


1995 FEIS MAUI
KIHEI UPCOUNTRY HWY PROJECT FROM
PIILANI HWY TO HALEAKALA HWY / KULA HWY
1 OF 2

MAR 8 2002

FILE COPY

KIHEI UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
VOLUME ONE: FINAL EIS AND TECHNICAL REPORTS



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FEBRUARY 2002

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
County of Maui, Hawaii

Final
Environmental Impact Statement


Submitted Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2)(c)
and
Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
and
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
Highways Division

Cooperating Agency
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

DEC 21 2001


Date of Approval



Brian K. Minaai
Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation

JAN 10 2002

Date of Approval



Abraham Wong
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Mr. Abraham Wong, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
P.O. Box 50206
300 Ala Moana Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850
(808) 541-2700

Mr. Brian K. Minaai
Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 587-2150

This report documents environmental impact studies of a proposed two-lane limited-access rural highway from Kihei, an urban area on the southern coast of Maui, to Upcountry, a region on the western flank of Haleakala volcano. Eight alternative alignments and a No Build alternative are currently being considered. The eight alignments consist of all combinations of two Kihei and four Upcountry terminus options. The preferred alternative has been identified as the U1,K1 Alternative, the alignment from the Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection in Upcountry to the Kaonoulu / Piilani Highway intersection in Kihei. The project would facilitate transportation between Kihei and Upcountry, thereby addressing growth in regional transportation demand, economic development trends, and coastal evacuation deficiencies. In addition, there is federal interest in the project because it would facilitate transportation between defense-related research activities at Science City atop Haleakala Crater and the Maui Research and Technology Park in Kihei. The project will have both adverse and beneficial impacts. Potential benefits and impacts include substantial travel time savings, loss of open space, interference with agricultural activities, changes in transportation patterns, loss of archaeological resources, and savings in energy consumption. The nature of the impact varies with the alignment alternative.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT STATEMENT

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, became effective January 1, 1970. This law requires that all federal agencies shall prepare a detailed Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is, therefore, required to have an EIS prepared on proposals funded under its authority if the proposal is determined to be a major action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

EISs are required for many transportation projects as outlined in NEPA. The processing of an EIS is carried out in two stages. Draft EISs are first written and forwarded for review and comment to federal, state and local agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise and are made available to the public. This availability to the public must occur at least 15 days before the public hearing and not later than the time of the first public hearing notice or notice of opportunity for hearing. Normally, 45 days, plus mailing time, will be allowed for comments to be made on the Draft EIS unless a time extension is granted by the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT). After this period has elapsed, preparation can begin on the Final EIS.

A Final EIS is prepared to reflect the distribution of the Draft EIS by including the following:

1. Basic Content of the Draft EIS as amended due to internal agency comments, editing, additional alternatives being considered, and changes due to the time-lag between the Draft and Final EIS.
2. Summary of public hearing comments.
3. Summary of comments received on the Draft EIS.
4. Evaluation and disposition of each substantive comment.

Administrative action cannot take place sooner than 90 days after circulation of the Draft EIS to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) or 30 days after submittal of the Final EIS to the USEPA.

Both the Draft and Final EIS are full disclosure documents, which provide a full description of the proposed project, the existing environment, and analysis of the anticipated beneficial or adverse environmental effects.

General Reviewer Information

In compliance with the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (amended in 1988) and a 1991 Presidential Executive Order, numbers throughout this Final EIS are presented in metric units with the English equivalents in parentheses.

SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION



S.1.1 APPLICANT AND PROJECT SUMMARY

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) are issuing this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as the lead federal and local agencies for this project, the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway in Maui, Hawaii.

Figure S-1 shows the general project location in the County of Maui. This proposed federal-aid limited access highway would link the Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui regions. In its initial phase, the highway will be constructed as a two-lane facility. The right-of-way for a future four-lane facility will be acquired, and in certain sections of the highway, earthwork for a future four-lane facility will be conducted during the initial phase of construction. This document addresses the operational impacts of a two-lane facility, the right-of-way acquisition for a four-lane facility, and, in certain locations, the earthwork for a future four-lane facility.

S.1.2 PLANNING CONTEXT AND HISTORY

Study of a Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway began over 25 years ago when, in 1970, the County of Maui studied the feasibility of a road between Upcountry Maui and Kihei. Two later studies, the County of Maui Toll Road Study (1988) and the Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study (May 1991), also examined a roadway link between Upcountry and Kihei. Subsequently, a task force consisting of State and County officials and private citizens (the Joint State/County Task Force) was formed to recommend an alignment for this roadway. The Task Force met in 1992 and 1993, and produced a report in October 1993. Also in 1993, the SDOT, in cooperation with the FHWA, began an in-depth study of this proposed roadway link, including an evaluation of new alternatives as well as alternatives derived from past efforts. This Final EIS marks the completion of the SDOT planning efforts that began in 1993.



Project Location
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE S-1



S.1.3 ACCEPTING AUTHORITIES

At the federal level, the FHWA Hawaii Division Administrator approved this Final EIS. At the State level, the accepting authority of this Final EIS is the Governor of the State of Hawaii. It is expected that the Governor will accept this Final EIS, completing the EIS requirements under Hawaii's EIS Law. It is also expected that the FHWA will issue a Record of Decision (ROD), completing the project's requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). After issuance of the ROD and Final EIS acceptance by the Governor, the design phase of the project may proceed.

S.1.4 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Final EIS has been prepared to comply with:

- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA);
- Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS);
- FHWA and FTA Joint Regulations, 23 CFR 771;
- Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, 40 CFR 1500-1508; and
- The Hawaii Administrative Rules [Title 11, Chapter 200 (August 1996)].

This document identifies and assesses the environmental and social impacts that could result from the development of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. The highway would be designed for anticipated traffic demand in the year, 2020, which corresponds to the planning horizon of the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996). Therefore, potential impacts are assessed for that year. Construction-phase impacts are also assessed.

The EIS process is designed to enable project sponsors to develop a well-planned project that is sensitive to the physical, natural and social environment within which it would exist, and to identify and evaluate impacts associated with various alternatives under consideration. Required coordination activities with interested and affected parties are also documented in this Final EIS.

S.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Upon completion, the Kihei-Upcountry Highway would satisfy the following six purposes and needs:

- Establish a roadway system linkage;
- Support economic development;
- Address existing intersection capacity deficiencies;
- Satisfy increased transportation demand;
- Promote the National interest as expressed through legislative directive; and
- Increase coastal evacuation capacity.

S.2.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM LINKAGE

The existing circuitous route between Kihei-Makena, a major employment center along Maui's southern coast, and Upcountry, a popular residential area on Haleakala's western flank, is at least 25 km (16 miles) (the distance between the northern tip of Pukalani to the northern tip of Kihei). In contrast, the straight-line distance between Kihei-Makena and most Upcountry communities is 15 km to 20 km (9 to 12 miles). Travelers between the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park in Kihei and scientific facilities at the summit of Haleakala, called Science City, must also use the present circuitous route. The transportation route between the Upcountry communities and West Maui (Lahaina-Kaanapali-Kapalua) is also circuitous. Depending on the alternative selected, a Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would provide up to a 50 percent reduction in the length these journeys, substantially reducing travel time and vehicle fuel consumption.

S.2.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Maui's largest industry now and for the foreseeable future is tourism. Kihei-Makena and West Maui (Lahaina-Kaanapali-Kapalua) are expected to remain the principal visitor accommodation areas on the island, as well as the island's second and third largest employment centers. These areas will also continue to have an economic relationship with

Upcountry Maui because Upcountry has tourist attractions, such as Haleakala National Park, and is a major and popular residential area. Another increasingly important industry on Maui is high technology based at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City on the summit of Haleakala. Improved transportation efficiency would support businesses and federal government personnel at the R&T Park who provide technical assistance to Science City. In addition, road construction would infuse federal funds into the local economy.

S.2.3 EXISTING INTERSECTION CAPACITY DEFICIENCIES

Traffic volumes at nine intersections along the existing route between Kihei and Upcountry were analyzed using methodologies contained in the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The HCM methodologies classify traffic operations by level of service, defined by letters "A" through "F", representing best to worst conditions, respectively. In the morning peak hour, three of these intersections (including the Haleakala Highway / Hana Highway intersection and the Mokulele Highway / Piilani Highway intersection) operated at levels of service "E." In the afternoon peak hour, five intersections (including the Hana Highway / Dairy Road intersection, the Dairy Road / Kuihelani Highway / Puunene Road intersection and the Mokulele Highway / Piilani Highway intersection) operated at levels of service "E" or lower. A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would divert some travel demand to an alternative route, thus relieving existing congestion at these intersections.

S.2.4 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND

Trip generation forecasts reported in the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996) indicate that the average number of daily trips on Maui would be over 386,000 in 2020, a 70 percent increase over 1990. A large portion of these trips would be generated by the tourism industry, such as home-based work trips by tourist industry employees and trips made by visitors. Because of this anticipated growth in travel demand and existing deficiencies in roadway capacity (see Section S.2.3), the following improvements are needed:

1. Additional roadway capacity between existing and future residential communities in Upcountry and employment centers in Kihei-Makena and West Maui; and
2. Additional roadway capacity between visitor accommodation regions (Kihei-Makena and West Maui) and Haleakala National Park and tourist attractions in Upcountry.

The proposed road would help satisfy both requirements above.

S.2.5 LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVE

Federal funding for the planning of this project was appropriated because of the national interest in providing an improved transportation connection between defense-related activities at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City at the Haleakala summit. Science City receives technical support from key defense contractors in the R&T Park.

S.2.6 COASTAL EVACUATION CAPACITY


On the southern coast of Maui, the Kihei-Makena urban area is vulnerable to coastal hazards such as tsunami and tropical storms. The only routes out of Kihei-Makena are Mckulele Highway and North Kihei Road. The termini of these roadways are about 90 m (300 ft) from one another at the northern end of Kihei. The limited number of evacuation routes and their close proximity suggest there could be substantial congestion in north Kihei during an evacuation emergency. In addition, there are no alternatives should the evacuation route be blocked. A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would increase evacuation capacity and provide an alternative evacuation route.

S.3 ALTERNATIVES AND ALTERNATIVE SELECTION PROCESS


S.3.1 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The preferred alternative for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project has been identified as the U1,K1 Alternative, the alignment from the Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection to the Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection (see Figure S-2). The highway will be a limited access, two-lane arterial roadway, with a length of approximately 15.8 km (9.8 miles). The posted speed limit would vary from 70 km/h (45 mph) in the urban area near Kihei to 90 km/h (55 mph) in the rural area in Upcountry. The width of the right-of-way would be at least 49 m (160 ft) in rural areas and at least 37 m (120 ft) in urban areas. These right-of-way widths are sufficient to accommodate a four-lane divided highway. The acquisition of the right-of-way for a four-lane facility is proposed to allow for the future expansion of the highway to four lanes. However, the proposed action addressed in this EIS is only the construction of a two-lane road because projections indicate that two lanes would be sufficient to accommodate the forecast travel demand in the design year, 2020.

The roadway will include one 3.7 m (12 ft) lane in each direction, and paved shoulders wide enough to accommodate bicyclists. The highway in the urban section will include bike lanes and sidewalks that are in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The highway termini will be designed with adequate channelization (right- and left-turn lanes) to handle the projected traffic volumes. Both intersections will likely warrant traffic signals. However, this decision will be made during the design phase of the project. Several grade-separation (i.e., interchange) options for the U1 terminus were considered after the selection of the preferred alternative. However, it was determined that the additional cost of a U1 interchange could not be justified since an at-grade signalized intersection would cost substantially less, and be able to acceptably handle projected year 2020 peak hour traffic demand.



Preferred Alternative
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE S-2



S.3.2 OTHER BUILD ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the preferred alternative, seven build alternatives have been carried forward for detailed analysis in this Final EIS (see Figure S-3). The eight build alternatives, including the preferred alternative, consist of all possible combinations of two Kihei and four Upcountry terminus options. Figure S-3 shows the candidate termini and the alignments that would link them. The Kihei termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. The names of the other build alternatives are:


- | | | |
|------------|------------|----------|
| 1. U1,K2 | 4. U2-B,K1 | 7. U3,K2 |
| 2. U2-A,K1 | 5. U2-B,K2 | |
| 3. U2-A,K2 | 6. U3,K1 | |

The U2-A alternatives (U2-A,K1 and U2-A,K2) would require the modification of the Pukalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would replace the Haleakala Highway leg (Pukalani side) and Haleakala Highway would be re-aligned to link and form a T-intersection with Pukalani Bypass at approximately 370 m (1200 ft) north of the "Five Trees" intersection. The existing segment of Haleakala Highway between the new connection to Pukalani Bypass and the "Five Trees" intersection would be converted to a cul-de-sac to maintain access to future land uses.

The design of the other build alternatives would be similar to the preferred alternative. They would provide a limited access arterial roadway with one 3.6 m (12 ft) lane in each direction, with a roadway right-of-way of at least 49 m (160 ft) wide in rural areas and at least 37 m (120 ft) wide in urban areas to allow for the widening of the facility to four lanes if appropriate in the future. The posted speed limits would vary from 70 km/h (45 mph) in urban areas to 90 km/h (55 mph) in rural areas.

S.3.3 NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

The No Build alternative consists of those roadway improvements that are expected to be implemented by 2020 as stated in the Maui Long-Range Plan Land Transportation Plan (Final




Legend
 --- Existing Roadway
 — Alignment Alternative
 ○ Proposed Terminus

Source: Warren S. Unemori, Engineering, Inc., October 1997



Build Alternatives
KIHEL-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE S-3



Report, February 1997), apart from the proposed project. The No Build alternative is the benchmark reference against which project impacts are assessed in this Final EIS.

S.3.4 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SELECTION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

S.3.4.1 Development of Project Alternatives

Three general steps were accomplished to develop the alternatives studied in this Final EIS:

1. A two-tiered alternatives screening analysis;
2. Refinement of Alternative U2; and
3. Additional adjustments to alignments.

A two-tiered alternatives screening analysis was performed to evaluate fourteen alternatives that were developed from prior studies and reports, scoping activities conducted as part of the EIS process, and public involvement activities (see Figures 2-6 and 2-7). Twelve of these alternatives were different alignments. The other two alternatives were "enhanced widening of existing roadways," beyond the widening proposed in the No Build Alternative, and Transportation Systems Management (TSM).

Candidate evaluation criteria were generated and sorted into two groups: Tier One (fatal flaws) and Tier Two. The Tier One (fatal flaw) criteria were developed to eliminate alternatives that are impractical, unfeasible or not fundable to avoid unnecessary analysis of alternatives that would have minimal chance of being selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Tier Two criteria relate primarily to the nature and degree of impact. An alternative not satisfying a Tier Two criterion could be feasible, but would not be advantageous with respect to the criterion in question.

The Tier One screening analysis eliminated from further study six alignment alternatives, the "enhanced widening of existing roadways" alternative, and the TSM alternative (see Section 2.2.1.3a). The Tier Two screening analysis evaluated the remaining six alternatives and eliminated two alignment alternatives (see Section 2.2.1.3b). The remaining four alternatives were then recast as combinations of mauka and makai segments. By combining the two

makai terminus choices (K1 and K2) with the three mauka terminus choices (U1, U2 and U3), it became possible to generate six alternatives comprised of common roadway segments.

Following selection of these six alternatives, it was discovered that Segment U2 would cross a site planned for a Kamehameha Schools / Bishop Estate campus. Also, archaeological reconnaissance surveys found notable sites (potentially eligible for the National and/or State Registers of Historic Places and important for preservation) within the U2 alignment (see Section 3.10.2). Therefore, four modifications of the eastern (mauka) section of the U2 alignment (U2-A, U2-B, U2-C and U2-D) were developed and evaluated based on such criteria as maximum grade, number of gulch crossings, and operational considerations. Following this evaluation, the U2-A and U2-B modifications were selected for further evaluation. The U2-A alignment shifts the eastern (mauka) portion of the U2 alternative northward, creating a terminus at the Pukaalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection. The U2-B alignment shifts the U2 alternative along the northern boundary of the future Kamehameha Schools campus while maintaining the same terminus (as the original U2 alternative) on Kula Highway.

Finally, the results of archaeological reconnaissance surveys (see Section 3.9) required minor re-alignments of Segments U2-A and U3. The alternatives shown on Figure S-3 reflect all of the changes described above.

S.3.4.2 Selection of the Preferred Alternative

The eight build alternatives described in Section S.3.1 and S.3.2 were evaluated to determine the preferred alternative using transportation performance, cost, and agricultural impact criteria. In addition, community plan preferences were used. The purpose of this comparison was to determine how well each of the alternatives fared with respect to these criteria and in comparison to one another. Other criteria that relate to environmental and social impacts were considered for this analysis, but were not used because, while important, they did not differentiate between the build alternatives. This analysis of build alternatives to select the preferred alternative does not include the No Build alternative, because the No Build alternative remains under consideration until the Record of Decision is issued.

In evaluating the transportation performance of the alternatives, all of the U3 and K2 alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they would not serve the major travel markets as well as the U1, U2 (A or B) and K-1 alternatives. The U3 terminus is furthest away from the Upcountry population centers, and the K2 alternatives would not serve the Upcountry - West Maui travel market. Although the K2 alternatives are better in augmenting the evacuation capacity of South Maui, this advantage was not judged to override the disadvantage of not serving the Upcountry - West Maui travel market. The remaining alternatives, U1,K1, U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1, were then evaluated using the other criteria.

Of these remaining alternatives, the U1,K1 alternative would be the least expensive to construct. However, the costs of the three alternatives are all within 7 percent of one another. Therefore, cost was only a minor factor in the decision to select the preferred alternative.

The U2-A, and U2-B alternatives would cause less of an impact to agriculture than the U1,K1 alternative. However, Alexander & Baldwin, the parent company of Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, indicated a willingness to work with the SDOT on appropriate mitigation to lessen the impact to their agricultural operations (see Volume Two: Draft FIS Comments and Responses). Therefore, like the cost factor, agricultural impacts were only a minor factor in the decision to select the preferred alternative.

All the remaining alternatives would be consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan, and therefore, this plan does not help discriminate among the remaining alternatives. On the other hand, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan indicates a strong preference for a No Build alternative. However, this plan goes on to state a preference for a U1 alternative, if the highway project moves forward. This preference for a U1 alternative, among all the build alternatives, was reiterated by several Upcountry commentators throughout the FIS process. The community plan preference for a U1 alternative, if constrained to select among the three remaining alternatives, was highly influential, and was a major determining factor that led SDOT and FHWA to select the U1,K1 alternative as the preferred alternative.

S.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Table S-1 summarizes the environmental and social impacts, including construction-phase impacts, of the No Build and build alternatives, including the preferred alternative. A summary of mitigation measures for each adverse impact of the build alternatives is also provided in this table. In general, the build alternatives' impacts are similar. However, the following differences do exist:

Alternatives with a U1 alignment (U1.K1 (preferred alternative) and U1.K2)

- These alternatives would have the most severe cropland impacts.

Alternatives with either a U2-A or U2-B alignment (U2-A.K1; U2-A.K2; U2-B.K1; and U2-B.K2)

- These alternatives would have the second most severe cropland impacts.

Alternatives with either a U1, U2-A or U2-B alignment (U1.K1 (preferred alternative); U1.K2; U2-A.K1; U2-A.K2; U2-B.K1; and U2-B.K2)

- These alternatives would increase the use of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as a through route. These roads were not designed for such a purpose, although the County is planning to improve them.

Alternatives with a U3 alignment (U3.K1 and U3.K2)

- These alternatives would be within visual distance of a cattle corral potentially affecting ranch operations. These alternatives would also cross two pineapple fields and the Kula Agricultural Park, County land that is leased to small-scale farmers at comparatively low rates. Remnant agricultural parcels that may be difficult to work may be created at one of the pineapple fields affected by this alternative.
- These alternatives may lead to the use of local residential roads between Kula and Haleakala Highways as a route to the Haleakala summit.

Alternatives with a K1 alignment (U1.K1 (preferred alternative); U2-A.K1; U2-B.K1 and U3.K1)

- These alternatives may affect adjacent ranching operations. Proper measures will need to be implemented to minimize the conflicts between cattle and roadway operations. For example, cattle will need to be herded across the highway right-of-way several times a year, and these crossings may take ten to fifteen minutes.

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
LAND USE	Common	Alignment-Specific
<p>Construction Impacts. <u>Construction impacts associated with the various roadway widening projects contained in the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February, 1997)</u></p> <p>Operational Impacts. Kula, the Department of Hawaiian Homelands' Keokea Homesteads, <u>the Alexander & Baldwin (A&B) housing development in Halimaile</u>, the expansion of the Maui R&T Park and other developments would continue as planned.</p>	<p>Construction Impacts. Introduction of a roadway to agricultural areas (sugarcane, pineapple and ranching), leading to an irrevocable loss of open space and interference with existing, adjacent agricultural practices (see Farmland below). No outright residential or business displacements.</p> <p>Operational Impacts. The highway would have minimal influence on long-term regional land use trends because other factors, such as water availability, health of the visitor industry, and pace of development of "high-tech" industry control the speed and extent of land use development.</p>	<p>U1 Alternative (including the preferred alternative). Will facilitate development beyond Pukalani's urban growth boundary as defined by the community plan. <u>Will support planned A&B development in Halimaile.</u></p> <p>U2-A or U2-B Alternative. Would support the planned Kula development. U2-B was the suggested alignment contained in the Kula Master Plan.</p> <p>U3 Alternative. Not expected to influence land use development in Kula because water availability would continue to be the major constraint.</p> <p>K1 or K2 Alternative (including the preferred alternative). May promote in-fill development in Kihei, which would be a beneficial impact.</p>
<p>Mitigation. None required.</p>	<p>Mitigation. Landowners affected by right-of-way acquisition will be compensated based on the guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970.</p>	
FARMLAND		
<p>Construction Impacts. <u>Farmland impacts associated with various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</u></p>	<p>Construction Impacts. Will convert agricultural lands to a transportation use, cause crop damage, disturb sugarcane and pineapple operations, and affect cattle grazing. Will damage existing</p> <p>U1 Alternative (including the preferred alternative). In addition to direct conversion of cropland to a transportation use, will isolate approximately 400 ha (1000 acres) of sugarcane land from a larger field,</p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
FARMLAND (cont.)	Common	Alignment Specific
<p>Construction Impacts (cont.). See above.</p>	<p>Construction Impacts (cont.). agricultural infrastructure (haul roads, and irrigation and drainage systems), adversely affecting current operating practices.</p>	<p>U1 Alternative (cont.). and cross a pineapple field. In addition to direct conversion of cropland to a transportation use, will isolate approximately 400 ha (1000 acres) of sugarcane land from a larger field, and cross a pineapple field.</p> <p>U2-A or U2-B Alternative. In addition to direct conversion of cropland to a transportation use, would isolate approximately 25 ha (60 acres) of sugarcane land from a larger field, and cross two pineapple fields.</p> <p>U2-A Alternative. The realigned Haleakala Highway in Pukalani would cross a pineapple field, converting some of this land to a transportation use.</p> <p>U3 Alternative. In addition to direct conversion of cropland to a transportation use, would cross two pineapple fields, and a County agricultural park, which is used to lease parcels to small-scale farmers at comparatively low rates.</p>
<p>Construction Impacts (cont.). Per the Farmland Protection Policy Act, Land Evaluation and Site Assessment scores for each alternative were calculated, and are shown to the right. No alternative has a score equal to or greater than 160, the threshold at which alternatives that avoid farmland impacts must be evaluated.</p>		<p>U1, K1 Alternative (preferred alternative). 151 points U1, K2 Alternative. 148 points U2-A, K1 Alternative. 141 points U2-A, K2 Alternative. 142 points U2-B, K1 Alternative. 139 points U2-B, K2 Alternative. 139 points U3, K1 Alternative. 140 points U3, K2 Alternative. 137 points</p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
FARMLAND (cont.)		
Operational Impacts. Sugarcane, pineapple, ranching and small farm agriculture in the study area would remain viable. They would, however, continue to be adversely affected by external forces such as world market conditions and suburban encroachment.	Operational Impacts. Will interfere with sugarcane and pineapple cultivation because the highway will cross active fields, which will make working the fields more difficult. Will improve access to cattle grazing areas.	<u>U3 Alternative.</u> Would be within visual distance of a major cattle corral and water system. The corral may not operate normally if the highway is within visual distance. <u>K1 Alternative (including the Preferred Alternative).</u> Without mitigation, adjacent landowner would herd cattle across the roadway several times a year. Crossing the highway would take 10 to 15 minutes.
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. A "Maintenance of Agricultural and Ranching Activities Plan" will be prepared during design and implemented during construction. Measures to offset adverse impacts to agricultural production include allowance for haul road crossings and grade separation of selected haul roads, and replacement and relocation of other existing agricultural infrastructure, such as irrigation and drainage systems. Farmers (owners and leaseholders) will be compensated for crop damage and lease losses, if necessary. Sections of the roadway crossing pastureland will require stock-proof fencing along both sides of the highway. Cattle crossing locations at certain bridges will be designated to avoid the need for cattle to cross the roadway.	
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC		
Construction Impacts. <u>Socio-economic impacts associated with the various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</u>	Construction Impacts. The project will infuse up to \$66 million of federal funds into the local economy, increasing short-term employment and the purchase of local goods and services.	
Operational Impacts. Implementation of community plans would affect existing communities by increasing population and traffic, and have environmental impacts, such as agricultural encroachment.	<u>U2-B alternative.</u> This alignment will be adjacent to a planned shopping center in the Kulamaly development. Depending on the type of shops at this center, visitor-related establishments in Makawao, and perhaps Pukalani, may suffer a loss.	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC (cont.)		
Operational Impacts (cont.). Implementation of community plans would affect existing communities by increasing population and traffic, and have environmental impacts, such as agricultural encroachment.	Operational Impacts (cont.). Impacts to existing business districts in Pukalani, Makawao, and Kihei are not anticipated. Adverse impacts to business districts in Kahului are also not expected because it is the island's principal commercial center. The potential for long-term employment opportunities will depend on how well the alternatives facilitate employment-producing land uses in areas approved by the County, such as Kulamalu or in-fill development in Kihei. Property tax revenues to the County would decrease by about \$13,000 to \$46,000 per year depending on the alternative because of the conversion of taxable real estate to public right-of-way.	U2-B alternative (cont.). of business from this market. This impact may also occur to a lesser extent under the U2-A and U3 alternatives.
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. None required.	
TRANSPORTATION		
Construction Impacts. Construction delays associated with various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts. Impacts to traffic flow will occur at construction site ingress and egress areas on Haleakala, Kula and Piilani Highways, and during work at intersections with existing roadways.	
Operational Impacts. Travel between Upcountry and Kihei-Makena / West Maui would continue to use the existing circuitous route. Transportation level of service would continue to deteriorate.	Operational Impacts. The proposed project will divert Kihei-Upcountry and some West Maui-Upcountry travel demand from its current circuitous route to the new highway. This traffic diversion will	
		U1, U2-A or U2-B Alternative (including the preferred alternative). Will encourage some motorists traveling between Kula and Kihei to use the substandard Omaopio or Pulehu Roads.

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
<p>TRANSPORTATION (cont.)</p> <p>Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.</p>	<p>Operational Impacts (cont.). reduce total regional vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT), fuel consumption and travel time. Transportation level of service will improve on the existing route. The new highway will operate at acceptable levels of service (D or better).</p>	<p>U1, U2-A or U2-B Alternative (cont.). Increasing use of these roads will interfere with farm vehicle movements and local traffic, and may increase traffic related noise. <u>This impact will be greatest under a U1 alternative, including the preferred alternative, because its Upcountry terminus is furthest away from the Omaopio and Pulehu Roads' intersections with Kula Highway.</u></p> <p>U3 Alternative. Would encourage some motorists traveling to the Haleakala summit to use local residential roads running between Kula and Haleakala Highways. This may increase traffic related noise along these roads and interfere with local traffic.</p>
<p>Mitigation. None required.</p>	<p>Mitigation. "Maintenance of Traffic Plan" will be prepared during the design phase to minimize impacts on traffic flows during construction.</p>	<p>U1, U2-A or U2-B Alternative (including the preferred alternative). Traffic conditions at the intersections of the proposed highway with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads will be monitored after completion of the project to determine whether one or both require signalization.</p> <p>U3 Alternative. Signage would be provided directing motorists to the proper route to the Haleakala summit.</p>
AIR QUALITY		
<p>Construction Impacts. <u>Dust and mobile source emissions will be generated during the construction</u></p>	<p>Construction Impacts. Air quality impacts during roadway construction will consist of fugitive dust and mobile source emissions from construction equipment.</p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
AIR QUALITY (cont.)		
Construction Impacts (cont.) of the various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts (cont.) See above.	
Operational Impacts. No violations of State or federal air quality standards are anticipated.	Operational Impacts. None of the alternatives will cause a violation of the applicable State or federal air quality standards.	
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. Dust control measures will be implemented during construction, such as minimizing land disturbance, using watering trucks and windbreaks, limiting vehicular paths, and stabilizing temporary roads. Following construction, any disturbed land not permanently in use will be revegetated.	
NOISE AND VIBRATION		
Construction Impacts. Noise will be generated during the construction of the various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts. Construction will normally occur during daylight hours when occasional loud noises are more tolerable, and construction activities will generally be in isolated areas away from noise sensitive land uses. Unacceptable noise and vibration impacts at sensitive sites are not anticipated.	
Operational Impacts. Predicted future traffic noise levels are expected to be no more than 1 dBA over the existing noise levels. The Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) would be approached at one noise receptor site located along Kula Highway.	Operational Impacts. Predicted traffic noise levels at 12 of the 13 selected noise receptor sites are predicted to increase 1 dBA to 11 dBA over existing ambient levels. These predicted increases are not considered "substantial" according to the SDOT Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy.	U3 Alternative. Although the predicted noise level at a site located on Kula Highway would be slightly below the predicted noise level under the No Build alternative, an impact, per the Noise Policy, would occur because the future noise level would approach the NAC. K1 Alternative (including the preferred alternative). Early morning noise impacts from vehicles traveling to the Haleakala summit were specifically mentioned as a potential concern during scoping.

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
<p>NOISE AND VIBRATION (cont.)</p> <p>Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.</p> <p>Mitigation. None required.</p>	<p>Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.</p> <p>Mitigation. Specifications for allowable noise levels during construction at nearby communities will be formulated and implemented. A noise permit will be obtained from the State Department of Health (SDOH) if stipulated noise control standards can not be met.</p>	<p><u>K1 Alternative (cont.)</u>. However, early morning noise levels at the most affected neighborhood would increase only by 3 dBA, which is barely perceptible and is well below a substantial increase.</p> <p><u>K2 Alternative</u>. A substantial increase in noise, per the <u>Noise Policy</u>, is predicted to occur at a site in the future Kihei Regional Park adjacent to the highway.</p> <p><u>U3 Alternative Mitigation</u>. A noise barrier at the site along Kula Highway was considered, but was found not to be reasonable and feasible because it would block viewplanes from the affected residence and would be inappropriate in a rural setting.</p> <p><u>K2 Alternative Mitigation</u>. The SDOT and FHWA would work with the County of Maui to mitigate impacts to noise sensitive activities at the future park. Measures could include buffer zones and berms along the highway.</p>
<p>WATER RESOURCES</p>		
<p>Construction Impacts. Erosion and sedimentation may occur during construction from various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</p>	<p>Construction Impacts. Water resource impacts could occur from erosion and sedimentation associated with the project's earthmoving and stockpiling activities, and construction of gulch crossings.</p>	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
WATER RESOURCES (cont.)		
Operational Impacts. Increase in regional pollutant loading of surface waters from roadway drainage because of increases in regional VMT.	Operational Impacts. Highway runoff containing automobile-related pollutants (petroleum, oil, rubber) would percolate into the ground. During heavy rain, runoff will drain into the gulches on the side of Haleakala. However, since total regional VMT will decrease (see Transportation), the highway's impact on total regional pollutant loading of surface waters from roadway drainage will be reduced in comparison to the No Build alternative. Inadvertent spills of petroleum-based fuels or chemical products could infiltrate groundwater sources underlying the highway.	
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. Storm water runoff and erosion during project construction will be mitigated through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) established before construction begins in coordination with the SDOH and Maui County. In the event of a petroleum or hazardous materials release, established incident response procedures will prevent impacts to groundwater sources. The depth of the water table from the ground will also help protect the aquifer under these conditions.	
FLORA		
Construction Impacts. Vegetational communities will be cleared in association with the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts. Vegetational communities will be cleared for the roadway (see right). None of these communities contain threatened or endangered species, consisting mostly of existing and former cultivated lands, kiawe forests, buffelgrass and gulch vegetation. Therefore, construction will not threaten the region's botanical resources, which consists of non-native species in the areas to be directly affected by construction.	
Operational Impacts. None.	Amount of Vegetation cleared by alternative: Alternative U1.K1 (preferred alternative). 97 ha (240 acres) Alternative U1.K2. 112 ha (277 acres) Alternative U2-A.K1. 99 ha (245 acres) Alternative U2-A.K2. 113 ha (280 acres) Alternative U2-B.K1. 99 ha (246 acres) Alternative U2-B.K2. 114 ha (282 acres) Alternative U3.K1. 89 ha (220 acres) Alternative U3.K2. 102 ha (252 acres)	
	K2 Alternative. This alignment would be approximately 1.5 km (1 mile) from Puu O Kali, a dry land forest containing three endangered plant	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
FLORA (cont.)		
Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.	Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.	K2 Alternative (cont.). species. This alignment would not directly affect the forest or these endangered species, however.
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. Landscaping will be provided, which would include native trees and shrubs wherever practicable. The Maui Native Plant Society and the State Department of Land and Natural Resources will be consulted. Details of the landscaping plan will be developed during the design phase. Existing SDOT specifications, such as proper use of mulch and cleaning and maintenance of construction vehicles and equipment, will help control the spread of alien species. Signage will alert motorists of possible fire conditions and warn them to take measures to minimize fire risk.	
FAUNA		
Construction Impacts. Animals associated with the vegetation to be removed would be displaced from the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts. Some existing faunal habitats will be converted into roadway and embankment. However, this change will not threaten the relatively common faunal communities in the region.	
Operational Impacts. None.	Operational Impacts. Use of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will increase the number of vehicle collisions with axis deer. It is unlikely that the highway will increase the incidence of vehicle-cattle collisions because cattle can be prevented from entering the highway right-of-way by well-maintained stock-proof fencing.	U1, U2-A or U2-B Alternative (including the preferred alternative). Will be in proximity to a reservoir that may be used by migratory and resident water birds, including the endangered Hawaiian coot. However, there is sufficient horizontal and vertical buffer between the alignment and the reservoir so that the highway will not affect the waterbirds using the reservoir. U1, K1 Alternative (preferred alternative). Alternative that is furthest away from the maximum

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
FAUNA (cont.)		
Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.	Operational Impacts (cont.). See above.	U1, K1 Alternative (cont.). <u>concentration of deer and therefore is the build alternative least likely to increase the rate of vehicle-deer collisions.</u> U3, K2 Alternative. <u>Most likely alternative to increase the rate of vehicle-deer collisions.</u>
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. Well-maintained stock-proof fencing at cattle grazing areas will prevent cattle from wandering onto the highway. <u>However, such fencing will not prevent deer from getting onto the highway if they so wish. Frequent signage will be provided warning motorists of the danger of deer on the highway.</u>	
SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE		
Construction Impacts. <u>Wastes would be generated in association with the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</u>	Construction Impacts. The volumes of cut and fill will be balanced across the project so there will be no requirement for fill material to be disposed of or imported from outside the construction site. Excavated material is expected to be free of contamination. Construction activities will generate solid and hazardous waste.	
Operational Impacts. None.	Operational Impacts. None.	
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. Solid and hazardous waste generated during construction will be properly handled and disposed of per SDOH and Maui County requirements.	
NATURAL HAZARDS		
Construction Impacts. None.	Construction Impacts. None.	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
<p>NATURAL HAZARDS (cont.)</p> <p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> Evacuation capacity of the Kihei-Makena region would continue to be limited due to the lack of roadway capacity and alternative routes.</p> <p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	<p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> An additional egress route and roadway capacity will be provided in the event of an evacuation from Kihei-Makena. The new highway will not result in additional exposure to natural hazards.</p> <p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	
<p>HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</p>		
<p><u>Construction Impacts.</u> Historic properties could be affected by the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</p> <p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> None.</p> <p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	<p><u>Construction Impacts.</u> Construction activities will eliminate archaeological sites that require data recovery, but do not require preservation. The number of these type of sites affected by each alternative is provided on the right. <u>Only the preferred alternative (U1.K1) underwent an archaeological inventory survey. The information about the other alternatives was based on reconnaissance surveys. It is likely that the number of sites that would be affected by the other alternatives would change if they were to undergo inventory surveys.</u></p> <p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> None.</p> <p><u>Mitigation.</u> A mitigation measure that has already been implemented is the modification of alignments to avoid sites that require preservation. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was prepared and signed by the FHWA and the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), with which the SDOT has concurred. The MOA specified that a data recovery plan be prepared and implemented, in coordination with the State Historic</p>	<p><u>Number of archaeological sites requiring data recovery by alternative:</u> <u>Alternative U1.K1 (preferred alternative), three (3) sites</u> <u>Alternative U1.K2, seven (7) sites</u> <u>Alternative U2-A.K1, three (3) sites</u> <u>Alternative U2-A.K2, seven (7) sites</u> <u>Alternative U2-B.K1, three (3) sites</u> <u>Alternative U2-B.K2, seven (7) sites</u> <u>Alternative U3.K1, six (6) sites</u> <u>Alternative U3.K2, ten (10) sites</u></p>

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
Mitigation (cont.). None required.	Mitigation (cont.). Preservation Division, before construction, buffer zones would be fenced around known archaeological sites that require preservation. If additional sites are uncovered during construction, work would stop immediately and the SHPO would be notified and consulted on the appropriate treatment measures.	
PARKLANDS		
Construction Impacts. Parklands could be affected by the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.	Construction Impacts. None.	
Operational Impacts. None.	Operational Impacts. The highway will enhance access to Haleakala National Park, the Kihei Aquatic and Community Center and the future Kihei Regional Park, among others. No parks or other recreational resources will be directly or indirectly adversely affected.	K2 Alternative. Would enhance access to the future Kihei Regional Park to a greater degree than a K1 alternative. However, this alternative would cause a substantial increase in noise from existing levels at areas in the future park adjacent to the alignment. The future park site is currently used for pasture.
Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. None required.	Mitigation. See Noise above.
VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES		
Construction Impacts. Vegetation along roadway shoulders would be removed from the construction of various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan. This could potentially affect existing viewsheds.	Construction Impacts. Imposition of a linear construction site on mauka viewsheds.	

**Table S-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation
(continued)**

No Build/Alternative	Build Alternatives	
	Common	Alignment-Specific
VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES (cont.)		
<p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> None.</p>	<p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> Regardless of the alternative selected, the visual quality of Upcountry viewsheds will not be affected because the terrain drops away towards Central Maui and the ocean. However, the intactness of the eastern (mauka) Haleakala viewshed from Kihei will be affected by a paved roadway and associated embankments climbing the slope. Viewpoints may be created by the proposed highway, offering motorists using the highway mauka and makai viewsheds.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	<p><u>Mitigation.</u> Landscaping consistent with the climatic conditions of the area will be provided to improve the appearance of the roadway. Opportunities to establish scenic overlooks will be explored.</p>	
ENERGY		
<p><u>Construction Impacts.</u> Energy would be expended in constructing the various roadway widening projects contained in the Long-Range Plan.</p>	<p><u>Construction Impacts.</u> Energy will be expended in constructing the highway.</p>	
<p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> Would have higher overall vehicle fuel consumption when compared to any of the build alternatives, as travelers experience increasing congestion between Upcountry and Kihei-Makena / West Maui along the existing indirect route.</p>	<p><u>Operational Impacts.</u> Will have lower overall vehicle fuel consumption when compared to the No Build alternative because the highway will provide a more direct route between Upcountry and Kihei or West Maui. As shown to the right, the trip length between the "Five Trees" intersection and the Lipoa Street / Piihoni Highway intersection will be reduced for each alternative when compared to the No Build alternative.</p>	<p><u>Trip length reductions by alternative:</u> <u>U1, K1 Alternative (preferred alternative).</u> 13 km (36%) trip reduction <u>U1, K2 Alternative.</u> 11 km (31%) trip reduction <u>U2-A, K1 Alternative.</u> 18 km (50%) trip reduction <u>U2-A, K2 Alternative.</u> 15 km (42%) trip reduction <u>U2-B, K1 Alternative.</u> 17 km (47%) trip reduction <u>U2-B, K2 Alternative.</u> 14 km (39%) trip reduction <u>U3, K1 Alternative.</u> 14 km (39%) trip reduction <u>U3, K2 Alternative.</u> 12 km (33%) trip reduction</p>
<p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	<p><u>Mitigation.</u> None required.</p>	

Alternatives with a K2 alignment (U1,K2; U2-A,K2; U2-B,K2; and U3;K2)

- These alternatives would cause noise impacts at the future Kihei Regional Park.

