recreation goals and policies of the General Plan. The facilities will provide a wide variety of recreational opportunities for the residents—physical as well as cultural, active as well as passive, for all age groups. A portion of the existing rain forest will remain for a nature trail to maintain the natural beauty of the area. A most distinctive feature of this project is the leadership role of Cooper Center Council and the active participation of the community in this project which serve as a model for the innovative provision of community facilities through long-term cooperative use agreements.

Land Use

Goals:

- Designate and allocate land uses in appropriate proportions and mix and in keeping with the social, cultural, and physical environments of the County.
- Protect and encourage the intensive utilization of the County’s important agricultural lands.
- Protect and preserve forest, water, natural and scientific reserves and open areas.

\(^{21}\) General Plan, Hawaii County, Ordinance 89-142 §4.K.
RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

Policies:

- Allocate appropriate requested zoning in accordance with the existing or projected needs of neighborhood, community, region and County.
- The County shall encourage the development and maintenance of communities meeting the needs of its residents in balance with the physical and social environment.  

The area designated for the project (10 acre parcel) conforms with the General Plan standard for community parks. Because the site is not prime agricultural land nor is it a forest reserve, the use of the Site for the proposed use does not conflict with the land use policies.

Public Facilities

Goal:
Encourage the provision of public facilities that effectively service community needs and seek ways of improving public service through better and more functional facilities which are in keeping with the environmental and aesthetic concerns of the community.

Policies:
- The County shall continue to seek ways of improving public service through the coordination of service and by maximizing the use of personnel and facilities.
- The County shall coordinate with appropriate State agencies for the provision of public facilities to serve the needs of the community.

The use of the Site has required the coordination of the State, County, and community resulting in improved public safety facilities such as a firehouse and police substation.

5.4 Puna Community Development Plan

The Puna Community Development Plan draft is under review by the Planning Department and not yet available for general public review.

5.5 Hawaii County Zoning Code

The Site is zoned Open (see Figure 10 on page 34). The nature of the proposed uses presents several alternative interpretations that will require a determination by the planning director. Public parks are permitted uses in this zoning district. The planning director will need to determine whether all proposed facilities in the master plan are encompassed by the term "public parks." If

32. General Plan, Hawaii County, Ordinance 89-142 §4.M.
33. General Plan, Hawaii County, Ordinance 89-142 §4.J.
construed to not meet the definition, the proposed facilities may need a Use Permit for a "major recreational use".

FIGURE 10. Zoning Map

35. The Use Permit requirements are specified in Hawaii County Code §35-28 to -29.
Alternatively, those facilities that do not fall under "public parks" could be permitted as "community, public, or public service" buildings which are permitted in all districts provided they conform with the General Plan.\(^\text{36}\) Whether permitted outright or through a Use Permit, the proposed use will require Plan Approval.\(^\text{37}\) Because height limits and yard setback requirements in the Open district are specified through Plan Approval, it is recommended that the conceptual master plan be submitted for preliminary Plan Approval prior to expending time and money on more detailed design.

### 5.6 Coastal Zone Management and Special Management Area

The project is located outside of the Special Management Area; therefore, a Special Management Area Permit is not applicable to the project. All actions within the State must comply with the objectives and policies of the Coastal Zone Management Act.\(^\text{38}\) Since most of the policies are oriented to shoreline resources, the only policies applicable to the project relate to controls on non-point source pollution:

- Control development in areas subject to storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, subsidence, and point and nonpoint source pollution hazards.\(^\text{39}\)

Two potential sources of non-point source pollution include: 1) wastewater leachate from the individual onsite wastewater systems and 2) erosion/sedimentation during construction. Design of the wastewater system will be in accordance with DOH regulations to prevent groundwater pollution as discussed previously in Section 4.1.6, "Water Resources," on page 20 (groundwater can transport pollutants as it flows and eventually discharges to the ocean). Erosion and sedimentation is controlled by the County's grading ordinance.\(^\text{40}\) In addition, the project would also require a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the State DOH if grading exceeds 5 acres. Since the project will be phased into components less than 5 acres, this permit would not likely apply to the project.

\(^{36}\) Hawaii County Code §25-51(e).

\(^{37}\) Plan Approval requirements are specified in Hawaii County Code §25-241 to -244.