Cumulative impacts in the project area would be caused by implementation of the County's Community Plans, and other actions by governmental and private interests (see Section S.5). However, these impacts would be tempered by the large size of the project area. For example, the loss of some uncultivated lands would not affect the biological diversity of the region because the plant species affected are abundant, and are mostly not native. However, continuing encroachment on agricultural land is a concern. If not controlled, continued urban encroachment could adversely affect the sugarcane and pineapple industries on Maui, as well the small-scale farmers in Kula. The planned residential and commercial developments in Upcountry are also a concern because they would substantially increase the population of a region that is largely based on rural and agricultural lifestyles. Many Upcountry residents expressed concern that large population growth could change the "country" ambience of Upcountry.

Secondary impacts from highway projects often occur because they can induce development. These secondary impacts can include effects on open space, air quality, water quality, natural vegetation, historic sites, social environment and demands on infrastructure. However, in this case, secondary impacts from the proposed project are not anticipated because the highway would have little influence on those proposing development because other factors, such as a severely limited water supply, appear to be controlling development. The exception would be the U1 alternatives, which may facilitate a westward (makai) expansion of Pukalani and additional growth in Haliimaile, beyond what is designated in the Community Plan.

S.5 MAJOR ACTIONS PROPOSED BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES IN THE PROJECT VICINITY AND COMPATIBILITY WITH LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES

Kihei-Upcountry Highway would be consistent with most of the governmental plans, policies and projects in the area. Specifically:

- Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would fulfill the recommendations of the Island of Maui-Long Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1997) to construct a new highway from Upcountry to Piilani Highway.
- The SDOT and the County of Maui are planning to make improvements to the highway and roadway system in the project area. Most SDOT improvements consist of widening existing highways. Most planned new roadways are in Kihei to improve local circulation. These other roadway improvements are consistent with the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway.
- The proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would support the goals of the Hawaii State Plan (June 1991) dealing with economic, physical and natural environment, and transportation objectives and policies.
- The proposed project would be consistent with the objectives and policies of the State's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program. The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT), the agency administering the State's CZM program, is presently reviewing project consistency.
- Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would be consistent with the County of Maui's General Plan 1990 dealing with economic, environmental, and transportation objectives and policies.
- All of the alternatives are consistent with Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998), which included the proposed highway. However, only the No Build alternative is fully consistent with Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996). The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan did not support the highway, but indicated a preference for the U1 terminus if the road were to be built.

Public and private interests are developing the following projects in the general vicinity of the proposed road:

- The State of Hawaii Department of Hawaiian Home Lands will be developing homesteads in Keokea.

- The County of Maui Board of Water Supply (BWS) is planning additional reservoirs and other improvements in the Upcountry water supply systems (Makawao, and Upper and Lower Kula). The purpose of these improvements is to support planned developments as specified in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan and to minimize the need to implement water use restrictions during drought conditions.
- A private developer will be constructing Kulamalu, an approximately 93 ha (230 acre) residential, recreational, cultural and commercial development located south of Pukalani. A Kamehameha Schools campus has already been built on this site.
- Alexander & Baldwin is planning a 27 ha (67 acre) residential housing development in Haliimaile.
- The Maui R&T Park may eventually encompass 168 ha (415 acres). Per County ordinance, fifty percent of the R&T Park must be dedicated to research and development, forty percent to support facilities and ten percent to light manufacturing and general industrial.
- The Maui Electric Company, Ltd., is planning to construct a 232-megawatt electrical generating station on Pulehu Road, approximately two miles east (mauka) of Mokulele Highway.
- Two parcels along Mokulele Highway, Mokulele Baseyard and the old Puunene Airport, are planned to be redeveloped for light industrial and other uses.

S.6 UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The major planning-level issues associated with the proposed highway have been addressed and resolved during the EIS process. There are no unresolved issues that need to be addressed at this phase of project planning. Several project mitigation measures must be tracked and implemented starting in the design phase of the project, including the preparation of detailed mitigation plans for archeological and agricultural impacts. Various design details must be investigated in the next phase of project planning, including the

provision of signals at the project termini and scenic overlooks. Various permits and approvals (see Section S.7) must be obtained before construction starts.

S.7 APPROVALS AND PERMITS

The following permits or approvals would be required prior to the construction of the highway.

Federal

- Army Corps of Engineers - Section 404 permit (Nationwide)

State

- State Department of Health (SDOH) - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (storm water from construction site)
- SDOH - Noise permit (if noise levels are expected to exceed allowable levels as stated in HAR 11-46-6(a), which would be determined during the design phase)
- SDOH - Water Quality Certification

County

- Department of Public Works (DPW)- Grading, Grubbing, Stockpiling and Excavation permit
- DPW - Permit for Excavation of Highway

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE: FINAL EIS AND TECHNICAL REPORTS

COVER SHEET

SUMMARY **S-1**

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... **i**

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION **1-1**

1.1 PLANNING CONTEXT..... 1-1
 1.1.1 ACCEPTING AUTHORITIES..... 1-1
 1.1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT..... 1-1
 1.1.3 HISTORY..... 1-3
1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT..... 1-5
 1.2.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM LINKAGE..... 1-5
 1.2.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT..... 1-7
 1.2.3 EXISTING INTERSECTION CAPACITY DEFICIENCIES..... 1-8
 1.2.4 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND..... 1-11
 1.2.5 LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVE..... 1-13
 1.2.6 COASTAL EVACUATION CAPACITY..... 1-14

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES **2-1**

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES..... 2-1
 2.1.1 NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE..... 2-1
 2.1.2 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE..... 2-2
 2.1.3 OTHER BUILD ALTERNATIVES..... 2-10
 2.1.4 ESTIMATED COST AND SCHEDULE..... 2-18
2.2 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT..... 2-20
 2.2.1 SCREENING ANALYSIS..... 2-20
 2.2.1.1 Alternatives Considered in the Screening..... 2-20
 2.2.1.2 Methodology..... 2-25
 2.2.1.2a Tier One Criteria..... 2-26
 2.2.1.2b Tier Two Criteria..... 2-28
 2.2.1.3 Alternatives Evaluation..... 2-31
 2.2.1.3a Tier One Screening..... 2-31
 2.2.1.3b Tier Two Screening..... 2-33
 2.2.1.4 Conclusion..... 2-36
 2.2.2 MODIFICATION OF SEGMENT U2..... 2-36
 2.2.3 ADJUSTMENTS TO PROJECT ALTERNATIVES..... 2-41
 2.2.4 SELECTION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE..... 2-41
 2.2.4.1 Cost Comparison..... 2-42
 2.2.4.2 Transportation Performance..... 2-43
 2.2.4.2a Travel Markets..... 2-43
 2.2.4.2b Regional Traffic Impacts..... 2-45
 2.2.4.3 Agricultural Impacts..... 2-47
 2.2.4.4 Community Plan Preference..... 2-48

2.2.4.5 Conclusion and Selection of Preferred Alternative 2-49

CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-1

3.1 LAND USE..... 3-1

3.1.1 REGIONAL SETTING..... 3-1

3.1.2 EXISTING LAND USES 3-1

3.1.3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS 3-4

3.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL PLANS, POLICIES AND CONTROLS FOR
THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-6

3.1.4.1 Hawaii State Plans and Controls..... 3-6

3.1.4.1a Hawaii State Plan..... 3-6

3.1.4.1b Hawaii State Land Use Controls..... 3-7

3.1.4.1c Coastal Zone Management Act (CZM) (Chapter 205A, HRS)..... 3-7

3.1.4.1d Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan 3-7

3.1.4.2 County of Maui Plans and Controls..... 3-9

3.1.4.2a General Plan..... 3-9

3.1.4.2b County of Maui Zoning..... 3-10

3.1.4.2c County of Maui Special Management Area 3-10

3.1.4.2d Community Plans..... 3-10

3.2 FARMLAND 3-15

3.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY 3-17

3.3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS..... 3-17

3.3.2 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS 3-20

3.3.3 INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS..... 3-22

3.3.4 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS 3-22

3.3.5 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES..... 3-24

3.3.6 CRIME..... 3-26

3.4 INFRASTRUCTURE..... 3-26

3.4.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM..... 3-26

3.4.1.1 Roadway Network..... 3-26

3.4.1.2 Roadway Accidents..... 3-29

3.4.2 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES 3-30

3.4.3 WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM..... 3-32

3.4.4 DRAINAGE..... 3-33

3.5 CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY 3-34

3.5.1 LOCAL METEOROLOGY..... 3-34

3.5.2 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS..... 3-34

3.5.3 ATTAINMENT STATUS OF STUDY AREA..... 3-36

3.5.4 MONITORED AIR QUALITY 3-36

3.6 NOISE..... 3-37

3.6.1 CHARACTERISTICS AND MEASUREMENT OF SOUND 3-37

3.6.2 NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA 3-38

3.6.3 MEASUREMENTS AND EXISTING CONDITIONS..... 3-38

3.7 WATER RESOURCES 3-41

3.7.1 SURFACE WATERS..... 3-41

3.7.2 GROUNDWATER..... 3-42

3.7.3 WETLANDS 3-42

3.7.4 FLOODPLAINS..... 3-43

3.8 ECOSYSTEMS.....	3-43
3.8.1 FLORA.....	3-43
3.8.2 FAUNA.....	3-45
3.8.3 ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES.....	3-45
3.9 GEOLOGY, PHYSIOGRAPHY, SITE CONTAMINATION AND NATURAL HAZARDS.....	3-47
3.9.1 PHYSIOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING.....	3-47
3.9.2 HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES.....	3-47
3.9.3 NATURAL HAZARDS.....	3-49
3.10 HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	3-49
3.10.1 EARLY AGENCY COORDINATION.....	3-51
3.10.2 RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY.....	3-51
3.10.2.1 Methodology.....	3-51
3.10.2.2 Survey Results.....	3-52
3.10.3 INVENTORY SURVEY.....	3-56
3.10.3.1 Methodology.....	3-56
3.10.3.2 Survey Results.....	3-57
3.10.4 TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES / PRACTICES.....	3-61
3.10.4.1 Methodology.....	3-62
3.10.4.2 Results of Study.....	3-62
3.10.5 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION.....	3-63
3.11 PARKS AND RECREATION.....	3-65
3.12 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES.....	3-67
CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	4-1
4.1 LAND USE.....	4-1
4.1.1 LAND USE IMPACTS.....	4-1
4.1.1.1 Kihei-Makena.....	4-2
4.1.1.2 Upcountry.....	4-2
4.1.2 RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROPOSED ACTION TO GOVERNMENTAL PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS.....	4-6
4.1.2.1 Hawaii State Plans and Controls.....	4-6
4.1.2.1a Hawaii State Plan.....	4-6
4.1.2.1b Coastal Zone Management (CZM).....	4-8
4.1.2.1c Island of Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan.....	4-11
4.1.2.2 County of Maui Plans and Controls.....	4-11
4.1.2.2a Maui County General Plan.....	4-11
4.1.2.2b Maui County Special Management Area.....	4-12
4.1.2.2c Community Plans.....	4-12
4.1.3 RELOCATION IMPACTS.....	4-12
4.1.4 MITIGATION MEASURES.....	4-13
4.1.4.1 Land Use.....	4-13
4.1.4.2 Relocation.....	4-13
4.2 FARMLAND.....	4-14
4.2.1 CROPLAND IMPACTS.....	4-14
4.2.2 RANCHING IMPACTS.....	4-17
4.2.3 FARMLAND PROTECTION POLICY ACT.....	4-18
4.2.4 MITIGATION MEASURES.....	4-18
4.3 SOCIOECONOMIC.....	4-20
4.3.1 NEIGHBORHOODS.....	4-20

4.3.2 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES.....	4-21
4.3.3 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES.....	4-22
4.3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EXECUTIVE ORDER 12898).....	4-24
4.3.5 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-25
4.4 INFRASTRUCTURE.....	4-26
4.4.1 TRANSPORTATION.....	4-26
4.4.1.1 Traffic Patterns.....	4-26
4.4.1.2 Future Traffic Operations.....	4-30
4.4.1.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Movements	4-35
4.4.2 WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.....	4-35
4.4.3 DRAINAGE.....	4-35
4.4.4 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-36
4.5 AIR QUALITY.....	4-36
4.5.1 POLLUTANTS FOR ANALYSIS	4-36
4.5.2 METHODOLOGY.....	4-37
4.5.2.1 Microscale Analysis	4-37
4.5.2.2 Mesoscale Analysis.....	4-38
4.5.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS	4-39
4.5.3.1 Microscale Analysis	4-39
4.5.3.2 Mesoscale Analysis.....	4-40
4.5.4 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-40
4.6 NOISE.....	4-41
4.6.1 PREDICTION METHODOLOGY	4-41
4.6.2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS	4-42
4.6.3 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-44
4.7 WATER RESOURCES	4-46
4.7.1 SURFACE WATER.....	4-46
4.7.2 GROUNDWATER.....	4-47
4.7.3 WETLANDS.....	4-47
4.7.4 FLOODPLAINS.....	4-48
4.7.5 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-48
4.8 ECOSYSTEMS.....	4-48
4.8.1 FLORA	4-48
4.8.2 FAUNA	4-50
4.8.3 ENDANGERED, THREATENED AND MIGRATORY SPECIES.....	4-51
4.8.4 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-52
4.9 GEOLOGY, PHYSIOGRAPHY, SITE CONTAMINATION AND NATURAL HAZARDS	4-53
4.9.1 GEOLOGIC AND PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING.....	4-53
4.9.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	4-53
4.9.3 NATURAL HAZARDS.....	4-54
4.10 HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	4-55
4.10.1 SECTION 106 AND CHAPTER 6E.....	4-55
4.10.2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS	4-57
4.10.2.1 Historic and Archaeological Resources.....	4-57
4.10.2.2 Traditional Cultural Properties / Practices.....	4-59
4.10.3 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-61

4.11 PARKLANDS.....	4-61
4.12 SECTION 4(F).....	4-62
4.13 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES	4-63
4.13.1 POTENTIAL IMPACTS	4-63
4.13.2 MITIGATION MEASURES	4-64
4.14 ENERGY	4-65
4.15 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	4-65
4.16 SECONDARY IMPACTS	4-72
4.17 CONSTRUCTION.....	4-73
4.17.1 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC	4-73
4.17.2 AIR QUALITY.....	4-73
4.17.2.1 Potential Impacts	4-73
4.17.2.2 Mitigation.....	4-74
4.17.3 NOISE AND VIBRATION.....	4-75
4.17.3.1 Potential Impacts	4-75
4.17.3.2 Mitigation Measures.....	4-76
4.17.4 WATER RESOURCES.....	4-77
4.17.4.1 Potential Impacts	4-77
4.17.4.2 Mitigation Measures.....	4-77
4.17.5 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND HAZARDOUS WASTE	4-78
4.17.5.1 Potential Impacts	4-78
4.17.5.2 Mitigation Measures.....	4-78
4.17.6 AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES	4-81
4.17.6.1 Potential Impacts	4-81
4.17.6.2 Mitigation Measures.....	4-81
4.17.7 HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	4-82
4.17.7.1 Potential Impacts	4-82
4.17.7.2 Mitigation Measures.....	4-82
4.18 PERMITS AND APPROVALS	4-82
4.19 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES VERSUS LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY.....	4-83
4.20 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES	4-83
CHAPTER 5 - COMMENTS AND COORDINATION.....	5-1
5.1 PROJECT SCOPING PROCESS.....	5-1
5.1.1 AGENCY SCOPING AND COORDINATION.....	5-1
5.1.2 COORDINATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS	5-6
5.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	5-6
5.1.3.1 Issuance of the EISPN and NOI.....	5-6
5.1.3.2 Responses Received During the EISPN Comment Period	5-7
5.2 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS.....	5-10
5.3 WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS.....	5-12
5.4 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.....	5-14
5.4.1 AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	5-14
5.4.2 PUBLIC HEARINGS.....	5-14
5.4.3 COMMENTS.....	5-18

CHAPTER 6 - LIST OF PREPARERS..... 6-1
CHAPTER 7 - FINAL EIS RECIPIENTS..... 7-1
CHAPTER 8 - BIBLIOGRAPHY 8-1
CHAPTER 9 - INDEX 9-1

APPENDICES

- A:** Early Scoping Comment Letters
 - Invitation to Agency Scoping Meeting
 - Minutes of the Agency Scoping Meeting
 - Minutes and Sign-in Sheets of the October 18 and 19, 1995 Public Information Meetings
 - Minutes and Sign-in Sheets of the May 15 and 16, 1996 Public Information Meetings
 - Comment Letters and Responses Following the May 15 and 16, 1996 Public Information Meetings
 - Public Announcement of the Alternatives to be Considered in the Draft EIS
 - Comment Letters Received After the Draft EIS Alternatives Announcement and Responses
- B:** Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN)
 - Notice of Intent (NOI)
 - Environmental Assessment Distribution List
 - Agency and Public Comment Letters Responding to the EISPN and Responses
 - Notices of Availability of the Draft EIS
 - Public Hearing Materials
- C:** Cooperating Agency Letter
 - Endangered Species Act Coordination Letters
 - Farmland Protection Policy Act Coordination Letters
 - National Historic Preservation Act Coordination Letters
 - Coastal Zone Management Letters
 - Other Agency Consultation Letters
- D:** Environmental Assessment
- E:** Alternatives Analysis Report
- F:** Air Quality Analysis Technical Memorandum
- G:** Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum
- H:** Community Impact Assessment
- I:** Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey Report
 - Archaeological Inventory Survey Report
 - Cultural Impact Assessment Report
- J:** Botanical Screening Reconnaissance Study
 - Botanical Survey
 - Additional Botanical Survey -- U2-A Alignment
- K:** EDR - Environmental Atlas

VOLUME TWO: DRAFT EIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

PUBLIC HEARING TRANSCRIPTS

Kihei Aquatic and Community Center, September 29, 1999
Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center, September 30, 1999
Kahului School, October 13, 1999

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT COMMENTS THAT REQUIRE
RESPONSES**

Transmittal Letter from the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
Letters, Comment Forms, Paraphrased Oral Comments and Responses from the State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT COMMENTS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE
RESPONSES**

Transmittal Letter from the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
Letters and Comment Forms

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1-1 Project Location 1-2
1-2 Corridor Alternatives Established by the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Task Force 1-4
1-3 Existing Route Between Maui R&T Park and Science City 1-6
1-4 Existing Peak Hour Volumes in Kihei and Kahului 1-9
1-5 Existing Peak Hour Volumes in Upcountry 1-10

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES

2-1 Preferred Alternative 2-3
2-2 Typical Roadway Sections 2-5
2-3 Bridge Locations 2-8
2-4 Typical Bridge Profiles 2-9
2-5 Build Alternatives 2-11
2-6 U2-A Alternative Near the "Five trees" Intersection 2-14
2-7 Alternatives Entering the Screening Analysis 2-21
2-8 Alternatives 2B, 2C and Enhanced Widening of Existing Roadways 2-24
2-9 Alternatives Selected Following Screening Analysis 2-37
2-10 Modifications of Segment U2 2-38

CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3-1 Existing Neighborhoods and Communities 3-2
3-2 Future Development Projects 3-5
3-3 State Land Use Districts 3-8
3-4 Special Management Area 3-11
3-5 Community Planning Areas 3-12
3-6 Sugarcane and Pineapple Fields 3-16
3-7 Census Tracts 3-18
3-8 Public Facilities 3-25
3-9 Major Roadways 3-28
3-10 Existing and Proposed Bikeways 3-31
3-11 Noise Monitoring Sites 3-39
3-12 Axis Deer Population Density 3-46
3-13 Soil Types in Project Area 3-48
3-14 Tsunami Evacuation Areas 3-50
3-15 Historic and Archaeological Sites Found During the Reconnaissance Surveys 3-53
3-16 Historic and Archaeological Site Found During the Inventory
Survey of Alternative U1,K1 3-58
3-17 Parks and Recreational Areas 3-66

CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4-1 Existing and Future Urban Areas in Pukalani-Makawao 4-5
4-2 Impacts to Croplands 4-15
4-3 Possible Intersections with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads 4-29
4-4 Potential Alternative U3 Impacts to Local Residential Roads 4-31
4-5 Viewplane from State Site 50-50-10-2701 4-60

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1-1 Existing Levels of Service at Critical Intersections 1-12

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

2-1 Estimated Right-of-Way Requirement For Each Alignment Alternative 2-13
2-2 Potential Bridges for Build Alternatives Other Than the Preferred 2-17
2-3 Bridge Requirements for Build Alternatives Other Than the Preferred 2-18
2-4 Estimated Cost by Alternative 2-19
2-5 Proposed Project Schedule 2-19
2-6 Original Alignment Alternatives 2-22
2-7 Tier One Screening 2-32
2-8 Tier Two Screening 2-34
2-9 Comparison of U2 Modifications 2-40

CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3-1 Demographic Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 3-19
3-2 Housing Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 3-21
3-3 Income Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 3-23
3-4 Crime Rate for Selected Offenses Per 10,000 Residents 3-27
3-5 Motor Vehicle Accidents 3-30
3-6 National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards 3-35
3-7 Air Quality Summary for Study Area (SDOH and MECO Monitoring Stations) 3-37
3-8 FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) 3-40
3-9 Existing Noise Levels 3-41
3-10 Sites Located During Reconnaissance Surveys 3-54
3-11 Summary of Inventory Survey of the U1,K1 Alignment 3-59

CHAPTER 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4-1 Estimated Displacement of Farmlands 4-14
4-2 Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Scores from Form AD-1006 4-19
4-3 Comparison of Traffic Pattern Impacts by Alternative 4-27
4-4 Projected Levels of Service for the U1, U2-A and U2-B Alternatives in 2020 4-32
4-5 Projected Levels of Service for the U3 Alternatives in 2020 4-33
4-6 Project Levels of Service at the Alternative Termini in 2020 4-34
4-7 Predicted Worst-Case 1-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)* 4-39
4-8 Predicted Worst-Case 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)* 4-40
4-9 Predicted Year 2020 Noise Levels 4-43
4-10 Size of Vegetational Displacement 4-50
4-11 Comparison of Earthwork (General Site Work) Among Alternatives 4-54
4-12 Historic Properties to be Adversely Affected by Alternative 4-58
4-13 Trip Distance Between Five Trees and the Lipoa Street by Alternative 4-66
4-14 Construction Equipment Noise Levels 4-76

CHAPTER 5 - COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

5-1 Public and Agency Consultation During Scoping 5-2
5-2 Summary of How Draft EIS Comments Were Provided 5-19

CHAPTER ONE

Purpose of and Need for Action

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1.1 PLANNING CONTEXT

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) are issuing this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) as the lead federal and local agencies for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project. This proposed federal-aid, two-lane limited access rural highway would directly link Kihei-Makena, an urban area on the southern coast of Maui, to Upcountry, a suburban and rural region on the western flank of Haleakala Volcano (see Figure 1-1). The highway would connect Piilani Highway (Kihei-Makena) with either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway (Upcountry). This project is included in the current, federally-approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.


1.1.1 ACCEPTING AUTHORITIES

At the federal level, the FHWA Hawaii Division Administrator approved this Final EIS. At the State level, the accepting authority of this Final EIS is the Governor of the State of Hawaii. It is expected that the Governor will accept this Final EIS, completing the EIS requirements under Hawaii's EIS Law. It is also expected that the FHWA will issue a Record of Decision (ROD), completing the project's requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). After issuance of the ROD and Final EIS acceptance by the Governor, the design phase of the project may proceed.


1.1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Final EIS has been prepared to comply with:

- the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA);
- Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS);



Project Location
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 1-1



- FHWA and FTA Joint Regulations, 23 CFR 771;
- Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, 40 CFR 1500-1508; and
- the Hawaii Administrative Rules [Title 11, Chapter 200 (August 1996)].


This document identifies and assesses the environmental and social impacts that could result from the development of the proposed highway. The highway would be designed for anticipated traffic demand in the year 2020, which corresponds to the planning horizon of the Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1997). Therefore, potential impacts are assessed for that year. Construction-phase impacts are also assessed.

The EIS process has been designed to enable project sponsors to develop a well-planned project that is sensitive to the physical, natural and social environment within which it would exist, and to evaluate and set forth the impacts associated with various alternatives under consideration. Coordination with interested and affected parties is also required and must be documented.

1.1.3 HISTORY

Study of a Kihei-Upcountry Highway began over 30 years ago when, in 1970, the County of Maui studied the feasibility of a road between Upcountry and Kihei. In 1988, the County of Maui Toll Road Study developed three possible alternative alignments. In 1991, the Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study was completed and again identified a link between Upcountry and Kihei as a needed transportation improvement.

More recently, in 1993, the Mayor of the County of Maui created a State/County Joint Task Force for an Upcountry/Kihei Highway (Task Force). Its membership consisted of State and County officials and private citizens. The Task Force's mission was to recommend an alignment between the coastal urban center of Kihei and the rural residential communities of Upcountry. The Task Force produced a report in October 1993, which recommended possible alignment corridors (see Figure 1-2). When SDOT and FHWA began in-depth study of this proposed roadway link, they considered the alignment corridors recommended by the Task Force as well as alternatives derived from other past efforts (see Section 2.2).



Source: State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, October 1993



Corridor Alternatives Established by the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Task Force
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 1-2

1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT


The project ("the proposed action") is being designed to satisfy the following six purposes and needs:

- establish roadway system linkage;
- support economic development;
- address existing intersection capacity deficiencies;
- satisfy increased transportation demand;
- promote the National interest as expressed through legislative directive; and
- increase coastal evacuation capacity.


1.2.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM LINKAGE

The travel distance between Kihei-Makena, a major employment center located along Maui's southern coast, and Makawao or Pukalani, the larger Upcountry residential communities, is 30 km to 35 km (19 to 22 miles). However, the straight-line distance between the two areas is substantially less, at 15 km to 20 km (9 to 12 miles). The large difference between distance by roadway and direct distance is due to the circuitous transportation route the traveler must presently take to get from one area to the other. Starting from Upcountry, the route includes Haleakala Highway, Hana Highway, Dairy Road, Hansen Road, Puunene Avenue, Mokulele Highway and Piilani Highway. In addition to other purposes, the Kihei-Upcountry route is used for travel between the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park in Kihei and scientific facilities at the summit of Haleakala, called Science City. The travel distance between the two interrelated facilities is presently about 70 km (45 miles) (see Figure 1-3). The transportation route between the Upcountry communities and West Maui (Lahaina-Kaanapali-Kapalua) is also circuitous.

A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would establish a direct route for these journeys, substantially reducing travel distances, thereby saving both travel time and vehicle fuel consumption.



Existing Route Between Maui R & T Park and Science City
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 1-3



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

1.2.2 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Maui's largest industry now and for the foreseeable future is tourism. According to socioeconomic projections prepared for the county (Maui County Community Plan Update Program, Socio-Economic Forecast, January 1994), the number of Maui visitors is expected to be close to four million by the year 2010, a daily average of over 66,000. In 1990, visitor arrivals numbered approximately 2.3 million, a daily average of 38,000. In other words, almost three out of ten persons, on a daily average, is a visitor. Independent projections prepared by the State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) indicate that the daily average visitor count will be 64,900 by the year 2010, which is close to the County of Maui projections.

In 1990, West Maui and Kihei-Makena contained approximately 53 percent and 42 percent of the island's hotel rooms, respectively. These two regions are expected to continue to be the primary visitor accommodation areas for the island, maintaining their 95 percent share of the island's hotel rooms in the future. In contrast to the hotel accommodation concentration in these two regions, tourist-related attractions are spread throughout the island: from the historic Lahaina town on the west side of the island, to Iao Needle near Wailuku, to Hana and Oheo Gulch (Seven Pools) on the east side of the island, to the new Maui Ocean Center in Maalaea on the south side of the island, to the National Park on the summit of Haleakala.

Along with visitor growth, the number of tourism-related jobs in Kihei-Makena and West Maui is also expected to increase. In 1990, these regions contained over 7,500 and 15,400 jobs, respectively, accounting for over 44 percent of the island's total. Socioeconomic projections contained in the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996) indicate by 2020 an increase to over 13,000 (73 percent) and 23,000 (49 percent) jobs in these two regions, respectively. Residential population is projected to grow by over 60 percent from 1990 to 2020. New housing to accommodate this growth would generally be concentrated at existing residential areas of Kahului-Wailuku, West Maui, Kihei-Makena and Upcountry. Upcountry would continue to be a popular residential area because of its spectacular vistas and cool climate.


Maui's high technology industry, located primarily at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City on the summit of Haleakala, is contributing to the diversification of Maui's economy. The Maui R&T Park currently houses the Maui High Performance Computing Center, Boeing-Rocketdyne, Sunsource, the U.S. Air Force, the Pacific Disaster Center, Lockheed Martin, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, and a number of small companies. Currently about eight percent built-out, the Park may eventually encompass 168 ha (415 acres) and include major new industries such as bio- and medical-technology; arts and entertainment; environmental, earth and ocean sciences; information processing and exchange; defense missions; and education and international training and technology conferencing. Science City, a federal facility, is used for space- and defense-related research and development. Science City receives technical support from defense contractors occupying space in the R&T Park.

A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would support economic development initiatives by facilitating tourist travel between hotel accommodation regions and Haleakala National Park and other tourist-related attractions in Upcountry; linking the growing residential areas of Upcountry with growing labor markets in Kihei-Makena and West Maui; and providing improved transportation mobility between the R&T Park and Science City, which would support businesses and federal government personnel at the R&T Park who provide technical assistance to Science City.

1.2.3 EXISTING INTERSECTION CAPACITY DEFICIENCIES


Figures 1-4 and 1-5 present the morning and afternoon peak hour turning movement volumes at the following intersections between Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui.

- Pukalani Bypass and Makawao Avenue
- Haleakala Highway and Halimaile Road
- Haleakala Highway and Hana Highway
- Hana Highway and Hansen Road
- Hana Highway and Dairy Road
- Dairy Road and Puunene Road and Kuihelani Highway



Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, June and August 1996

Existing Peak Hour Volumes in Kihai and Kahului
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 1-4



Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, June and August 1996

Existing Peak Hour Volumes in Upcountry
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 1-5

- Puunene Avenue and Hansen Road
- Puunene Avenue and Mokulele Highway
- Mokulele Highway and Piilani Highway

Operating conditions at these intersections were analyzed using the methodologies contained in the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The HCM methodologies classify traffic operations by "level of service" (LOS). LOS is designated "A" through "F", representing best to worst conditions. The levels are based on user delays, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. LOS C or D are generally considered the lowest levels that are still acceptable.

Table 1-1 summarizes the existing levels of service at the intersections identified above. In the a.m. peak hour, three intersections are experiencing levels of service "E" or lower. In the p.m. peak hour, five intersections are experiencing levels of service "E" or lower.

A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would divert some travel demand from these intersections to a new, more direct route; relieving existing congestion at these intersections.

1.2.4 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND

In 1990, daily average trip generation on the island exceeded 233,000 trips. According to the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996), daily trip generation is projected to increase to over 386,000 trips in the year 2020. Kihei-Makena and West Maui presently generate a large portion of these trips as major employment centers and primary hotel accommodation regions. The concentration of trip generation is expected to remain in these regions. Since Maui's population is expected to grow by over 60 percent from 1990 to 2020, home-based work trips are projected to exceed 69,000 in 2020; 26,000 more than in 1990. Many home-based work trips would be between residential areas and the employment centers of Kihei-Makena and West Maui. Many workers in these two regions live in other parts of the island, including Upcountry, which is one of Maui's most popular residential regions because of its cool climate and spectacular vistas.

**Table 1-1
Existing Levels of Service at
Critical Intersections**

Location	Peak Hour	
	A.M.	P.M.
Haleakala Hwy./Pukalani Bypass (Signalized)	C	B
Haleakala Hwy./Haliimaile Road(Unsignalized)	A	B
Major Street Left Turn	D	B
Minor Street Left Turn	F	F
Haleakala Hwy./Hana Hwy. (Signalized)	E	C
Hana Hwy./Hansen Road (Unsignalized)	A	F
Major Street Left Turn	B	F
Minor Street Left Turn	F	F
Hana Hwy./Dairy Road (Signalized)	C	E
Dairy Rd./Kuihelani Hwy./Puunene Road (Signalized)	D	E
Puunene Ave./Hansen Road (Unsignalized)	E	F
Major Street Left Turn	B	B
Minor Street Left Turn	F	F
Puunene Ave./Mokulele Highway (Unsignalized)	A	A
Major Street Left Turn	B	B
Minor Street Left Turn	D	F
Mokulele Hwy./Piilani Highway (Signalized)	E	E

Notes: LOS A: describes operations with very low delay, i.e., less than 5.0 seconds per vehicle, and most vehicles do not stop at all.
 LOS B: describes operations with delays in the range of 5.1 to 15.0 seconds per vehicle.
 LOS C: describes operations with delays in the range of 15.1 to 25.0 seconds per vehicle. The number of vehicles stopping become more noticeable, however, many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping.
 LOS D: describes operations with delays in the range of 25.1 to 40.0 seconds per vehicle. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines.
 LOS E: describes operations with delays in the range of 40.1 to 60.0 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.
 LOS F: describes operations with delay in excess of 60.0 seconds per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers.

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, November 1997

Maui's heavy reliance on the tourist industry also generates a high percentage (15 percent) of daily trips made by visitors. Trip generation by visitors is projected to increase from over 35,000 in 1990 to close to 60,000 (approximately a 70 percent increase) in 2020 based on projections of visitor arrivals. Many Maui tourists would visit Haleakala National Park, arriving by rental car, tour bus or shuttle, or bicycle tour. Currently, approximately one million people visit the Haleakala summit annually. A Park official indicated that the number of visitors to the summit correlates with the number of visitors to the island, including seasonal variations (telephone conversation, December 8, 1997). Therefore, a visitor count projection of four million in the year 2010 (made by the County of Maui) would increase the number of visitors to the summit to approximately 1.7 million. Since approximately 95 percent of the visitors stay at Kihei-Makena and West Maui (based on these regions' share of hotel rooms on the island), a large number of trips would be made between accommodation regions and the summit.

Based on the transportation demand projections and intersection capacity deficiencies described in Section 1.2.3, the following improvements are needed:

1. additional roadway capacity between existing and future residential communities in Upcountry and employment centers in Kihei-Makena and West Maui; and
2. additional roadway capacity between visitor accommodation regions in Kihei-Makena and West Maui, and Haleakala National Park and tourist attractions in Upcountry.

The proposed project would help satisfy both requirements.

1.2.5 LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVE

Federal funding for the planning of this project was appropriated because of the national interest in improved mobility between defense-related activities at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City at the Haleakala summit (see Section 1.2.2). Science City does and will continue to receive technical support from defense contractors in the R&T Park. The construction of the proposed highway would address the national interest as expressed by this legislative directive.

1.2.6 COASTAL EVACUATION CAPACITY

Located on the southern coast of Maui, Kihei-Makena is vulnerable to coastal hazards such as tsunami or tropical storms. In the event of an evacuation, the only routes presently available are Mokulele Highway and North Kihei Road. Both roads are near sea level, making them vulnerable to flooding during a heavy storm, and may become impassable. In addition to the limited number of lanes these roads provide (two each), their north Kihei termini are approximately 90 m (300 ft) from one another. The close proximity of Mokulele Highway and North Kihei Road, their limited number of lanes, and the vulnerability of these roads to flooding could become sources of evacuation delay.

A Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would improve evacuation capacity by providing two additional lanes out of Kihei-Makena approximately 2.4 km (1.5 miles) or 7.6 km (4.7 miles) from the Piilani Highway / Mokulele Highway intersection (2.4 km (1.5 miles) for the preferred alternative). These two additional lanes would relieve some of the evacuation congestion at the northern end of Kihei, and provide an alignment for evacuation that would be geographically separated from the existing routes.

CHAPTER TWO

Alternatives

CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES

This chapter describes the alternatives that receive detailed analysis in Chapter 4 of this Final EIS (eight build alternatives and the No Build alternative). It also describes the alternative development and screening processes that led to the selection of these alternatives.

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

2.1.1 NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

The No Build alternative consists of roadway improvements that are expected to be implemented by 2020, according to the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (Final Report, February 1997), except for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project. Proposed roadway improvements in the vicinity of the proposed project include:

- South Kihei Road. Widen from two to four lanes with a continuous left turn lane from Longs Drug Store to Lipoa Street, and widen from two to four lanes from Kupuna Street to Welakahao Road;
- North-South Collector. Construct a two lane collector road from Uwapo Road to Road F;
- Road C. Construct a four lane connector road from South Kihei Road (at Azeka Commercial Center) to Piilani Highway;
- Piilani Highway. Widen from two to four lanes from Mokulele Highway to Wailea Ike Road;
- Mokulele Highway / Piilani Highway Intersection. Reconfigure intersection making Mokulele Highway to Piilani Highway the through movement;
- Mokulele Highway. Widen from two to four lanes from Puunene Avenue to North Kihei Road;
- Puunene Avenue. Widen from two to four lanes from Kaahumanu Avenue to Mokulele Highway;

- Kuihelani Highway. Widen from two to four lanes from Puunene Road to Honoapiilani Highway, and construct an access road to Kahului Airport, bypassing Dairy Road;
- Hana Highway. Widen from four to six lanes from Kaahumanu Avenue to Haleakala Highway, and widen from two to four lanes from Haleakala Highway to Baldwin Avenue;
- Haleakala Highway. Widen from three to four lanes from Hana Highway to Haliimaile Road;
- Pukalani Bypass. Widen from three to four lanes from Haliimaile Road to Kula Highway; and
- Kula Highway. Widen two to four lanes from Haleakala Highway to Pulehu Road.

The Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (1996) also references the construction of Ke Alii Alanui Street. This project was completed in 1997.

In summary, the No Build alternative consists primarily of widening to varying degrees the existing roads along the present route from Kihei to Upcountry. The No Build alternative (the projects listed above) serves as the reference against which project impacts are assessed in Chapter 4.

2.1.2 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The preferred alternative is the alignment from the Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection to the Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection (see Figure 2-1). This alternative is called U1.K1. (As discussed in more detail below, the alternative Kihei termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the alternative Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3.)


The proposed highway will be a limited access, two-lane arterial roadway, with a length of approximately 15.8 km (9.8 miles). A two-lane highway is proposed because projections indicate that two lanes would be sufficient to accommodate travel demand in the design year, 2020. A truck climbing lane is not proposed because the number of loaded trucks heading uphill is expected to be small, and cars would have opportunities to pass.

The roadway will include one 3.7 m (12 ft) lane in each direction, and paved shoulders (see Figure 2-2). The shoulders will be wide enough to accommodate bicyclists. A rural design, shown on Figure 2-2, will generally be used where the highway traverses rural areas presently used for crop production, pasture or open space. The urban design, which includes bike lanes and sidewalks that are in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (see Figure 2-2), will be used for the section of highway that passes through Urban-designated land (in accordance with the State land use classification system) in the vicinity of the Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection (K1 terminus).

Under the rural design, roadway drainage structures will consist of a partially concrete-lined swale along one side of the road and a grated inlet catch basin on the other side at or near the right-of-way center line. Roadway runoff will be discharged to the nearest gulch. The urban design's drainage facilities will be storm drains or grated catch basins along the curbs. Runoff will again be discharged to the nearest gulch or drainage canal.

The width of the right-of-way needed for Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would be at least 49 m (160 ft) in rural areas and at least 37 m (120 ft) in urban areas. Although only a two-lane highway is being proposed initially, the acquisition of right-of-way for a four-lane divided highway will be conducted to allow for the future expansion of the highway to four lanes (two lanes in each direction). The preferred alternative assessed in this document involves construction and operation of a two-lane road, and the necessary earthwork for a four-lane, divided highway where the highway crosses some gulches (see below), and where the urban design roadway section will be provided (see Figure 2-2). During the detailed design of the earthwork, the cut and fill volumes will be balanced so that excess fill material will not need to be disposed outside the construction area, nor will fill material need to be imported from other areas. If the road is widened in the future, additional earthwork will only be required in rural areas and those gulches not addressed in the initial phase of construction.

The precise width of the right-of-way at a given point will depend on local terrain features, which will affect the amount of earthwork required (i.e., cut and fill to achieve the desired roadway profile).



Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997

Typical Roadway Sections
 KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 2-2

The amount of land estimated for the preferred alternative's right-of-way is approximately 97.6 ha (241 acres), which will be obtained from three property owners: Alexander & Baldwin (42.4 ha), Haleakala Ranch (47.5 ha) and Kaonoulu Ranch (7.7 ha).

At the termini, Kihei-Upcountry Highway will be designed with adequate channelization (right- and left-turn lanes) to handle the projected traffic volumes. Both the mauka and makai termini will probably warrant traffic signals. However, this decision will be made during the design phase of the project based on traffic signal warrants specified in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, published by FHWA. Lighting will be provided at the termini, but will not be provided along the length of the highway.

Four grade-separated (i.e., interchange) options were evaluated for the U1 terminus in comparison to an at-grade signalized intersection. Under each of the following options Haliimaile Road / Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would pass underneath Haleakala Highway: 1) diamond; 2) single point urban (a signalized intersection is provided directly underneath Haleakala Highway at the point where Haliimaile Road transitions to Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway); 3) partial cloverleaf (single cloverleaf for the Haleakala Highway to Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway makai bound movement); and 4) diamond with flyover (ramp for the Haleakala Highway to Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway makai bound movement). An at-grade signalized intersection is estimated to cost roughly \$800 thousand not including right-of-way, and an additional \$250 thousand if double left-turn lanes are provided. The interchange options would cost between \$20.3 million (diamond) and \$29.8 million (diamond with flyover) not including right-of-way. None of the interchange options were found to warrant further consideration because the additional cost could not be justified, especially since the at-grade signalized intersection would be able to acceptably handle projected year 2020 traffic volumes.

The posted speed limit would vary from 70 km/h (45 mph) in urban areas to 90 km/h (55 mph) in rural areas.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross several gulches. These crossings will either be by bridge or embankment (fill) within the gulches. The decision to construct a bridge or embankment depended in part on the storm water flow in the gulch being spanned. Culverts

at the base of an embankment could handle up to 100 m³/s (3,500 cfs) of storm water flow. Flow volumes above this amount require a bridge crossing. Another factor affecting the type of gulch crossing was construction considerations, such as ease of access into the gulch and location of the gulch in relation to source of available borrow material. Based on these criteria, the preferred alternative will require five bridges (see Figure 2-3). Those bridges crossing Pulehu (#2), Kolaloa (#3), Keahuia (#4), and Waiakoa (#5) Gulches will be shorter spans, approximately 30 m (100 ft), with clearances ranging from 3 m (9 ft) to 8 m (25 ft). The bridge crossing Kalialinui Gulch (#1) will be approximately 100 m (340 ft) long.


All the bridges will be two lanes. If the highway is expanded to four lanes in the future, additional two-lane bridges would be constructed at the gulch crossings.

The four shorter span bridges may not require piers, whereas the Kalialinui Gulch bridge may require piers (see Figure 2-4). If piers are required for the Kalialinui Gulch bridge, their placement will be designed to not impede storm water flow, and scour protection will be provided where necessary in accordance with federal and State requirements. Details of the bridges will be determined during the design phase of the project.

Embankment crossings will require placing fill material in the affected gulch and providing suitable scour protection. Excess material from grading to establish the roadway profile will be used to construct the embankments. The amount of borrow material created by establishing the roadway profile will be sufficient to construct all of the required embankments. Culverts will be placed at the base of the embankments to convey the storm water flow.

The preferred alternative also includes environmental mitigation measures to lessen the degree of unavoidable adverse impact. Major mitigation elements are listed below:

- Construction of grade-separated intersections (undercrossings) where the highway will cross two existing cane haul roads (see Figure 2-3; #14 and #15). The steepness of the terrain at these locations would make it difficult for the 136 000 kg (300,000 lb.) cane hauling trucks to stop if at-grade intersections are used, such as those along




Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Bridge Locations
KIHEL-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 2-3



Source: Warren S. Unimorff Engineering, Inc., December 1997


Typical Bridge Profiles
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 2-4

Haleakala, Hana and Mokulele Highways. These undercrossings will be approximately 12 m (40 ft) long, with 10.7 m (35 ft) clearance.

- Landscaping will be provided wherever practicable, which will include native trees and shrubs adapted to the site climatic conditions. Details of the landscaping plan will be developed during the design phase.
- Signage will be provided to alert motorists to possible fire conditions, and axis deer that may be on the highway.
- Scenic overlooks may be provided. This will be explored during the design phase.
- A "Maintenance of Agricultural and Ranching Activities Plan" will be prepared during the design phase and implemented during construction to minimize the adverse impact of construction-phase activities on adjacent agricultural and ranching activities. The Plan will address such items as repair and replacement of affected agricultural infrastructure systems, provision of stock-proof fencing, and designation of cattle crossings.
- A "Maintenance of Traffic Plan" will be prepared during the design phase and implemented during construction to minimize impacts on existing traffic flows during construction.
- Appropriate archaeological mitigation will be implemented at historic sites affected by the preferred alternative.

2.1.3 OTHER BUILD ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the preferred alternative, seven build alternatives receive detailed analysis in this Final EIS (see Figure 2-5). All eight alternatives, including the preferred alternative, consist of all possible combinations of two Kihei terminus options and four Upcountry terminus options. Figure 2-5 shows the Kihei and Upcountry termini and the roadway segments that would link the termini. The Kihei termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3 (the evolution of U2-A and U2-B from U2 is explained in Section 2.2.2). All these alternatives would address the purposes and needs described in Chapter 1.



Source: Warren S. Unemori, Engineering, Inc., October 1997

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Build Alternatives
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 2-5

Descriptions of the alternatives excluding the preferred alternative, which was described in Section 2.1.2, follow:

1. Alternative U1,K2. This alternative is the same as the preferred alternative from the Upcountry terminus to where the alternative alignments cross. However, this alternative would proceed southwest to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Piilani Highway intersection. The length of Alternative U1,K2 is approximately 17.5 km (10.9 miles). Table 2-1 shows the land requirement for this alternative.

2. Alternative U2-A,K1. This alternative would extend from the existing Pukalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection in Upcountry, and follow a generally west to southwest alignment to the Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei. The length of this alternative is approximately 15.8 km (9.8 miles). The U2-A terminus connection to the "Five Trees" intersection would require the realignment of the Haleakala Highway leg (Pukalani side) of the intersection (see Figure 2-6). The modification of the "Five Trees" intersection would consist of the following, as shown in Figure 2-6:
 - The Haleakala Highway leg (Pukalani side) would curve in an eastern direction to Pukalani Bypass, and a new Haleakala Highway / Pukalani Bypass T-intersection would be provided approximately 370 m (1200 ft) north of the "Five Trees" intersection (see Figure 2-6). At the T-intersection, only right turns would be allowed (eastbound traffic on the realigned Haleakala Highway turning southbound on Pukalani Bypass; and southbound traffic on Pukalani Bypass turning westbound on the realigned Haleakala Highway) for safety reasons. Left turns for northbound traffic on Pukalani Bypass onto the realigned Haleakala Highway would not be allowed.
 - The existing segment of Haleakala Highway between the new connection to Pukalani Bypass and the "Five Trees" intersection would remain open to traffic, maintaining access to future land uses in this area. Access to this cul-de-sac would be from the Northwest. A physical barrier would be erected to prevent automobile access between this cul-de-sac and the "Five Trees" intersection. The

**Table 2-1
Estimated Right-of-Way Requirement For Each Alignment Alternative**


Land Owner	Alignment Alternative									
	U1,K1	U1,K2	U2-A,K1 ¹	U2-A,K2 ²	U2-B,K1	U2-B,K2	U3,K1	U3,K2		
Alexander & Baldwin (HC&S)	42.4 ha	42.4 ha	16.8 ha	16.8 ha	16.8 ha	16.8 ha	--	--	--	--
County of Maui	--	--	--	--	--	--	8.9 ha	8.9 ha	--	8.9 ha
Dowling Company	--	--	6.4 ha ²	6.4 ha ²	12.4 ha	12.4 ha	--	--	--	--
Haleakala Ranch	47.5 ha	58.3 ha	47.6 ha	58.4 ha	48.5 ha	59.3 ha	42.9 ha ²	52.5 ha ²		
Kaonoulu Ranch	7.7 ha	11.5 ha	7.7 ha	11.5 ha	7.7 ha	11.5 ha	7.7 ha	11.5 ha		
Malama Mohala Corp.	--	--	8.1 ha ²	8.1 ha ²	--	--	--	--	--	--
Maui Land & Pineapple Company	--	--	13.8 ha	13.8 ha	12.3 ha	12.3 ha	20.7 ha ²	20.7 ha ²		
Von Tempsky Trust	--	--	--	--	--	--	10.5 ha	10.5 ha		
Others ³	--	--	0.9 ha	0.9 ha	1.7 ha	1.7 ha	2.4 ha ²	2.4 ha ²		
Total	97.6 ha	112.2 ha	101.3 ha	115.9 ha	99.4 ha	114 ha	93.1 ha	106.5 ha		

Notes: ¹ Includes right-of-way for re-aligned Haleakala Highway under the U2-A alternatives.

² Includes the acquisition of remnant parcels.


³ Other land owners are: Robert A. and Astrid I. Watanabe, Alfred Boteilho, Dwight Joan, Sr., et.al., and the State of Hawaii.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., October 1997, July 1998 and September 1998



Source: Warren S. Unemori, Engineering, January 1998

GRAPHIC SCALE:



U2-A Alternative near the "Five Trees" Intersection
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 2-6



roadway between the cul-de-sac and intersection will be converted to a pedestrian walkway.

3. Alternative U2-A,K2. This alternative would extend from the existing Pukalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Piilani Highway intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 17.5 km (10.9 miles). This alternative also includes the realignment of the Haleakala Highway leg (Pukalani side) of the "Five Trees" intersection as described above for U2-A,K1. (see Figure 2-6). Table 2-1 shows the land requirement for this alternative.
4. Alternative U2-B,K1. This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway at approximately 700 m (2300 ft) south of the "Five Trees" intersection. The alignment runs parallel with Segment U2-A for about 3000 m (10,000 ft), and then shares the same U2-A alignment. This alternative's Kihei terminus is at the Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 15.5 km (9.6 miles).
5. Alternative U2-B,K2. This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway at approximately 700 m (2300 ft) south of the "Five Trees" intersection. The alignment runs parallel with Segment U2-A for about 3000 m (10,000 ft), and then shares the same U2-A alignment. This alternative's Kihei terminus is at the Piilani Highway / Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 17.3 km (10.8 miles).
6. Alternative U3,K1. This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei. The length of this alternative is approximately 14.5 km (9.0 miles). Table 2-1 shows the land requirement for this alternative.
7. Alternative U3,K2. This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Piilani Highway intersection in Kihei. The length of this alternative is approximately 16.1 km (10.0 miles). Table 2-1 shows the land requirement for this alternative.

Like the preferred alternative, the other build alternatives would provide a limited access, two-lane arterial roadway, but would reserve right-of-way for a future four-lane divided roadway (see Figure 2-2). Since most of the roadway would be in rural areas, primarily the rural design would be used. Those alternatives with U2-A, U2-B or K1 alignments would pass through State Urban-designated lands, which may require an urban design for these segments.

The other build alternatives would also be designed with adequate channelization (right- and left-turn lanes) to handle the projected traffic volumes at the Upcountry and Kihei termini. If either a U2-A or K2 alternative were selected as the preferred alternative, the existing traffic signals at the U2-A terminus (Five Trees Intersection) and K2 terminus (Piilani Highway / Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection) would be modified. At the other termini (U1, U2-B, U3, and K1), the decision to place traffic signals would be made during the design phase, and would be based on traffic signal warrants specified in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

The other build alternatives would have the same posted speed limit, and similar roadway drainage structures as the preferred alternative.

The same criteria for selecting a bridge or embankment crossing of particular gulches that applied to the preferred alternative, also applied to the other build alternatives. Table 2-2 displays the bridges anticipated along each build alternative other than the preferred alternative, and their locations are shown on Figure 2-3. The number of bridge crossings for each these alternatives is shown on Table 2-3. The shorter span bridges may not require piers, whereas longer span bridges (e.g., 60 m (200 ft) or more) may require at least one pier within the gulch (see Figure 2-4). The placement of any piers in the gulches would be done in a manner to not impede storm water flow, and scour protection would be provided where necessary.

The other gulch crossings would be by embankments, and excess material from grading other sections of the roadway would be used to construct the embankments. Culverts would be placed at the base of the embankments to convey storm water flow.

Table 2-2
Potential Bridges for Build Alternatives Other Than the Preferred

Loc.	Description	Segment	Approx. Length m (ft)	Approx. Clearance m (ft)
2	Pulehu Gulch*	U2-(A or B)	30 (100)	5.5 (18)
3	Kolaloa Gulch #1*	U2-(A or B)	30 (100)	6 (20)
4	Keahuia Iwi Gulch #1*	U2-(A or B)	30 (100)	3 (9)
5	Waiakoa Gulch # 1*	U2-(A or B)	30 (100)	8 (25)
6	Kulanihakoi Gulch	K2	30 (100)	5.2 (17)
7	Waipuilani Gulch	K2	30 (100)	6.4 (21)
8	Keokea Gulch	K2	30 (100)	4 (13)
9	Kalialinui Gulch #2	U2-A	90 (300)	19.5 (64)
10	Kalialinui Gulch #3	U2-B	210 (680)	30 (96)
11	Kolaloa Gulch #2	U3	130 (440)	17 (55)
12	Keahuia Iwi Gulch #2	U3	60 (200)	9.4 (31)
13	Waiakoa Gulch #2	U3	80 (260)	9.8 (32)

Note: Locations of bridges are shown on Figure 2-3.

* These bridges will be constructed under the preferred alternative.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997

The other build alternatives would also include environmental mitigation measures, similar to those described for the preferred alternative. If a U2-A or U2-B alternative were selected as the preferred alternative, the project would have included pedestrian facilities at or near King Kekaulike High School or Kamehameha School. For example, under a U2-A alternative, the segment of the Haleakala Highway at the Five Trees intersection, which would have been replaced by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, would be converted to a pedestrian walkway. In addition, sidewalks would be provided between the modified Five Trees Intersection and the high school. Also, an archaeological inventory survey would need to be conducted if another alignment were selected as the preferred alternative. Depending on the results, appropriate mitigation would need to be conducted.

Table 2-3
Bridge Requirements for Build Alternatives Other Than the Preferred

Alternative	Number of Bridges
U1,K2*	10
U2-A,K1	5
U2-A,K2	8
U2-B,K1	5
U2-B,K2	8
U3,K1	3
U3,K2	6

Note: * U1 alignments include undercrossings where they cross two cane haul roads

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997

2.1.4 ESTIMATED COST AND SCHEDULE

The preferred alternative, U1,K1, is currently (year 2001) estimated to cost \$80.3 million, which includes approximately \$4.9 million for right-of-way and \$75.4 million for construction. The cost of the preferred alternative includes the cane haul undercrossings (see Section 2.1.2). Estimated right-of-way acquisition and construction costs (year 1997 dollars) for the other build alternatives are provided in Table 2-4. The lowest cost build alternative is U3,K1 because it would be the shortest, have the fewest bridges and have lower right-of-way acquisition cost. The most expensive alternative is U2-A,K2. Design normally costs approximately ten percent of the construction cost.

The present schedule of the project is shown on Table 2-5. Design is scheduled to commence in 2002, and construction could begin in 2004. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway could open for service in 2007.

**Table 2-4
Estimated Cost by Alternative**

Alternative	Estimated Cost (1997 Dollars) ¹		
	Construction ⁴	Right-of-Way ⁴	Total ⁴
U1,K2 ²	\$75,000,000	\$3,800,000	\$78,800,000
U2-A,K1 ³	\$63,500,000	\$5,600,000	\$69,100,000
U2-A,K2 ³	\$77,200,000	\$5,600,000	\$82,800,000
U2-B,K1 ⁵	<u>\$61,400,000</u>	<u>\$6,600,000</u>	<u>\$68,000,000</u>
U2-B,K2 ⁵	<u>\$75,800,000</u>	<u>\$6,500,000</u>	<u>\$82,400,000</u>
U3,K1	\$49,600,000	\$3,500,000	\$53,100,000
U3,K2	\$63,000,000	\$3,400,000	\$66,400,000

Notes: ¹ Costs are based on acquiring right-of-way for a four-lane divided highway; conducting earthwork for a two-lane highway in rural areas and a four-lane highway in urban areas, earthwork for a four-lane highway within major gulches where bridges would not be used, and construction of a two-lane highway (see Figure 2-2) and two-lane bridges (see Tables 2-2 and 2-3).

² Includes two undercrossings where the road crosses cane haul roads.

³ Includes the re-alignment of Haleakala Highway in Pukalani.

⁴ Estimates are rounded to the nearest 100 thousand.

⁵ Reflects reduced cost with credit for portion constructed as part of Kulamalu development.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997, June 1998, September 1998 and November 1999

**Table 2-5
Proposed Project Schedule**

Activity	Period
Design and Right-of-Way Acquisition	<u>2002 - 2004</u>
Construction	<u>2004 - 2007</u>
Open for Service	<u>2007</u>

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, January 2001

2.2 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Three steps were accomplished to develop the alternatives described in Section 2.1.2.1. The first step was a two-tiered screening analysis used to eliminate some of the alternatives developed during the project's scoping phase. This resulted in the selection of two Kihei terminus options and three Upcountry terminus options. The second step was an evaluation of alternatives evolving from the original U2 alignment, after it was found to impact a future private school site (the school has since been constructed) and two archaeological sites likely to require preservation in place. The third step involved minor alignment shifts of U2-A and U3 to avoid important sites identified in archaeological reconnaissance surveys.

2.2.1 SCREENING ANALYSIS


A two-tiered alternatives screening analysis was performed to evaluate a wide range of candidate alternatives and eliminate those with the fewest benefits or overriding adverse characteristics so that a manageable number of alternatives would be evaluated in detail in the Draft and Final EIS (see Chapter 4). The No Build alternative was not evaluated in this screening analysis because it is automatically included in the Draft and Final EIS as a viable option.

This section summarizes the screening analysis. The Alternatives Analysis Report that was prepared after the screening analysis appears in Appendix D.

2.2.1.1 Alternatives Considered in the Screening

Ten alignment alternatives (see Figure 2-7 and Table 2-6) were developed during the public and agency scoping process that preceded the issuance of the project's Environmental Assessment (EA) (see Chapter 5.0). The alternatives were introduced to the public through distribution in September 1995 of an EA addressing the project (see Chapter 5). After publication of the EA, public comments were received through the channels listed below, and were used to develop additional alternatives:

- written comments generated in response to the EA;



Alternatives Entering Screening Analysis
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 2-7

- oral testimony given at two public information meetings held in October 1995;
- testimony provided during a second round of public information meetings held in May 1996 (one Upcountry and one in Kihei); and
- written comments following the May 1996 information meetings.

**Table 2-6
Original Alignment Alternatives**

Alternative	Upcountry Terminus	Kihei Terminus	Length
Alternative 1	Haleakala Highway / Haliimaile Road inter.	Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street inter.	14.3 km (8.9 miles)
Alternative 2	Haleakala Highway / Haliimaile Road inter.	Maui R&T Park	16.3 km (10.1 miles)
Alternative 3	Haleakala Highway, between Haliimaile Road and Pukalani	Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street inter.	15.5 km (9.6 miles)
Alternative 4A	Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road	Maui R&T Park	16.6 km (10.3 miles)
Alternative 4B	Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road	Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street inter.	15.5 km (9.6 miles)
Alternative 5	Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula	Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street inter.	14.0 kilometer (8.7 miles)
Alternative 6A	Kula Highway, near Kekaulike Highway / Kula Highway inter.	Maui R&T Park	17.0 km (10.6 miles)
Alternative 6B	Kula Highway, near Kekaulike Highway / Kula Highway inter.	Piilani Highway, next to the future Kihei Regional Park	16.3 km (10.1 miles)
Alternative 7	Kula Highway south of Kula Sanitarium	southern section of Piilani Highway	14.4 km (8.9 miles)
Alternative 8	Haleakala Highway in Pukalani	Mokulele Highway	14.6 km (9.1 miles)


Sources: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. derived from State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry / Kihei Highway Final Report, October 1, 1993; County of Maui Toll Road Study, 1988; and Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study, 1991

Based on these comments, conceptual engineering was prepared for three additional alternatives: Alternatives 2B and 2C (modifications of Alternative 2) and the "enhanced widening of existing roadways" alternative (see Figure 2-8).

- Alternative 2B. This alternative would extend from Haleakala Highway / Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area, (as Alternative 2), but would then share portions of Alternative 4B's mauka alignment near the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S) land to Kihei at Kaonoulu Street. The length of this alternative is approximately 15.6 km (9.7 miles).
- Alternative 2C. This alternative would maintain the Haliimaile Junction Upcountry terminus and share Alternative 4B's alignment near the HC&S land. However, its Kihei terminus would be located at the intersection of Piilani Highway and the proposed Road F. The length of Alternative 2C is approximately 17.5 km (10.9 miles).

Alternatives 2B and 2C were developed in response to comments asking that impacts to Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar (HC&S) Company land be minimized, the Maui R&T Park not be bisected, and the Kihei terminus be moved as far south as possible to create an alternative evacuation route for South Kihei and to support hotels and resorts in Wailea / Makena.

- The "enhanced widening of existing roadways" alternative. This alternative would provide an additional lane in each direction on the existing roads between Kihei and Upcountry beyond the widening improvements already proposed in the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996) (see Section 2.1.1). Enhanced widening of the following roadways is included in the "enhanced widening of existing roadways" alternative:
 - Haleakala Highway (12.4 km (7.7 miles));
 - Hana Highway (3.2 km (2.0 miles));
 - Dairy Road (1.3 km (0.8 miles));
 - Puunene Avenue / Mokulele Highway (10.5 km (6.5 miles)); and
 - Piilani Highway (4.8 km (3.0 miles)).



Alternatives 2B, 2C and Enhanced Widening of Existing Roadways
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 2-8

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Finally, FHWA participation in this project requires that Transportation Systems Management (TSM) be considered among the alternatives. TSM is the application of construction, operational, and institutional actions to make the most efficient and cost effective use of existing transportation infrastructure. TSM actions are categorized as being either "demand-side" or "supply-side". As is explained below, TSM can be an attractive solution to many types of transportation problems. However, TSM would not satisfy a purpose such as provision of a system linkage between two localities, such as this project, that is intended to connect Kihei and Upcountry. Therefore, a TSM alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Demand-side TSM actions, often referred as Transportation Demand Management (TDM), are intended to reduce congestion by decreasing the number of vehicles traveling at the same time by such measures as increasing vehicle occupancy, lowering the peak travel demand by shifting the time of travel, or making the use of single-occupant vehicles less attractive. Demand-side actions include high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, ride-sharing programs, parking management, and transit service improvements. Except for HOV facilities, demand-side actions tend to be more appropriate within the context of a metropolitan area.

TSM actions are intended to increase the capacity of existing infrastructure (e.g., a roadway) using relatively "low cost" and localized solutions, such as use of contraflow lanes, intersection channelization, improved pavement or signage, and synchronization of traffic signals. Supply-side actions are most effective when alleviating traffic problems at spot locations. Supply-side TSM actions would not be used when a project's intent is to provide a transportation connection between two localities.

2.2.1.2 Methodology

Criteria for evaluating the project alternatives described in Section 2.2.1.1 were developed from the following sources:

- Federal Highway (FHWA) Technical Advisory Guide (October 1987);
- State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry / Kihei Highway Final Report (October 1993);

- Federal, State, County, and local comments to a project initiation letter issued by SDOT on September 1, 1994;
- An agency scoping meeting held on October 26, 1994;
- Engineering standards (Hawaii Statewide Uniform Design Manual for Streets and Highways, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM));
- Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Environmental Assessment (EA) (May 1995);
- Written comments received in response to publication of the EA; and
- Comments (oral and written) made at the public information meetings held on Maui on October 17 and 18, 1995, and on May 15 and 16, 1996.

The evaluation criteria were then sorted into two groups: Tier One (fatal flaws) and Tier Two.

2.2.1.2a Tier One Criteria

Tier One (fatal flaw) criteria identify alternatives that are impractical, unfeasible or cannot be funded given the constraints associated with federal participation in project construction. Eliminating alternatives with "fatal flaws" avoids unnecessary analysis of alternatives that are extremely unlikely to be selected as the Preferred Alternative. For this project, the Tier One criteria were:

- Satisfaction of project goals;
- Conformance with engineering design criteria;
- Benefit/cost ratio; and
- Bifurcate Maui R&T Park.

Satisfaction of Project Goals

The alternatives were evaluated with respect to whether they satisfied the project goals stated in Chapter 1, such as establishing a roadway linkage between the Kihei and Upcountry areas. An alternative received a "Y" (yes) score if it would satisfy the project goals. A "N" (no) score means the alternative would not satisfy the project goals.

Design Feasibility

The alternatives were evaluated to determine whether they met engineering design criteria for a rural, limited access arterial roadway, such as minimum curve radius and design speed. A "Y" (yes) signifies that the alternative would have a conforming design, whereas a "N" (no) would mean that its design would not conform to the criteria.

Benefit-Cost Ratio

A preliminary benefit-cost analysis to the year 2023 (completion of construction plus 20 years) was performed to eliminate alternatives that would clearly not be cost-effective in achieving the goal of linking Kihei and Upcountry Maui. Calculation of the benefit-cost ratio (BCR) for each alternative was based on a comparison of travel time between two centroids, one located at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and the other in Pukalani, Upcountry Maui, under the future No Build Alternative. Other factors used to calculate the BCRs included:

- cost of each alternative, consisting of initial cost (construction, right-of-way acquisition, design) and annual roadway maintenance;
- user costs for vehicle operation and maintenance; and
- economic factors, such as the expected long-term inflation rate and discount rate.

The methodology conformed to procedures described in the Manual On User Benefit Analysis of Highway and Bus Transit Improvements (AASHTO, 1977). Normally, an alternative's BCR would have to be greater than one (the benefits of the project exceed its cost) for the investment to be economically justified. However, because of the preliminary nature of the analysis and the limited definition of what is considered a benefit, an alternative would have to have an extremely low BCR to have a "fatal flaw."

Bifurcate Maui R&T Park

The master plan for the Maui R&T Park was revised in 1996 to create a more campus-like atmosphere, in contrast to the light industrial park atmosphere that was originally envisioned. Its central roadway element is a large roundabout or "green" located at the core of the Park. Any alignment that divides the Maui R&T Park would be inconsistent with the Park's proposed campus-like roadway system. Because the Maui R&T Park is intended to be one of the major beneficiaries of the proposed highway, conformance with the master plan's proposed

campus-like roadway system was elevated to a Tier One level of significance. Those alternatives that bifurcate the R&T Park were given a "Y" (yes), while those that did not were given a "N" (no). A "Y" score for this criterion indicates that the alternative has a "fatal flaw."

2.2.1.2b Tier Two Criteria

The Tier Two criteria were developed to further screen the alternatives passing the first tier criteria. These criteria relate primarily to the nature and degree of adverse impact or benefit. An alternative not satisfying these criteria could be feasible, but would not be advantageous with respect to the criterion in question. A large number of candidate Tier Two criteria were developed, but many of them were rejected. The Alternatives Analysis Report (November 1996) (see Appendix C) contains the rationale for their rejection. Many criteria were not used in the Tier Two analysis because they would not discriminate among alternatives. The omission of a criterion from the Tier Two analysis does not imply that the criterion is not important. In the final analysis, the following Tier Two criteria were used:

- Adverse agricultural impact;
- Cost;
- Conformance with community plans;
- Highway operations;
- Potential impact on endangered and threatened species;
- Enhancement of access to Hawaiian Home Lands (HHL) parcel (TMK 2-02-002:014);
and
- Visual impacts.

Adverse Agricultural Impact

The number of hectares presently used for crop production (pineapple or sugarcane cultivation or Upcountry truck farms) which each alternative would displace was calculated. Impacts on pasture lands were not considered as important because of the abundance of pasture land in the area and the substantially reduced level of investment in irrigation, drainage and other infrastructure for pasture in comparison to cropland. The following five-point scale was defined based on the acreage of encroachment for each alternative:

(1): less than 10 hectares

- (2): 10 to 20 hectares
- (3): 20 to 30 hectares
- (4): 30 to 40 hectares
- (5): over 40 hectares

Cost

This criterion compares the estimated cost of land acquisition, site work, roadway construction, and drainage for each alternative. The following four-point scale was used to score these costs:

- (1): less than \$45 million
- (2): \$45 to \$55 million
- (3): \$55 to \$65 million
- (4): over \$65 million

Conformance with Community Plans

There are nine planning regions in Maui County for which community plans have been prepared. The plans report current and anticipated conditions, and stipulate advance planning goals, objectives, policies and implementation considerations to guide decision making for each region. The study area overlaps planning areas addressed by the Kihei-Makena Community Plan and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan. Although the community plans are not official until adopted by the County Council and the Mayor, it is customary on Maui to use the most recent proposed update to the community plans to assess conformance with county planning.

The most recent proposed update for the Kihei area is the Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998). This proposed plan recommends a roadway that would link the primary residential area of Upcountry with job centers within the Kihei region. The Plan, therefore, favors those alternatives with mauka termini near Pukalani, and makai termini at or north of the Maui R & T Park. The Kihei-Makena Community Plan was approved by the County Council and the Mayor in early 1998.

The Community Plan Update of Makawao-Pukalani-Kula (July 1996) "files" (removes from the active list) the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, and states that the No Build alternative is favored over any build alternative. However, the recommendations also include provisions that if the roadway is built, the preferred Upcountry terminus is in the vicinity of Haliimaile Road.

The alternatives that best conform to the community plans were scored "Y" (yes). Alternatives that did not conform as well were scored "P" (poor). Alternatives that do not conform to the plans were scored "N" (No).

Highway Operations

While all of the alternatives entering the Tier Two screening can be designed to conform with applicable engineering standards (see Section 2.2.1.3), there may be operational problems with certain alternatives when connected to the existing roadway network. Those alternatives that would connect well with the existing roadway network were scored a "B" (better); those that would not were scored a "W" (worse).

Impact on Endangered and Threatened Species

A botanical reconnaissance was conducted to rank the alternatives in terms of their relative potential adverse impact on areas where endangered or threatened plant species might exist. The survey included:

- a helicopter reconnaissance of the project area;
- government agency interviews and literature search;
- a comparative ranking of the alternatives for potential botanical impacts, emphasizing impacts on rare species; and
- a general assessment of the level of potential impact of each alternative.

Based on the botanical reconnaissance, alternatives were scored numerically, from "1" (alternatives that were least likely to threaten endangered species) to "5" (alternatives with a higher possibility of displacing endangered species). Potential impact on endangered species was not considered a "fatal flaw" because at this stage of project planning, the

alignment alternatives are considered general enough to allow some latitude to bypass particularly sensitive locations, if warranted.

Enhancement of Access to Hawaiian Home Lands Parcel

The Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway State/County Joint Task Force's Final Report (October 1, 1993) identified access to the Hawaiian Home Lands parcel (TMK 2-02-002:014) as a desirable benefit of this project. Alignment alternatives that would enhance future access to the HHL parcel received a "B" (better), while those alternatives that would not enhance access received a "W" (worse).

Visual Impact

Since all of the alternatives share a common typical design (see Figures 2-2 and 2-3) and a similar setting (agricultural lands on the western flank of Haleakala), the amount of earthmoving (cut plus fill) required for roadway construction was used as an approximate indicator of the project's long-term aesthetic impacts. It is assumed that the more material moved during construction, the greater the potential for visual disturbance of the existing landscape, even after the establishment of new plantings.

A four-point scale was developed to score the total amount of cut and fill material required for each alternative. Alternatives requiring less earthmoving received lower scores, while those requiring the most activity received a "4."

- (1): less than 1.5 million cubic meters
- (2): 1.5 to 2.0 million cubic meters
- (3): 2.0 to 2.5 million cubic meters
- (4): over 2.5 million cubic meters.

2.2.1.3 Alternatives Evaluation

2.2.1.3a Tier One Screening

Table 2-7 summarizes the outcome of the Tier One evaluation. Scores not satisfying the criteria are shaded. In summary, Alternatives 4A, 6A through 8, the enhanced widening of existing roadways alternative, and the TSM alternative were eliminated from further study.

Table 2-7
Tier One Screening

Criteria	Alternative													
	1	2	2B	2C	3	4A	4B	5	6A	6B	7	8	EWR	TSM
Satisfies Project Goals	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Design Feasibility	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N.A.
Benefit-Cost Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.06	0.67	1.01	0.94	1.34	1.53	0.42	0.28	0.04	1.10	Low ¹	N.A. ²
Bifurcate Maui R&T Park	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N.A.	N.A.

Notes: EWR: Enhanced Widening of Existing Roadways Alternative

TSM: Transportation Systems Management Alternative

Y: Yes

N: No

Does not satisfy criterion.

N.A.: Not Applicable.

¹ The BCR for the EWR Alternative was not calculated because it failed to satisfy the project goals criterion. If the BCR for the EWR Alternative was calculated, it would be quite low because the method of calculating BCRs is based on a comparison with the future No Build Alternative of travel time between Kihei and Upcountry Maui. When compared to the No Build Alternative, the EWR Alternative would offer a slight decrease in travel time because of marginally less congestion along the same circumferential route. This travel time savings, however, would not compare favorably to the decrease in travel time that would be achieved by substantially shortening the distance between Kihei and Upcountry Maui through a new roadway. Therefore, along with its large capital cost (\$78 million), its BCR, as calculated here, would be small.

² The BCR for the TSM Alternative was not calculated because it failed to satisfy the project goals criterion.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. and Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., January 1997

Non-satisfaction of project goals eliminated the enhanced widening of existing roadways and TSM alternatives. The enhanced widening of existing roadways alternative would not establish a roadway linkage between Kihei and the Upcountry area. The TSM alternative would also not satisfy this goal, nor other goals, such as providing additional roadway capacity and infrastructure to meet existing and future travel demand in the region.

The design feasibility criterion eliminated Alternative 8 because it is constrained to an existing government right-of-way that does not conform to modern highway design standards.

The preliminary benefit-cost analysis generated BCRs ranging from -0.04 to 1.53 (see Table 2-7). After noting the spread of the results and considering the preliminary nature of the analysis, the allowable threshold was set at 0.67, which eliminated Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7. To affect these results (pass some alternatives eliminated by this criterion), the minimum passing BCR would have to be lowered to 0.42. However, lowering the BCR to this threshold would not affect the overall screening because Alternative 6A, with its 0.42 BCR, would have been eliminated anyway because it bifurcates the Maui R&T Park, the last Tier One criterion. This last criterion also eliminated Alternatives 2 and 4A.

2.2.1.3b Tier Two Screening

Table 2-8 summarizes the Tier Two screening analysis. An alternative did not have to satisfy every criterion to pass the screening. However, in certain instances, a particular score or group of scores disqualified an alternative from moving forward. These disqualifying scores are shaded.

Based on the Tier Two criteria, Alternatives 1 and 3 were dropped from future study in the Draft EIS for the following reasons:

- Alternative 1. This alternative would produce a substantially greater displacement of cultivated fields. It would displace approximately 56.2 ha (139 acres), while the alternative with the next largest impact, Alternative 3, would displace approximately 32.6 ha (81 acres), 42 percent less.
- Alternative 3. This alternative was eliminated because of its poorer operational aspects, particularly at its mauka terminus at the intersection of Haleakala Highway

and Pukalani Bypass Highway where there is a seven percent grade. Because of this steep grade, a very long left turn storage lane would be required for makai-bound traffic on Haleakala Highway turning left onto Kihei-Upcountry Highway. The length of this left turn lane, plus the proximity of the two intersections, would cause a conflict in turning movements. Furthermore, this alternative scored a four (4) in terms of displacement of cultivated acreage.

**Table 2-8
Tier Two Screening**

Criteria	Alternative					
	1	2B	2C	3	4B	5
Adverse Agricultural Impact Score Encroachment (hectares)	5 56.2	3 27.1	3 27.1	4 32.6	3 21.6	2 13.3
Cost Score Estimated Cost (\$ millions)	3 57	2 47	3 57	2 54	2 52	1 40
Conformance with Community Plans Kihei-Makena Makawao-Pukalani-Kula	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	Y N	P N
Highway Operations	B	B	B	W	B	B
Potential Impact to Endangered & Threatened Species	1	1	2	2	3	5
Enhancement of Access to HHL	W	W	B	W	W	W
Visual Impacts Score Est. Earthmoving (millions of cubic meters)	3 2.1	1 1.4	2 1.7	2 1.9	2 1.8	1 1.4

Notes: B: Better Y: Yes
P: Poor N: No
W: Worse

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. and Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., January 1997

Alternatives 2B, 2C, 4B and 5 passed the screening evaluation for the following reasons:

- Alternative 2B. The advantages of Alternative 2B are its cost (the second cheapest alternative) and its relatively minimal environmental impacts in those disciplines selected for the screening analysis. Although this alternative scored a three (3) in the agricultural impact criterion, the alignment was coordinated with HC&S to minimize adverse impacts to their sugarcane operations.
- Alternative 2C. Since this alternative is similar to Alternatives 2B and 4B, it too passed the Tier Two screening. The major disadvantage of this alternative, in comparison to these other two alternatives, is its cost (21 percent greater than Alternative 2B and 10 percent greater than Alternative 4B). Its advantages are that it is the only remaining alternative that may facilitate access to the HHL parcel, and it provides another Kihei terminus option (Alternatives 2B, 4B and 5 all have the same Kihei terminus at Kaonoulu Street).
- Alternative 4B. This alternative compares favorably against other alternatives regarding cost, impacts to cultivated fields and visual environment. It scores relatively high (3) under the "potential impact to endangered and threatened species" criterion. However, because the botanical reconnaissance was done from the air and because there is some latitude in modifying alternatives to avoid sensitive locations, this moderately high score did not warrant eliminating this alternative at this stage.
- Alternative 5. The primary benefits of this alternative are its cost (the least expensive alternative) and it would have the least impact on cultivated fields. The disadvantages of this alternative are its higher probability of encountering endangered species habitats, and its "P" (poor) score in regards to conformance to the Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998). However, these factors did not warrant eliminating this alternative.

In general, the alternatives passing Tier Two would generate comparatively fewer adverse environmental impacts in the topics selected for the screening analysis, and would not

present operational difficulties interfacing with the existing roadway network. Only one of the passing alternatives would facilitate access to the HHL parcel.

2.2.1.4 Conclusion


The four alternatives that passed the screening analysis (2B, 2C, 4B and 5) were recast as combinations of mauka and makai segments. By combining their two Kihei terminus choices with their three Upcountry terminus choices, it became possible to generate six alternatives comprised of common roadway segments.

Figure 2-9 shows the Upcountry and Kihei termini choices and the alignment segments that would be used by the six alternatives. As shown on this figure, the Kihei termini and segments were named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments were named U1, U2 and U3.

2.2.2 MODIFICATION OF SEGMENT U2

Following selection of the six alternatives described in Section 2.2.1.4, it was discovered that the eastern (mauka) portion of Segment U2 would bisect a Kamehameha Schools / Bishop Estate campus (portions of the campus have been developed). Furthermore, the U2 alignment would potentially affect two archaeological sites that were likely to require preservation (see Section 3.10.2). Therefore, the following four variations to the U2 described in Section 2.2.1.4 were developed (see Figure 2-10):

- U2-A. This modification would shift the U2 terminus 685 m (2250 ft) north to the Pukalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" Intersection. The Haleakala Highway (Pukalani side) leg of this intersection would be modified to join Pukalani Bypass north of the "Five Trees" intersection.
- U2-B. This modification would maintain the original U-2 terminus on Kula Highway. It would shift the alignment to the north, running along the northern boundary of the Kamehameha School campus and a future commercial district that would be located west (makai) of Kula Highway.




Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., January 1997

GRAPHIC SCALE:




Alternatives Selected Following Screening Analysis
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 2-9



- Legend**
- Existing Roadways
 - Original U2 Alignment
 - U2 Modifications
 - Proposed Terminus
 - Dowling Commercial District
 - Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate Site

Source: Warren S. Unemori, Engineering, January 1998



**Modifications of Segment U2
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**
Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 2-10

- U2-C. This modification is similar to U2-B in maintaining the original U-2 terminus on Kula Highway. However, instead of shifting the alignment to the north, it would shift the alignment to the south, bisecting a pineapple field and two vacant agricultural lots in the Kula Estates subdivision.
- U2-D. This modification is similar to U2-C. However, instead of terminating at the original U-2 terminus, it would terminate at the intersection of Kula Highway and Ohana Street, one of the access roads to the Kula 200 residential subdivision, 335 m (1100 ft) south of the original U2 terminus. It would also bisect the pineapple field and two different agricultural lots in the Kula Estates subdivision.

Table 2-9 compares the four alternative modifications to U2 against ten criteria based on design and engineering considerations.