\(^{38}\) Hawaii Revised Statutes §205A-4(b) (Supp. 1992). The "coastal zone management area" is defined as "all lands of the State and the area extending from the shoreline to the limits of the State's police power..." Hawaii Revised Statutes §205A-1 (Supp. 1993).


\(^{40}\) Hawaii County Code Chapter 10.
5.7 UFAS Compliance

All plans and specifications for the construction of any State or County building must be prepared so the building is accessible to and usable by the physically handicapped.\(^\text{41}\) Since the facilities on the Site are County-owned, even if partially or entirely funded by community donations, the facilities must conform to the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS), 41 C.F.R. \$101-19.6, Appendix A. To ensure compliance, the County should send the construction plans and specifications to the Commission on Persons with Disabilities for review and advice.

5.8 Executive Order

By Executive Order 3056 dated 13 May 1981, then-Governor George Ariyoshi set aside the Site for the following public purpose:

> For a community center facility and associated activity area to be under the control of the County of Hawaii and to be designated as the Volcano Community Activity Center situated at Ona, Puna, Island of Hawaii ... (emphasis added).

The State has raised concerns that the non-recreational facilities (i.e., firehouse and police substation) are not normally associated with a "community center" and therefore exceed the scope of the Executive Order. To accommodate the proposed facilities in the master plan, the State will work with the County to cancel Executive Order 3056 and issue a new Executive Order that would permit a broader scope of activities to include recreational and civic facilities.\(^\text{42}\) This environmental assessment provides the State, County, and other interested parties an opportunity to review and approve the proposed master plan for the Site, while also satisfying the environmental review requirements of Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343, as a condition for replacing the current Executive Order.

5.9 Other Permits and Approvals

Other applicable permits include the County grading and building permits. Table 3 below summarizes the permits and approvals applicable to the project.

\(^{41}\) Hawaii Revised Statutes \$103-50.

\(^{42}\) Consultation with the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Land Management, Hawaii District Land Agent on June 2, 1994.
### ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

#### TABLE 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit or Approval</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Approving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE OF HAWAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground Injection Control (possibly)</td>
<td>HAR Chap. 11-23</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Systems Approval</td>
<td>HAR Chap. 11-62</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order (new)</td>
<td>HRS §171-11</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Facilities Accessibility Standards (UFAS)</td>
<td>HRS §103-50</td>
<td>Commission on Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY OF HAWAI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Permit (possibly)</td>
<td>PC Rule 6</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Permit (possibly; not necessary if Special Permit applies)</td>
<td>HCC §25-28; PC Rule 7</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Approval</td>
<td>HCC Chap. 25, Article 20</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveway Permit</td>
<td>HCC §22-60</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Permit</td>
<td>HCC Chap. 10</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>HCC Chap. 5</td>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRS= Hawaii Revised Statutes  
HAR= Hawaii Administrative Rules  
HCC= Hawaii County Code  
PC= Rules of Practice and Procedure, Planning Commission, County of Hawaii  

---

### 6.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

#### 6.1 No Action

If the master plan is not approved or implemented, the significant adverse impacts that would be avoided include clear-cutting the forest and the increased
noise from the outdoor recreational activities. On the other hand, the significant socio-economic benefits resulting from the proposed facilities would be foregone, such as the increased recreational opportunities for the residents of all ages, the youth programs to provide more meaningful leisure alternatives for this vulnerable age group, and the enhanced police services. The residents of the area will have to rely on facilities in Mountain View, Keau, or Hilo for active recreation (e.g., ballfields, gymnasiums, swimming, tennis). The existing community center, playground, and firehouse would be the only facilities on the Site.

6.2 Alternative Sites

The primary alternative site considered was Keakealani School, a public school administratively part of Mountain View Elementary School. Keakealani School consists of 3.15 acres (TMK 1-9-4:19). This school is used exclusively for outdoor education. Any public school in the State may request to participate in the school’s programs. The programs include overnight stays, day trips, and special classroom programs conducted away from Keakealani.

Keakealani has a playfield. As an alternative to developing the Site, joint use of Keakealani’s playfield by the school and community was considered. This alternative is not viable for the following reasons:

• Joint use is nearly impossible during the school year due to the intensive classroom use. Because of the overnight stays, there are no “after-school” hours where the playfield would be available.