U2-A has several advantages over the other U2 options, including: termination at an established signalized intersection; a 6.8 percent maximum grade; no residential displacements with proper advance planning and coordination; minimal proximity impacts (air quality and noise) to the Kamehameha School campus, which opened in August 1999; and conformance with future widening of Pukalani Bypass. The disadvantage of this alternative is that it would have the highest right-of-way cost because of its length through urban designated land.

U2-B is the suggested alignment of the Kulamalu master plan, a future commercial, housing and institutional development just south (mauka) of Pukalani (see Section 3.1.3). Therefore, U2-B would be consistent with this development, and the private developer would not have to modify its master plan and has offered to donate the right-of-way. U2-B's disadvantage is that it does not meet AASHTO's recommended seven percent maximum grade for a limited access rural highway. U2-B's maximum grade is 10 percent. All the other U2 modifications (U2-A, U2-C and U2-D), alignment alternatives (U1, U3, K1 and K2), and federal-aid highways in the project vicinity (Haleakala Highway, and Pukalani Bypass) meet this criterion.

U2-C and U2-D require little or no right-of-way acquisition in State urban designated land, minimizing their right-of-way costs. The disadvantages common to both alternatives are

Table 2-9
Comparison of U2 Modifications

Criterion	Alternative Modification			
	U2-A	U2-B	U2-C	U2-D
Maximum Grade	6.8%	10.0%	6.8%	6.8%
Number of Bridges	1	1	1	1
Length of Bridge Required	76 m (250 ft)	215 m (700 ft)	76 m (250 ft)	76 m (250 ft)
Maximum Pier Height	20 m (65 ft) ±	32 m (105 ft) ±	11 m (35 ft) ±	11 m (35 ft) ±
Number of Gulch Crossings	3	3	5	6
Maximum Height of Fill	17 m (55 ft)	15 m (50 ft)	21 m (70 ft)*	21 m (70 ft)
Maximum Height of Cut	9 m (30 ft)	11.5 m (38 ft)	12 m (40 ft)*	12 m (40 ft)
Length Through State Urban Land	2100 m (6900 ft)	1740 m (5700 ft)	460 m (1500 ft)	0
Distance from Kamehameha School Campus	120 m (400 ft)	Abuls Northern Boundary	106 m (350 ft)	106 m (350 ft)
Distance from Kula Highway/ Haleakala Highway Intersection	0	685 m (2250 ft)	685 m (2250 ft)	1020 m (3350 ft)

Note: * Includes the 900 m (3000 ft) of roadway already constructed for Kulamalu development.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., May 1997

adverse impact to two vacant agricultural lots in the Kula Estates subdivision and an active pineapple field, and bisection of a future commercial site that is inconsistent with site's master plan.

In conclusion, U2-A and U2-B were selected as the preferred U2 option. U2-A's operational advantage (termination at an established signalized intersection) outweighed its higher right-of-way cost. U2-B was selected because of its consistency with Kulamalu development.

2.2.3 ADJUSTMENTS TO PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The results of archaeological reconnaissance surveys (see Section 3.10.2) required the realignments of Segments U2-A and U3. The U2-A and U3 alignments shown on Figure 2-5 avoid direct impacts to all significant archaeological sites found during the surveys. For more information, see Section 3.10.2.

The results of the archaeological inventory survey on the preferred alternative (see Section 3.10.3) required the realignment of the highway at Waiakoa Gulch to avoid potentially affecting petroglyphs approximately 15 m (50 ft) to the west of the alignment's centerline. The alignment was shifted 45 m (150 ft) to the east.

2.2.4 SELECTION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Following public release of the Draft EIS on August 8, 1999, a public and agency review period followed, which lasted to October 14, 1999. During this period, the public and government agencies provided a great deal of information on the facts and analyses presented in the Draft EIS, as well as opinions about which alternative was preferred by the commenter. The Draft EIS public and agency review process is described in more detail in Chapter 5.

The SDOT and FHWA reviewed and considered all of the information provided during the Draft EIS review period, which helped in the selection of the preferred alternative. The No Build alternative was not included in this analysis because it remains a viable alternative until

the Record of Decision is issued by FHWA. In the selection process, the following criteria were used:

- cost;
- transportation performance;
- agricultural impact; and
- consistency with community plans.

These criteria were found to be relevant and useful in discriminating among the build alternatives. This does not mean that other criteria that were considered, which are listed below, are not important. They were not selected because they did not help in drawing distinctions among the build alternatives. Chapters Three and Four include discussions of these environmental resources and potential impacts from Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

- residential and business displacement
- traffic safety
- parks and recreational impacts
- threatened and endangered species impacts
- flora and habitat displacement
- energy impacts
- air quality and noise impacts
- changes to visual and aesthetic conditions
- geological and site contamination impacts
- employment and economic effects
- provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- historic, archaeological, and traditional cultural properties / practices impacts

2.2.4.1 Cost Comparison

The estimated capital cost comparison of Build alternatives (right of way and construction) is reported in Sections 2.1.4. The ranking of the alternatives from least to most costly is provided below.

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. <u>U3,K1</u> | 5. <u>U2-A,K1</u> |
| 2. <u>U1,K1</u> | 6. <u>U1,K2</u> |
| 3. <u>U3,K2</u> | 7. <u>U2-B,K2</u> |
| 4. <u>U2-B,K1</u> | 8. <u>U2-A,K2</u> |

2.2.4.2 Transportation Performance

The transportation performance of the alternatives was determined by evaluating how well they would serve major travel markets, and their traffic impacts on the regional roadway system.

2.2.4.2a Travel Markets

The major travel markets that would be served by a Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway include travel between:

- Upcountry - Kihei;
- Upcountry - West Maui;
- Maui R&T Park - Science City; and
- Emergency evacuation from South Maui.

Other travel markets, such as local circulation in Kihei or Upcountry, and commuter travel to Wailuku/Kahului, would not be directly served by a Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, although these travel markets could be indirectly affected by decreases in overall congestion and an increase in the capacity of the regional roadway system. Such indirect impacts were considered under traffic impacts.

Several assumptions were used to evaluate how well each alternative would serve these major travel markets. First, the evaluation considered the distance between the proposed termini and major residential centers and commuter destinations. For example, the U3 terminus is not near a major population center, and therefore, would not serve travel markets as effectively as the other three Upcountry termini. Second, travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City would be most convenient via a U2-A or U2-B alignment, and moderately convenient via U1 and U3. The choice of a Kihei terminus for this travel market would not have much impact on the effectiveness of the route. Third, K2 would not serve the Upcountry

- West Maui travel market due to its location in South Kihei. On the other hand, K2 would provide a better evacuation route for South Maui because of its physical separation from the existing evacuation route through North Kihei.

The ranking of the alternatives in terms of effectiveness in serving the major travel markets (in decreasing order of effectiveness) is as follows:

1. U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1 (tie);
2. U1,K1, U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2 (tie);
3. U1,K2; and
4. U3,K1 and U3,K2 (tie).

The U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1 alternatives were considered equal in terms of their effectiveness in serving the target travel markets because their Upcountry termini are relatively close to one another. Both alternatives would serve the Upcountry travel markets to and from Kihei-Makena and West Maui, and both would facilitate travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City. However, these alternatives would only moderately improve evacuation capacity from Kihei.

The U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2 alternatives were also considered equal in effectiveness in serving the target travel markets. Both alternatives would serve the Upcountry - Kihei travel market, and facilitate travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City. However, these alternatives would not serve the Upcountry - West Maui travel market.

The U1,K1 alternative was evaluated as being approximately equal in effectiveness in serving travel markets to the U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2 alternatives. It would serve the both the Upcountry travel markets to and from Kihei and West Maui, and serve moderately well travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City, and provide some South Maui evacuation capacity.

The U3 alternatives (K1 and K2) were evaluated as being the least effective in serving the target travel markets. They would serve the Upcountry - Kihei travel market and travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City only moderately well. The K1 alignment would serve the Upcountry - West Maui travel market only moderately well because of its Upcountry

terminus being so far from population centers. The K2 alignment would only marginally serve this market. The K2 alignment would, however, provide the better South Maui evacuation capacity because of the proximity of K1 to the existing evacuation route.

2.2.4.2b Regional Traffic Impacts

Three primary traffic impacts may result from the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway:

- reduction in traffic volumes on Haleakala Highway (in comparison to the No Build);
- increase in the amount of through traffic on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads; and
- increase in the amount of through traffic on local Kula residential roads.

Although many public comments stated a perception that the U2-A alternatives would adversely affect traffic operations and safety at the Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway, or "Five Trees" intersection, all proposed alternatives would provide terminus intersections with appropriate capacity and channelization for turning and through movements, signalization, sidewalks, crosswalks and other safety and pedestrian and vehicular traffic capacity features. Therefore, an adverse impact at the Five Trees intersection is not anticipated, and was not considered in the evaluation.

Public comments on the Draft EIS also indicated the mistaken belief among Pukalani residents that there would be a direct connection between the U2 (A or B) alternatives and Pukalani Terrace. These commentors were concerned about traffic passing through their neighborhood to access Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway if a U2 alternative were selected. Since this impact would not occur under a U2 alternative, the evaluation of regional traffic impacts did not consider this issue.

The ranking of the alternatives in terms of their potential regional traffic impacts is as follows:

1. U2-A.K1, U2-A.K2, U2-B.K1 and U2-B.K2 (tie);
2. U1.K1 and U1.K2 (tie); and
3. U3.K1 and U3-K2 (tie).

The U2 (A and B) alternatives were considered to have the most favorable and least adverse regional traffic impacts. First, the U2 alignments would give Pukalani, Kulamalu, and

Makawao residents two choices for traveling between Upcountry and the coastal areas (Haleakala Highway or Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway). Therefore, traffic volumes on Haleakala Highway would decrease, thereby improving operations on this highway. The U2 alternatives would also not affect Kula residential roads because their termini are at or near the Five Trees Intersection. However, it is anticipated that some of the motorists traveling between Kula and Kihei would use Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as an access route to the new highway, instead of traveling to either the U2-A or U2-B terminus. This was seen as the only adverse regional traffic impact of the U2 alternatives.

Like the U2 alternatives, the U1 alternatives would not affect the Kula residential roads because of the large distance between the U1 terminus and Kula. Also like the U2 alternatives, some motorists would use Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as a through route to access the new highway. More motorists would use Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as shortcuts with the U1 alternatives than under the U2 alternatives because the shortcut would save more time with the U1 alignment.

In comparison to the U2 alternatives, the U1 alternatives would not reduce the traffic volume on Haleakala Highway between Makawao Avenue and Haliimaile junction. During the morning peak period, all makai bound traffic would travel along this section of Haleakala Highway under the U1 alternatives. The U2 alternatives would remove a portion of this makai bound traffic, switching them to the less congested mauka bound direction to the U2 terminus. The opposite would occur during the afternoon peak period. Therefore, operations on Haleakala Highway would be worse with the U1 alternatives than with the U2 alternatives.

The regional traffic impacts of the U3 alternatives would include motorists using the residential roads between Haleakala Highway and Kula Highway inappropriately as a through route. Also, the U3 alternatives would only moderately reduce traffic volumes on Haleakala Highway, and not to the extent of the U2 alternatives. However, unlike the U1 and U2 alternatives, the U3 alternatives would not encourage motorists to use Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as a through route.

2.2.4.3 Agricultural Impacts

Because the potential alignments traverse agricultural areas over most of their length, and the agricultural parcels are very large, substantial adverse environmental impacts are not anticipated. None of the alternatives would bisect or pass immediately adjacent to existing residential communities, or require business or residential relocations. There are no threatened or endangered floral species along the alternative alignments. None of the alignments would traverse or be near a critical habitat, valuable water body or wetland. Archaeological sites were found within the corridors, but the alignments were modified to avoid the significant sites requiring preservation. The land uses that would sustain significant adverse impacts from the proposed highway are agricultural and ranching activities. Since the level of this impact varies by alternative, these impacts were evaluated to determine the differences between alternatives.

Total land evaluation and site assessment scores from Form AD-1006, which are calculated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and FHWA (see Section 4.2.3), were used to assess the difference in agricultural impact between the alternatives. In accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act, this form is used to determine whether alternatives that avoid farmland impacts need to be considered. The threshold land evaluation and site assessment score for this determination is 160 points. None of the alternatives reached 160 points, but scores ranged between 137 and 151 points. Based on the land evaluation and site assessment scores, the alternatives were ranked in the following manner (from least adverse agricultural impact to most):

1. U3,K2: 137 points;
2. U2-B,K1 and U2-B,K2 (tie): 139 points;
3. U3,K1: 140 points;
4. U2-A,K1: 141 points;
5. U2-B-K2: 142 points;
6. U1,K2: 148 points; and
7. U1,K1: 151 points.

As shown in these rankings, the land evaluation and site assessment scores generally decrease from U1 to U3. The Kihei terminus options were not as influential in the scores. The U1 alternatives had the highest scores (most adverse impact) because they would traverse a large parcel of sugarcane land and a pineapple field. Therefore, the agricultural impacts of the U1 alternatives would be most severe.

2.2.4.4 Community Plan Preference

The Kihei-Makena and Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plans provided divergent positions regarding Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. The Kihei-Makena Plan supported a highway providing improved access to Upcountry. While not identifying preferred locations for an Upcountry or Kihei terminus, the Plan indicated a preference for an alignment that connects major population centers and travel destinations ("trip attractors" and "trip generators"). In its assessment of a transportation link with the Upcountry area, the Kihei-Makena Plan stated "[t]he focus should be on improving transportation services for island residents and thus the chosen route should be located to minimize travel times for the maximum number of island residents." This statement was interpreted in the following manner:

- the U3 alternatives, with a terminus relatively far from the population center of Upcountry, would not fulfill this objective statement;
- the U1 and U2 alternatives are clustered in a higher population area near Pukalani, Makawao and Haliimaile; and
- although there is not much difference between the K1 and K2 alignments in terms of proximity to the center of Kihei, the K1 alignment would be favored because it would serve the West Maui region, thereby helping to decrease travel times for the greatest number of travelers.

Unlike the Kihei-Makena Plan, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan clearly states that the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is undesirable. However, the Plan also stated that given no other recourse, a U1 terminus is preferred. A preference for the Kihei terminus was not specified. It is therefore assumed that, if constrained to select a Build alternative, a U1 alternative would be most consistent with the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

In combining the preferences inferred from the two relevant community plans, the following ranking was determined (from most favored to least):

1. U1,K1;
2. U1,K2, U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1;
3. U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2; and
4. U3,K1 and U3,K2.

The U1,K1 alternative rated the highest in terms of community preference. First, this alternative serves population, employment and visitor centers, an objective of the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. In particular it would serve West Maui travel markets. Second, the Upcountry terminus would be at the preferred terminus stated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, U1.

The U1,K2 and U2 alternatives were all rated second and third in terms of community preference. All of these alternatives would serve population, employment and visitor centers. However, the U1,K2 alternative was marked down by having a Kihei terminus at K2, which would not serve West Maui. The U2 alternatives would have an Upcountry terminus in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

The U3 alternatives rated the worst in terms of community preference. Not only would these alternatives not serve population, employment and visitor centers, but the Upcountry terminus would be located in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

2.2.4.5 Conclusion and Selection of Preferred Alternative

The Build alternatives were compared using cost, transportation performance, agricultural impacts and community plan preference criteria. The purpose of this comparison was to help identify a preferred build alternative. The No Build alternative did not enter into this analysis because it remains a viable alternative until the Record of Decision is issued by FHWA. Other criteria were considered for the evaluation but were not used because, while important, they did not differentiate between the alternatives.

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

In combining the preferences inferred from the two relevant community plans, the following ranking was determined (from most favored to least):

1. U1,K1;
2. U1,K2, U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1;
3. U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2; and
4. U3,K1 and U3,K2.

The U1,K1 alternative rated the highest in terms of community preference. First, this alternative serves population, employment and visitor centers, an objective of the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. In particular it would serve West Maui travel markets. Second, the Upcountry terminus would be at the preferred terminus stated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, U1.

The U1,K2 and U2 alternatives were all rated second and third in terms of community preference. All of these alternatives would serve population, employment and visitor centers. However, the U1,K2 alternative was marked down by having a Kihei terminus at K2, which would not serve West Maui. The U2 alternatives would have an Upcountry terminus in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

The U3 alternatives rated the worst in terms of community preference. Not only would these alternatives not serve population, employment and visitor centers, but the Upcountry terminus would be located in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

2.2.4.5 Conclusion and Selection of Preferred Alternative

The Build alternatives were compared using cost, transportation performance, agricultural impacts and community plan preference criteria. The purpose of this comparison was to help identify a preferred build alternative. The No Build alternative did not enter into this analysis because it remains a viable alternative until the Record of Decision is issued by FHWA. Other criteria were considered for the evaluation but were not used because, while important, they did not differentiate between the alternatives.

In evaluating the transportation performance of the alternatives, all the U3 and K2 alternatives were eliminated from further consideration. The U3 terminus is located about 6 km (4 miles) from the Upcountry population centers and would therefore serve the target travel markets poorly. The K2 alternatives would not serve the Upcountry – West Maui travel market, and is therefore, at a severe disadvantage to the K1 alternatives. The benefit of K2's superior evacuation potential for South Maui did not override the disadvantage of not serving the Upcountry - West Maui travel market. The U2-A and U2-B alternatives, with a slight edge to the U2-A alternatives because of their direct connection to the Five Trees intersection, were judged to be superior to the U1 alternatives in transportation performance. These alternatives would best serve the target travel markets and maximize congestion- relief on Haleakala Highway. The top-ranking alternatives from the perspective of transportation performance are: 1) U2-A, K1; 2) U2-B, K1; and 3) U1, K1. All the other alternatives were eliminated from further consideration.

The U1, K1 alternative would be the least expensive to construct among the three alternatives remaining. However, the costs of the three remaining alternatives are within 7 percent of one another, and therefore, unlike transportation performance, was only a minor factor in the decision to select the preferred alternative.

The U2-A and U2-B alternatives would have less of an adverse impact on agriculture than the U1, K1 alternative. However, Alexander & Baldwin (see Draft EIS Comments and Responses), the parent company of Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, indicated a willingness to work with the SDOT on appropriate mitigation to lessen the impact to their agricultural operations. Therefore, agricultural impacts became less of a factor in the identification of the preferred alternative.

The U1, K1, U2-A, K1 and U2-B, K1 alternatives would all be consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. Therefore, this Plan does not help discriminate among the remaining alternatives. On the other hand, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan indicated a strong preference for a U1 alternative. This preference for U1 was repeated by several Upcountry commentators, each asking that the project respect the preference stated in their community plan. The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan preference for a U1 alternative

In evaluating the transportation performance of the alternatives, all the U3 and K2 alternatives were eliminated from further consideration. The U3 terminus is located about 6 km (4 miles) from the Upcountry population centers and would therefore serve the target travel markets poorly. The K2 alternatives would not serve the Upcountry - West Maui travel market, and is therefore, at a severe disadvantage to the K1 alternatives. The benefit of K2's superior evacuation potential for South Maui did not override the disadvantage of not serving the Upcountry - West Maui travel market. The U2-A and U2-B alternatives, with a slight edge to the U2-A alternatives because of their direct connection to the Five Trees intersection, were judged to be superior to the U1 alternatives in transportation performance. These alternatives would best serve the target travel markets and maximize congestion-relief on Haleakala Highway. The top-ranking alternatives from the perspective of transportation performance are: 1) U2-A, K1; 2) U2-B, K1; and 3) U1, K1. All the other alternatives were eliminated from further consideration.

The U1, K1 alternative would be the least expensive to construct among the three alternatives remaining. However, the costs of the three remaining alternatives are within 7 percent of one another, and therefore, unlike transportation performance, was only a minor factor in the decision to select the preferred alternative.

The U2-A and U2-B alternatives would have less of an adverse impact on agriculture than the U1, K1 alternative. However, Alexander & Baldwin (see Draft EIS Comments and Responses), the parent company of Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, indicated a willingness to work with the SDOT on appropriate mitigation to lessen the impact to their agricultural operations. Therefore, agricultural impacts became less of a factor in the identification of the preferred alternative.

The U1, K1, U2-A, K1 and U2-B, K1 alternatives would all be consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. Therefore, this Plan does not help discriminate among the remaining alternatives. On the other hand, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan indicated a strong preference for a U1 alternative. This preference for U1 was repeated by several Upcountry commentators, each asking that the project respect the preference stated in their community plan. The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan preference for a U1 alternative

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

In combining the preferences inferred from the two relevant community plans, the following ranking was determined (from most favored to least):

1. U1,K1;
2. U1,K2, U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1;
3. U2-A,K2 and U2-B,K2; and
4. U3,K1 and U3,K2.

The U1,K1 alternative rated the highest in terms of community preference. First, this alternative serves population, employment and visitor centers, an objective of the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. In particular it would serve West Maui travel markets. Second, the Upcountry terminus would be at the preferred terminus stated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, U1.

The U1,K2 and U2 alternatives were all rated second and third in terms of community preference. All of these alternatives would serve population, employment and visitor centers. However, the U1,K2 alternative was marked down by having a Kihei terminus at K2, which would not serve West Maui. The U2 alternatives would have an Upcountry terminus in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

The U3 alternatives rated the worst in terms of community preference. Not only would these alternatives not serve population, employment and visitor centers, but the Upcountry terminus would be located in an area not favored in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan.

2.2.4.5 Conclusion and Selection of Preferred Alternative

The Build alternatives were compared using cost, transportation performance, agricultural impacts and community plan preference criteria. The purpose of this comparison was to help identify a preferred build alternative. The No Build alternative did not enter into this analysis because it remains a viable alternative until the Record of Decision is issued by FHWA. Other criteria were considered for the evaluation but were not used because, while important, they did not differentiate between the alternatives.

In evaluating the transportation performance of the alternatives, all the U3 and K2 alternatives were eliminated from further consideration. The U3 terminus is located about 6 km (4 miles) from the Upcountry population centers and would therefore serve the target travel markets poorly. The K2 alternatives would not serve the Upcountry - West Maui travel market, and is therefore, at a severe disadvantage to the K1 alternatives. The benefit of K2's superior evacuation potential for South Maui did not override the disadvantage of not serving the Upcountry - West Maui travel market. The U2-A and U2-B alternatives, with a slight edge to the U2-A alternatives because of their direct connection to the Five Trees intersection, were judged to be superior to the U1 alternatives in transportation performance. These alternatives would best serve the target travel markets and maximize congestion-relief on Haleakala Highway. The top-ranking alternatives from the perspective of transportation performance are: 1) U2-A, K1; 2) U2-B, K1; and 3) U1, K1. All the other alternatives were eliminated from further consideration.

The U1, K1 alternative would be the least expensive to construct among the three alternatives remaining. However, the costs of the three remaining alternatives are within 7 percent of one another, and therefore, unlike transportation performance, was only a minor factor in the decision to select the preferred alternative.

The U2-A and U2-B alternatives would have less of an adverse impact on agriculture than the U1, K1 alternative. However, Alexander & Baldwin (see Draft EIS Comments and Responses), the parent company of Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, indicated a willingness to work with the SDOT on appropriate mitigation to lessen the impact to their agricultural operations. Therefore, agricultural impacts became less of a factor in the identification of the preferred alternative.

The U1, K1, U2-A, K1 and U2-B, K1 alternatives would all be consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan. Therefore, this Plan does not help discriminate among the remaining alternatives. On the other hand, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan indicated a strong preference for a U1 alternative. This preference for U1 was repeated by several Upcountry commentators, each asking that the project respect the preference stated in their community plan. The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan preference for a U1 alternative

was highly influential, and became the major determining factor that led SDOT and FHWA to select the U1,K1 alternative as the preferred alternative.

CHAPTER THREE
Affected Environment

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This chapter describes the existing environmental conditions in the project area. Impacts of the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project on these conditions are discussed in Chapter 4.

3.1 LAND USE


3.1.1 REGIONAL SETTING

The County of Maui consists of four major islands, Maui, Lanai, Kahoolawe, and most of Molokai (Kalawao, located on the northern side of Molokai, is officially designated a separate county). The county is the second largest in the State with a total land area on four islands of 4190 km² (1,160 square miles), and it ranks third in population (estimated 122,000 in 1999). Maui island is the second largest in the Hawaiian Archipelago, with an area of approximately 1890 km² (729 square miles).

The project would be located on Maui island between the coastal community of Kihei-Makena and an area on the western slope of Haleakala known as Upcountry Maui (see Figure 1-1). Defined neighborhoods or communities in the vicinity of the proposed project include Makena, Wailea, Kihei, Pukalani, Haliimaile, Makawao, and the Kula communities of Omaopio, Pulehu, Naalea, Waiakoa and Keokea. The locations of these neighborhoods and communities are shown on Figure 3-1.

3.1.2 EXISTING LAND USES

The Kihei-Makena region is comprised of the urban mixed-use community of Kihei and the resort land uses of Wailea and Makena. Development of the Kihei-Makena region has occurred primarily because of the phenomenal growth of Maui's visitor industry since the 1960s. Coastal communities in this region are essentially linear, extending from Kaelia Pond



Existing Neighborhoods and Communities
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-1



to Makena. This region is the second largest visitor accommodation area on Maui (behind the Kapalua-Kaanapali-Lahaina region on the western side of the island). Kihei, the largest and most populous of these coastal communities, consists of a wide mix of housing types from single-family to multi-family low to medium density units, small to medium-sized commercial malls, and small to medium sized hotels along South Kihei Road. The Wailea-Makena area is a resort community, similar in size and scale to other resort communities on Maui, such as Kapalua and Kaanapali located in West Maui. In terms of urban design and socio-economic conditions, Wailea-Makena is vastly more "upscale" than Kihei, which is a working class community. Wailea-Makena contains some of Maui's most luxurious condominiums and resort hotels, such as the Grand Wailea Resort & Spa, the Maui Inter-Continental Resort, the Four Seasons Resort, and the Maui Prince Hotel.

The Upcountry Maui communities of Makawao, Pukalani and Haliimaile are a mixture of suburban and rural, with Pukalani being the most suburban of the three. Pukalani and Makawao contain most of Upcountry's commercial land uses. Pukalani's businesses are mostly located along Haleakala Highway and are typical of a suburban community (neighborhood shopping center, convenience stores, small offices, etc.). Businesses in Makawao, centered around the intersection of Makawao and Baldwin Avenues, are generally smaller, more pedestrian-oriented, and some preserve the town's historic architecture. These businesses consist of restaurants, gift stores, and art galleries.

The Kula region contains a mixture of rural and agricultural land uses with human settlement most concentrated at Waiakoa. Single-family residences on lots up to 0.4 ha (1 acre) are generally found between Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and Kula Highway. This area and the area west (makai) of Kula Highway are also used for small truck farms and agricultural lots. The small two to four hectare (five to ten acre) farms produce vegetables, such as the famous Maui onions, and flowers. Large-scale sugarcane and pineapple activities extend from the west slopes of Haleakala, generally west (makai) of the small truck farms, to central Maui. Cattle ranching occurs in the area east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue, and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala. On the summit is Haleakala National Park (see Figure 1-1). The few commercial activities in Kula are primarily along the route to Haleakala National Park and in central Kula around Waiakoa.

3.1.3 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Major proposed development projects in the study area (see Figure 3-2) include:


- Kulamalu;
- Alexander & Baldwin housing development in Haliimaile
- Department of Hawaiian Home Lands homesteads in Keokea;
- Maui Research and Technology Park;
- Waena Generating Station;
- Mokulele Baseyard; and
- redevelopment of the old Puunene Airport.

The Kulamalu development is proposed south (mauka) of Pukalani and would consist of 32 ha (80 acres) of single-family housing, 3 ha (7 acres) of multi-family housing, 2 ha (5 acres) of elderly housing, 8 ha (19 acres) of business and commercial uses, 2 ha (5 acres) for an amphitheater, 2 ha (5 acres) for public uses, 6 ha (15 acres) for parks, and 38 ha (94 acres) for a Kamehameha Schools campus. The commercial area would be designed in compliance with Business Country Town design guidelines (Kulamalu Project, Draft Environmental Assessment, April 1997). The U2-B alignment is consistent with the Kulamalu master plan (see Section 2.2.2).

Alexander & Baldwin (A&B) is planning to develop approximately 200 single-family housing units on 27 ha (67 acres) in Haliimaile about 1.6 km (1 mile) from the U1 terminus (intersection of Haleakala Highway and Haliimaile Road). According to A&B, the development is consistent with the Community Plan (see Section 3.4.1.2d), but needs to obtain the proper zoning (telephone conversation on January 31, 2001).

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) plans to develop homesteads for qualified individuals and families in Keokea. DHHL land holdings are approximately 2450 ha (6,100 acres). Water system and other site improvements to serve a portion of this area will be built over the next two to five years (see Appendix C).

The Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park, in Kihei east (mauka) of Piilani Highway, is the center of Maui's efforts to develop its high technology industry. Current tenants include



Legend

- Existing Roadway
- Alternative Alignments of Proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
- Proposed Terminus



Future Development Projects
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement **FIGURE 3-2**

the Maui High Performance Computing Center, Boeing-Rocketdyne, Sunsource, the U.S. Air Force, the Pacific Disaster Center, Lockheed Martin, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, and a number of small companies. Currently about eight percent built-out, the R&T Park may eventually occupy a total of 168 ha (415 acres). Major new industries expected to locate in the park include bio- and medical-technology; arts and entertainment; environmental, earth and ocean sciences; information processing and exchange; defense missions; and education and international training and technology conferencing.

Maui Electric Company, Limited is planning to construct and operate a 232-megawatt electric generating station on a 65 acre parcel along Pulehu Road (see Figure 3-2). The first phase of this project, 58-MW of generating capacity, is scheduled to be completed by the year 2006. The timing of future phases would be dependent on future load growth, power availability from independent power purchase agreements and unit retirements. Site preparation for future phases would be completed in the first phase.

Two parcels on Mokulele Highway, Mokulele Baseyard and the old Puunene Airport site, are being planned for redevelopment (see Figure 3-2). The existing baseyard would be expanded for light industrial use, and the old airport site would be redeveloped for various uses, such as light industrial, a raceway park, recreational facilities, a heliport or a general aviation airport.

3.1.4 GOVERNMENTAL PLANS, POLICIES AND CONTROLS FOR THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1.4.1 Hawaii State Plans and Controls

3.1.4.1a Hawaii State Plan

The Hawaii State Plan (June 1991) consists of comprehensive goals, objectives, policies and priorities in all areas of government functions. These functions include the protection of the physical environment, the provision of public facilities, and the promotion and assistance of socio-cultural advancement.

3.1.4.1b Hawaii State Land Use Controls

Chapter 205, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), relating to the State Land Use Commission (SLUC), regulates land use through classification of State lands into four districts: Urban, Agriculture, Conservation and Rural. The intent of the land classification is to accommodate growth and development while retaining the natural resources of the area. Each district has specific land use objectives and development constraints.

Figure 3-3 shows the State land use districts in the study area. Urban-designated land in the study area is primarily in Kihei-Makena, the Upcountry communities of Pukalani and Makawao, and in relatively small areas in Kula along Kula, Haleakala and Kekaulike Highways. Much of the built-up areas (i.e., residences) in Upcountry have a Rural designation.

The Kihei-Upcountry Highway would traverse Agricultural lands along most of its length. The U2-A and U2-B alternatives would traverse vacant Urban land south of Pukalani, which is being developed as part of the Kulamalu development (see Section 3.1.3). The K1 alternative would pass through vacant Urban land at its terminus at Piilani Highway.


3.1.4.1c Coastal Zone Management Act (CZM) (Chapter 205A, HRS)

The Kihei-Upcountry Highway would be within the State's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) area. The objectives and policies of the Hawaii CZM Program are intended to protect and manage Hawaii's coastal resources. Federally assisted activities affecting Hawaii's coastal zone, such as the Kihei-Upcountry Highway, must be consistent with the CZM objectives and policies.

3.1.4.1d Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan

The Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1997) was prepared through a cooperative effort of the State Department of Transportation and the County of Maui. The Plan serves as a guide for the development of major surface transportation facilities and programs in the County of Maui. It identifies both short-range and long-range (year 2020) strategies and actions that will lead to an integrated intermodal transportation system.

A range of alternative investments in transportation infrastructure was developed to address deficiencies in the transportation system identified during the plan's development. A



State Land Use Districts
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-3



methodology to evaluate these alternatives was developed and applied, based on the following criteria:

- congestion relief effectiveness;
- service effectiveness;
- cost effectiveness;
- planning objective effectiveness; and
- environmental impacts (land use, noise, visual, resource conservation, air quality, energy).

Following the evaluation, a list of improvements, including new highways, bypass highways (relief routes), roadway extensions, roadway widening and improvements to intersections (e.g., including signals, reconfigurations and grade separations) were recommended. Among the recommended improvements was an Upcountry-Kihei highway.

3.1.4.2 County of Maui Plans and Controls

3.1.4.2a General Plan

The County of Maui's General Plan 1990 was adopted by Ordinance No. 2039, which took effect on September 27, 1991. The General Plan consists of objectives and policies to meet Maui residents' needs and desires. The following major themes were incorporated in the General Plan: protect Maui County's agricultural land and rural identity; prepare a directed and managed growth plan; protect Maui County's shoreline and limit visitor industry growth; maintain a viable economy that offers diverse employment opportunities for residents; and provide for needed resident housing.

The General Plan's transportation objectives were the following:

1. To support an advanced and environmentally sensitive transportation system which will enable people and goods to move safely, efficiently and economically.
2. To develop a program for anticipating and enlarging the local street and highway systems in a timely response to planned growth.
3. To develop a Maui County Transportation system linked to land use planning that is less dependent on the automobile as its primary mode of moving people.

3.1.4.2b County of Maui Zoning

Zoning in the County of Maui is administered by its Planning Department. Since most of the study area is designated Agriculture by the SLUC (see Section 3.1.4.1b), the County also zones this land Agriculture. The State Urban land in Kihei-Makena is zoned for residential, business and hotel land uses. A portion of the residential land is for higher density apartment uses. In Upcountry, the State Urban lands are mostly in Pukalani and Makawao. In these areas, the County zoning is mostly residential. However, there are areas zoned "business" and "parks", including golf courses. Also, much of the built-up areas in Upcountry have a State Rural designation.

3.1.4.2c County of Maui Special Management Area

Chapter 205A outlines special controls, policies and guidelines for development within the area along the shoreline designated by the 1975 Shoreline Protection Act as the Special Management Area (SMA). This Act gave the counties authority to issue permits for development activities proposed within the SMA. In the study area, the landward limit of the SMA is Piilani Highway (see Figure 3-4).


3.1.4.2d Community Plans

The County prepares nine Community Plans to help guide its decisions regarding development. Two of these plans are of relevance to the proposed project--the Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998) and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996). Their planning areas are displayed on Figure 3-5.


Kihei-Makena Community Plan

The Kihei-Makena Community Plan was approved by the County Council and Mayor in early 1998. The Kihei-Makena Plan addressed Kihei-Makena's physical and social infrastructure, emphasizing that community facilities are not keeping up with growth. Therefore, objectives were established to limit hotel and residential development until adequate public facilities and services, such as schools, are established to meet existing needs. The exception to this recommendation is encouragement of appropriate commercial and light industrial activities to diversify the region's economic base.

The Kihei-Makena Plan seeks the following land use patterns:




Special Management Area
KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-4



Note: Community Planning Areas for Molokai, Lanai and Kahoolawe not shown.

Source: County of Maui



GRAPHIC SCALE:



Community Planning Areas
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 3-5



- Vacant land between Piilani Highway and South Kihei Road / Kilohana Road to be developed as an urban mix, such as single-family and multi-family residences and commercial land uses (shopping centers, hotels, etc.).
- Limited commercial/light industrial development mauka of Piilani Highway, such as the Kaonoulu parcel and the build-out of the Maui R&T Park.
- Resorts and resort-related activities (some residences, retail, commercial, etc.) to continue to be developed in the resort area of Wailea and Makena.

The Kihei-Makena Plan recommended a transportation connection to the Upcountry area. This connection would save commuter time between the residential area of Upcountry and job centers within the Kihei region. In choosing the alignment for this connection, the Kihei-Makena Plan recommended that preference be given to improving transportation service for the maximum number of residents.

Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan

The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) seeks to protect and enhance the unique qualities of this region through policies and recommendations to expand the region's agricultural base and enhance the rural qualities associated with Upcountry Maui. The Plan seeks to accomplish this by directing growth to already established urbanized centers. For example, Pukalani would be the region's "hub" for business, commercial and housing land uses. Makawao's and Waiakoa's unique town ambiance and Kula's rural and agricultural atmosphere would be maintained. The Community Plan seeks the following land use patterns:

- Agriculture and open space would be maintained.
- Residential growth would be directed to the established urbanized communities of Pukalani, Makawao and Haliimaile.
 - In Makawao:
 - * businesses would develop around the established central core; and
 - * the country town ambiance would be maintained.
 - In Pukalani:

- * residential growth would be within (in-fill) and to the north (makai) and south (mauka) of the community;
 - * multi-family residences (for senior housing in the Kulamalu development) would be consistent with the community's size and character; and
 - * Pukalani would be developed as Upcountry's geographic, public service and commercial hub.
- In Haliimaile:
- * some small-scale commercial uses would serve existing and proposed residences; and
 - * limited single-family residential growth would be contiguous with existing residences.
- Small-scale agriculture in Kula, particularly on the west (makai) side of Kula Highway, would be preserved.
 - Waiakoa would be developed as Kula's town center:
 - some low density residential uses;
 - some small scale commercial; and
 - no urban sprawl.
 - Residences in Kula would generally be allowed between Kula Highway and Haleakala Highway. Lot sizes would be no larger than 0.2 ha (1/2 acre).
 - The Keokea area would be developed for homesteads by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL).
 - No large-scale retail or heavy industrial land uses.
 - Existing communities would remain separated with no in-fill development between communities.

With regards to the proposed project, the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan stated a preference for the No Build alternative. If the road is built, however, the Plan recommended the U1 alternatives.


3.2 FARMLAND

Large-scale sugarcane and pineapple cultivation and cattle ranching are the major economic activities in Upcountry. Other agricultural activities include small-scale vegetable and flower production. Sugarcane and pineapple activities are located from the west slopes of Haleakala to central Maui. Cattle ranching generally occurs in the area east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala. In Kula, smaller scale agricultural crops include vegetables, such as head cabbage, lettuce and round onions; and flowers, such as carnations and protea. Unlike sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, agricultural activities in Kula are on much smaller farm lots of about two to four hectares (five to ten acres).

Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) cultivates approximately 14 000 ha (35,000 acres) of sugarcane (see Figure 3-6). HC&S operates a sugar mill in Puunene, which also exports electricity to the Maui electrical grid. HC&S's Paia mill was recently closed. Other highways, such as Haleakala and Hana Highways, already cross HC&S fields (see Figure 3-6), and these highways adversely affect productivity for several reasons. For example, only some public road-haul road intersections are signalized, and these crossings delay the transport of sugarcane to the mills. In addition, suburban encroachment interferes with certain agricultural operations, such as cane burning and aerial spraying.

The other large-scale agricultural business in the study area is Maui Land & Pineapple Company (ML&P), the last pineapple processor in the State. ML&P's pineapple fields are located around Haliimaile, Makawao and Pukalani, and in lower Kula (see Figure 3-6). ML&P selected these areas to cultivate pineapple because they have good soil conditions and access to water. Similar to HC&S, urban encroachment has adversely affected ML&P productivity.

Small farms are located in Kula around Omaopio, Pulehu, Naalea, Waiakoa, and Keokea (see Figure 3-1). As described in Section 3.1.2, these two to four hectare (five to ten acre) farms cultivate vegetables and flowers. One of these farming areas is the Kula Agricultural Park, owned by the County of Maui. The Agricultural Park leases parcels to small-scale farmers at low rents. Kula farmers face problems similar to those expressed by HC&S and ML&P: urban



Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, May 1997
Sugarcane and Pineapple Fields
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-6

encroachment and periodic water use restrictions during drought conditions. Urban encroachment affects Kula farmers through speculation (increasing land values), neighbor complaints of chemical use by farmers, and increased traffic.

Cattle ranching generally occurs east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala. The ranching enterprises in the study area are the Haleakala and Kaonoulu Ranches. Similar to HC&S and ML&P, urban encroachment has adversely affected these ranches because of complaints about noise and cattle crossing public roadways.


3.3 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

As shown on Figure 3-7, U.S. census tracts (CTs) 303.01, 303.02, 304.01, 304.02, and 307 encompass the study area. CT 303.01 covers the Kula neighborhoods (see Figure 3-1); CT 303.02 includes Wailea and Makena; CT 304.01 includes Makawao and Haliimaile; CT 304.02 includes Pukalani and parts of Kula; and CT 307 includes Kihei.

3.3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3-1 exhibits selected demographic characteristics of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui study area. In 1990, the population of the study area as delineated by the above CTs was 34,171, or 34 percent of the County population. Population growth in the study area was rapid during the 1980s (annual average growth of 5.6 percent). In comparison, County and State annual average population growth in the same period was 3.5 percent and 1.4 percent, respectively. The Kihei area (CT 307) experienced the greatest population increase both in absolute terms (6,863) and by percentage--an average of 7.9 percent per year. The Pukalani-Kula area (CT 304.02 -- partial) had the smallest average annual growth rate within the study area of 3.5 percent per year. Kula (CT 303.01), Wailea-Makena (CT 303.02) and Makawao-Haliimaile (CT 304.01) had annual growth rates of 3.8 percent, 7.3 percent, and 5.1 percent, respectively.

Table 3-1 also displays the number of households, families, ethnicity and age distributions for the study area in 1990. Overall whites made up 60 percent of the total population of the study



Source: U.S. Census Bureau

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Census Tracts
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

**Table 3-1
Demographic Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990**

	Kula	Wailea- Makena	Haliimaile- Makawao	Pukalani- Kula (Part)	Kihei	Total	Maui County
	CT 303.01	CT 303.02	CT 304.01	CT 304.02	CT 307		
Population	5,567	2,483	7,174	6,064	12,883	34,171	100,374
Sex							
Males	50%	51%	52%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Females	50%	49%	48%	49%	48%	48%	49%
Households	1,940	1,043	2,283	1,919	4,902	12,087	33,148
Families	1,439	661	1,793	1,576	3,112	8,581	23,672
Ethnicity							
White	64%	80%	54%	43%	65%	60%	40%
Chinese	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Filipino	3%	4%	11%	13%	14%	11%	21%
Japanese	18%	5%	11%	25%	5%	12%	17%
Other Asian	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Hawaiian	8%	3%	14%	14%	9%	10%	15%
Pacific Islander	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Black	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Other Race	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Age							
Less than 5 Years	10%	7%	11%	10%	9%	9%	9%
5 to 17 Years	17%	12%	20%	21%	14%	17%	17%
18 to 34 Years	20%	22%	28%	23%	31%	26%	26%
35 to 64 Years	41%	48%	34%	38%	39%	39%	36%
65 or More Years	12%	12%	7%	8%	8%	9%	11%

Note: CT: Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii

area, which is 20 percentage points greater than their county-wide proportion (see Table 3-1). Japanese, Filipinos and Hawaiians were the second, third and fourth next most common ethnic groups, respectively. Within the study area, the proportion of whites as compared to the total ranged from a high of 80 percent in the Wailea-Makena area to a low of 43 percent in the Pukalani-Kula area. The age distribution of residents in the study area does not appear to be substantially different from the age distribution of the entire county.

3.3.2 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3-2 exhibits certain housing characteristics of selected Kihei-Upcountry areas in 1990. Overall, 54 percent of the housing units were one-unit structures. However, this ratio varied by community within the study area. In the Upcountry areas, such as Kula (CT 303.01), Makawao-Pukalani (CT 304.01), and Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02), one-unit housing types made up more than 90 percent of all housing units, consistent with Upcountry's suburban and rural characteristics. The coastal areas of Wailea-Makena (CT 303.02) and Kihei (CT 307) have a mix of housing types consistent with these areas' more urban characteristics.

The age ratios of structures (see Table 3-2) is a good indicator of the ages of the neighborhoods within the CTs. From the information presented in Table 3-2, Wailea-Makena (CT 303.02) and Kihei (CT 307) are relatively young communities in comparison to all communities combined on the island. Very few of the houses in these areas are older than 20 years. In terms of age of their communities, Kula (CT 303.01) and Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02) are very similar to the island overall. The age ratios of Haliimaile-Makawao indicate that they are older communities that have recently experienced surges in residential growth.

Overall the owner versus renter occupancy ratio for the study area was 58:42 in 1990, roughly the same as the owner-renter occupancy ratio for the county. Within communities of the study area, this ratio varied from 65:35 in Makawao-Pukalani to 51:49 in Kihei. According to the Maui County Data Book (December 1994), approximately 32 percent of the housing units in the Kihei to Makena area were used for seasonal or recreational purposes in 1990. In the Upcountry areas, only two to three percent of the housing units were used for such purposes.

Table 3-2
Housing Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990

	Kula	Wailea- Makena	Haliimaile- Makawao	Pukalani- Kula (Part)	Kihei	Total	Maui County
	CT 303.01	CT 303.02	CT 304.01	CT 304.02	CT 307		
Housing Units	2,189	2,207	2,345	1,995	7,902	16,638	42,060
Units in Structure							
1 Unit	96%	50%	96%	98%	41%	64%	68%
2 to 4 Units	2%	12%	2%	1%	3%	4%	4%
5 or More Units	0%	38%	0%	0%	55%	31%	27%
Mobile or Other	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Age of Structure							
1 Year	4%	11%	7%	5%	9%	8%	5%
2 to 10 Years	32%	41%	37%	35%	32%	34%	27%
11 to 20 Years	31%	43%	26%	34%	51%	42%	37%
21 Years or More	33%	5%	30%	27%	8%	16%	30%
Tenure							
Owner-Occupied	63%	53%	64%	66%	51%	58%	58%
Renter-Occupied	37%	47%	36%	34%	49%	42%	42%

Note: CT: Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii

3.3.3 INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3-3 exhibits certain income characteristics for selected Kihei-Upcountry areas in 1990. Median household incomes in the study area were higher than the median for the County, which was \$38,771 in 1989. Incomes varied from a low of \$40,483 in Kula (CT 303.01) to a high of \$45,694 in Wailea-Makena (CT 303.02). The poverty rates of residents in Kihei-Upcountry areas were slightly higher than the rate for the County. The percentage of households with incomes below the poverty level ranged from a low of six percent in Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02) to a high of 12 percent in Wailea-Makena (CT 303.02).

From 1980 to 1993, the unemployment rate for Maui island ranged from 2.2 percent in 1989 to 7.6 percent in 1992. The average in this period was 4.9 percent. The Kihei to Makena region is one of the island's major employment centers (see Sections 1.2.2 and 3.3.4).

3.3.4 ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Maui's most important industry is tourism. From 1989 to 1993, an average of over 2.3 million visitors arrived on Maui per year. The peak for this period was 1989 when there was over 2.5 million visitors. In 1998 and 1999, the island supported 2.24 and 2.28 million visitors, respectively. Most of Maui's hotels, resorts, and visitor-related businesses are in West Maui from Lahaina to Kapalua, and in South Maui from Kihei to Makena. In the latter area, there were 84 visitor-accommodation facilities in 1993 providing a total of 7,318 visitor rental units, approximately 40 percent of all visitor-related units on Maui. In contrast, the Upcountry areas had only 63 visitor-related units. The Kihei-Makena region held about 14.6 percent of the employment on Maui, ranking third behind West Maui and Wailuku-Kahului in the number of jobs on the island.

Unlike Kihei-Makena, agriculture is Upcountry Maui's prime economic activity. Agricultural activities in Upcountry Maui include large-scale sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, ranching and small-scale farming in Kula (see Section 3.2). Upcountry Maui also has small to medium-scale (e.g., supermarket) commercial activities, mostly in Pukalani and Makawao. The medium sized commercial land uses are exclusively within Pukalani. Makawao's

**Table 3-3
Income Characteristics of Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990**

	Kula	Wailea- Makena	Haliimaile- Makawao	Pukalani- Kula (Part)	Kihei	Maui County
	CT 303.01	CT 303.02	CT 304.01	CT 304.02	CT 307	
Median Household Income	\$40,483	\$45,694	\$41,949	\$43,032	\$40,558	\$38,771
Selected Sources of Income						
Social Security Income	24%	24%	19%	21%	19%	26%
Retirement Income	14%	15%	16%	18%	12%	18%
Public Assistance Income	3%	3%	6%	2%	4%	6%
Households Below Poverty Level	11%	12%	10%	6%	8%	8%

Note: CT: Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii

business district contains pedestrian-oriented small retail stores and restaurants. Kula has very few commercial activities.

Scientific research is becoming an increasingly important industry on Maui. This industry is centered at the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City on the summit of Haleakala. Science City, a federal research campus, is used for space- and defense-related research and development. Information about the Maui R&T Park can be found in Sections 1.2.2 and 3.1.3.

3.3.5 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES


Community facilities and services in the Kihei-Upcountry Maui study area include community centers, schools, police and fire stations and medical facilities (see Figure 3-8).

There are three schools in the Kihei-Makena region: Kihei Elementary School, Lokelani Intermediate School, and the new Kamalii Elementary School. Schools in Upcountry Maui include Makawao School, Pukalani Elementary, Kula Elementary, Kalama Intermediate, Seabury Hall (private), King Kekaulike High School, and Kamehameha School, which opened in 1999.

Police patrols for Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui operate out of the main police headquarters in Wailuku. The Makawao Community Police Officer maintains an office in the town. There are plans to construct a police sub-station in Kihei. Fire stations are located on South Kihei Road near Kalama Park, in Makawao, and in Kula near Waiakoa.

Maui Memorial Hospital in Wailuku is the principal hospital on Maui. Smaller hospitals are in Hana and Kula (Kula Sanatorium). The Kula Sanatorium provides care for tubercular, mental and long-term patients. An ambulance stationed in Makawao provides emergency service between the Upcountry area and Maui Memorial Hospital. There is no 24-hour ambulance service in Kula. Emergency medical service in Kihei is provided by Maui Memorial Hospital.

Section 3.11 contains information about community parks and recreational facilities in the project area.



Public Facilities
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-8

3.3.6 CRIME

Table 3-4 exhibits the crime rates of the communities in the study area for selected offenses for the years 1993 to 1996. The table indicates that the property crime rate (e.g., burglary and theft) in the Kihei to Makena communities is two to four times the rate of Upcountry communities. The crime rate differences for other offenses, such as criminal property damage, are not as great, or the Upcountry communities have higher rates than the Kihei-Makena communities.

3.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

3.4.1 ROADWAY SYSTEM

3.4.1.1 Roadway Network

Figure 3-9 displays the major transportation facilities in Kihei-Makena and Upcountry, and the roadways that connect the two regions.

The major roadways in Kihei-Makena are South Kihei Road, Piilani Highway, Wailea Alanui and Makena Alanui (see Figure 3-9). South Kihei Road, Wailea Alanui and Makena Alanui, which are two-lane arterials running along the Kihei-Makena coastline, are County facilities. They are the main roadway spine providing access to all land uses in Kihei, Wailea and Makena. Piilani Highway is a limited-access two-lane State facility that runs parallel to and east (mauka) of South Kihei Road, beginning at its intersection with Mokulele Highway and terminating at Wailea Iki Drive in Wailea. It has paved shoulders with left- and right-turn deceleration lanes at major intersections. South Kihei Road becomes North Kihei Road north of its intersection with Mokulele Highway, providing access to West Maui.

**Table 3-4
Crime Rate for Selected Offenses Per 10,000 Residents**

Offense/Location	Year			
	1993	1994	1995	1996
Burglary				
Haliimaile	97.61	126.45	40.98	59.88
Makawao	53.90	162.05	149.25	97.29
Pukalani	88.47	67.85	93.84	65.64
Kula	100.40	54.37	43.54	49.94
Kihei	211.12	304.89	241.38	249.24
Wailea-Makena	141.69	144.69	206.49	132.51
Theft				
Haliimaile	86.77	231.82	174.18	189.62
Makawao	297.10	342.79	264.75	282.48
Pukalani	237.47	256.33	199.41	175.51
Kula	111.92	166.29	163.27	166.46
Kihei	730.30	905.90	909.66	843.66
Wailea-Makena	631.60	618.44	814.61	766.34
Criminal Property Damage				
Haliimaile	108.46	126.45	163.93	129.74
Makawao	158.68	180.42	177.03	161.42
Pukalani	85.36	123.64	77.71	57.08
Kula	64.19	57.56	65.31	90.80
Kihei	138.01	238.65	176.96	197.89
Wailea-Makena	100.86	105.02	117.99	154.59
All Offenses*				
Haliimaile	835.14	1022.13	891.39	928.14
Makawao	1483.79	1676.23	1783.09	1587.77
Pukalani	963.84	1020.81	1036.66	927.51
Kula	515.14	580.43	738.61	776.33
Kihei	2134.23	2863.76	2784.85	2753.02
Wailea-Makena	1203.17	1155.19	1590.65	1462.01

Note: * Includes violent, drug, forgery, gambling, runaway, sex, terroristic threatening, truancy, and court order violation offenses.

Source: Police Department, County of Maui, July 14, 1997

Upcountry Maui's major highways are Haleakala Highway, Pukalani Bypass and Kula Highway (see Figure 3-9). Haleakala Highway and Pukalani Bypass are three-lane (two lanes east (mauka) and one lane west (makai) bound) limited-access facilities with paved shoulders. At the north (makai) side of Pukalani, Haleakala Highway extends into Pukalani where it becomes

a two-lane roadway with signalized intersections and driveway access to adjacent land uses. During the a.m. peak period, the middle south-bound (mauka) lane on Haleakala Highway/Pukalani Bypass is contra-flowed to the north-bound (makai) direction. At the "Five Trees" intersection, Haleakala Highway extends east (mauka) to the summit of Haleakala, and is the southeastern (mauka) terminus of Pukalani Bypass. The "Five Trees" intersection is the northern terminus of Kula Highway, which provides access to most of the Kula communities. This State highway terminates at Ulupalakua.

Omaopio and Pulehu Roads (see Figure 3-9) are County facilities used by Kula farmers to move equipment from field to field and transport agricultural products to Kahului Harbor. Although these roads are narrow and winding, they are used by some motorists as an alternative to Haleakala Highway to travel to Kahului or other parts of Maui.

The transportation infrastructure between the Kihei-Makena and Upcountry regions consists of Mokulele Highway, Puunene Avenue, Hansen Road, Dairy Road and Hana Highway (see Figure 3-9). Mokulele Highway and Puunene Avenue are two-lane arterials running north-south between Kahului and Kihei, and are one of the primary connections between the north and south coasts. Hana Highway begins in Kahului and runs along the north coast terminating at the southeast end of the island. Between Kahului and Haleakala Highway, it is a four-lane divided roadway. There are two alternative routes between Puunene Avenue and Hana Highway. The first and most popular route is Dairy Road, a recently widened four-lane roadway. The second is Hansen Road, a two-lane roadway with numerous curves and a low design speed.

3.4.1.2 Roadway Accidents

Table 3-5 presents information on the number of accidents on roadways between Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui between September 23, 1992 and June 26, 1997.

As indicated on Table 3-5, Pulehu Road, Omaopio Road, Dairy Road, Mokulele Highway and Hansen Road have experienced a high number of vehicle accidents. Pulehu, Omaopio and Hansen Roads carry much smaller volumes of traffic in comparison to Dairy Road and Mokulele Highway. Presently, Dairy Road is probably a safer facility than indicated on Table

3-5 because it has recently been widened to four lanes. Mokulele Highway is planned to be widened to four lanes, which should improve safety on this roadway.

**Table 3-5
Motor Vehicle Accidents**


Street	Year					
	1992 ⁽¹⁾	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997 ⁽²⁾
Holopuni Road	0	1	2	3	2	2
Pulehu Road	11	18	18	23	19	7
Omaopio Road	10	24	24	32	34	13
Piliwale Road	2	0	2	2	2	1
Haleakala Highway (Hana Highway to "Five Trees" intersection)	2	2	2	6	9	10
Hana Highway (Haleakala Highway to Dairy Road)	11	21	17	14	15	9
Dairy Road	37	58	60	69	81	48
Pukalani Bypass	0	0	1	7	1	3
Mokulele Highway	33	101	89	68	80	33
Hansen Road	38	56	40	67	74	32

Notes: (1) 1992 data collected from September 23 to December 31.
(2) 1997 data collected from January 1 to June 26.

Source: County of Maui, Police Department, July 14, 1997

3.4.2 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

The Bike Plan Hawaii: A State of Hawaii Master Plan (April 1994) recommended improvements to the State's bikeway systems. This plan serves as guidance to the SDOT and County transportation agencies when new roadway construction or improvements to existing roadways are contemplated. Within the study area, there is an existing bike route on Piilani Highway from Mokulele Highway to Wailea-Makena (see Figure 3-10). Recommended



Existing and Proposed Bikeways
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-10

bikeways are also shown on Figure 3-10. Recommended bikeways include facilities on South Kihei Road, Mokulele Highway, and Haleakala Highway.

Bicycle tours are a popular tourist activity on Maui. Tours normally start from the summit of Haleakala, run through Crater Road, Haleakala Highway and Baldwin Avenue, and end in Paia.

Pedestrian facilities within the Kihei area exist along South Kihei Road and the side streets, and at points where there is public access to the beaches and shoreline. Because of its rural environment, existing pedestrian facilities in Upcountry are limited to some of the residential neighborhoods.

3.4.3 WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Maui is served by five major water supply systems: Central Maui, Makawao, Kula, Hana, and Lahaina; and 15 individual sub-systems. The Iao Aquifer in the West Maui Mountains is the water source for Kihei-Makena and other areas. Water is transmitted from the West Maui Mountains through transmission lines running along South Kihei Road, Piilani Highway, and Wailea Alanui Drive. The Maui Board of Water Supply (BWS) is planning to develop groundwater resources in East Maui for Kihei and other areas.

Unlike Kihei-Makena, Upcountry's water supply is from surface sources along the north and east side of the island that feed into the Makawao and Kula systems. Makawao and Pukalani receive their water from the Makawao system. Surface water is treated at the Kamole Weir Water Treatment Plant near Haliimaile, and pumped up to the two communities. This system has no reservoir. The Maui BWS is planning to construct a 760 000 m³ (200 million gallon) reservoir to support the planned developments specified in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (see Section 3.1.4.2d). The East Maui groundwater resource, once developed, would be used by the Makawao system during droughts when surface water resources are dry.

The Kula system operates as two separate systems (Upper and Lower), with each having its own separate surface water intakes, treatment plant, and distribution system (lines run along

the upper portion of Haleakala Highway for the Upper system, and along Kula Highway for the Lower system). However, water can be pumped up (lower to upper) or gravity-fed (upper to lower) between the two systems, if required. Also, during droughts, water is sometimes pumped to the Kula systems from the Makawao system, and customers are required to reduce water use. The Maui BWS has recently constructed two 190 000 m³ (50 million gallon) reservoirs in the Upper Kula System, but there are no other immediate plans for a new reservoir in this system. A reservoir similar in size to the planned Makawao system reservoir (760 000 m³ (200 million gallon)) is being planned for the Lower Kula System. The Maui BWS is also planning to convert the Upper system to a dual system, in which non-potable water would be made available to Kula farmers in the Upper area for irrigation purposes.

The Kulamalu developer (see Section 3.1.3) drilled a well in Haiku to supply water to this development (The Maui News, September 5, 1997, correspondence from the Maui BWS, May 4, 1998, and letter from Kulamalu, Inc. dated September 20, 1999). The pump installed at this well will produce 6200 m³ (1.64 million gallons) per day of which 45 percent, or 2800 m³ (7.38 million gallons) per day, will be allocated to the Kulamalu project. The remaining water will not require treatment, and will remain in Haiku. Initially, this water will provide an additional supply during drought conditions, and improve the reliability of the Upcountry systems. The Kulamalu developer will provide storage tanks and new or improved mains within the development.

3.4.4 DRAINAGE

Because it is an urban community, Kihei-Makena requires drainage collection systems. The system consists of lined and unlined channels, drain lines, pipe or box culverts, and road-side ditches.

The Upcountry area contains limited drainage collection infrastructure because of its low development density, well-draining soils and its low to moderate rainfall. When it rains enough to produce overland flow, sheet flows enter the numerous gulches on the west flank of Haleakala.

3.5 CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY

3.5.1 LOCAL METEOROLOGY

Maui's climate varies according to altitude and leeward/windward location. Lowland areas tend to have a semi-tropical climate, while higher elevations are characterized by temperate climates. Maui is cooled by northeast trade winds approximately 70 percent of the year. These winds are constant during the spring and summer months. Trade winds are affected by local topographic conditions. The northeast trade winds become northerly as they are funneled between the West Maui Mountains and Haleakala. Areas in the "wind shadows" are shielded.

The climate of Upcountry Maui is conducive to farming, being mild with warm days and cool evenings. Pukalani and Kula are relatively dry with rainfall ranging between 50 to 100 cm (20 to 40 inches) annually. The amount of rainfall increases northeastward towards Makawao and Haiku to approximately 125 to 250 cm (50 to 100 inches) annually. Temperatures range from around 15 (C) (60s (F)) during the winter to the high 20s (C) (mid 80s (F)) in the summer.

Kihei-Makena is on the south side of the island, in the rain shadow of Haleakala. The region is generally sunny, warm and dry the entire year. Temperatures range from a minimum of 17 degrees (C) (62 degrees (F)) in February to a maximum of 32 degrees (C) (90 degrees (F)) in July. Average annual precipitation is less than 38 cm (15 inches) per year. Most of this precipitation occurs during the winter months when storms are usually accompanied by south winds.

3.5.2 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

As required by the Clean Air Act, National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) were established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for seven major air pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), ozone (O₃), particulate matter smaller than 10 microns (PM₁₀), PM_{2.5} (particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns), sulfur oxides (SO_x), and lead. Current standards for ozone and PM_{2.5} were established in September 1997. The State

of Hawaii has also established its own standards for these pollutants. Both the National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards are listed in Table 3-6. The "primary" standards have been established to protect the public health with an "adequate margin of safety." The "secondary" standards are intended to protect the nation's welfare and account for air pollutant effects on soil, water, visibility, materials, vegetation, and other aspects of the general welfare. The State of Hawaii issues its ambient air quality standards in terms of a single standard that is designed "to protect public health and welfare and to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality."

**Table 3-6
National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards**

Pollutant	Standard		
	Hawaii State	Federal Primary	Federal Secondary
Carbon Monoxide (CO)			
1 Hour	10 mg/m ³ (9 ppm)	40 mg/m ³ (35 ppm)	40 mg/m ³ (35 ppm)
8 Hour	5 mg/m ³ (4.5 ppm)	10 mg/m ³ (9 ppm)	10 mg/m ³ (9 ppm)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)			
Annual Arithmetic Mean	70 ug/m ³	100 ug/m ³ (0.053 ppm)	100 ug/m ³ (0.053 ppm)
Particulate Matter < 10 micrometers (PM₁₀)			
24 Hour	150 ug/m ³	150 ug/m ³	150 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	50 ug/m ³	50 ug/m ³	50 ug/m ³
Particulate Matter < 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5})			
24 Hour	--	65 ug/m ³	65 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	15 ug/m ³	15 ug/m ³
Ozone (O₃)			
1 Hour	100 ug/m ³	235 ug/m ³ (0.12 ppm)	235 ug/m ³ (0.12 ppm)
8 Hour	--	157 ug/m ³ (0.08 ppm)	157 ug/m ³ (0.08 ppm)
Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)			
3 Hour	1300 ug/m ³	--	1300 ug/m ³ (0.5 ppm)
24 Hour	365 ug/m ³	365 ug/m ³ (0.14 ppm)	--
Annual Arithmetic Mean	80 ug/m ³	80 ug/m ³ (0.03 ppm)	--
Lead (Pb)			
Quarterly Average	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch.
EPA NAAQS, Updated July 1997.

3.5.3 ATTAINMENT STATUS OF STUDY AREA

Section 107 of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments requires the EPA to publish a list disclosing whether geographic areas are in compliance with the NAAQS. Areas not in compliance with the NAAQS are termed nonattainment areas. Areas which have insufficient data to make a determination are unclassified, and are treated as attainment areas until proven otherwise. The designation of an area is made on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

The State of Hawaii is designated as an attainment area for all of the applicable pollutants.

3.5.4 MONITORED AIR QUALITY

Air pollutant levels in Hawaii are monitored by a network of sampling stations under the supervision of the State of Hawaii Department of Health (SDOH). On Maui, there are only two stations. They are strategically located in Kihei and Paia to be downwind of several sugarcane fields (cane fields are burned before harvest). Established in 1996, these stations monitor sugarcane burning activities, sampling PM₁₀. Sugarcane operations also generate fugitive dust from cane haul vehicles traveling on dirt roads within the fields, and other activities. Fugitive dust can travel a few hundred meters.

Additional ambient air quality data for other pollutants was obtained from an air quality study for the proposed Kahului Airport Improvements, which obtained its data from the Maui Electric Company (MECO) (Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Application for Maalaea Combined Cycle Project, August 1990).

A summary of the SDOH and MECO air quality data in the study area is provided in Table 3-7. As indicated on this table, monitored levels are well below the applicable State and federal standards.

**Table 3-7
Air Quality Summary for Study Area
(SDOH and MECO Monitoring Stations)**

Pollutant	Location		
	Maalaea (MECO Site #233)	Kihei (SDOH Site)	Paia (SDOH Site)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)			
1 Hour	14 ug/m ³ (.012 ppm)	NM	NM
8 Hour	6 ug/m ³ (.005 ppm)	NM	NM
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)			
Annual Arithmetic Mean	6 ug/m ³ (.003 ppm)	NM	NM
Particulate Matter < 10 micrometers (PM₁₀)			
24 Hour	56 ug/m ³	100 ug/m ³	131 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	14 ug/m ³	24 ug/m ³	18 ug/m ³
Particulate Matter < 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5})			
24 Hour	--	NM	NM
Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	NM	NM
Ozone (O₃)			
1 Hour	86 ug/m ³ (.044 ppm)	NM	NM
8 Hour	--	NM	NM
Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)			
3 Hour	34 ug/m ³ (.013 ppm)	NM	NM
24 Hour	13 ug/m ³ (.005 ppm)	NM	NM
Annual Arithmetic Mean	3 ug/m ³ (.001 ppm)	NM	NM
Lead (Pb)			
Quarterly Average	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³

Note: NM – not monitored

Sources: Hawaii Air Quality Data 1999, HDOH, Clean Air Branch.
Air Quality Study for the Proposed Kahului Airport Improvements, B.D. Neal & Associates,
December 1995

3.6 NOISE

3.6.1 CHARACTERISTICS AND MEASUREMENT OF SOUND

Several characteristics of sound affect its impact. These include the sound level (loudness), the frequencies involved, the period of exposure to the noise, and changes or fluctuations in the noise levels during exposure.

Loudness is measured in decibels. Since the human ear does not perceive all pitches or frequencies equally, noise levels are adjusted, or weighted, to correspond to human hearing. This adjusted unit is known as the A-weighted decibel, or dBA.

Since dBA describes a noise level at just one moment, and very few noises are constant, ways of describing noise over extended periods are needed. One way is describing fluctuating noise heard over a period as if it were a steady, unchanging sound. This type of an average is called the equivalent sound level, L_{eq} . L_{eq} is the constant sound level that, for a given situation and time period (e.g., 1-hour, $L_{eq}(1)$; hourly, $L_{eq}(h)$; or 24 hours, $L_{eq}(24)$), conveys the same sound energy as the actual time varying sound.


3.6.2 NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA

The FHWA has developed noise impact criteria, and the State of Hawaii has adopted these criteria as its standard. Table 3-8 lists the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC). A noise impact occurs when predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the NAC, or when predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise level. The NACs set thresholds for determining when noise abatement has to be considered.

Most of the land in the study area is used for agriculture and ranching, and therefore falls under Activity Category D. Some land uses near the east (mauka) and west (makai) ends of the alternatives are residences, and therefore fall under Activity Category B.

3.6.3 MEASUREMENTS AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

Field measurements of existing noise levels were taken from June 18 to 20, 1997 at thirteen sites, as shown on Figure 3-11. These sites were considered representative of sensitive noise receptors in the area. The noise measurements were taken when traffic volumes were high, yet vehicles operated at the allowable speed limit. However, Site 1, a residential community east (mauka) of Piilani Highway near the K1 alignment, was not measured during these traffic conditions. This site was selected because of public comments made during the environmental scoping phase that noise impacts would occur at this site from early morning



Noise Monitoring Sites
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-11

vehicles (buses, vans, cars) traveling to the Haleakala Summit (see Section 1.2.4). Noise measurements at this site were taken at 5:00 a.m.

**Table 3-8
FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC)**

Activity Category	$L_{eq}(h)$ for Noisiest Traffic Hour	Description of Activity Category
A	57 (Exterior)	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
B	67 (Exterior)	Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals.
C	72 (Exterior)	Developed lands, properties, or activities not included in Categories A or B.
D	----	Undeveloped lands
E	52 (Interior)	Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and auditoriums.

Notes: $L_{eq}(h)$ is the one-hour energy equivalent sound level.

Interior noise level standards apply to:

1. Indoor activities for those parcels where no exterior noise sensitive land use or activities have been identified; and
2. Situations where the exterior activities are either remote from the highway or shielded so that while the exterior activities remain undisturbed, noise nevertheless affects interior activities.

Source: Federal Aid Highway Program Manual (FHPM), 23 CFR Part 772 "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise," 1982.

All the sites, except Site 4, are in NAC Activity Category B areas. Site 4 is considered Activity Category D.

Noise measurements and traffic counts taken during the noise measurements were used to calibrate the computer model discussed in Section 4.6. Existing counts from the traffic analysis were then utilized in the model to determine the peak noise under current conditions. Existing peak hour $L_{eq}(h)$ levels are reported on Table 3-9. As indicated on this table, noise levels at the receptor sites are generally below the NAC. The only site that approaches the

NAC of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA is Site 7. The high noise level at this site, and the noise level at many of the other sites, is primarily caused by traffic on nearby roadways.

**Table 3-9
Existing Noise Levels**

Site No.	Location	Land Use Activity	Noise Level ($L_{eq}(h)$) (dBA)
1	Ohukai community (Ohukai St.)	Residential	39
2	Kamalu Elementary School	School	58
3	Omaopio Homesteads	Residential	53
4	Haleakala Hwy. / Haliimaile Rd. Intersection	Agriculture	68
5	Pukalani community (Alani St.)	Residential	57
6	Kula 200 community	Residential	51
7	Kula residence along Kula Hwy.	Residential	66
8	Pulehu community (Holopuni Rd.)	Residential	47
9	Future Kamehameha School	School	53
10	Piilani Hwy. / Kaonoulu St. Intersection	Residential	60
11	Future Kihei Regional Park	Park	45
12	King Kekaulike High School	School	49
13	Unnamed Road off of Haleakala Hwy. near Five Trees Intersection	Residential	49

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., June 1997

3.7 WATER RESOURCES

3.7.1 SURFACE WATERS

Surface water resources in the study area consist primarily of intermittent streams or gulches. The more prominent gulches are:

- Kalialinui
- Kaluapulani

- Pulehu
- Kolaloa
- Keahuia Iwi
- Waiakoa
- Kulanihako
- Waipuilani
- Kaonoulu
- Waiohuli

These gulches collect rainfall and direct flows toward the ocean. However, the gulches are usually dry, and in many places their stream beds have eroded to bedrock. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has regulatory jurisdiction over the gulches since intermittent streams are technically considered "waters of the U.S".

3.7.2 GROUNDWATER

Maui has four principal types of groundwater reserves: fresh basal water, brackish basal water, dike-confined water, and perched water. Most of Maui's groundwater extraction infrastructure is at lower elevations where groundwater resources are more accessible and abundant. Dike complex formations in the Upcountry area may also contain abundant groundwater. However, Upcountry groundwater resources are largely unexploited because of exploring, drilling and operating costs. There is no U.S. Environmental Protection Agency-designated principal or sole-source aquifer in the project area (under the provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act).

3.7.3 WETLANDS

As defined by 40 CFR 230.41(a)(1), wetlands are those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil conditions. According to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Maps, wetlands near the project area occur at Kealia Pond on the south coast of the central Maui valley, and along the Kihei-Makena coast. These wetlands are not within the project area. The Inventory Map identifies wetlands within some of the gulches crossed by the proposed alignments. However, botanical surveys conducted for the project (see Section 3.8.1 and Appendix J) found no evidence (vegetation, soils or hydrology) of wetlands in any

of the gulches where they would be crossed by the alternatives. Therefore, field observations indicate that there are no wetlands within the study area, even though wetlands are identified on the Inventory Map.

3.7.4 FLOODPLAINS

According to Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), the project area is contained within Zone C, indicating that the land is prone to minimal flooding.

3.8 ECOSYSTEMS

3.8.1 FLORA

The alternatives pass through actively cultivated lands at higher elevations and uncultivated lands at lower elevations. Botanical field surveys were conducted in January, February and September, 1997 to assess the botanical resources along the alternative alignments (see Appendix J). An area 60 m (200 ft) wide (30 m (100 ft) on each side of the centerline) was surveyed along each alignment. Where the alignments cross large gulches, the survey corridor was widened to 150 m (500 ft) because remnant populations of native plants are more likely to occur on steep, inaccessible areas such as gulch walls and rocky outcroppings, away from agricultural or animal grazing disturbances.

Sugarcane fields and their associated networks of cane haul roads and irrigation systems are found along the U1 alignment.

The U2-A alignment crosses three vegetational types:

- abandoned pineapple fields characterized by scattered remnant patches of pineapple (*Ananas comosus*) in overgrown fields of Rhodes grass (*Chloris gayana*) and other weedy species;
- Christmas berry/mixed shrub land; and
- actively cultivated pineapple fields.

The U2-B alignment crosses three vegetational types: Kikuyu/mixed grass pasture land, gulch vegetation, and cultivated lands. The vegetational types found along both U2-A and U2-B alignments are dominated by introduced species.

The U3 and U1/U2-A,-B alignments both cross pineapple fields and uncultivated lands. A portion of the U3 alignment crosses the Kula Agricultural Park.

The uncultivated lands are covered primarily by kiawe/buffelgrass association. Kiawe trees (*Prosopis pallida*), native to tropical America, and buffelgrass (*Cenchrus ciliaris*), native to Africa and tropical Asia, are the dominant components of this vegetational type. The kiawe/buffelgrass association occurs along the K1 and K2 alignments, most of the U3 alignment, and portions of the U1/U2-A alignment. The remaining smaller sections of uncultivated land support Kikuyu (*Pennisetum clandestinum*), mixed grass pasture land along the U2-A,-B and U3 alignments, and gulch vegetation along all the segments crossing large, steep-walled gulches, such as Waiakoa, Pulehu, and Kalialinui Gulches. Most of the uncultivated lands are used for grazing cattle and horses.

Three small clusters of the endangered Ko'olua'ula (*Abutilon menziesii*), a member of the mallow or hibiscus family, were found between the 210 m and 230 m (690 foot and 750 foot) elevation within Kalialinui Gulch, nearest to the U1 alignment. The clusters are estimated to be between 820 m (2700 ft) to 1100 m (3600 ft) from the U1 alignment, which is at the 255 m (840 foot) elevation at the Kalialinui Gulch crossing.

The vegetation along the alignments is dominated by introduced or alien plant species. Very few native species were identified along the alignments, and most were found in or adjacent to the gulches.

None of the plant species found within the 60 m (200 feet) wide corridors are listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered species; nor is any plant a species of concern. There are no areas on or adjacent to the termini or alignments that support sensitive native plant-dominated communities.

Appendix J contains the botanical survey reports prepared for this project.

3.8.2 FAUNA

Faunal species in the study area consists of introduced species that are common throughout the Hawaiian islands, such as rats, mice, bats, goats, mongoose, cats, and dogs (Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Site Selection for the New Kihei Public Library, Kihei, Maui, June 1991; Site Selection Study and Final Environmental Impact Statement New Kihei Elementary School, Kihei, Maui, April 1992; and Site Selection Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Upcountry Maui High School, December 1991).

The project area also contains a relatively large axis deer population. Figure 3-12 illustrates the density of the deer population in the project area. The deer tend to prefer dry kiawe forest areas, such as in Ulupalakua, and are less abundant in the agricultural areas (e.g., sugarcane and pineapple fields), such as Pukalani and Haiku.


Birds found in the study area include the cardinal, barred dove, spotted dove, mockingbird, ricebird, white eye, myna, house sparrow, and two native species, the Hawaiian pueo and the golden plover (same sources as above).

3.8.3 ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and the Department of Natural Resources (DLNR), Division of Forestry and Wildlife was initiated per requirements of the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543) and State law. Copies of the correspondence are located in Appendix C.

"Endangered" species are those that are in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant part of their ranges. A "threatened" species is one which is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future. "Candidate 1" species are those for which the Service has evidence of vulnerability, but there are not enough data to support formal proposal as an endangered or threatened species.

In a letter dated January 8, 1997, the Service stated that alternatives that use the K2 segment pass within 1.5 km (1 mile) of Puu o Kali. This puu supports one of the few remaining examples of dry land forest in the State, and may contain three federally endangered plants



Source: Steven B. Anderson, October 19, 1999.

Axis Deer Population Density
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-12



(*Abutilon menziesii*, *Hibiscus brackenridgei* spp. *brackenridgei*, and *Bonamia menziesii*) and rare plant species (*Acacia koaia*, *Achyranthes splendens* var. *splendens*, *Canavalia pubescens*, and *Nesoluma polynesicum*). The Service also reported that the alternatives that use the U2-A,-B segment pass near a reservoir which may be used by migratory or endangered waterbirds. The federally listed endangered Hawaiian coot (*Fulica americana alai*) was seen in this reservoir in 1986.

3.9 GEOLOGY, PHYSIOGRAPHY, SITE CONTAMINATION AND NATURAL HAZARDS


3.9.1 PHYSIOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

Maui consists of two major volcanoes, the West Maui Mountains and Haleakala. The older volcano, the West Maui Mountains, may be extinct. It consists of steep valleys and peaks carved by numerous streams. The younger volcano is Haleakala. Unlike the West Maui Mountains, Haleakala is a classic rounded dome typical of a shield volcano. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would be located on Haleakala's western flank. The broad gently sloping plain connecting the two volcanoes, the Maui Isthmus, was formed when lava from Haleakala banked against the already existing West Maui volcano. Haleakala last erupted almost two centuries ago and is considered dormant. The potential for future eruptions exists.

Figure 3-13 displays the soil types in the project area. The alignments mostly traverse the Waiakoa-Keahua-Molokai association. This soil is characterized as nearly level to moderately steep, well-drained, and moderately fine textured. Portions of Segment U3 traverse the Puu Pa-Kula-Pane and Kamaole-Oanapuka associations.

3.9.2 HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES

Although the project area is largely undeveloped, a database search was conducted to investigate the potential occurrence of hazardous material sites along the proposed alignments (see Appendix K). The database search included federal and State environmental



Soil Types in Project Area
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 3-13

databases, in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standards for environmental site assessments (E1527-93). No hazardous materials sites were identified in the database search that would be likely to pose a threat to public safety.

3.9.3 NATURAL HAZARDS


Maui's last major earthquake occurred in 1938, damaging roads and buildings on Maui and Molokai and causing minor damage in Honolulu. Its epicenter was about 40 km (25 miles) north of Puawela Point on the north coast of Maui. Most major earthquakes in Hawaii occur on the island of Hawaii, where earthquake epicenters are concentrated in the southern half of the island.

Tsunamis are usually generated when the ocean floor is deformed abruptly during an earthquake. Tsunami reaching Hawaii are generated by earthquakes occurring in such places as Chile, Japan, the Aleutian Islands, Alaska and Hawaii. Based on historical records, the areas most vulnerable to tsunamis are Hilo and the North shores of all the islands. Although the project area is not susceptible to tsunami, much of Kihei-Makena is within a tsunami evacuation area (see Figure 3-14).

Hawaii's heaviest rains are brought by winter storms from October to April. These storms can bring three or more inches of rain in a single hour. Lowland leeward areas, such as Kihei-Makena, obtain their rainfall chiefly from a few winter storms, and therefore, their rainfall is strongly seasonal. Hurricanes can also bring heavy rain and wind and cause damage. However hurricanes on Maui are infrequent.

3.10 HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section documents activities to identify and evaluate historic and archaeological resources, and traditional cultural properties or practices (TCP) in the project area in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) pertaining to the Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR 800).



Source: Joint Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research, University of Hawaii, in cooperation with the State of Hawaii Civil Defense System.



Tsunami Evacuation Areas
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-14

3.10.1 EARLY AGENCY COORDINATION

Coordination with the DLNR, State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) was initiated during project scoping to achieve consensus on meeting the requirements of 36 CFR 800.4, Identifying Historic Properties. SHPD suggested that a reconnaissance-level survey be conducted on alignments considered in the Draft EIS because of the high cost of conducting an inventory-level survey of multiple alignments up to 17.5 km (10.9 miles) in length. This suggestion was followed as described below. SHPD also suggested that an inventory-level survey be conducted on the preferred alternative, which would be identified after public distribution of and comment on the Draft EIS. This suggestion was also followed as described below.