• If joint use were permitted while students were staying at the school, there would be increased potential for conflicts (e.g., fights, theft, vandalism) with no clear delineation of liability (i.e., whether the State, County, or other party).

• Feasibility studies would need to be conducted to determine the possibility and cost to provide the necessary upgrading to allow joint use. Required minimum improvements would include additional parking, expanding the playfield to official size to allow sanctioned little league games, and restrooms.

• The site is too small to accommodate all the facilities proposed in the master plan.

• The school site was donated to the State specifically for educational purposes. There may be deed restrictions that would need to be researched and cleared, if necessary, to allow community recreational uses.

43 According to the annual report for the 1992-93 school year, there were only 3 weeks in which the Keakealani facilities were not being used (not counting the last two weeks in December for Christmas break). Summary of Activities for 1992-1993: Keakealani Outdoor Education Center, June 10, 1993.
There were no other alternative sites that were already cleared and would therefore not involve clear-cutting forest land, that were available to the community at no or minimal cost, and that were centrally located.

6.3 Alternative Site Plans

The proposed master plan represents the maximum build-out of the Site. To reduce the extent of clear-cutting, some of the proposed facilities could be deleted by consolidating certain facilities (e.g., consolidate the multi-purpose center with the community center and the tennis courts with the multi-purpose courts). As much as possible, the unbuilt areas could be left as is to create strips of forests between structures. As the master plan is fine-tuned and/or periodically updated, this alternative of minimizing structures by consolidating functions should be considered.

7.0 DETERMINATION WITH SUPPORTING FINDINGS AND REASONS

The proposed facilities are not expected to cause significant impacts to the environment, pursuant to the significance criteria established by the Environmental Council as discussed below. Therefore, the determination is to issue a negative declaration.

The proposed project will not involve an irrevocable commitment to loss or destruction to any natural or cultural resources. The project will clear-cut most of the existing forest on the Site. However, this unavoidable impact is outweighed by the socioeconomic benefits arising from the project, the lack of viable alternatives, and the land use allocation designations that intended the Site to be used for agricultural or community use while preserving the more pristine forest areas in the vicinity as part of the Oahu Forest Reserve. The Site does not have prime agricultural soils.

The proposed project will not curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment. The surrounding uses are zoned for agricultural or residential uses. The proposed project meets an urgent need of this growing community, especially the needs of the idle youth in the community. The proposed project will engender, rather than curtail, beneficial uses of the Site and surrounding developing area.

The proposed project will not conflict with the State’s long-term environmental policies. The proposed project is consistent with the long-term environmental policies expressed in Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 344 in that the project

44. Hawaii Administrative Rules, §11-200-12.
Determination with Supporting Findings and Reasons

will promote a sense of community and provide internal opportunities for recreation that would reduce the dependency on automobile trips for certain recreational purposes.45

The proposed project will not involve substantial secondary impacts, such as population changes or effects on public facilities. The project will provide public facilities in response to the needs of the existing and projected population; the project is a reaction to existing and projected population growth trends rather than an inducement of further population growth. The project will not require significant improvements to public infrastructure such as roads, water, or wastewater facilities.

The proposed project will not involve a substantial degradation of environmental quality. There will be no significant degradation of air or water quality. Landscaping will utilize the existing vegetation and native plants as much as possible.

The proposed project will not substantially affect any rare, threatened or endangered species of flora or fauna or habitat. The site is not a known habitat for endangered or threatened flora or fauna species.

The proposed project will not detrimentally affect air or water quality or ambient noise levels. The proposed project will not produce any air emissions. Wastewater flows will be disposed via approved septic treatment systems. The drainage system will be designed in compliance with county and state regulations to protect the groundwater quality and not adversely impact downstream properties. Sitework will be in accordance with grading permit conditions to minimize erosion, non-point source pollution, and dust. Noise levels will be mitigated through setbacks, landscaping, and restricting night outdoor activities.

The proposed project is not located in an environmentally sensitive area (e.g., flood plain, tsunami zone, coastal area). The project is not located within the 100-year flood plain or other environmentally sensitive area.