3.10.2 RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY

3.10.2.1 Methodology

Cultural Surveys Hawaii (CSH) performed an archaeological reconnaissance from February 18 through March 6, 1997 along six alternative alignments (U1,K1; U1,K2; U2,K1; U2,K2; U3,K1; and U3,K2; see Section 2.2.1.4). The reconnaissance survey extended 60 m (200 ft) from the alignment center line (120 m (400 ft) total width). In total, 36 930 linear meters (121,160 ft of roadway centerline) or 450.3 ha (1113 acres) were surveyed. The reconnaissance survey report (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, December 9, 1997) included a field survey to assess archaeological sites, archival research of historical documents and maps, and a review of previous archaeological research by others.

Following the reconnaissance survey, two new alternatives were developed to replace the eastern (mauka) portion of Segment U2 because the U2 alignment would cross a future Kamehameha School campus, and would potentially affect archaeological sites likely to be important for preservation (see Section 2.2.2, and below). A reconnaissance survey was conducted of the U2-A (two versions; see below) (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, November 14, 1997 and July 1998) and U2-B alignments (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, November 14, 1997).

Cultural Surveys Hawaii prepared a single report that includes the results of all four reconnaissance surveys (see Appendix I).


3.10.2.2 Survey Results

A total of twenty-five sites were identified within the 120 m (400 ft) study corridor (see Figure 3-15 and Table 3-10). Twenty of these sites are newly discovered, and five sites were previously recorded from other surveys. As indicated in Section 3.10.5, the sites listed on Table 3-10 are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

The sites listed on Table 3-10 fall into two general categories: (1) prehistoric (or possibly early post-contact); and (2) post contact archaeological remains. The presumed prehistoric archaeological remains include simple shelter structures and petroglyphs. The post-contact sites include wall sections, various water control features, and clearing mounds associated with sugarcane irrigation and cattle ranching. Military features in the form of enclosures were also observed. The "barren" zone between the more environmentally favorable inland (mauka) and coastal (makai) habitation and agricultural zones contained very few sites, which is consistent with previous archaeological studies and the archival research on human settlement patterns for this area.

The first reconnaissance survey (U1, U2, U3, K1 and K2) identified three sites that would likely require preservation, State Sites 50-50-10-1061, 4178 and 4764 (see Section 3.10.5). The U2 alignment was modified to the U2-A and U2-B alignments, in part because of its potential affect on Sites 1061 and 4178. In addition, the U3 alignment was shifted northeast to avoid impacts to Site 4764. It is undetermined whether this U3 shift would adversely affect other archaeological sites. However, this information would be developed for U3 should it have been identified as the preferred alternative, because an inventory survey was conducted on the Preferred Alternative (see Section 3.10.3).

Reconnaissance surveys of the original U2-A alignment (see Section 2.2.2) identified two sites, one site in Kaluapulani Gulch (Site 1062) and the other in Kalialinui Gulch (Site 4779), within the alignment (see Figure 3-15 and Table 3-10). The sites appear to be significant (see Section 3.10.5), and would require preservation. These discoveries resulted in further



Source: Cultural Surveys Hawaii, December 1997

GRAPHIC SCALE:
 0 1 km 2 km 3 km 0 1 mi. 2 mi.

**Historic and Archaeological Sites Found During the Reconnaissance Surveys
 KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 3-15

Table 3-10
Sites Located During Reconnaissance Surveys

State Site # ¹	Description	Comments	Affected Alignment
1061 ^{2,3}	Complex (cliff overhang shelter and panels with petroglyphs)	2 features; 60+ petroglyph figures, including poss. boxers and canoes	U2 (old)
1062 ^{2,3}	Petroglyph friezes	Located in Kaluapulani Gulch; +/- 50 figures including overhang shelter and stone wall	U2-A (Original)
4178 ^{2,3}	Petroglyphs on north wall of gulch	Located in Kaluapulani Gulch; +/- 15 figures	U2 (old)
4180 ^{2,3}	Wall	Identified by Wulzen (1996); related to pineapple cultivation and cattle control	U2 (old)
4181 ²	Complex of two agricultural mounds; two stone alignments	Historic agriculture function; site already excavated for its information	U2-B
4760 ³	Modified outcrop	Cattle trail bisects site	U2 (old)
4761 ³	Oval enclosure	Recurrent habitation	U2 (old)
4762 ³	Square enclosure	Permanent habitation	U2 (old)
4763	Wall (enclosure segment)	Cattle wall	U3
4764 ³	Cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs	15 pecked and incised figures	U3 (old)
4765	Mounds, road berm and irrigation ditch	3 features; ditch, clearing mounds, and berm segment	U1;U2-A,-B
4766	Area of sites	+/- 30 associated features (enclosures, alignments, and mounds)	K2
4767	Circular enclosure	Agriculture	K2
4768	Wall	Possibly a cattle wall	K2
4769	Wall and cairn	2 features; wall and ahu	K2
4770	Enclosure and cairn	2 features; enclosure and ahu	K2
4771	Mound	Possibly a clearing mound	K2
4772	Boundary wall	Site extends across entire corridor	K2
4773	Complex of 2 enclosures and 7 enclosures	Contain live small arms ammunition	U1;U2-A,-B; K1,K2
4774	Wall	Cattle	U3
4775	Wall	Cattle	U3

Table 3-10
Sites Located During Reconnaissance Surveys
(Continued)

State Site # ¹	Description	Comments	Affected Alignment
4776	Midden and lithic scatter, and mound	Previous test units observed in surrounding area (association undetermined)	K1
4777	Wall	Cattle, above power line at bottom of gulch	U1
4778	Enclosure	Undetermined	U1;U2-A,-B
4779	Shelter-cave	Located in Kalialinui Gulch; recurrent habitation	U2-A (Original)

Notes: ¹ All numbers preceded by "50-50-10-."
² Site identified from previous research.
³ Site no longer affected because of modifications to alternatives.
 See Figure 3-15 for the locations of the sites.

Source: Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, June 1999

refinement of the U2-A alignment to avoid the sites. The second version of U2-A would avoid Site 1062 by shifting the original alignment north at Kaluapulani Gulch. It would avoid Site 4779 by shifting the original alignment south at Kalialinui Gulch.

A reconnaissance survey of the second version of U2-A found that it would indirectly affect a heiau (State Site 50-50-10-2701). This heiau appears to be significant under Criteria D and E (see Section 3.10.5). The alignment would pass on the south (makai) side of the heiau. It would obstruct the view plane from the heiau (see Figure 3-15 and Table 3-10), even though Site 2701 is not within the 120 m (400 ft) study area. CSH noted that an alignment on the north (mauka) side of the heiau, such as the original U2-A, would not present such an effect. Potential impacts to the heiau resulted in another redefinition of the U2-A alignment, as a combination of the original and second version of U2-A. This third version of U2-A avoids Sites 1062 and 4779 (second version of U2-A), and shifts the alignment south (mauka) of the heiau (original U2-A), avoiding visual affects. Since the third version of U2-A embodies the

alignments of both the original and second version of U2-A, an additional reconnaissance survey was not necessary.

The reconnaissance survey of U2-B was prepared using an existing archaeological reconnaissance survey report (Archaeological Inventory Survey, 44-Acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision III, Land of Aapueo, Makawao District, Island of Maui, 1996) prepared for the area surrounding the eastern (mauka) portion of U2-B. Field work was conducted on the western (makai) end of U2-B (Kaliaiinui Gulch to Omaopio). The Pukalani Inventory Survey identified State Site 50-50-10-4181 within the U2-B alignment. However, the site was excavated for the information that attributed significance to the site, and is no longer considered significant as an historic property. The field work found no other sites.

3.10.3 INVENTORY SURVEY

Following the identification of the preferred alternative (U1,K1), an archaeological inventory survey with limited subsurface testing was conducted on this alignment (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Ka'ono'ulu Ahupua'a (TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009 2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016, and 3-09-001: por. 016), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, December 2000).

3.10.3.1 Methodology

CSH performed an archaeological inventory survey of the U1,K1 alignment from August 28, 2000 to October 3, 2000. Like the reconnaissance survey, the inventory survey area extended 60 m (200 ft) on both sides of the centerline, a total width of 120 m (400 ft). However, different methods were utilized during the course of the survey. Along those sections in active sugar cane fields, the surveying was conducted by two archaeologists in a vehicle. The active cane fields were not surveyed by foot. Along those sections in active pineapple fields, the surveying was conducted by four archaeologists on foot following existing pineapple roads. All clearing mounds in the pineapple fields within the survey area were inspected. All other sections, including gulches, valleys and ravines even within active agricultural areas, were surveyed by four archaeologists spaced 1 m (3 ft) to 15 m (50 ft)

apart. Generally, the four archaeologists were spaced 1 m (3 ft) to 3 m (10 ft) apart when surveying within gulches, valleys and ravines because petroglyphs are known to exist in these types of places in the study area. The archaeologists were spaced 5 m (16 ft) to 15 (50 ft) apart when surveying open savannah with scattered kiawe.

3.10.3.2 Survey Results

A total of 126 structural and nonstructural features were identified along the 120 m (400 ft) wide study corridor of the U1,K1 alignment. These features are organized into 17 distinct sites that are associated with a variety of functions, including traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation, agricultural, symbolic (petroglyph sites), animal husbandry, a marker and historic military training activities. Table 3-11 provides a listing of the sites identified along the U1,K1 alignment, and the locations of these sites are shown on Figure 3-16.

Hawaiian Temporary Habitation Sites

The seven temporary habitation sites (State Sites 3742, 3743, 3745, 5032, 5033, 5034 and 5035) identified along the U1,K1 alignment are grouped at the lower portion of the alignment, roughly between the elevations of 14 m (45 ft) and 140 m (460 ft) (see Figure 3-16). Sites 3742, 3743 and 3745 were identified in a previous survey and cultural materials from these sites were collected at that time. Therefore, these sites were not re-evaluated.

Site 5032 consists of a series of boulder alignments and was determined to be a temporary habitation site based on the presence of cultural material observed on the surface that included a basalt net sinker stone, a basalt adz preform or core, and a single piece of marine shell midden. These items are typically associated with pre-contact Hawaiian culture. The construction style of the Site 5032 is similar to military sites found along the project corridor rather than the other temporary habitation sites. The size of the site is unique in that it is considerably longer.

Site 5033 is a rectangular enclosure that appears to be a traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation site that was later modified either by the military or by hunters. No cultural materials were observed on the surface, but 29.8 g (1.02 oz) of marine shell midden was encountered during excavation of the site.




Table 3-11
Summary of Inventory Survey of the U1,K1 Alignment

<u>State Site #</u>	<u>Site Type</u>	<u>Function</u>	<u>Distance / Orientation from Center Line</u>	<u>Age</u>
<u>3727²</u>	<u>Stone Piles</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>15 m (50 ft) / South</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>
<u>3728²</u>	<u>Stone Piles</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>45 m (150 ft) / South</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>
<u>3729²</u>	<u>Stone Cairn</u>	<u>Marker</u>	<u>50 m (165 ft) / South</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>
<u>3742²</u>	<u>Surface Scatter</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>On Center Line</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>
<u>3743²</u>	<u>Surface Scatter</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>60 m (200 ft) / South</u>	<u>Pre-Contract</u>
<u>3745²</u>	<u>Surface Scatter</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>40 m (130 ft) / South</u>	<u>Pre-Contract</u>
<u>4765</u>	<u>Irrigation Ditches, and Mounds</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Crosses Center Line</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>4773</u>	<u>Military Complex</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>Encompasses Corridor Section</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>4776</u>	<u>Oval Enclosure</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>15 m (50 ft) / North</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>4778</u>	<u>L-Shape Enclosure</u>	<u>Military</u>	<u>23 m (75 ft) / East</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>5029</u>	<u>Petroglyphs</u>	<u>Symbolic</u>	<u>60 m (200 ft) / East</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>5030</u>	<u>Walls</u>	<u>Animal Husbandry</u>	<u>On Center Line</u>	<u>Historic</u>
<u>5031</u>	<u>Petroglyphs</u>	<u>Symbolic</u>	<u>60 m (200 ft) / West</u>	<u>Pre-Contract</u>
<u>5032</u>	<u>Alignments</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>58 m (190 ft) / North</u>	<u>Pre-Contract</u>
<u>5033</u>	<u>Rectangular Enclosure</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation and Military</u>	<u>45 m (150 ft) / North</u>	<u>Pre-Contract and Historic</u>
<u>5034</u>	<u>Square Enclosure</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>23 m (75 ft) / South</u>	<u>Pre-Contract</u>
<u>5035</u>	<u>C-Shape Enclosure</u>	<u>Temporary Habitation</u>	<u>15 m (50 ft) / North</u>	<u>Intermediate</u>

Notes: ¹ All numbers preceded by "50-50-10-"
² Site identified from previous research.
See Figure 3-16 for the locations of the sites.

Source: Cultural Surveys Hawaii. Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Ka'ono'ulu Ahupua'a (TMK 2-05-001; por. 001, 002, 003, 009 2-05-002; por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016, and 3-09-001; por. 016), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, December 2000, June 1999

Site 5034 is a square enclosure that appears to have been bulldozed, damaging the west and north walls of the enclosure. A sparse amount of marine shell midden was encountered during excavation of the site.

Site 5035 is a C-shaped enclosure. No cultural materials were observed on the surface or during excavation. However, a darker stained layer similar to the cultural layers found at Sites 5033 and 5034 was encountered, which suggests that the site contains cultural material.

Petroglyph Sites

Two petroglyph sites were found in Kalialinui (Site 5029) and Waiakoa (Site 5031) Gulches. Site 5029 consists of a panel of three historic petroglyphs pecked into the northern cliff face. Site 5031 consists of at least three traditional petroglyphs of anthropomorphic figures located on the southern side of the gulch. Both petroglyph sites are located about 60 m (200 ft) from the alignment center line. Site 5031 was originally only 15 m (50 ft) from the center line, but the alignment was adjusted 45 m (150 ft) to the east to avoid the site. Therefore, both petroglyph sites are outside of the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) because they are 60 m (200 ft) from the centerline and because both gulches will be crossed by bridge.

Agriculture and Marker Sites

Three sites consisting of stone piles and cairns (Sites 3727, 3728 and 3729), which were identified in a previous study, are functionally associated with agriculture and a marker. All three sites were completely excavated during the previous study.

Military Sites

Site 4773 is large historic military site consisting of 102 features that include enclosures of various shapes. The U1,K1 alignment passes directly through the site at an elevation between 150 m (500 ft) and 225 m (740 ft) (see Figure 3-16). No cultural material was observed on the surface, and none of the test probes or excavations encountered cultural material.

Site 4776 is a small oval and isolated enclosure. The site was interpreted as a military site based on its construction style, size, location and lack of traditional cultural materials. There may have been more sites or features surrounding Site 4776 because there is evidence of considerable bulldozing in the area.

Site 4778 is a small L-shaped enclosure, and is similar to Site 4776 in that it is isolated with no observable cultural materials. The site was interpreted as a military site based on its construction style, size, location and lack of traditional cultural materials.

Historic Sugar Cane Agricultural Site

Site 4765 consists of remnants of historic sugar cane cultivation infrastructure in the section of the corridor between Pulehu and Omaopio Roads. The U1,K1 alignment passes directly through this site. Recorded features include clearing mounds associated with historic sugar cane cultivation and five inactive earthen irrigation ditches with each having two to three small bridges constructed of concrete and lumber. The bridges are in poor condition.

Cattle Wall Site

Site 5030 consists of sections of cattle walls along the north side of Waiakoa Gulch. The walls were used to prevent cattle from entering or exiting the gulch.

3.10.4 TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES / PRACTICES

According to draft Procedures for Ethnographic Surveys (SHPO, 1999), a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) is defined as:

"Any historic property associated with the traditional practices and beliefs of an ethnic community or members of that community for more than fifty years. These traditions (are) founded in a community's history and contribute to maintaining the community's cultural identity. (They) demonstrate a continuity of practice or belief until present or documented in historical source materials, or both. These properties include, but are not limited to, some types of archaeological sites." (italics added)

According to the National Register Bulletin 38, Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties (1994), a TCP is defined generally as a resource that is eligible for the NRHP because of its association with the cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that community's history, and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.

TCPs differ from archaeological or historic sites in that they are sites or resources that are currently in use by a particular ethnic group. Examples of TCPs that may be in the study area include ancient fishing *ko'a*, coastal zones providing edible shell fish and seaweed, land areas harvested for culturally significant plants, and structures associated with ceremonies conducted for graduates of *hula halau*.

3.10.4.1 Methodology

Scientific Consultant Services (SCS) conducted archival research and oral history interviews with long-time local residents of the Kihei-Upcountry region to determine whether there may be cultural resources in the project area. The oral interviews attempted to identify cultural properties in the study area, as well as defining their characteristics and associated cultural activities. These resources were evaluated in terms of their physical relationship with the alternatives. The SCS report is included as Appendix I to this FEIS.

More than 50 people were contacted and interviewed. They included several people associated ranching activities and those previously living in plantation camps. In addition, a descendant of a Land Commission Award recipient whose family had remained in the area was also interviewed.

3.10.4.2 Results of Study

No TCPs, based on definitions contained in draft Procedures for Ethnographic Surveys and National Register Bulletin 38, were identified in the project area. However, numerous culturally-significant sites and features in the general vicinity of the project area were identified through the oral histories, such as religious sites, ancient trails, petroglyphs, fishponds, and burial caves. Topographic anomalies associated with pre-contact events, individuals, or recorded in legends and stories were also noted. In addition, the reconnaissance and inventory surveys (see Sections 3.10.2 and 3.10.3) identified culturally-important archaeological sites (i.e., Criterion E for significance; see Section 3.10.5).

The following culturally-significant sites or resources in and surrounding the project area were identified through oral histories:

- Puu Pane, located outside the project area on the crest of a hill east of Haleakala Highway, which was declared sacred by the paramount chief Kihapi'ilani (c. A.D. 1500-1600s) and was used as a heiau for the high chiefs of Maui from ancient times to Kihapi'ilani;
- several old trails, including a trail near Puu o Kali, the ancient alanui coastal trail, and Waiakoa Trail, of which only portions remain or are visible;
- petroglyphs in the vicinity of Puu o Kali;
- fishponds, such as Kalepolepo, along the coast outside the project area; and
- heiau (site 2701; see Section 3.10.2) and makahiki sites near the U2-A alignment.

With the possible exception of the two heiau, one of the above potentially culturally-significant sites or resources are presently being used in a manner that would make them a TCP. The current uses of site 2701 and Puu Pane, if any, are unknown.

3.10.5 SIGNIFICANCE EVALUATION

CSH conducted significance evaluations of the sites identified during the reconnaissance surveys and the 17 sites found during the inventory survey of the preferred alternative. The evaluations were based on criteria established for the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places.

A resource may be considered eligible for the National Register if it has "integrity of location, design, setting, materials workmanship, feeling, and association," and meets any one of the following criteria:

- A: associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B: associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C: embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D: yielded, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The Hawaii Register includes another criterion:

- E: site that has cultural significance, such as religious structures (shrines, *heiau*), or human burial locations.

The purpose of conducting a significance evaluation is to determine whether a site is a "historic property," which is defined as being on or eligible for the National Register. Federal actions that affect "historic properties" are required to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

State Sites 50-50-10-1061, 1062, 4178 and 4764 appear to be significant under Criteria C, D and E. These findings led to the modifications of Alternatives U2-A and U3 to avoid these sites. These sites are likely to yield information important to history and prehistory, are considered excellent for their site types, and are culturally significant.

Sites 4762, 4779, 5029 and 5031 appear to be significant under Criteria C and D because they are excellent examples of their type, and may yield varying types of scientific data. After refinement of the alignments, none of these sites is within the path of any alternative, including Sites 5029 and 5031, which were identified during inventory survey.

Site 2701 appears to be significant under Criteria D and E because of its information content and its cultural significance as a traditional Hawaiian religious structure.

All the other sites, including the 15 sites identified during the inventory survey within the project's APE, were evaluated by CSH as significant under Criterion D. CSH did not believe the value of these sites warranted modifications or realignments of any of the alternatives. CSH found that data recovery at each of the sites affected by the project would be appropriate. Data recovery of many of the sites, such as Sites 4181, 3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743 and 3745, was completed by others. Similarly, CSH recommended that no further work is needed for Sites 4765, 4773, 4776, 4778, 5030 and 5034 because the inventory survey documented their locations, types, age and functions sufficiently that no further research on these sites appears warranted. However, CSH did recommend that data recovery be conducted on sites 5032, 5033 and 5035.

In a letter dated June 21, 1999, the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred that the sites identified in the reconnaissance surveys are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (see Appendix C). Following completion of the inventory survey and cultural impact reports, they were distributed to organizations recommended by the SHPD for consultation. In a letter dated May 10, 2001, the SHPD communicated agreement with the mitigation proposals contained in the inventory survey report, but asked that significance evaluations of Sites 5029 and 5031 be changed from "D" only to "C" and "D" (see Appendix C). The survey report was revised as recommended by SHPD (see Appendix I).


3.11 PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks and recreational resources in the project area are shown on Figure 3-17.

The Kihei-Makena region contains three major beach parks (Kalama, Kamaole I, II and III and Mai Poina Oe Lau), and other smaller beach parks along the Kihei to Makena coastline. This region also features the recently completed Kihei Aquatic and Community Center, Silversword Golf Course, and two private golf courses in Wailea. The Kihei District Regional Park is being planned for the area east (mauka) of Piilani Highway, near its intersection with Ke Alii Alanui Street. According to the County of Maui Department of Parks and Recreation, development of the park has been delayed partly because of the recent completion of the Kihei Aquatic and Community Center. The master plan for the regional park includes football, baseball, softball and soccer fields, basketball courts, nature trails and an amphitheater.

Parks and recreation facilities in Upcountry Maui include the Makawao Park/Mayor Eddie Tam Memorial Center in Makawao; the Upcountry Youth Center, Pukalani Park and Community Center, Pukalani Country Club Golf Course in Pukalani; Kula Botanical Garden, Harold F. Rice Park, Keokea Par, and a new park in Kulamalu.

At the summit of Haleakala is Haleakala National Park. The National Park extends from the higher elevations on the western flank of the volcano across the crater, to the eastern coastline at Kipahulu. According to a Park official, approximately a million people visit the summit and about one half million visit the Kipahulu side of the Park annually (telephone conversation,



**Parks and Recreational Areas
 KĪHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 3-17**

December 8, 1997). In a one-year period between 1999 and 2000, about two millions people visited the national park ("Haleakala Park Visits Reach Record-High", Honolulu Advertiser, February 25, 2001). Based on Maui Visitor Bureau estimates, a little more than half the number of park visitors went to the summit, which is consistent with the park official estimate. Approximately a third of the summit visitors watch Haleakala's famous sunrise. The summit is also used as a starting point for bike tours down the volcano (see Section 3.4.3). It was estimated that about 86,000 people bike down from the summit in 2000, up from 74,000 the year before (Honolulu Advertiser, February 25, 2001)

3.12 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

Identifying viewsheds is an important step to assess a project's potential visual affects. A viewshed can be described as all surface areas visible from an observer's viewpoint. The following are general viewsheds of the study area:

Ocean and Shoreline Views

The ocean and shoreline views, including views of Kahoolawe, Lanai, and Molokini Islands, are spectacular scenic viewsheds from both Upcountry and Kihei.

Haleakala

The dry vegetated slopes of Haleakala are a backdrop to the dominant eastern (mauka) viewshed from Kihei.

West Maui Mountains

The West Maui Mountains, a rugged and majestic physical landmark, can be seen from both Upcountry and Kihei.

Central Maui.

From Upcountry looking down hill, the Central Maui area is primarily open agricultural land.

These viewsheds have visual quality according to FHWA's guidance document on visual impacts (Visual Impact Assessment For Highway Projects Publication No. FHWA-HI-88-054) because they have a high level of vividness (memorability of landscape), some intactness

(extent to which the landscape is free from visual encroachment) and some unity (the degree to which the landscape joins together to form a coherent, harmonious visual pattern).

The viewsheds from Upcountry have visual quality because of the panoramic views of Central Maui, the West Maui Mountains, and the ocean. However, Kihei, Kahului and Wailuku degrade the intactness and unity of the Upcountry viewsheds.

The makai viewshed from Kihei offers near sea level views of the ocean and coastline. However, since this viewshed has visual obstructions because of Kihei's low elevation, its visual quality is not as high as the same viewshed from Upcountry. Kihei's uphill views of Haleakala and distant vistas of the West Maui Mountains have high visual quality because they have few visual disruptions.

CHAPTER FOUR

Environmental Consequences

CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter describes the potential environmental and social impacts of the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. The No Build alternative is used as the basis against which to evaluate the potential impacts of the preferred alternative (U1,K1) and the other build alternatives. Mitigation measures are also presented in this chapter. Many of the impacts and mitigation measures are attributed to a particular alternative, group of alternatives (e.g. the U3 alternatives), segment (e.g., Segment U1) or terminus (e.g., Terminus K2). In these instances, the particular section of the alternative is identified. When a particular impact or mitigation measure is attributable to the project regardless of the alternative selected, "Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway" is often used.

4.1 LAND USE

4.1.1 LAND USE IMPACTS

Construction of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will introduce a roadway into areas presently used for agriculture and ranching. Therefore, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cause an irrevocable loss of agricultural- and pasture-related open space (see Section 4.8.1). These areas contain few manmade structures, other than those related to agricultural / ranching activities and infrastructure.

Highway projects can remove impediments to development by enhancing access to vacant land or increasing transportation capacity. To evaluate the potential land use impacts of a highway project, one compares the proposed transportation project to the planned growth within the project area. The potential growth impacts of the proposed roadway is based on an assessment of whether the transportation infrastructure will facilitate planned growth, or induce unplanned growth. The pattern of planned growth is described in the Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998) and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) (see Section 3.1.4.2d).

All the alternatives will support planned growth because they will improve transportation between Kihei and Upcountry by reducing travel time (see Section 1.2.1). Furthermore, the proposed project is intended to meet existing and future travel demand resulting from implementation of the study area's land use plans. The issue of whether Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would induce unplanned growth is addressed below.

4.1.1.1 Kihei-Makena

Development in Kihei-Makena has historically correlated with the health of Maui's visitor industry. Support of growth would be beneficial in Kihei-Makena where there is ample room between Piilani Highway and South Kihei Road. Additional development would conform to Kihei's visitor-based urban environment. Factors, such as future hotel and resort development and the pace of development of Maui's "high-technology" industry (see Section 1.2.2) are expected to determine the speed and extent of growth in Kihei more than the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

As indicated in the Kihei-Makena Community Plan, only limited commercial and business development would be allowed east (mauka) of Piilani Highway, most of which consists primarily of the continued development of the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park. State and county zoning east (mauka) of Piilani Highway will remain in agriculture. Therefore, neither K1 or K2 segments will facilitate development in areas east (mauka) of Piilani Highway. If Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway facilitates in-fill development between Piilani Highway and South Kihei Road, this would be considered a positive impact consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan.

4.1.1.2 Upcountry

The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) describes preservation of low densities, open space, and agricultural activities in Upcountry's rural communities. Because of the strong concern about potential impacts of the proposed project on the "quality of life" in Upcountry, stated repeatedly during project scoping activities (see Chapter 5), a Community Impact Assessment report was prepared for this project (see Appendix H). The findings of this report are summarized below and elsewhere in Chapter 4.

In scoping activities and interviews conducted for this EIS, many "key informants" stated a broad concern about the proposed highway facilitating urban development and increasing traffic volumes in Upcountry, elements that are inconsistent with the vision articulated for the area in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan. However, it is appropriate to look beyond these concerns to other factors that could affect land use trends in Upcountry, and to the relative differences among the alignment alternatives.

The project could facilitate planned residential and commercial developments in Upcountry because it will provide a transportation link between the Kihei-Makena employment center and the popular Upcountry Maui residential area. However, regardless of whether areas are available to be developed (i.e., have appropriate zoning or are identified for growth in official County land use plans), the greatest obstacle to further development in Upcountry is water availability, which has historically constrained urban growth. According to the Maui Board of Water Supply (BWS), there is currently barely enough capacity to serve current Upcountry customers. Under drought conditions, customers are required to reduce water use, and the reservoirs quickly empty.


The Maui BWS uses the Community Plans in planning new water systems and/or increasing the capacity of existing systems. As described in Section 3.4.3, the Maui BWS is planning improvements to the Makawao system in response to the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (see Section 3.1.4.2d), and has allowed the private drilling of a well in Haiku to free water in the Makawao system for the Kulamalu development (see Section 3.1.3). These projects in the Upper and Lower Kula systems (see Section 3.4.3) are intended to improve service to current customers. With these improvements, the Maui BWS should not have to implement water use restrictions as frequently as in the past during drought conditions (telephone conversation with Maui BWS, May 5, 1998).

Providing the additional amount of water to the Kula systems that would be sufficient to support unplanned development in Upcountry, particularly Kula, is unlikely, mainly because the system relies on surface water. Surface water resources are vulnerable to drought conditions, whereas groundwater resources are a more stable source even during a year or two of limited rainfall. According to the Maui BWS, the high cost and substantial risk of developing alternative sources of water (i.e., wells) has stopped and constrained many

development proposals in Upcountry. The Kulamalu developer was able to assume the high cost and risk of drilling a well in Haiku only because of the large size and scale of the development, which is not expected to be typical for Upcountry because of land use controls (telephone conversation with Maui BWS, May 5, 1998). Therefore, water supply limitation is likely to constrain development in Upcountry in the future, despite the efforts of the Maui BWS to improve the Upcountry systems, and despite the construction of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.


Since the Maui BWS is planning to accommodate development in Pukalani, which is part of the Makawao system, the U1 alternatives could facilitate Pukalani's growth westward (makai) toward the proposed highway. This growth inducement will be partially consistent with the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan because there are parcels on the west (makai) side of Pukalani designated for residential growth (see Figure 4-1). The U1 alternatives, including the preferred alternative, could facilitate development beyond Pukalani's urban growth boundary if the landowner, Alexander and Baldwin (A&B), chooses to develop its land north (makai) of Pukalani and Makawao. Similarly, the U1 alternatives may induce development in Halimaile beyond what is designated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (see Figure 4-1).

The U2-A and U2-B alignments may have very little influence in the area south (mauka) of Pukalani. As described in Section 3.1.3, the area south (mauka) of Pukalani is planned for development to create Kulamalu, and its developer will be making substantial improvements to the water supply infrastructure (see Section 3.4.3). Since parcels for this project already have State urban classification, the County has approved zoning and Community Plan amendments supporting the project (Maui News, December 2, 1997). With water availability not being a constraint, Kulamalu will be developed with or without Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. However, the U2-A and U2-B alternatives would support this development to a greater degree than the U1 or U3 alternatives by providing additional transportation infrastructure directly to the site (i.e., Kulamalu residents would not have to use Haleakala or Kula Highways to travel to Kihei). The U2-B alignment came from the Kulamalu Master Plan, and therefore, is the alignment most consistent with this development.



Source: County of Maui, Makawao-Pukalani Community Plan, July 23, 1996, Kulamatu, Inc.

GRAPHIC SCALE:



**Existing and Future Urban Areas in Pukalani-Makawao
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 4-1**

The U2-A and U2-B alignments may facilitate in-fill development along Pukalani's southern (mauka) side. According to the Community Plan, some of Pukalani's growth is directed toward this area (see Figure 4-1).

Segment U3 is located approximately 5 km (3 miles) south (mauka) of Upcountry's "urban" areas of Pukalani and Makawao, in an area where the Community Plan designates very little additional growth. The developments that are planned include small scale commercial land uses in Waiakoa and rural residences. These uses, particularly the residences, are not dependent on the highway because of Kula's attractiveness as a residential area. However, these developments will have to receive other governmental approvals (e.g., zoning, subdivision, etc.) and obtain water meters. The latter could be difficult (see above discussion on U1, U2-A and U2-B). In summary, U3 would facilitate planned growth, but not induce unplanned growth.

4.1.2 RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROPOSED ACTION TO GOVERNMENTAL PLANS, POLICIES, AND CONTROLS

4.1.2.1 Hawaii State Plans and Controls

4.1.2.1a Hawaii State Plan

The No Build alternative does not support the objectives and policies of the Hawaii State Plan (June 1991) that seek to enhance the public welfare and economic development by providing needed infrastructure. Although the No Build alternative does not support these State Plan objectives and policies, it is not necessarily inconsistent with the State Plan.

The Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will support those objectives and policies of the Hawaii State Plan dealing with economic, physical and natural environment, and transportation objectives and policies.

In accordance with the Plan's economic objectives and policies, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will facilitate commerce through an improved transportation network. It will contribute to the economy of Maui County and the State by providing largely federally funded

construction jobs. The State and federal government will spend roughly \$80 million to construct Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

The proposed highway will support both the State's established visitor industry and its growing high technology industry by providing a transportation link between Haleakala / Science City and Kihei-Makena / West Maui. Kihei is also home to the growing Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park. Because of its 3050 m (10,000 ft) elevation, the Haleakala summit is used for science and defense-related research located in Science City.

The Plan has objectives and policies promoting the viability of sugar, pineapple and diversified agriculture. The proposed highway will serve all three of these agricultural activities (see Section 4.2.1). Although certain proposed roadway segments will cross agricultural fields, mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize adverse impacts on these fields (see Section 4.2.4). No small privately-owned farm will be directly affected by any alternative.

In accordance with the objectives and policies for the physical and natural environment, the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will minimize impacts to the existing environment, and where unacceptable environmental impacts might occur, mitigation measures will be implemented. Since the proposed work will be located east (mauka) of Piilani Highway, it will not adversely affect the shoreline area. The proposed highway will also not affect the spectacular panoramic views from Upcountry of the West Maui Mountains, Central Maui and the ocean. Impacts on the physical and natural environment are discussed in more detail in other sections of this chapter.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will accommodate the transportation needs of both residents and visitors. For visitors, the highway will improve transportation between Maui's hotels and resorts along the coasts, and tourist-related activities in high elevation areas of Upcountry and Haleakala. The proposed highway will contribute to residents' quality of life by improving transportation between popular residential areas in Upcountry, and employment centers and recreational attractions in Kihei-Makena and West Maui. Since the improvement in transportation will result in substantial travel time savings, the highway will provide up to 50 percent savings in vehicle fuel consumption for certain alignment alternatives and/or trips.

4.1.2.1b Coastal Zone Management (CZM)

The following describes the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway's consistency with the objectives and policies of the State's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program. This assessment was reviewed by the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT), the agency administering the State's CZM program. DBEDT deferred its consistency determination pending completion of the Final EIS so that further information can be obtained about potential impacts to scenic and open space resources, public participation and historic resources (see letter dated March 30, 2001 in Appendix C).

Recreation Resources

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not adversely affect any park or recreational resource in the project area. The K2 alternatives (with the Kihei terminus at the Ke Aii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection) would facilitate access to the future Kihei Regional Park for Upcountry residents.

Historic Resources

Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 6E of the Hawaii Revised Statutes (the State's historic resources law) is required for this project. Archaeological reconnaissance surveys of the alternatives identified 25 sites potentially eligible for the National and State Registers of Historic Places. The archaeological inventory survey of the preferred alternative identified 17 significant sites, an increase from five sites identified during the reconnaissance survey of this alignment. As described in Section 4.10, only three of these sites will be adversely affected by the preferred alternative because the other sites have either been avoided, or the sites have been recorded with sufficient documentation so that no further archival work is needed.

Impacts sites eligible for the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places, and recommended for preservation-in-place, were avoided by modifying the alignment of the appropriate alternative. These sites include petroglyphs located in the gulches crossed by some of the alternative alignments, and one heiau in the vicinity of the U2-A alignment. Alignments were not adjusted to avoid affected sites not recommended for preservation, such

as temporary habitation sites, agricultural sites and military sites (see Section 4.10 for further details).

Scenic And Open Space Resources

Panoramic vistas of Central Maui, the West Maui Mountains, and the ocean can be seen from Upcountry Maui. Vistas from Kihei consist of near sea level views of the ocean and coastline, uphill views of Haleakala, and distant views of the West Maui Mountains. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not disrupt views from Upcountry because the terrain drops away towards Central Maui and the ocean. The proposed highway will, however, change the eastern (mauka) view of Haleakala from Kihei by introducing a paved roadway into the present visual backdrop of agriculture and pasture land.

Coastal Ecosystems

Since Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not be within the Shoreline Setback Area or Special Management Area, the alternatives will not directly affect coastal habitats, wetlands or ecosystems. Roadway drainage and runoff from construction areas will also not affect coastal areas because of natural conditions and measures to minimize off-site discharges and sedimentation.

Economic Uses

The proposed highway will support both the State's established visitor industry and its growing high technology industry by improving transportation between Kihei-Makena (and West Maui) and Upcountry Maui, including Haleakala and Science City. Kihei-Makena is Maui's second largest visitor accommodation region, the third largest employment center and home to the growing Maui R&T Park. Upcountry Maui is a popular residential area, with some tourist activities including Haleakala National Park. Science City at the Haleakala summit is the site of science and defense-related research.

Depending on the alternative, Upcountry's sugarcane and pineapple cropland will be adversely affected to varying degrees (see Section 4.2).

Coastal Hazards

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will facilitate evacuation from Kihei-Makena in the event of coastal emergency, such as a tsunami. The K2 alternatives, with a more southern Kihei terminus, would facilitate evacuation better than the K1 alternatives, with a terminus in north Kihei close to the existing exit from South Maui. A more southern Kihei terminus would provide a more geographic separation between the exits from South Maui, allowing for a more orderly evacuation if needed.

Managing Development

The proposed roadway will require State and County permits. The permitting processes include provisions for public participation important for the protection of coastal resources.

Public Participation

The project included numerous scoping and coordination meetings with government agencies, elected officials, and the general public, as described in detail in Chapter 5. In addition, three public hearings were held during the public comment period on the Draft EIS. Over 400 oral and written statements about the project were received during this period.

Beach Protection

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not affect the shoreline setback area nor have an impact on coastal erosion because it will not be adjacent to or abutting the shoreline.

Marine Resources

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not directly affect marine and coastal resources. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will improve access to coastal areas, especially from the Upcountry region.

Some indirect impacts are possible, such as erosion during construction, and roadway runoff during extreme storm events. However, a NPDES permit will be obtained, which will specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion. As described in Section 4.7, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will lead to a reduction of pollutant loading of coastal waters when compared to the future no-build condition.

4.1.2.1c Island of Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan

The No Build alternative assumes the construction of the transportation system that is recommended in the Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996), except for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. Therefore, the No Build alternative is consistent with the Long Range Plan, with the exception of providing the Kihei-Upcountry highway link.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be consistent with the Long Range Plan because it is an element of the Long Range Plan.

4.1.2.2 County of Maui Plans and Controls

4.1.2.2a Maui County General Plan

The No Build alternative would be consistent with the General Plan because of roadway improvements described in Section 2.1.1, provided that these improvements are implemented in a manner sensitive to Maui's environmental and social conditions.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be consistent with the County of Maui's General Plan 1990 dealing with economic, environmental, and transportation objectives and policies. First, the proposed highway will support both Maui's visitor and high technology industries. The highway will improve Maui's highway network by shortening the length and duration of certain trips made by visitors, visitor industry employees and those traveling between the Maui R&T Park and Science City. Second, the project will minimize impacts to the existing environment, and will not affect vistas from Upcountry. Third, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will provide a piece of transportation infrastructure that will enable people and goods to move safely, efficiently and economically between Kihei and Upcountry. In addition, the highway will be supportive of desired urban development objectives of the County of Maui (see Section 4.1.1), and therefore, will be responsive to planned growth.

The General Plan advocates land use planning that will promote a transportation system less reliant on the automobile as the primary transportation mode (see Section 3.1.2.2a). Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not help achieve this objective without new transportation options becoming available. Furthermore, land use planning is not within the authority of the SDOT.

4.1.2.2b Maui County Special Management Area

There are projects under the No Build alternative that would occur in the County's Special Management Area (SMA). Construction of each of those individual projects in the SMA would require an SMA use permit.

Since no portion of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be within the SMA, the project will not require an SMA permit from Maui County.

4.1.2.2c Community Plans

Consistency of the project with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan (1998) and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) land use objectives are discussed in Section 4.1.1, Land Use Impacts. As described in Sections 3.1.2.2c, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is consistent with the Kihei-Makena Community Plan because it includes a roadway between Kihei and Upcountry. However, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is not consistent with the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan because it does not include a roadway.