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Design Phase:
• Conduct soil engineering studies to determine proper design for foundations, drainage, and onsite individual wastewater system.
• Design nature trail with a boardwalk or other appropriate surface.
• Retain as much as the existing vegetation as possible; landscape with native plants as much as possible.

45. Hawaii Revised Statutes §344-3(C) and -4(8)(B).
• Maintain a buffer between the playfield/covered court and the adjacent private property to mitigate noise.
• Restrict night lights at the playfield and covered court, as well as other outdoor proposed facilities as necessary to control noise.
• Maintain a border of the existing ohia trees around the existing playground to preserve the unique woodland character.
• If deemed necessary by the Civil Defense, design facilities to serve as public shelters.
• Clarify with the Planning Department whether the project will require a Special Permit or Use Permit.
• Obtain applicable permits and approvals.
• Have plans reviewed by the Commission on Persons with Disabilities.

Construction Phase:
• Include a standard clause in the construction contract for the contractor to stop work and inform the Division of Historic Sites in the event possible archaeological remains are uncovered.
• Limit construction to standard work hours to minimize noise disturbance to neighboring residents.
• Implement dust control, as required.
• Use the fallen logs for woodworking or firewood, rather than disposing at the landfill; compost other debris.

Operational Phase:
• Monitor the invasion of introduced species into the nature trail area and aggressively weed them.
• Restore the remaining forest as much as possible with a replanting program using appropriate native species.
• Initiate or promote a nature education program for youths, possibly in coordination with Keakealani School to understand and appreciate the surrounding native rain forest.
8.0 REFERENCES

Reports


Laws, Ordinances, Resolutions, Administrative Rules


*Hawaii County Code*, Chapter 25 (Zoning).

County of Hawaii, *General Plan*, Ordinance No. 89-142 (An Ordinance Adopting the County of Hawaii General Plan and Repealing Ordinance No. 439, as amended).
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Introduction

The purposes of the study were 1) to determine the relative intactness of the native ohia forest within the project site; 2) determine the presence/absence of any endangered or threatened plant or avifauna species within the limits of the survey methodology; and 3) establish a baseline that could possibly be used to monitor the impacts of the proposed action on the native forest. The survey was conducted on the morning of May 7, 1994.

Survey Method

Species List. Within the approximately 147m x 300m project site, four transects were laid out each 35m apart running in a north-south direction (see Figure 1). Along each transect, species lists were produced at stations spaced 50m apart. Canopy height was estimated to the nearest 5 meters.

Cover-Abundance Estimate. At transect 3-station 2 and transect 4-station 4, a Braun-Blanquet cover assessment was conducted in a 20m x 20m plot. The Braun-Blanquet cover-abundance scale is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Abundance</th>
<th>Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>any number</td>
<td>&gt; 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>any number</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>any number</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>any number</td>
<td>5-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>numerous</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>small cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>solitary</td>
<td>small cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The upper four scale values (5, 4, 3, 2) refer only to cover, while the lower three scale values are primarily estimates of abundance. This combination recognizes the practical fact that "abundance can be estimated with some precision only for herb and shrub layer species with little or insignificant crown or shoot cover. Cover can be estimated more accurately only for species that contribute significantly to the biomass of the community."

Bird Counts. An eight minute bird count was also conducted at the same stations as the Braun-Blanquet estimates. Detections were made either visually or by listening for vocalizations. The Braun-Blanquet and bird count sites were chosen because one of the stations (station 3-2) would represent an area to be clearcut, and the other station (4-4) would represent an area to be preserved. The information may be useful in monitoring impacts during and after site development.

Results and Discussion

A species list by transect station is summarized in the attached Table 1. No endangered, threatened, or

candidate species were encountered.

Avifauna

The common apapane is attracted to the mature stands of ohia ranging in height from 15 to 20 meters. They were quite plentiful throughout the survey and utilized the canopy where the lehua were in bloom. The two stations at which counts were done indicate a healthy population. Clear cutting the area for the proposed facilities would leave approximately an acre of forest bird habitat for the nature trail area.

The only other native bird detected was the omao. The understory of the VCC parcel does not appear to be able to support birds which rely on insects normally found on native shrubs and subcanopy trees. This is reflective of the amount of alien species encountered.

Vegetation

The ohia forest appears to be of similar age with no evidence of dieback. The VCC parcel sits on the same lava flow as the Olua Tract of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park in which dieback does occur (Tunison, 1994). There is a high probability that human disturbance occurred within the VCC area to have caused this situation. Nearby areas do have older and larger ohia trees.

The understory appears devoid of native shrubs and herb type plants. There is a large amount of litter over most of the parcel. It is possible that before the VCC was constructed and the area used more, that feral pigs could have contributed significantly to this clearing and degradation of the understory. There appears to be much human activity behind the VCC, evidenced by foot trails and machete marks.

If the nature trail is constructed, it may be wise to use concrete or asphalt (which has its negative aspects), or a wooden boardwalk. With the amount of rainfall (100"/year) in this closed canopy forest, an undeveloped nature trail would soon turn muddy and remain so for most of the year. This would lead to widening of the trail by use of adjacent non-mud areas. Along with appropriate education, weed invasion should be kept to a minimum or at least easily monitored.

Clear cutting would also open the canopy and enhance the invasion of weed species. Species already there may become dominant around the fringes and new species would likely be found as people and implements move through the area.

References


| Scientific Name | Common or Hawaiian Name | Transcet Stations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| * Hedychium gardnerianum | * kahili ginger | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| * Hypericum multiflorum | impalions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Impatiens wallerana | impalions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Klythia beeinfida | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Pimeleia clandestinum | * kikuyu | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Phalacra tananikawaea | Chinese ground orchid | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Rubus argutus | blackberry | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Rubus eligosus | himalayan raspberry | x | x | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Tibouchina urelliana | glairybush | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Torenia crocosmiflora | | | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Litter | | | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BIRDS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Himantone sanguinea | * japane | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Myiastes obtusus | * omao | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| * Cardinalis cardinalis | N. American cardinal | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Carpodacus mexicanus | house finch | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Zosterops japonicas | * Japanese white-eye | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |

* Introduced species  

1bm = canopy height  

* Braun-Blanquet and bird count stations
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COMMENTS & RESPONSES
TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
COMMENTS & RESPONSES

The 30-day public review period for the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) commenced with the July 23, 1994 OEQC Bulletin publication date and ended on August 22, 1994. The Applicant consulted or sent the Draft EA to the agencies listed in §1.2 of the Final EA. Those who sent comments during the 30-day comment period are listed below and copies of the letters are included in this Appendix. Most of the comments were not substantive (i.e., the comments either supported the project, concurred with information presented in the Draft EA, determined the project had no impact on resources within their jurisdiction, or had "no comments"), and therefore did not require a response. An asterisk (*) indicates those substantive comments to which responses were sent.

○ Federal
  - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

○ State

○ County
  - Department of Water Supply
  - Police Department
  - Fire Department

○ Community & Environmental Organizations; Individuals
  - T. Tunison*
  - D. Hasenyager*
  - J. Mermel*
August 18, 1994

Glen Miyao  
Department of Parks and Recreation  
County of Hawaii  
25 August St.  
Hilo, Hawaii 96720  

Dear Mr. Miyao:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EA for the "Volcano Community Park." The text of the EA was not available at the store on the many occasions I looked, so my comments are based on the drawing enclosed in the Volcano Community Newsletter.

I am distressed by the drawing of the proposed community park because it reduces the natural area to approximately 10% of the total acreage. Not only is it a natural area and nature trail an important component of a recreational park, the community is setting a bad example for private landowners by removing forest cover. Although much of the forest on the property is probably second growth ("malu"), the trees are young and vigorous and weed problems can be rectified by an aggressive management program led by community volunteers. The area set aside for the nature trail should be at least three times greater than the area indicated. In addition, strips of forest should be left between structures. Expanding the area dedicated to native forest can be achieved by consolidating recreational facilities. For example, the proposed multi-purpose center can be combined with the expansion of the existing community center, the tennis courts can be combined with the partially enclosed multi-purpose court, and the two leach fields can be combined with the playing field. A final consideration in terms of forest preservation. The "best" forest patch (most vigorous, least weedy, richest in terms of species) should be preserved, and other recreational facilities should be located in other areas. Differences in forest quality can be determined by a systematic mapping of key plant species.