4.1.3 RELOCATION IMPACTS

Depending on the alternative, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will require right-of-way from the land owners listed below. The existing uses on these lands are also provided:

- Alexander & Baldwin (Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S)): sugarcane cultivation (U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives);
- County of Maui (Kula Agricultural Park): leased diversified agriculture (U3 alternatives);
- Dowling Company: Kamehameha Schools campus, mostly inactive, but with planned future housing and commercial development (U2-A and U2-B alternatives);
- Haleakala Ranch: pasture land and pineapple cultivation (all alternatives);
- Kaonoulu Ranch: pasture land (K1 and K2 alternatives)
- Malama Mohala Corp.: inactive, but future urban uses (U2-A alternatives)
- Maui Land & Pineapple Company: pineapple cultivation (U2-A, U2-B and U3 alternatives)
- Von Tempsky Trust: pasture land (U3 alternatives);

- Others (see Table 2-1 for a list of land owners): inactive with some planned future urban uses (U2-A alternatives); and existing pasture (U3 alternatives)

None of these land owners or uses will need to be relocated. All of the enterprises listed above could continue operation at their present locations after acquisition of roadway right-of-way. Mitigation measures to lessen the adverse impact on agricultural and ranching activities will be provided (see Section 4.2.4).

No alternative will require the displacement of any residence.

4.1.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1.4.1 Land Use

Mitigation for potential land use impacts is not necessary because Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is intended to meet existing and projected traffic demand derived from existing land use planning objectives. The roadway is not anticipated to induce unplanned land use development in the study area. As described in Section 4.1.1, the health of the visitor industry determines the size, rate and location of development in Kihei-Makena. In Upcountry, water supply restrictions, and other factors such as State and County land use controls, determine the size, rate and location of development.

4.1.4.2 Relocation

Since no residence, tenant or business will be displaced by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, relocation assistance will not be necessary. However, land owners affected by right-of-way acquisition will be compensated in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. In addition, farmers (owners and leaseholders) will be compensated for crop damage and lease losses, if necessary (see Section 4.17.6).

4.2 FARMLAND

4.2.1 CROPLAND IMPACTS


Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross agricultural land and convert the roadway right-of-way to transportation use (see Figure 4-2). Most of the agricultural impacts will occur on existing sugarcane and pineapple fields (see below). As indicated on Table 4-1, the degree of impact will depend on the alignment selected. The U1 alternatives, including the preferred alternative, would displace the greatest amount of active farmland (approximately 48 ha (120 acres)). Table 4-1 also shows the estimated amount of agriculturally-productive soil that will be permanently displaced by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

Table 4-1
Estimated Displacement of Farmlands

Alternative	Est. Displacement	Land Owner
<u>U1.K1</u>	<u>48.3 ha (119.4 acres)</u>	<u>Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U1.K2</u>	<u>48.3 ha (119.4 acres)</u>	<u>Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U2-A.K1</u>	<u>35.3 ha (87.2 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U2-A.K2</u>	<u>35.3 ha (87.2 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U2-B.K1</u>	<u>31.5 ha (77.8 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U2-B.K2</u>	<u>31.5 ha (77.8 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; Alexander & Baldwin; Haleakala Ranch</u>
<u>U3.K1</u>	<u>21.8 ha (53.8 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; County of Maui</u>
<u>U3.K2</u>	<u>21.8 ha (53.8 acres)</u>	<u>Maui Land & Pineapple; County of Maui</u>

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., September 1998

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not directly affect any privately-owned Kula small-scale farm, although leased fields located in the Kula Agricultural Park owned by Maui County would be affected by the U3 alternatives (see below). Also, some of the alternatives could



Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., May 1997

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Impacts to Croplands
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 4-2

modify travel patterns in a way that may adversely affect certain Kula farms. This issue is discussed in Section 4.4.1.1, "Traffic Patterns."

All alternatives will adversely affect agricultural operations, such as planting, aerial spraying, irrigation, drainage and harvesting, for several reasons. For example, the highway will cross agricultural infrastructure, such as existing service roads and irrigation and drainage systems. In addition, the roadway could isolate portions of fields, making them inaccessible and unworkable for cultivation. However, in most cases, this project will not create unworkable remnant parcels because mitigation measures to maintain the productivity and workability of the affected fields will be implemented (see Section 4.2.4).

The impacts of alternative alignments are described below:

- Segment U1 crosses sugarcane fields owned by Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) west (makai) of Pukalani (see Figure 4-2). The alignment will separate approximately 400 ha (1000 acres) of sugarcane land from larger fields, and cross existing cane haul roads and irrigation and drainage systems. The isolated parcel will remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, will be implemented if a U1 alternative were constructed.
- Segment U1/U2-A crosses a Maui Land and Pineapple Company (ML&P) pineapple field along Pulehu Road, affecting internal roadways, water conveyance infrastructure and drainage patterns (see Figure 4-2). The two newly created parcels will remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, will be implemented if either a U1 or U2-A alternative were constructed.
- Segments U2-A and U2-B separate approximately 25 ha (60 acres) of HC&S sugarcane land from a larger field (see Figure 4-2). It will also cross two major water ditches, the Hamakua Ditch and the Reservoir 40 ditch. The U2-A alignment also crosses a ML&P pineapple field south (mauka) of Pukalani, separating two parcels from a larger field. These affected fields would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, would be implemented if a U2-A or U2-B alternative were constructed.

- The re-aligned Haleakala Highway, under the U2-A alternatives, crosses a ML&P pineapple field on the southeast (mauka) side of Pukalani. The field would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, would be implemented if a U2-A alternative were constructed.
- Segment U3 crosses two ML&P fields along Pulehu Road (see Figure 4-2). The western (makai) field would be divided into two field. However, both fields would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, would be implemented if a U3 alternative is constructed. Unworkable remnant parcels would be created at the eastern (mauka) field because of the small size of the isolated field. The U3 alignment would also cross the Kula Agricultural Park owned by Maui County (see Figure 4-2). The Agricultural Park leases low-rent parcels to small-scale farmers. Some of the parcels would be converted to the roadway. The remaining parcels and parcels modified by the roadway alignment would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 4.2.4, would be implemented if a U3 alternative were constructed.

Segments K1 and would not affect existing cropland.

4.2.2 RANCHING IMPACTS

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway crosses land used for cattle ranching and grazing. All proposed alternatives traverse cattle ranching and pasture land located toward the southern portion of the study area, south of the sugarcane fields and west (makai) of the small Kula farms. While reducing the acreage of pasture lands, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway increases accessibility to such land.

The U3 alignment would be approximately 90 m (300 ft) from a working corral and water system (tank and troughs) (see Figure 4-2). The owner of the corral, Haleakala Ranch, has indicated a preference that the highway not be within visual distance of the corral to prevent highway users from interfering with cattle operations. The U3 alignment would therefore interfere with corral operations.

Haleakala Ranch also stated that they will have to herd cattle across the K1 alignment several times a year. Herds may reach 1,500 cows, and take about 10 to 15 minutes for the animals to cross the highway. However, impacts are not anticipated because mitigation measures will be provided as described in Section 4.2.4.

4.2.3 FARMLAND PROTECTION POLICY ACT

Under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA), federal agencies must identify and consider the adverse effects of their programs on the preservation of farmland; consider alternative actions that could lessen adverse effects; and ensure that their programs, to the extent practicable, are compatible with State, local government and private programs and policies to protect farmland. Agricultural areas that will be affected by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway (see Section 4.2.1) are considered prime, unique, statewide or locally important according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Therefore, the proposed project is subject to FPPA.

Per 7 CFR 658.4(a), a Form AD-1006, "Farmland Conversion Impact Rating," was submitted to the NRCS for a "relative value of farmland to be converted" score for each alternative alignment. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) completed the Form AD-1006 by providing site assessment scores per 7 CFR 658.5. Combined Land Evaluation and Site Assessment scores are shown on Table 4-2. The completed Form AD-1006 is provided in Appendix C.

If an alternative receives a total score equal to or greater than 160 points, alternatives that avoid farmland impacts must be evaluated. However, as indicated on Table 4-2, none of the alternatives has a score equal to or greater than 160 points.

4.2.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Affected agricultural areas will require mitigation measures to maintain their productivity. These measures will include haul road crossings (U1 includes two undercrossings; see Figure 2-3), and the modification and reconstruction of existing irrigation and drainage systems. Access provisions for farm equipment to reach isolated fields will be made. If U2-A or U2-B

were selected, Hamakua and Reservoir 40 Ditches would be protected and remain operative during and following construction. If U3 were selected, SDOT would purchase any unworkable remnant ML&P land based on guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act; and would work with Maui County to modify the Kula Agricultural Park. The details of the above mitigation measures will be specified in a "Maintenance of Agricultural and Ranching Activities Plan," which will be prepared during the design phase.

**Table 4-2
Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Scores from Form AD-1006**

Alternative	Score		
	Part V ¹	Part VI ²	Total ³
U1,K1	66	85	151
U1,K2	63	85	148
U2-A,K1	61	80	141
U2-A,K2	62	80	142
U2-B,K1	59	80	139
U2-B,K2	59	80	139
U3,K1	60	80	140
U3,K2	57	80	137

Notes: ¹ Part V of AD-1006: "Relative value of farmland to be converted." Score calculated by NRCS.
² Part VI of Form AD-1006: "Total site assessment points." Calculated by FHWA.
³ Land evaluation and site assessment score calculated by combining Parts V and VI of Form AD-1006

Source: Form AD-1006, completed by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, October 1997

To minimize impacts to ranching activities, stock-proof fencing will be erected along both sides of the highway where there is cattle grazing. The details of this fencing (type and location) will be determined during the design phase. Existing stock-proof fencing in the project area consists of hog wire with barb wire along the top and bottom of the fence. Also, provisions will be made at various bridge crossings and other locations as appropriate so that

cattle may be herded between pastures without disrupting traffic. Cattle will be herded underneath the bridges at certain gulches. If U3 were selected, SDOT would work with Haleakala Ranch to find a suitable location to relocate the cattle corral based on guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. The locations of the cattle crossing areas, and the relocated corral (if a U3 alternative were constructed) will be determined during the design phase.

4.3 SOCIOECONOMIC

A detailed discussion of the socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project is found in Appendix H, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Community Impact Assessment (October 1998). Most of the following information is based on that report.

4.3.1 NEIGHBORHOODS

Figure 3-1 identifies the neighborhoods and communities in the study area. None of the alternatives will split any existing neighborhood or isolate parts of neighborhoods from the greater community. Therefore, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not adversely affect community cohesion. The No Build alternative would also not affect community cohesion.

Although Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not in itself change land use patterns in Upcountry in a manner different from the future development described in the community plan (see Section 4.1.1), implementation of the community plan may affect the rural country lifestyle of Upcountry by increasing the population and density, increasing traffic and associated roadway noise, and encroaching on agricultural land.

Some of the alignment alternatives have the potential to change existing travel patterns in a way that could adversely affect certain existing neighborhoods. These potential impacts are discussed in Section 4.4.1.

4.3.2 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

The No Build alternative would not affect property values or property tax revenues collected by Maui County. Its impact on existing agricultural activities in Upcountry would be less than any build alternative. However, the No Build alternative would not support Maui's visitor and high technology industries to the degree of any build alternative.

Property values could increase over the long term for lands adjacent to the proposed highway, particularly at the termini. Increased values would result in increased property tax revenues for Maui County. None of the alignment alternatives would decrease property values on adjacent parcels because the market value of these properties (see Table 2-1) are based on other factors unrelated to the proposed highway, such as market demand for housing and agricultural produce.

Because of the conversion of private taxable real estate into a public right-of-way, Maui County's property tax collections would decrease by an estimated \$13,000 to \$17,000 per year (1997 dollars) under the U1 or U3 alternatives. Property tax revenues would decrease by approximately \$44,000 to \$46,000 per year (1997 dollars) under the U2-A or U2-B alternatives. This higher impact for the U2 alternatives is attributable to the conversion of urban-designated land into roadway right-of-way. The U1 and U3 alternatives will convert almost exclusively lands designated agricultural, which have much lower property values.

The proposed project will infuse federal funds into the local economy, which will increase short-term employment and the purchase of local goods and services. However, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will have little influence on long-term employment opportunities because there will be little difference in future employment-producing development (e.g. commercial) between the No Build and build conditions (see Section 4.1.1). For example, the Kulamalu development (see Section 3.1.3) includes business development that will occur with or without the project (see Section 4.1.1). However, a U2-A or U2-B alternative will better support the Kulamalu development as a business district because of improved accessibility. The U2-B alignment was derived from the Kulamalu master plan.

Existing commercial districts in Upcountry are in Pukalani and Makawao (see Section 3.3.4). Kihei also supports commercial districts along South Kihei Road and at a parcel in North Kihei, west (mauka) of Piilani Highway. Regardless of the alternative chosen, the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is generally not expected to adversely affect these districts because the roadway will not function as a commercial district bypass, except for Kahului. However, a Kulamalu shopping center is planned adjacent to the U2-B alignment. Depending on the tenants at the shopping center, a U2-B alternative would shift a portion of visitor spending to this shopping center, away from the visitor-oriented shops in Makawao. This shift may occur to lesser extent with a U2-A or U3 alternative. This effect would also occur with residents commuting between Upcountry and Kihei or West Maui.

Although Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will enable many motorists to bypass Kahului, economic impacts to Kahului businesses are not expected because residents will continue to travel to Kahului regardless of the proposed project because of Kahului's attractiveness as the island's principal commercial center, featuring Kaahumanu Shopping Center, K-Mart, and Costco, among others.

All the build alternatives will enhance access to tourist destinations in Upcountry and Haleakala National Park, and therefore will have a positive effect on the visitor industry. However, the proposed project is not expected to facilitate visitor-related economic activities in Kihei or Upcountry (see Section 4.1.1).

Impacts on agricultural activities are discussed in Section 4.2.

The proposed project will support Maui's efforts to develop high technology industry (see Section 3.1.3). The roadway will provide increased synergism between Science City on the summit of Haleakala Crater and the R&T Park in Kihei.

4.3.3 PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

None of the alternatives will directly affect (through right-of-way impacts) existing public facilities described in Section 3.3.5. However, access to these facilities and services will be

enhanced by any of the build alternatives because of the decreased travel time between Kihei and Upcountry.

Many people who commented on the Draft EIS expressed concerns about the safety of students driving or walking to King Kekaulike High School and the new Kamehameha Schools campus, especially with regards to the U2 alternatives (A and B) because these alignments would be near or adjacent to these schools. King Kekaulike High School is on Kula Highway near the Five Trees intersection (the U2-A terminus) and the Kamehameha Schools campus is next to the U2-B alignment within Kulamalu (see Figure 3-8).

The amount of traffic passing the school on Kula and Haleakala Highway would be the same under the No Build, U1 or U2-A alternative, disregarding the effects of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads in diverting traffic. These alternatives would not change the routes of travel markets so that those routes that do not presently pass the school would not pass the school in the future. On the other hand, a U2-B or U3 alternative would increase traffic volumes passing by the high school. These alternatives would change the routes of some of the major travel markets, such as the Makawao-Pukalani / Kihei-Makena and the drive to/from the summit, to routes that pass by the high school. However, the highways (Kula and Haleakala) fronting the school are subject to lower speed limits during school hours.

The installation of signalized crosswalks and sidewalks can prevent students walking to and from the schools being placed in danger from vehicles using the highways (see Section 4.4.4). For example, under the U2-A alternative, the Pukalani leg of Haleakala Highway would be converted to a pedestrian walkway and sidewalks would be installed along Kula Highway near the high school. Under the U2-B alternative, an urban design that includes sidewalks would be used in the section of the highway adjacent to the Kamehameha Schools campus.

Scoping activities and interviews conducted for this Final EIS indicated a strong belief among some Upcountry residents that Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will increase the crime rate in Upcountry because criminals based in Kihei will have more convenient access to Upcountry. The Makawao and Kula community police officers (see Appendix H) could not speculate on whether the highway will increase the crime rate in Upcountry, although both officers were in

agreement that the proposed highway will facilitate better police response through additional highway infrastructure.

4.3.4 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EXECUTIVE ORDER 12898)

Executive Order (EO) 12898, signed on February 11, 1994, requires federal agencies to take appropriate and necessary steps to identify and avoid disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal projects on the health and environment of minority and low-income populations. Because of the expected federal participation in the construction funding for this project, the project must comply with EO 12898. This section has been prepared in accordance with FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (December 2, 1998).

Figure 3-1 identifies the residential areas in the study area. The Upcountry communities are clustered along Haleakala and Kula Highways. As described in Section 3.1, Pukalani, Makawao and Haliimaile are mostly suburban. The Kula communities are of lower density, and many are typical of a rural setting (i.e., small truck farms). The Kihei-Makena communities are mostly located west (makai) of Piilani Highway. The area midway between Upcountry and Kihei, or the area that will be used for the proposed highway, is owned by a few large land owners, such as Alexander & Baldwin and Haleakala Ranch, and are used for large-scale agricultural activities. Near Haleakala, Kula and Piilani highways, where the residential communities are clustered, the alternatives have the following physical relationships with these residential areas:

- Segment U1 is located, approximately 1200 to 1400 m (4000 - 4500 ft) west to northwest (makai) of Pukalani.
- At its closest point, Segment U2-A is located approximately 150 m (500 ft) south of Pukalani and approximately 300 m (1000 ft) north of a few Omaopio homesteads.
- Segment U2-B is located approximately 275 m (900 ft) south of Pukalani and approximately 240 m (800 ft) north of the Omaopio homesteads. The lower part of a

- residential subdivision, Kula 200, is directly east (mauka) of the U2-B/Kula Highway intersection. However, this subdivision is upslope from the terminus.
- Segment U3 is located approximately 240 to 700 m (800 to 2300 ft) north of residences along Pulehu Road. U3's intersection with Kula Highway is approximately 500 m (1600 ft) southwest of the Kula Kai Subdivision, which is located east (mauka) of Lower Kula Road. However, the U3 alignment would displace portions of Kula Agricultural Park (see Section 5.2.1), which is used by minority farmers, but not as residences. Although impacts would be mitigated if a U3 alignment were selected as the preferred alternative, minority farmers would be at least temporarily be affected by the project.
- Segment K1 is located approximately 500 m (1600 ft) south of a residential subdivision located east (mauka) of Piilani Highway. Kaonoulu Estate is the nearest residential subdivision, located west (makai) of the K1/Piilani Highway intersection.
- The nearest residential area to Segment K2 is approximately 500 m (1600 ft) north of the K2/Piilani Highway intersection, across Piilani Highway.

Based on the information above, no alternative will cut through a neighborhood (see Section 4.3.1) or displace any residence or business (see Section 4.1.3). In addition, proximity impacts to these communities, such as high noise levels or degraded air quality, are not anticipated. Therefore, other than minority farmers using the Kula Agricultural Park who would be temporarily affected by the U3 alternative, there are no minority or low-income populations that will be adversely affected by the proposed project, which is the finding required by EO 12898 regarding Environmental Justice.

4.3.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

Potential adverse social impacts could occur through travel pattern impacts and the location of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway near existing schools. Mitigation measures to minimize this impact are discussed in Section 4.4.4.

4.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

4.4.1 TRANSPORTATION

4.4.1.1 Traffic Patterns

Table 4-3 summarizes the discussion in this section.

Under the future No Build condition, major traffic pattern changes are not anticipated because no new major roadway, other than Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, is planned for the project area. No Build transportation improvements, as described in Section 2.1.1, consist of capacity enhancements of existing roadways. Therefore, although capacity enhancements would improve the operations of the roadways identified in Section 2.1.1, changes in traffic patterns would not occur.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, on the other hand, will cause major changes to existing traffic patterns in the project area. The proposed project will divert most trips between Kihei-Makena and Upcountry onto the new highway and off of Haleakala Highway, Hana Highway, Dairy or Hansen Roads, Puunene Avenue and Mokulele Highway, the Kihei and Upcountry, and the route that would persist under the No Build alternative. If a K1 alternative were selected, some of the travel demand between Upcountry and West Maui will also be diverted onto the new highway. Kihei-Upcountry trip lengths could be cut by half, depending on the alternative, trip origin and trip destination. Therefore, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will substantially reduce total regional vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT), fuel consumption, air pollutant emissions and travel time for a large number of trips in comparison to the No Build condition. Under the No Build alternative, regional VMT would increase as population and subsequent travel demand increase on Maui. However, overall travel time may be slightly reduced under the No Build alternative in comparison to the present condition because of better roadway operations from capacity enhancements.

The diversion of trips by the proposed highway will reduce traffic volumes on the existing Kihei to Upcountry route, and therefore improve operations along this route for the remaining traffic in comparison to the No Build alternative. However, the K1 alternatives will increase

**Table 4-3
Comparison of Traffic Pattern Impacts by Alternative**

Alternative	Relief of Upcountry to Kihei Traffic Congestion	Relief of Upcountry to West Maui Traffic Congestion	Enhance Contra-Flow of Morning Peak Directional Traffic in Upcountry	Adverse Effect on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads	Adverse Effect on Local Roads Between Kiua and Haleakala Highways
No Build	No	No	No	No	No
U1,K1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
U1,K2	Yes	Some	No	Yes	No
U2-A,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
U2-A,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	Yes	No
U2-B,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
U2-B,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	Yes	No
U3,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
U3,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	No	Yes

Note:  Indicates an adverse impact

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., October 1997

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

Table 4-3
Comparison of Traffic Pattern Impacts by Alternative

Alternative	Relief of Upcountry to Kihei Traffic Congestion	Relief of Upcountry to West Maui Traffic Congestion	Enhance Contra-Flow of Morning Peak Directional Traffic in Upcountry	Adverse Effect on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads	Adverse Effect on Local Roads Between Kula and Haleakala Highways
No Build	No	No	No	No	No
U1,K1	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
U1,K2	Yes	Some	No	Yes	No
U2-A,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
U2-A,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	Yes	No
U2-B,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
U2-B,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	Yes	No
U3,K1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
U3,K2	Yes	Some	Yes	No	Yes

Note:  Indicates an adverse impact


Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., October 1997

traffic volumes on Piilani Highway, north of the K1 terminus, and North Kihei Road, as traffic is diverted off the above roadways and Kuihelani Highway (Upcountry-West Maui trips). The traffic diversion impacts on Piilani Highway and North Kihei Road will not be substantial under the K2 alternatives (see above).

The U2-A, U2-B and U3 alternatives would create a redistribution of morning peak directional traffic on Haleakala Highway, Pukalani Bypass and Kula Highway. As described in Section 3.4.1, the middle south (mauka) bound lane on Pukalani Bypass and Haleakala Highway is presently contra-flowed to the northwest (makai) bound direction in the morning peak period because most home-based work trips originating in Upcountry use these roadways to travel to Maui's major employment centers at Kahului-Wailuku, Kihei-Makena and West Maui. This redistribution would consist of Makawao and Pukalani commuters, and Kula commuters under the U3 alternatives, traveling southeast / south (mauka) bound against peak directional traffic to access either the U2-A, U2-B or U3 alignments. With the K1 terminus option, many of these commuters would include those traveling to West Maui. By contrast, under the U1 alternatives, Upcountry morning commuters would continue to travel in the north / northwest (makai) bound direction on Kula Highway, Pukalani Bypass and Haleakala Highway, as they currently do, until the U1 terminus at Haliimaile Road. At that point, many of the commuters would turn onto the proposed roadway.

The U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives intersect both Omaopio and Pulehu Roads (see Figure 4-3), which would cause an increase in through traffic on these agricultural roads (see Section 3.4.1). The traffic on these roads will be higher under the preferred alternative, as well as the U1,K2 alternative because the U1 terminus is farther from Kula than the U2-A and U2-B termini. By increasing the use of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as through routes, impacts from the inappropriate use of these roads is expected (see Sections 3.4.1.1 and 3.4.1.2). These impacts include interference with farm equipment movements, increased traffic noise and lower traffic safety through excessive speeds on inappropriate roadways. However, the County is planning to improve Omaopio and Pulehu Roads, which should improve safety.

In addition, the U1/U2-A,B crossings will have a slight adverse effect on farm product transportation from Kula to Kahului because delivery trucks will cross the new highway. However, the highway will enhance product transportation to Kihei-Makena. Safety at the at-



Possible Intersections with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 4-3




grade crossing of the new highway with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads will be maintained through mitigation measures (see Section 4.4.4). Farm vehicles will use the new highway.

The U3 alternatives intersect Pulehu Road (see Figure 4-3). Since the U3 terminus is a short distance away from the Pulehu Road/Kula Highway intersection, traffic diversion similar to the impacts described above on Pulehu Road would not be expected. However, U3 alternatives may encourage travelers to and from the Haleakala summit to use local residential roads between Kula Highway and Haleakala Highway because it would appear to a visitor reading a map that this is a shorter route to the summit (see Figure 4-4). The preferred route for this trip is for motorists to stay on Kula and Haleakala Highways. Increasing traffic volumes on local residential roads that are not designed for through traffic would adversely affect the adjacent neighborhoods through increased traffic noise (including travel to the summit early in the morning to watch the sunrise), and the increased potential for accidents on roadways not designed for heavy volumes. The potential use of local roads between Kula and Haleakala Highways would be mitigated as described in Section 4.4.4 if a U3 alternative were selected as the preferred alternative.


4.4.1.2 Future Traffic Operations

Year 2020 traffic volume projections were analyzed using methods described in the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) to determine levels of service (LOS) for each alternative during the morning and afternoon peak hours. Levels of service are classified on an "A" through "F" scale, representing best to worst conditions. The LOS is based on user delays, a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time.

Depending on the alternative, between 7,000 to 13,000 vehicles per day are predicted to use the highway. The K2 alternatives will produce lower volumes. Tables 4-4 and 4-5 provide projected levels of service for the build alternatives. For the U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives, three roadway segments were analyzed: Haleakala Highway or the "Five Trees" intersection to Omaopio Road; Omaopio Road to Pulehu Road; and Pulehu Road to Piilani Highway. For the U3 alternatives, two roadway segments were analyzed: Kula Highway to Pulehu Road; and Pulehu Road to Piilani Highway.



Potential Alternative U3 Impacts to Local Residential Roads
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
 FIGURE 4-4



**Table 4-4
Projected Levels of Service for
the U1, U2-A and U2-B Alternatives in 2020**

Alternative/Peak Hour	Level of Service		
	Haleakala Hwy. to Omaopio Rd.	Omaopio Rd. to Pulehu Rd.	Pulehu Rd. to Piilani Hwy.
U1,K1			
A.M. Peak Hour	D	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	D	D	E
U1,K2			
A.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D
U2-A,K1			
A.M. Peak Hour	D	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	D	D	E
U2-A,K2			
A.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D
U2-B,K1			
A.M. Peak Hour	D	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	D	D	E
U2-B,K2			
A.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	C	D	D

Source: Traffic data used to produce analysis provided by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation; Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. prepared the analysis, October 1997

As indicated on Tables 4-4 and 4-5, most segments will operate acceptably, at LOS C or D during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. However, there will be segments that are projected to operate at LOS E for alternatives U1,K1, U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1. This condition will occur during the p.m. peak hour when volumes will be heaviest in the upgrade direction.

**Table 4-5
Projected Levels of Service for
the U3 Alternatives in 2020**

Alternative/Peak Period	Level of Service	
	Kula Hwy. to Pulehu Rd.	Pulehu Rd. to Piilani Hwy.
U3,K1		
A.M. Peak Hour	D	D
P.M. Peak Hour	E	E
U3,K2		
A.M. Peak Hour	C	C
P.M. Peak Hour	D	D

Source: Traffic data used to produce analysis provided by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation; Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. prepared the analysis, October 1997

Table 4-6 shows the LOS at the six alternative termini for each alternative. As indicated on this table, only the U1 terminus under Alternative U1,K1 is predicted to operate worse than LOS C. As indicated on Table 1-1, certain movements at this intersection are currently operating at LOS D and F.

**Table 4-6
Project Levels of Service at the
Alternative Termini in 2020**

Location	Level of Service	
	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
U1;K1		
U1 Terminus	D	D
K1 Terminus	C	B
U1;K2		
U1 Terminus	C	C
K2 Terminus	B	C
U2-A;K1		
U2-A Terminus	B	B
K1 Terminus	C	B
U2-A;K2		
U2-A Terminus	B	B
K2 Terminus	B	C
U2-B;K1		
U2-B Terminus	B	B
K1 Terminus	B	B
U2-B;K2		
U2-B Terminus	B	B
K2 Terminus	B	C
U3;K1		
U3 Terminus	B	B
K1 Terminus	B	B
U3;K2		
U3 Terminus	B	B
K2 Terminus	B	B

Note: All termini are assumed to be signalized.

Source: Traffic data used to produce analysis provided by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation; Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. prepared the analysis, July 1997

4.4.1.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Movements

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will have no adverse effects on any existing and future bikeway. When completed, some bicycle tour companies may use the roadway, modifying their Haleakala bike tours. Although Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway was not identified in Bike Plan Hawaii (April 1994) as a potential bikeway, the Kihei-Makena region will be a natural area to end some of the Haleakala bike tours if the highway were constructed. The proposed roadway will have sufficient room for bicyclists riding single file because bike lanes will be provided along urban roadway sections and adequate shoulders will be provided along rural roadway sections (see Figure 2-2). If a U2-A or U2-B alternative were selected, bike tours may interact with traffic surrounding King Kekaulike High School. If a U3 alternative were selected, bike tour operators utilizing this route would probably use Kula residential roads between Haleakala and Kula Highways. Bicycle tours moving through these neighborhoods may disturb residents and disrupt local traffic. Bike tour operators will be less likely to modify their routes if a U1 alternative were selected because of the distance between the "Five Trees" intersection and the U1 terminus.

No alternative will adversely affect an existing pedestrian facility. In some cases, some of the alternatives will improve or install walkways, sidewalks and crosswalks along existing roads (see Section 4.4.4). Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will include sidewalks in conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) where the highway is constructed in an urban area. In rural areas, pedestrian facilities will not be provided.

4.4.2 WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not affect existing water supply systems or future Maui BWS plans, which are described in Section 3.4.3.

4.4.3 DRAINAGE

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not affect existing drainage systems in the project area.

4.4.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Under a U1, U2-A or U2-B alternative, traffic conditions at the intersections of the proposed highway with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads will be monitored after completion of the project to determine whether these intersections meet traffic signal warrants specified in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, published by FHWA.

If a U2-A alternative were selected, the modified Five Trees intersection would include crosswalks and sidewalks to the high school. In addition, the Pukalani leg of Haleakala Highway would be converted to a pedestrian walkway.

If a U2-B alternative were selected, an urban design (see Section 2.1.2) would be used next to the Kamehameha Schools campus in Kulamalu. This design includes sidewalks.

If a U3 alternative were selected, signage will be provided to direct motorists to the proper route to the Haleakala summit.

4.5 AIR QUALITY

A detailed discussion of the microscale air quality impacts of the proposed project is found in Appendix F, Air Quality Study for the Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway (September 1998). The following information is based on that report.

4.5.1 POLLUTANTS FOR ANALYSIS

The pollutants relevant to evaluating the air quality impacts of a roadway project are those contained in motor vehicle emissions. These pollutants include carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbons (HC), nitrogen oxide (NO_x), ozone (O₃), and lead. Vehicles account for a very small percentage of regional emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and particulate matter (PM₁₀), and therefore detailed analyses of these contaminants are typically not warranted for a proposed roadway.

Motor vehicles have historically constituted a major source of lead emissions to the atmosphere. However, lead levels have decreased substantially and will continue to do so due to the mandated decrease and elimination of lead in gasoline. Therefore, a detailed analysis of the impact of lead emissions is also not warranted.

HC and NO_x emissions from automotive sources are of concern primarily because of their roles as precursors in the formation of O₃ in the lower atmosphere. Ozone, a major greenhouse gas, is formed through a series of reactions that take place in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. Since the reactions are slow and occur as the pollutants diffuse downwind, elevated ozone levels are often found many miles from sources of the precursor pollutants. HC and NO_x emissions are therefore examined on a regional or "mesoscale" basis.

CO impacts are localized. Even under the worst meteorological conditions and most congested traffic conditions, high concentrations are limited to a relatively short distance (91 to 183 m (300 to 600 ft)) from heavily traveled roadways. Consequently, it is appropriate to predict concentrations of CO on a localized or "microscale" basis.

4.5.2 METHODOLOGY

4.5.2.1 Microscale Analysis

To estimate future CO levels by year 2020, microscale air quality modeling was performed using the most recent version of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) mobile source emission factor model (MOBILE 5A) and the CAL3QHC version 2 air quality dispersion model. Appendix F contains a more detailed description of the methodology used to predict CO concentrations.

Adverse air quality effects of a roadway project are caused by increased vehicular activity in a particular area, such as an intersection. Impacts at these local areas, typically intersections, are often referred to as "hot spots." According to the EPA Conformity Guidelines, a hot spot analysis should be prepared if:

- the project worsens an intersection's LOS if it was previously a C or D; and

- the intersection LOS is D or worse and the project substantially increases intersection delay.

According to Section 4.4.1, the LOS at the alternative termini (U1, U2-A, U2-B, U3, K1 and K2) are predicted to remain the same as present or be no worse than LOS C, except for one terminus. Because of this predicted traffic condition, only the following two sites received detailed CO analysis because they represent the termini with the worst predicted traffic conditions:

- Site #1: Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway / Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway intersection - Alternatives U1,K1 and U1,K2; and
- Site #2: Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway / Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway intersection - Alternative U1,K1

A localized (microscale) analysis of mobile sources applies mathematical models that simulate physical conditions to predict CO concentrations at specific receptor locations. Mobile source dispersion models are the basic analytical tools used to estimate CO concentrations expected under given conditions of traffic, roadway geometry and meteorology. The mathematical expressions and formulations that comprise the various models attempt to describe extremely complex physical phenomena. However, because all models contain simplifications and approximations of actual conditions, most have been designed to be conservative.

4.5.2.2 Mesoscale Analysis

The effects of a proposed project on regional hydrocarbon and nitrogen oxide emissions are an indication of the project's overall affect on areawide ozone levels. A regional emission burden (or mesoscale) analysis is often conducted to estimate these effects. This analysis utilizes vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and vehicle hours or travel (VHT) within the region (together with appropriate mobile source emission factors) to estimate changes in pollutant burden levels with and without the proposed project. The results of this analysis are then used to determine if the area will be in compliance with regulations set forth in the Final Conformity Rule.

4.5.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

4.5.3.1 Microscale Analysis

Maximum 1-hour and 8-hour carbon monoxide levels were predicted at two analysis sites for Alternatives U1,K1 and U1,K2. The results of this analysis are provided in Tables 4-7 and 4-8. An analysis of other sites and alternatives, including the No Build alternative, is unnecessary because the CO levels at Sites #1 and #2, under the U1 alternatives, would be the "worst-case" among all of the other termini and alternatives. Therefore, the predicted CO levels at these two analysis sites would be the highest due to microscale effects from the project. As indicated on Tables 4-7 and 4-8, no violations of State Ambient Air Quality Standards (SAAQS) for one- or eight-hour CO standards are predicted, even at these "worst-case" locations (the SAAQS are more stringent than the Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards).

Since the project is not predicted to cause a violation of the applicable air quality standards, it conforms to the goals set forth in the Clean Air Act Amendments.

**Table 4-7
Predicted Worst-Case 1-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)***

Site	Description	Alter.	State Std.	Build (Year 2020)	
				AM	PM
1	Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K1	9	0.81	0.71
1	Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K2	9	0.91	0.61
2	Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection	U1,K1	9	0.81	0.81

Note: * 1-hour CO Background = .012 ppm

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., September 1998

**Table 4-8
Predicted Worst-Case 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)***

Site	Description	Alternative	State Standard	Build (Year 2020)
1	Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K1	4.5	0.07
1	Haliimaile Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K2	4.5	0.08
2	Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection	U1,K1	4.5	0.07

Note: * 8-hour CO Background = .012 ppm

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., September 1998

4.5.3.2 Mesoscale Analysis

On a regional air quality basis, any of the build alternatives will produce an improvement over the No Build alternative because of the reduction of travel distance between Upcountry and Kihei-Makena or West Maui, which will result in decreased fuel consumption. The Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is included in the current State of Hawaii Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), 1997, for Fiscal Years 1998-2000. The regional effects of this project are incorporated into and satisfy the requirements of the conforming Statewide Implementation Plan (SIP). Therefore, a regional or mesoscale analysis is not necessary.

4.5.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation measures for the air quality impacts of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway after its construction will not be necessary. Construction-phase air quality impacts and mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.17.2.

4.6 NOISE

A detailed discussion of the noise impacts of the proposed project is found in Appendix G, Noise Technical Report for Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway (January, 1998). The following information is based on that report.

The noise impact analysis for Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway was prepared using SDOT's FHWA-approved Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy (October 1996) (hereinafter referred to as Noise Policy). This Final EIS considers two types of future traffic noise impacts:

- the traffic noise levels along Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway under each alignment alternative; and
- the change in traffic noise levels on other roadways within the project study area due to traffic diversion caused by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

4.6.1 PREDICTION METHODOLOGY

Future noise levels with and without the project were predicted using FHWA's highway traffic noise prediction model, STAMINA 2.0 Highway Traffic Noise Modeling Program (FHWA, 1982). Input variables to the model include traffic volumes, speeds and vehicle fleet mix (auto, medium truck, and heavy truck percentages). The analysis assumes that existing and future traffic conditions have the same vehicle mix and speeds.

The noise analysis considered the following traffic scenarios:

- two-lane facility (proposed project) - sunrise hours (5:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.);
- two-lane facility (proposed project) - peak hour; and
- two-lane facility (proposed project) - roadway operating at level of service (LOS) C.

Roadway "level of service" (LOS) is measured on a scale from A to F (see Section 4.4.1). LOS C is a traffic condition, where vehicular volume is at the capacity of the roadway, yet vehicles operate at the allowable speed limit. This is considered to be the noisiest of the six levels of service (A through F).

4.6.2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Noise abatement must be considered when there is a noise impact. According to the Noise Policy, a noise impact occurs when:

- predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC); or
- predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise levels.

Noise is measured by the one-hour $L_{eq}(h)$ parameter. "Approach" means to attain a noise level 1 dBA less than the NAC and "substantially exceed the existing noise levels" means to increase the one-hour $L_{eq}(h)$ by at least 15 dBA.

Computer modeling results for the Year 2020 are presented in Table 4-9.

Under the No Build alternative, predicted future traffic noise levels are expected to be no more than 1 dBA over the existing noise levels. The NAC of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA is expected to be approached at Site 7 (see Table 4-9). All other sites are predicted to remain below the NAC.

The predicted sunrise noise levels presented in Table 4-9 represent traffic using the proposed highway and other roadways during the early morning hours to model the condition of tourists traveling to the Haleakala summit for sunrise. However, these predicted noise levels do not include the cumulative effects of ambient early morning noise from other activities except at Site 1, which includes the effects of ambient early morning noise because measurements at this site were taken at 5:00 a.m. (see Section 3.6.3). The results in Table 4-9 indicate that the effects of early morning traffic will not cause future noise levels at the receptor sites to approach or exceed the NAC, including the K1 alternatives' traffic noise effects on Site 1. Site 1's sunrise noise levels are predicted to increase by 3 dBA over the existing ambient level, which is considerably less than the "substantial increase" threshold in the Noise Policy. A 3 dBA increase is barely perceptible to the human ear. Predicted noise levels at Site 1 included the effect of tour buses accelerating uphill.

Table 4.9
Predicted Year 2020 Noise Levels

Site	Location	Segment	Noise Levels (L _{eq} (h) (dBA))					
			NAC	Existing	No-Build	Build Condition		
					Sunrise	Peak Hour	LOS C 2 Lanes	
1	Ohukai community (Ohukai St.)	K1	67	39	40	42	46	48
2	Kamalu Elementary School	K2	67	58	59	46	60	61
3	Omaopio Homesteads	U2-A	67	53	54	52	59	63
		U2-B	67	53	54	52	59	63
4	Haleakala Hwy. / Haliimalile Rd. Intersection	U1	---	68	69	49	69*	69*
5	Pukalani community (Alani St.)	U2-A	67	57	58	48	56	59
		U2-B	67	57	58	45	58	60
6	Kula 200 community	U2-B	67	51	52	48	55	59
7	Kula residence along Kula Hwy.	U3	67	66	67	33	67*	67*
8	Pulehu community (Holopuni Rd.)	U3	67	47	48	50	56	57
9	Future Kamhehameha School	U2-B	67	53	54	42	54	56
10	Piilani Hwy. / Kaonoulu St. Intersection	K1	67	60	61	52	62	63
11	Future Kihei Regional Park	K2	67	45	46	55	63	70
		U2-A	67	49	50	40	51	53
12	King Kekaulike High School	U2-B	67	49	50	38	50	52
13	Unnamed Road off of Haleakala Hwy. near Five Trees Intersection	U2-A	67	50	46	56	60	63
		U2-B	67	49	50	44	52	58

Notes: (XX)- Values that are underlined approach or exceed the applicable Noise Abatement Criteria.
 * The predicted future traffic at Sites 4 and 7 results in noise levels that are lower than the predicted future No-Build noise levels. Therefore, future noise levels at these sites are assumed to be the same as the future No-Build levels.