Sincerely,

Tia Tamiya  
P.O. Box 751  
Volcano, Hawaii 96785  
cc: Roy Takekoshi

Roy R. Takekoshi  
Land Use Planning & Law Consultant  
P.O. Box 751  
Volcano, Hawaii 96785  

August 24, 1994  

Mr. Tia Tamiya  
P.O. Box 751  
Volcano, Hawaii 96785  

RE: Volcano Community Center Environmental Assessment

Dear Mr. Tamiya:

Thank you for taking the time to comment on the proposed plan for the Volcano Community Center. We apologize that the environmental assessment document was not available for your review at the store. Cooper Center Council will send you a copy of the Final Environmental Assessment. Your continued input to Cooper Center Council is still welcome at this time the master plan.

One of the alternatives discussed in the environmental assessment is an alternative site plan (see §6.3). The Final Environmental Assessment expanded this section to include your suggestions (e.g., consolidating the multi-purpose center with the community center, as well as combining the tennis courts with the multi-purpose court). The environmental assessment included a site selection survey (see Appendix A). From this survey, it can be concluded that the current site is the most suitable for the community center. Generally, more native species are found closer to Wrigley Road. The area designated for the nature trail, which is located farthest away from Wrigley Road, seems to be a good choice. Your input is welcome to determine the best location and the key species that should be considered.

Please keep in mind that the master plan is a long-term plan—i.e., it is designed to meet the needs of the growing Volcano community for more 20 years. The facilities will be gradually built over this time period. Hence, most of the site would be in its present forested state for many more years. The master plan would be subject to ratification as needs become more defined. Your suggestions would be a point of consideration each time the plan is reviewed. If, in fact, all the facilities as presently shown on the master plan are built, it would probably be a lesser impact to concentrate all these community recreational facilities at one site rather than dispersing the impacts to perhaps other forested sites.

If you have any questions, please call me.

Yours truly,

Roy R. Takekoshi  
Cooper Center Council
August 23, 1994
Ray Takemoto
P. O. Box 10217
Hilo, HI 96721

Re: Environmental Assessment (EA) for Volcano Community Center

I have thoroughly reviewed the Draft EA dated July 1, 1994 for the Volcano Community Center. My interest in this matter stems from my having owned a home in Volcano (Mauka Loa Estates) for the past 10 years and my concern as to how the community is developing.

In my view the EA covers very thoroughly the factors and issues that need to be considered in determining whether the proposed master plan for the center/park should be approved.

The need for the various planned facilities for this rapidly growing community is clearly evident, some of which are quite urgently needed, such as the multi-purpose covered court, expansion of the existing community center (Cooper Center) and a police substation.

I have a strong protective feeling for our beautiful wooded environment in the Volcano area; however, I believe the proposed facilities and community center/park will not have a significant impact on the environment.

I strongly support the determination with supporting findings and reasons to issue a negative declaration.

Thank you for considering my views on this matter.

Sincerely,

D. G. Hasenjager

DONALD G. HASENJAGER
POST OFFICE BOX 555
VOLCANO, HAWAII 96785

August 25, 1994

Ray R. Takemoto
Land Use Planning & Law Consultant
P.O. Box 10217, Hilo, HI 96721

Mr. Donald G. Hasenjager
P.O. Box 555
Volcano, HI 96785

RE: Environmental Assessment for Volcano Community Center

Dear Mr. Hasenjager:

Thank you very much for your letter supporting the subject project. Your letter affirmed the need for the proposed facilities and your concurrence that the project will not have a significant impact. The Department of Parks and Recreation agreed that the impacts are not significant and will therefore file a negative declaration.

We encourage your continued interest and participation as this project progresses through the subsequent planning, design, and construction phases. If you would like to see a copy of the Final Environmental Assessment, please contact the Cooper Center Council.

Yours truly,

Ray R. Takemoto

cc: Department of Parks and Recreation
Cooper Center Council
Mr. Roy Takeno, Consulting,  
and Mr. Glenn Miya 
Department of Parks and Recreation  
County of Hawaii  
25 August Street  
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

Dear Sirs:

I am writing with regard to the draft E.A. and Master Plan of Volcano Community Park.

I am an 18-year resident of Volcano, a parent of six- and eleven-year-old children and have been active in a variety of community activities here in Volcano over the years.

Prior to moving to Volcano, I worked in the field of community involvement in the decision-making process by government—everything from Peace Corps to the "Poverty Programs" of the 1960's to my developing tenant associations in public housing for the San Francisco Housing Authority.

I mention this only to say how proud I am of how those in my community organized a community vote back in April to determine what activities we'd like to see take place on the 30-acre Community Park. As an observer to that process, I can safely say that the vote was fair and represents the best approach to determining what the community really wants to take place there.

Regarding the Master Plan itself, I like it. I'm glad to see the proposed multi-purpose court located where it is, alongside Wright Road. Puna Police say that it's the best location so that they can patrol by and see any illegal activities.

Some have said that "the 10 acres was given to us for recreation purposes only." I don't know if that is true or not. I do believe that our democratic system should be responsive to the will of the community.

Clearly the Volcano Community said it wants a firehouse or site or else it never would have been built by volunteers pouring nails and building a building worth over $100,000.00.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey K. Naka

110 Kawae Street, Volcano, Hawaii 96785

Jeffrey K. Naka

110 Kawae Street, Volcano, Hawaii 96785
Tel. (808) 961-5464 • Fax (808) 961-5623 • Toll Free 1-800-760-5464
August 25, 1994

Mr. Jeffrey Merson
ca. The Fireplace Center
110 Kaneo Street
Hilo, HI 96720

RE: Environmental Assessment for Volcano Community Center

Dear Mr. Merson:

Thank you very much for your letter supporting the subject project. Your letter allowed the participatory decision-making process used for the master plan, the need for the police substation, and the finding that the ohia forest on the site is not a pristine native forest based on your own observations with a trained biologist. The Department of Parks and Recreation concurred with your opinion that the impacts are not significant and will file a negative declaration.

We encourage your continued interest and participation in this project progressing through the subsequent planning, design, and construction phases. If you would like to see a copy of the Final Environmental Assessment, please contact the Cooper Center Council.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Ray R. Takeno

cc: Department of Parks and Recreation
Cooper Center Council

---

August 11, 1994

Planning Division

Mr. Glenn Niyao
Department of Parks and Recreation
County of Hawaii
35 Aupuni Street
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

Dear Mr. Niyao:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Volcano Community Center, Olawa, Puna District, Hawaii (No. 1-9-32-17). The following comments are provided pursuant to Corps of Engineers authorities to disseminate flood hazard information under the Flood Control Act of 1960 and to issue Department of the Army (DA) permits under the Clean Water Act; the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899; and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.

a. Based on the information provided, the project does not involve waters of the U.S.; therefore, a DA permit is not required.

b. The flood hazard information provided on page 17 is correct.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ray B. Jyo, P.E.
Director of Engineering

Copy Furnished:

[Signature]
Ray R. Takeno
Land Use Consultant
P.O. Box 10217
Hilo, Hawaii 96721
DEPARTMENT OF WATER SUPPLY, A COUNTY OF HAWAII

August 8, 1984

To: [Redacted]

State of Hawaii

P.O. Box 4089

City, County of Honolulu

Attention: Chief, Water Supply Division

RE: Water Storage Facility

Subject: Review of Water Supply Project

Dear [Redacted],

Please be informed that the subject property is not within the Department of Water Supply's existing water system facilities.

incerely,

[Signature]

Copy - Mayor F. Takamine
August 16, 1994

TO: GEORGE YOSHIDA, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

FROM: JOHN R. DE SA, ACTING CHIEF OF POLICE

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
FOR THE VOLCANO COMMUNITY CENTER, OLAH, PUNA DISTRICT
APPLICANT: COOPER CENTER COUNCIL
TMK: 1-9-3-17

The Draft Environmental Assessment was reviewed and we foresee
no adverse effect with the traffic patterns proposed for this
project.

DF:sk

cc: Roy H. Takesoto, Land Use Consultant
P. O. Box 10217, Hilo 96721
Puna Police

August 8, 1994

TO: Department of Parks & Recreation
Attention: Glenn Miyao

From: Helson M. Tuji, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE
VOLCANO COMMUNITY CENTER
OLAHA, PUNA DISTRICT, HAWAI'I
TMK: 1-9-3-17

We have no comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the
Volcano Community Center.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit our comments.

(SEAL)

NELSON M. TUJI
Fire Chief

HNM/50

cc: Roy H. Takesoto