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., June 1997 and September 1998

Peak hour and LOS C traffic noise levels at 12 of the 13 receptor sites are predicted to increase from 1 dBA to 11 dBA over existing ambient noise levels (see Table 4-9). Site 11 is located at the future County Park in South Kihei. Under the K2 alternatives, Site 11's peak hour and LOS C noise levels are predicted to increase by 18 dBA and 25 dBA over its existing ambient level, respectively. Both increases are considered "substantial," and the LOS C condition would exceed the NAC. Therefore, a noise impact is predicted at Site 11 with the K2 alternatives, even though the site of the future park is currently being used for pasture.

Site 7, an off-site receptor, is predicted to have peak hour noise levels of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA under the U3 alternatives and the No Build alternative. Its predicted $L_{eq}(h)$ under the U3 alternatives would be slightly lower than the predicted $L_{eq}(h)$ under the No Build alternative (or under a U1 or U2-A alternative). Nevertheless, a noise impact is predicted at Site 7 because future conditions under the U3 alternatives would "approach" the NAC, as defined in the Noise Policy.

4.6.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

Noise abatement measures must be considered as part of the project if traffic noise impacts are identified. The Noise Policy is used to help determine whether noise abatement measures shall be implemented, depending on whether the measures are reasonable and feasible based on the following criteria:

- Measure would provide a minimum noise reduction of 5 dBA.
- Cost of noise abatement would not exceed \$35,000 per residence benefited. The number of residences protected includes all dwelling units - owner occupied houses, rental units, mobile homes, etc. All units benefited by a 5 dBA or more noise reduction will be counted regardless of whether or not they were identified as impacted.
- Views from impacted residences are a major consideration in the reasonableness of noise abatement measures.

- Greater consideration of implementation of abatement measures is given to residential areas where high absolute traffic noise levels are expected to occur, e.g., greater than 70 dBA, or where large increases over existing noise levels are anticipated.
- Greater consideration of implementing abatement measures is given to residential areas along highways in a new location, residential areas constructed before an existing highway, and residential areas in place along an existing highway for an extended period of time.
- Consideration of adverse environmental effects and beneficial reduction of construction noise.

Noise abatement would only be considered at existing residential or planned development sites where building permit approvals have been obtained, and would only apply to outdoor ground level areas.

As stated in Section 4.6.2, a noise impact is predicted at Site 7 under the U3 alternatives, and Site 11 under the K2 alternatives.

At Site 7, a noise barrier that would provide at least a 5 dBA reduction in $L_{eq}(h)$ at the Site 7 residence was considered, but was found not to be reasonable and feasible because the barrier would block the residence's egress/ingress on Kula Highway, block viewplanes from the residence and not be appropriate in a rural, country setting.

At Site 11, abatement measures that are reasonable and feasible include buffer zones between the roadway right-of-way and noise-sensitive areas within the park, and berms that deflect noise from the highway. If a K2 alternative had been selected as the preferred alternative, the SDOT would work with the County of Maui Department of Parks and Recreation to determine which combination of these two measures would be preferred. For example, according to the latest master plan for the park, an amphitheater would be located at the southwest corner of the park adjacent to the K2 alignment. The grade at this location would allow the highway to be constructed at a lower elevation than the amphitheater, and therefore the highway would be separated from the park by berms. At other locations along the southern perimeter of the park, activities that are not noise sensitive (e.g., ball fields) could act as buffer zones for activities that are noise sensitive (e.g., camping grounds).

4.7 WATER RESOURCES

4.7.1 SURFACE WATER

Impacts to the intermittent streams (gulches) crossed by the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be associated in part with the bridges or embankments that will cross the gulches. After construction, the bridges will have no or very minimal impacts on the intermittent streams because current flow capacities of the gulches will be maintained. Storm water will be confined within the gulch, preventing flooding of adjacent areas. Information about the size and location of the bridges is provided in Section 2.1.2, and typical bridge profiles are shown on Figure 2-4.

Decisions on whether to use a bridge or embankment for gulch crossings partially depend on the storm water flow in the affected gulches. Many of the affected gulches have small storm water flows (under 100 m³/sec (3,500 cfs) for the 100-year design storm), which culverts will be able to accommodate. Therefore, the embankment crossings (containing culverts) will not create upstream impoundments, and there will be no hydraulic impacts except perhaps during conditions exceeding the 100-year design storm.

In rural areas, the roadway will cause run-off to drain into areas previously free of automobile-related pollutants. However, these areas have already been exposed to agricultural and ranching-related pollutants, such as fertilizers, pesticides and livestock waste. Under most cases, the roadway runoff will drain into gulches and thereupon percolate into the ground. Roadway run-off could enter coastal waters during a heavy rain. However, roadway pollutant levels are related to VMT, and by reducing total regional VMT (see Sections 4.4.1 and 4.13), Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway's impact to total pollutant loading will be to decrease pollutant emissions in comparison to the No Build alternative. Under the No Build alternative, a larger amount of pollutants would be generated because of the greater VMT compared to the build alternatives.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), has stated that construction of bridges and embankments in Haleakala's gulches will require a U.S. Department of Army Nationwide permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (see Appendices B and C). The Corps is

therefore a cooperating agency in the preparation of this document. A Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the State of Hawaii Department of Health (SDOH) may also be required.

4.7.2 GROUNDWATER

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will overlie dike-confined groundwater sources deep below the surface. The amount of roadway run-off percolating into the ground will not be sufficient to reach the deep aquifers. In addition, according to the Maui Board of Water Supply, these sources are not utilized for potable water because of the high cost of drilling and the risk of not reaching water.

As an arterial roadway, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be used by vehicles transporting fuel and other chemicals. In the event of an inadvertent spill, fuels or chemicals could be released. Should there be an inadvertent release, State regulations require immediate containment and clean-up, and the County Department of Fire Control already has response procedures in place. The depth from the surface to the groundwater will help protect the aquifer under these conditions.

As described in Section 3.7.2, there is no U.S. Environmental Protection Agency designated principal or sole-source aquifer in the project area. Therefore, the requirements pertaining to potential impacts to such a resource under Section 1424(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act do not apply to the proposed project.

With the No Build Alternative, roadway pollutants also would be generated and the risk of spills would exist. The location of the discharges would be different, however.

4.7.3 WETLANDS

Wetlands at Kealia Pond and along the Kihei-Makena coastline will be unaffected by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. Although the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Map identifies wetlands within two of the gulches that will be crossed by some of the alternatives (Waipuilani and Waiakoa), botanical surveys conducted for this project found no

vegetational, soil or hydrological evidence that wetlands exist in any gulch to be crossed by the proposed highway. Therefore, wetlands do not exist within the path of any alternative.

4.7.4 FLOODPLAINS

As described in Section 3.7.4, the project area is not considered a floodplain because of its Zone C classification on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The hydrological impacts of the proposed bridges and culverts on the intermittent stream flow in the gulches are discussed in Section 4.7.1.

4.7.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

According to existing State regulations, hazardous spills require immediate containment and clean-up. Effective incident response procedures will minimize impacts to water sources. Measures to mitigate or prevent adverse impacts to the quality of State waters during construction are described in Section 4.17.4.

4.8 ECOSYSTEMS

4.8.1 FLORA

The No Build alternative consists of widening several existing roadways. The floral impact of the No-Build alternative would be removal of the vegetation in the construction zone of these widening projects.

Construction of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will also remove vegetational communities. Some of these communities are commercial croplands, and cropland impacts are discussed in Section 4.2.

None of the alternatives (No-Build and Build) are expected to have an adverse impact on the region's botanical resources. The vegetational communities that will be directly affected by the proposed highway are regionally abundant (see Section 3.8.1). From a botanical

perspective, there is no alternative that is preferable because of the extensive involvement of existing agricultural areas along all alignment alternatives. However, for comparative purposes, the area of vegetational clearance for each alternative (including cropland) is shown on Table 4-10. Alternative U3,K1 requires the least clearance of vegetation.

The indirect effects of the highway include increased risk of fire and the potential introduction of alien species. Kihei-Upcountry Highway may increase the potential of brush fires in the region by enhancing public access to areas that are near dry land forests. The kiawe/buffelgrass association is especially fire-prone during the dry summer months. According to the National Park Service (letter dated October 25, 1994; see Appendix A), wildland fires are generally caused by humans.

The introduction of alien plant species to areas free of such species is also a concern. This concern was raised explicitly by the U.S. Department of Interior (see letter commenting on the Draft FIS, dated September 30, 1999 in Volume Two: Draft FIS Comments and Response).

One way that alien species could be introduced is through materials of construction and equipment that would be used to build the roadway. Since Maui already has all the equipment and vehicles needed to construct the road, there is little chance that off-island alien species would be introduced to the project area through equipment. In addition, much of the construction materials, such as base course and aggregate, would be obtained on Maui. Imported materials needed for the project include asphalt, cement, and rebar, but such materials are unlikely to contain alien species. Mulch may be imported for roadside landscaping, but in accordance with SDOT specifications, this material would be certified to be free of alien seed before being used.

Another way that alien species could be introduced would be through the conduit created by the roadway. This mechanism would be a greater concern if the roadway crossed areas of native vegetation. However, the agricultural areas that would be traversed by the roadway are already highly disturbed, and the increased risk of introduction of alien species is considered minimal.

In summary, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not change the current floral conditions of the project area. The area surrounding the highway will continue to be dominated by agriculture and kiawe trees/buffelgrass. The highway does not cross areas of native vegetation, and so would not increase the risk of introducing alien species into areas presently supporting native vegetation.

4.8.2 FAUNA

The impact of the No Build alternative on faunal resources would be associated with the habitat disturbance caused by the roadway widening projects contained in this alternative. This impact would not affect regional faunal conditions.

As with the No-Build alternative, the Build alternatives will convert faunal habitats into roadway and embankment. Table 4-10 shows the acreage of habitat converted for each alternative. Alternative U3,K1 would convert the smallest amount of acreage. However, regardless of the alternative, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not have a regional impact on faunal communities because they are common and widespread. As discussed in Section 3.8.2, the mammal and bird species in the project area are common throughout the Hawaiian Islands.

**Table 4-10
Size of Vegetational Displacement**

Alternative	Approximate Vegetational Displacement
U1,K1	97.6 ha (241.2 acres)
U1,K2	112.2 ha (277.3 acres)
U2-A,K1	98.5 ha (243.3 acres)
U2-A,K2	113.1 ha (279.4 acres)
U2-B,K1	99.4 ha (245.6 acres)
U2-B,K2	114 ha (281.7 acres)
U3,K1	89 ha (219.3 acres)
U3,K2	102.4 ha (252.5 acres)

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., October 1997

Several commentors to the Draft EIS (see Volume Two: Draft EIS Comments and Responses) stated that Kihei-Upcountry Maui would increase the number of vehicle collisions with axis deer. The number of deer is increasing, their range is expanding, and the build alternatives cross areas where the deer have been observed (see Section 3.8.2). While the risk of vehicle-cattle collisions can generally be minimized by well-maintained stock-proof fencing (see Section 4.8.4), preventing vehicle-deer collisions is more difficult because deer can jump stock fencing. The population of axis deer in the study area is denser in Ulupalakua and less dense in Puunene. Therefore, of all the build alternatives, the U1,K1 alignment (the preferred alternative), has the least involvement with the axis deer population. The U3,K2 alignment would have the most involvement with concentrations of axis deer.

4.8.3 ENDANGERED, THREATENED AND MIGRATORY SPECIES

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) (Parsons Brinckerhoff letter November 25, 1996 (see Appendix C)) and the State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Division of Forestry and Wildlife (see Section 5.1.1) has occurred. The Service was consulted because of its jurisdiction under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to impose requirements upon federal agencies regarding endangered or threatened species and critical habitat. The Service noted that Puu o Kali supports a rare dry land forest which may contain endangered and rare plant species. The Service also noted a reservoir that may be used by migratory or endangered waterbirds (see Section 3.8.3).

Botanical surveys which covered all alignment alternatives did not identify any listed, proposed or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, or any plant species of concern (see Section 3.8.1 and Appendix J). None of the species identified in the Service's January 8, 1997 letter were observed.

Concern about potential impacts to endangered or migratory waterbirds resulted in additional consultations with Service staff (telephone conversations on April 2 and May 9, 1997). Service staff clarified that the January 8, 1997 letter did not request faunal surveys of the alignments and the reservoir. Additional consultation with the Maui Nature Conservancy (telephone conversation on April 2, 1997) supported the Service's position that endangered or

threatened faunal species were unlikely to be found along the alignments. However, Service staff recommended that the EIS acknowledge that the reservoir could attract migratory or endangered waterbirds. At its nearest approach, the edge of the U2-A,B alignment right-of-way would be approximately 70 m (230 ft) from the reservoir (horizontal distance), with an elevational difference between the road and the reservoir of approximately 20 vertical meters (60 ft). None of the U2-A or U2-B alternatives would modify the reservoir or its functions during or after construction.

Based on the information above, FHWA determined that Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will have no effect on the plant species identified in the Service's January 8, 1997 letter or other listed, proposed or candidate threatened or endangered plant species known at the time the botanical surveys were conducted. FHWA also determined that the proposed project will have no effect on migratory or endangered waterbirds that use the reservoir near the U2-A,B alignment. A letter was sent to the Service on December 1, 1997 requesting concurrence with the above conclusions under Section 7. In a letter dated December 24, 1997, the Service concurred with the FHWA determinations (see Appendix C).

4.8.4 MITIGATION MEASURES

Losses of floral communities will be partially mitigated by the implementation of a landscaping plan, which is discussed further in Section 4.13.2. Mitigation for losses of cropland is discussed in Sections 4.1.4 and 4.2.4.

Signage will be provided to encourage motorists to prevent brush fires. In addition, SDOT will conduct regular maintenance to control weed growth along highway shoulders. During the design phase, sources of water near the highway will be inventoried, and procedures to use these sources during a brush fire will be established.

Well-maintained stock-proof fencing will be provided at cattle grazing areas (see Section 4.2.4) to prevent cattle from wandering onto the highway. However, since such fencing will not prevent deer from getting onto the highway, frequent signage will be provided warning motorists of the danger of deer crossing the highway. Also, reduced speeds could help prevent and reduce the severity of vehicle-deer collisions. Although the highway is planned for

a 90 km/h (55 mph) posted speed limit in rural sections, this limit will be re-evaluated during the design phase, and the risk of vehicle-deer collisions will be considered further in this assessment. As noted in one of the Draft EIS comment letters, the reflection of automobile headlights off of the raised pavement markers used on many of the highways on Maui mimic the headlight reflection off of axis deer eyes, which make it difficult for drivers to see the deer. Therefore, alternative pavement markers would be studied during the design phase.

Existing SDOT specifications on the use of mulch for landscaping will be followed to prevent alien plant species from invading the project area. In addition, existing SDOT specifications requiring construction vehicles and equipment to be washed after use will help prevent the spread of alien species among construction sites on Maui.

4.9 GEOLOGY, PHYSIOGRAPHY, SITE CONTAMINATION AND NATURAL HAZARDS

4.9.1 GEOLOGIC AND PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING

None of alternatives will affect the geologic conditions of the study area.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will alter the physiography of the study area by introducing a roadway where there is presently open space used for agriculture and ranching. The project will require cuts and fills, resulting in localized changes in topography. Table 4-11 displays the estimated amount of earthwork for each alternative. Alternative U3,K1 will require the least amount of earthwork. Regardless of the alternative, total cuts and fills will be balanced during the design phase so material will not need to be disposed of or imported from outside the project site.

4.9.2 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A search of federal and State environmental databases did not identify hazardous materials sites along any of the alignments. Prior land use history indicates agricultural and ranching

use. Therefore, hazardous materials are not expected to be encountered during project construction.

Table 4-11
Comparison of Earthwork^A (General Site Work) Among Alternatives

Alternative	Excavation	Embankment	Total
U1,K1 ^B	656 900 m ³	516 300 m ³	1 173 200 m ³
U1,K2 ^B	792 800 m ³	625 100 m ³	1 417 900 m ³
U2-A,K1 ^C	922 700 m ³	739 400 m ³	1 662 100 m ³
U2-A,K2 ^C	1 058 800 m ³	848 200 m ³	1 907 000 m ³
U2-B,K1	770 900 m ³	616 700 m ³	1 387 600 m ³
U2-B,K2	906 800 m ³	725 500 m ³	1 632 300 m ³
U3,K1	489 600 m ³	391 800 m ³	881 400 m ³
U3,K2	604 600 m ³	483 700 m ³	1 088 300 m ³

Notes: ^A Earthwork for a two-lane highway in rural areas and a four-lane highway in urban areas, and excess excavation material to be used to fill major gulches (where bridges will not be used) for a four-lane roadway

^B Includes earthwork to construct two undercrossings where the road crosses cane haul roads.

^C Includes earthwork to re-align Haleakala Highway in Pukalani.

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997 and July 1998

4.9.3 NATURAL HAZARDS

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not produce any additional exposure of communities to geologic hazards, tsunami or other natural hazards, such as tropical storms and hurricanes. The No Build alternative would also not result in additional exposure to natural hazards.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will enhance roadway evacuation capacity from Kihei-Makena in the event of a coastal emergency. In comparing the alternatives for their evacuation effectiveness, the K2 alternatives, with their more southerly terminus, would facilitate a coastal evacuation better than the K1 alternatives. With the K1 alternatives, including the preferred alternative, traffic flows will collect in North Kihei because the K1 terminus is approximately 1 km (0.6 mile) from the Piilani Highway/Mokulele Highway intersection.

4.10 HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The purpose of this section is to summarize potential project impacts on historic and archaeological resources and traditional cultural properties (TCP), and to document compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Chapter 6E of the Hawaii Revised Statutes.

In coordination with the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), reconnaissance level surveys were conducted on all the alternatives considered in the EIS, and an inventory-level survey was conducted on the preferred alternative. More information about the project's historic and archaeological research activities is provided in Section 3.10.

4.10.1 SECTION 106 AND CHAPTER 6E

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that federal agencies consider the effect of their projects on any resource listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, in coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is given an opportunity to review project impacts if appropriate. Chapter 6E places similar responsibilities on State agencies to evaluate their projects. The processes of Section 106 (as described in 36 CFR 800) and Chapter 6E are very similar, with both containing two basic steps: (1) identify historic properties (sites on or eligible for the National and Hawaii Registers); and (2) assess effects, and if necessary, mitigate adverse impacts.

Section 3.10 documents the activities performed to comply with Step 1.

In assessing the effects of a project on a historic property (Step 2), there can be only one of the following three possible findings under the Section 106:

- no historic properties affected;
- no adverse effect; and
- adverse effect.

"No historic properties affected" means that either there are no historic properties present or there are historic properties present but the undertaking will have no effect upon them of any kind (that is, neither harmful nor beneficial). An "effect" means alteration to the characteristics of a historic property qualifying it for inclusion in or eligibility for the National Register.

"No adverse effect" means that there could be an effect, but the effect would not be harmful to those characteristics that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. In other words, it would not diminish or adversely affect the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.

An "adverse effect" means an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration is given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

If a project has an "adverse effect", a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that is signed, at minimum, by the federal sponsoring agency and the SHPO, is required. The ACHP may sign the MOA when the federal agency and the SHPO are in disagreement. Other entities may sign the MOA as concurring parties, such as the State sponsoring agency (SDOT), and agencies and organizations with an interest in the historic property(ies) affected.

Effect determinations, in accordance with Section 106 and Chapter 6E, are provided in Section 4.10.2.

Section 106 also requires consultation with those who may have knowledge about historic properties in the project area. A group of organizations and individuals recommended by the SHPD, which included the State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the State Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, were contacted and asked to participate in consultation at various times throughout the project. They were sent copies of the reconnaissance survey reports, the inventory survey report, and the cultural impact study, and were also asked if they had

knowledge of other historic properties not identified in these reports (see Appendix C). One of the consulted parties provided information about other historic properties near the U2-A alignment during the Draft EIS review period (see letter from Charles Maxwell in Volume Two).

4.10.2 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

4.10.2.1 Historic and Archaeological Resources

None of the build alternatives completely avoid significant historic and archaeological sites. Table 4-12 lists the historic properties (sites eligible for the National Register) that would be adversely affected ("adverse effect") depending on the alternative. Since an inventory survey was only conducted on the U1,K1 alignment, the preferred alternative, the level of information obtained for this alternative is superior to the information obtained for the other alternatives. If inventory surveys were conducted on the other alternatives, additional significant sites could be identified. In addition, FHWA rendered official Section 106 effect determinations only for the U1,K1 alignment (see Appendix C). Section 3.10 contains information about these sites, including significance evaluations that indicate that they all are significant only under Criterion D. Criterion D sites yield, or may likely yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Although the number of historic properties that would be adversely affected differs by alternative, the overall impacts among the alternatives were judged to be equal because none of the affected historic properties are culturally significant (i.e., eligible for listing based on Significance Criteria E), or require preservation. Both the FHWA and SHPO agreed that none of these sites warrant modifications or realignments of any of the alternatives, and that data recovery would be an appropriate mitigation measure at each of the sites affected by the project.

The FHWA determined that the U1,K1 alignment, the preferred alternative, will have an "adverse effect" on three historic properties, State Sites 5032, 5033 and 5035. Sites 5032 and 5033 are about 57 m (190 ft) and 45 m (150) from the U1,K1 center line, respectively, which is barely within the alignment's Area of Potential Effect (APE). Nevertheless, FHWA rendered adverse effect determinations even though construction of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway may not affect these sites. As described in Section 3.10.2, Sites 5032, 5033 and 5035 functioned

as temporary habitation as evidenced by the discovery of cultural materials. Although these sites do not require preservation, additional data recovery is needed if detailed design activities to be conducted in the next phase of project engineering confirm that these sites are displaced by the project.

**Table 4-12
Historic Properties to be Adversely Affected by Alternative**

Alternative	Historic Properties Adversely Affected¹
U1,K1 (Preferred Alternative)	<u>5032, 5033 and 5035</u>
U1,K2	4766, 4767, 4768, 4769, 4770, 4771 and 4772,
U2-A,K1	<u>5032, 5033 and 5035</u>
U2-A,K2	4766, 4767, 4768, 4769, 4770, 4771 and 4772,
U2-B,K1	<u>5032, 5033 and 5035</u>
U2-B,K2	4766, 4767, 4768, 4769, 4770, 4771 and 4772
U3,K1	4763, 4774, 4775, <u>5032, 5033 and 5035</u>
U3,K2	4763, 4766, 4767, 4768, 4769, 4770, 4771, 4772, 4774, 4775

Note: ¹ Site numbers preceded by "50-50-10-,"
The impacts of the U1,K1 Alternative reflect information from the inventory survey. The impacts of other U1 and K1 alternatives partially reflect information from the inventory survey. Section 106 effect determinations were made only for the U1,K1 alternative.

Source: Cultural Surveys Hawaii, November 1997, December 1997, July 1998 and December 2000 Federal Highway Administration, June 18, 2001 (see Appendix C).

The FHWA rendered "no adverse effect" determinations on State Sites 3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743, 3745, 4765, 4773, 4776, 4778, 5030, and 5034. None of these sites warrant preservation and sufficient documentation on these sites was compiled during the inventory survey or in previous studies. The SHPD agreed in a May 10, 2001 letter (see Appendix C) that no further work is needed on these sites.

The two petroglyph sites (State sites 5029 and 5031) are located approximately 60 m (200 ft) from the alignment centerline in Kalialinui and Waiakoa Gulches. Because of this distance, and since Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross both gulches via two-lane bridge, both

petroglyph sites are outside the APE. Nevertheless, mitigation measures will be implemented during construction to prevent accidental damage to the sites (see Section 4.17.7.2).

As described in Section 3.10.2, the U2-A alignment avoids State Sites 1062 and 4779 (petroglyph sites). With proper mitigation (see Sections 4.10.3 and 4.15.7.2), proximity impacts can also be avoided.

At its nearest point, the U2-A alignment's edge of pavement would be approximately 50 m (150 ft) from State Site 2701 (a heiau; see Section 3.10.2). Adverse effects on this site would not be expected because the alignment runs along the heiau's south (mauka) side, which would not affect the heiau's downslope (north and west) view plane (see Figure 4-5). Measures to mitigate proximity impacts to State Site 2701 would be implemented if a U2-A alternative were selected as the preferred alternative (see Sections 4.10.3 and 4.15.7.2).


State Site 4181 may be within the U2-B alignment's APE. However, this site is no longer considered a historic property (see Section 3.10.2).

The U3 alignment was shifted to avoid Site 4764 (see Section 3.10.2). Measures to mitigate proximity impacts to Site 4764 would be implemented if a U3 alternative were selected as the preferred alternative (see Sections 4.10.3 and 4.15.7.2).

4.10.2.2 Traditional Cultural Properties / Practices

As described in Section 3.10.4, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. (SCS) prepared a report on the potential cultural resource impacts of the proposed project (Identification and Assessment of Potential Traditional Cultural Impacts Within the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project Area, Maui, Hawai'i [TMK: 2-2 and 2-3], October 2000). The SCS report is provided in Appendix I.

According to the SCS study, the project area contains no TCPs, although there are culturally-significant sites near the project area, such as the petroglyphs (Sites 5029 and 5031) and heiau (Site 2701). None of the culturally-significant sites will be affected by Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway (see Section 4.10.2.1). The SCS study was reviewed by the SHPD, the State



Viewplane from State Site 50-50-10-2701
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Final Environmental Impact Statement
FIGURE 4-5

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

Office of Hawaiian Affairs and others who were consulted regarding the historic impacts of the project (see Appendix C).

4.10.3 MITIGATION MEASURES

In accordance with Section 106 regulations, a MOA was prepared and signed by the FHWA and SHPO because of the "adverse effects" that the project could have on three historic properties along the U1.K1 alignment (see Appendix C). The MOA specifies that a data recovery plan be prepared and implemented in coordination with the SHPD. The plan will be prepared during the design phase and will specify:

- the research questions to be addressed through the data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance and importance;
- the methods to be used, with an explanation of their relevance to the research questions;
- contents of the archaeological data recovery report;
- the report review procedures;
- a report completion date;
- proposed distribution of the results; and
- proposed methods by which native Hawaiian groups will be notified when the work is beginning and be provided a summary of the report findings.

Should a previously unidentified historic or archaeological site be discovered during construction, all work will stop and the SHPD will be informed and consulted on the appropriate treatment measures.

4.11 PARKLANDS

In general, the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will enhance access to Haleakala National Park, the new Kihei Aquatic and Community Center and the future Kihei Regional Park. No alternative, including the No Build, will adversely affect access to or use land from any existing or future park or recreational facility described in Section 3.11.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is not anticipated to increase the approximately one million visitors traveling to the summit annually. The health of Maui's visitor industry is the fundamental factor affecting the number of visitors to Haleakala. Roadway capacity does not act as a constraint on the number of visitors.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, regardless of the build alternative, will improve access to the future Kihei Regional Park. However, the K2 alternatives would enhance access to the Regional Park to a greater degree than the K1 alternatives. However, if a K2 alternative were selected as the preferred alternative, the SDOT would work with the County of Maui Department of Parks and Recreation to determine appropriate noise mitigation measures, such as buffer zones and berms (see Section 4.6.3).

4.12 SECTION 4(F)

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 303 and 23 U.S.C. 138 (referred to hereafter as "Section 4(f)"), permits the use of land for a transportation project from a significant publicly-owned public park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or a historic site only when the FHWA has determined that:

- there is no feasible and prudent alternative to such use; and
- the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

The purpose of Section 4(f) is to preserve significant parkland, recreation areas, refuges, and historic/archaeological sites by limiting the circumstances under which such land can be used for transportation projects. The word "use" in this case means:

- land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility;
- there is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of preservation of the resource; or
- the project's proximity to the site substantially impairs those functions that qualify the site as a Section 4(f) resource even though no land is permanently or temporarily acquired. This type of use is called "constructive use."

None of the alternatives will use lands from publicly-owned public parks or recreational facilities, or wildlife and waterfowl refuges, because there are no such resources within the path of the alignments. The Section 4(f) resource nearest to any alternative is the future Kihei Regional Park, which would be adjacent to the K2 alternatives. As described in Section 4.6.2, these alternatives are predicted to have a noise impact at the future park because there would be a "substantial" increase of noise from its present level (the area is presently vacant and is used for pasture). However, a constructive use of the park would not occur because the SDOT would work with the County to ensure that noise impacts are mitigated by buffer zones or berms (see Section 4.6.3).

An archaeological site falls within the protection afforded by Section 4(f) only if it is on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the site has been determined, after consultation with the SHPO and the ACHP, to be important for preservation-in-place. Since none of the historic and archaeological sites that may be affected by the project meet these two criteria (see Section 3.10.2), the project would not involve any historic properties under the jurisdiction of Section 4(f).

4.13 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

4.13.1 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The No Build alternative, which consists of widening existing roadways, would not affect the viewsheds described in Section 3.12. Views of roadside trees and landscaping could be affected by the removal of vegetation associated with the widening.

Regardless of the build alternative selected, views from Upcountry will not change because the terrain drops away towards Central Maui and the ocean. The visual quality of the ocean, West Maui Mountains and Central Maui from Upcountry will not be affected. In fact, the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will provide additional viewpoints of these vistas for motorists. The possibility of providing a scenic overlook will be studied further in the design phase of the project.

The intactness (extent to which the landscape is free from visual encroachment) of the eastern (mauka) view of Haleakala from Kihei will be affected by a paved roadway and associated embankments climbing the slope.

Highway lights will be provided at the terminus intersections, and they will be visible from several vantage points during the evenings. Highway lights will not be provided along the entire length of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

The visual quality of the ocean, coastline and the West Maui Mountains from Kihei will be unaffected.

4.13.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

Although the proposed project's visual impact is expected to be minor, landscaping will be provided to improve the appearance of the roadway. Native trees and shrubs will be used. These plants are already adapted to local growing conditions and will require less water and soil amendments. Some of these native species include:

- wiliwili--these occur naturally in some of the larger gulches in the study area;
- naio (*Myoporum sandwicense*)--a glossy, dark green shrub with fragrant white flowers;
- nehe--a member of the daisy family;
- ilima (*Sida fallax*)--a small shrub with bright orange flowers that is used in landscaping;
and
- akia (*Wikstroemia uva-ursi*)--a low, mat-forming shrub and excellent ground cover which is used in landscaping.

The Maui Native Plant society and the DLNR will be contacted for additional suggestions for planting and planting material. A project "Landscaping Plan" will be developed and completed during the project's design phase.

Scenic overlooks will be established if appropriate location(s) are found. This will be explored during the design phase.

4.14 ENERGY

The No Build alternative would have higher regional VMT and vehicle fuel consumption when compared to any of the build alternatives because travelers would experience increased traffic delay along the existing circuitous route between Upcountry and Kihei-Makena or West Maui.

In contrast, any build alternative for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will produce lower regional VMT and vehicle fuel consumption when compared to the No Build alternative because any build alternative will provide a shorter, more direct route between Upcountry and Kihei or West Maui. As an example, Table 4-13 provides the travel distances from the "Five Trees" intersection (a point representing a centralized location in Upcountry) and the Lipoa Street/Piilani Highway intersection (a point representing a centralized location in Kihei) for the No Build and build alternatives. Trip lengths between these centroids will decrease from 50 percent to 26 percent, depending on the alternative. Alternative U2-A,K1 would decrease the length of this trip by half, and subsequently reduce vehicle fuel consumption by roughly this amount.

Electricity will be needed for roadway lighting at the termini and signalization.

4.15 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

A cumulative impact, according to 40 CFR 1508.7, is defined as:

. . . . an impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

Table 4-13
Trip Distance Between Five Trees and the
Lipoa Street by Alternative

Alternative	Approx. Distance Between Centroids (km)	Trip Reduction	
		Length (km)	Percentage
No Build	36	n/a	n/a
U1,K1	23	13	36%
U1,K2	25	11	31%
U2-A,K1	18	18	50%
U2-A,K2	21	15	42%
U2-B,K1	19	17	47%
U2-B,K2	22	14	39%
U3,K1	22	14	39%
U3,K2	24	12	33%

Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., October 1997

Sections 2.1.1, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4.2d describe proposed roadway improvements, the major land use developments in the project area, and the characteristics of the built environment in accordance with the County's Community Plans, respectively. The cumulative impacts of the proposed project and the transportation and land use projects described in these sections have the potential to be serious, if not mitigated. Under the No Build alternative, there would be a smaller level of cumulative impacts because the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would not be included in the mix. A discussion of the expected cumulative impacts as they relate to major environmental resources is provided below.

Land Use

Planned land use development projects, such as the Waena Generating Station, Kulamalu, DHHL homesteads and the expansion of the Maui R&T Park, would immediately and irrevocably change the land use of these areas from agriculture, open space and pasture to industrial, urban, suburban and rural uses. Roadway projects are capable of inducing regional development because they often remove

one of the impediments to growth—transportation access. Since some of the planned roadway projects, including the proposed project, are intended to improve circulation in existing urban areas, a certain amount of development can be expected from transportation and other infrastructure projects. Development in existing urban areas, such as in Kihei, would be consistent with County land use plans. Highway-induced growth in areas not approved for development, such as existing agricultural lands in Upcountry, is not expected because of land use controls (e.g., zoning) and other constraints, such as water availability. However, the major planned residential developments in Upcountry, such as the Kulamalu and DHHL projects, would substantially increase population in the region, which may encourage commercial development. For example, plans for Kulamalu include a commercial shopping center.

Farmland

The agricultural activities of the project area include large scale sugarcane and pineapple operations, and small-scale Kula farms that cultivate vegetables and flowers (see Section 3.2). The No Build alternative, comprised of several roadway widening projects, would affect sugarcane operations through the conversion of active fields to roadway infrastructure. Since these projects entail the widening of existing highways (Mokulele, Kuihelani, Hana and Haleakala), sugarcane operations would not be severely affected. In contrast, some of the build alternatives would cause more severe effects because they would bisect active fields. In addition, the planned Waena Generating Station would displace 66 acres of sugarcane fields. Although the residential projects in Upcountry would not directly affect agricultural land, they would substantially increase population in the region, which may exacerbate many of the concerns expressed by both the large and small scale farmers: urban encroachment, competition for water, increasing land values, and complaints from neighbors about farming activities (e.g., pesticide spraying, cane burning, etc.).

Socioeconomic Characteristics

Regardless of the alternative, planned projects would provide short-term construction employment. In addition, the expansion of the Maui R&T Park, the Waena Generating

Station and Kulamalu commercial development would provide long-term employment. The expansion of the Maui R&T Park would benefit and diversify the local economy. None of the planned roadway projects are anticipated to cause adverse social or economic impacts to any community in the study area. The Upcountry residential projects would substantially increase population in Upcountry, which may change the "country" ambiance of the region by potentially affecting the factors that create this ambiance: farming (see above), open space, low population density, and rural lifestyle. Population growth in existing urban areas, such as Kihei or even Pukalani, would have less of a social impact because these two areas are physically and culturally already urban and suburban.

Transportation

Without adequate transportation improvements, planned land use developments, such as expansion of Pukalani, Kulamalu, DHHL Homesteads and Maui R&T Park, can overburden the existing roadway infrastructure. However, the planned roadway projects, including the proposed project, would alleviate the traffic impacts of these developments, and help improve regional and local circulation.

Air Quality

Other than particulate matter emissions from sugarcane burning activities, the project area has excellent ambient air quality conditions (see Section 3.5). The planned projects or developments are not anticipated to substantially change these conditions. However, some of the roadway projects may change "hot spot" or microscale conditions at certain locations. The planned Waena Generating Station would also be a major point source of Nitrogen Dioxide, Sulfur Dioxide and PM₁₀ (particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter). However, it is not anticipated that this project would cause the SAAQS and NAAQS to be exceeded.

Noise

None of the planned land developments are anticipated to substantially affect ambient noise levels, including the Waena Generating Station. This power station would be located in a relatively isolated area surrounded by sugarcane fields. Some of the

roadway improvements, especially those near noise sensitive land uses, may cause noise impacts. These projects include the North-South Collector and Road C in Kihei, Piilani Highway widening, Kuihelani Highway widening, Haleakala Highway widening and Kula Highway widening.

Water Resources

Surface waters in the project area consist of gulches that contain intermittent streams, coastal ocean waters, and Kealia Pond (see Section 3.7.1). Groundwater in the project area is largely unexploited (see Section 3.7.2). Wetlands in the project area are at Kealia Pond and along the coastline of Kihei-Makena (Section 3.7.3). Construction that clears vegetation can cause erosion, which could increase sediment loading of surface waters during heavy rains. However, under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit process, large projects are required to incorporate Best Management Practices to minimize erosion. Once completed, many of the projects would contribute to the amount of runoff containing automobile-related (petroleum, oil, rubber) and domestic (waste water, pesticides, etc.) pollutants that could percolate into the ground or drain to surface and coastal waters. The EPA, in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, has identified several surface water bodies in the project area as impaired by point and non-point pollution sources. Among these include the Kihei coastal waters.

None of the planned projects would be constructed in a wetland or floodplain, except the Mokulele Highway widening, which would be partially constructed in a floodplain at its terminus in Kihei. Wastewater from new development can pose a pollution threat to groundwater resources if sewer and treatment systems are not used. For example, the DHHL homesteads would probably utilize septic systems or seepage pits or fields for wastewater disposal.

Biological

The vegetation of the project area consists of cultivated lands (see above discussion on farmland), and uncultivated lands of various non-native and weedy species, but dominated by kiawe trees and buffelgrass. Although the projects described in Sections 2.1.1, 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.2b would clear vegetation on uncultivated lands, an

adverse impact on the botanical resources of the project area is not expected because the type of vegetation found on uncultivated lands would still be regionally abundant. Likewise, faunal habitat would remain unaffected because of the large size of the project area.

As described in Section 3.8.3, federally-protected plant species may be found in a dry land forest at Puu o Kali on the south side of the project area. Since this forest is within the DHHL property that would be used for homesteads, the DHHL project may be adversely affect the forest and the endangered species contained within it (see Section 3.8.3). There are no known federally-protected faunal species in the project area other than migratory or endangered waterbirds that may use the agricultural reservoirs.

Historic and Archaeological

Most of the planned projects are not expected to affect historic or archaeological sites because of the relative paucity of sites in the project area. However, archaeological reconnaissance and inventory surveys conducted for the proposed project found petroglyph sites and a heiau. These sites are considered to be significant and important for preservation. Since development is planned around some of these sites, they could be adversely affected. However, under State law private land owners are required to inform the SHPD before any construction work that would affect a historic property. The SHPD could permit the land owner to proceed if he or she demonstrates that mitigation would be implemented to protect the historic property or the necessary data recovery occurs prior to construction.

Parklands

None of the planned projects are anticipated to adversely affect any park or recreational resource. However, the Upcountry residential projects would substantially increase population in the region, which would place additional burdens on existing park resources. Additional parks, such as the Kihei Regional Park and Kulamalu Park, are planned to accommodate expected growth.

Visual and Aesthetic

Major visual resources of the project area are views of Haleakala and the West Maui Mountains from low-lying areas, views from Upcountry, and views of the coastline from various locations (see Section 3.12). Some of the planned projects, especially those on the slopes of Haleakala, would affect the visual quality of the Haleakala view plane.

Infrastructure and Utilities

Roadway projects would enhance Maui's transportation infrastructure, and would help improve response time for police and emergency personnel. The planned residential developments could place substantial burdens on the existing infrastructure and public services. For example, residential development in Upcountry may worsen the overburdened water supply condition of the region. As described in Section 3.4.3, Upcountry residents and farmers are presently required to reduce water use during drought conditions because surface waters are the source. The Kulamalu development has drilled a well in Haiku to free existing water capacity for the development.

In summary, cumulative impacts are tempered by the large size of the project area. For example, the loss of uncultivated lands from some of the projects would not affect the biological diversity of the region because the plant species affected are abundant, and mostly non-native. Moreover, these plant species are not federally-protected with the exception of those found at Puu o Kali. Although the impacts to uncultivated lands are not a major concern, the cumulative impacts to agricultural land, in particular HC&S sugarcane fields, are a concern. Although the cumulative take would be marginal compared to the total size of HC&S's sugarcane land holdings (14 000 ha (35,000 acres)), throughout the century HC&S has sustained substantial losses of productive croplands due to urban encroachment. Although foreseeable cumulative impacts are not likely to shut down HC&S's operations, continuing urban encroachment, if not controlled, may adversely affect the sugarcane-growing industry on Maui.

Planned development in Upcountry would also be a cumulative impact concern because it would substantially increase the population of a region that is largely rural and agriculturally

based. The developments may place substantial new demands on public infrastructure and services, such as water supply systems, schools, and roadways. Farming activities in Upcountry may be affected because of increasing land values, worsening traffic conditions and complaints about agricultural activities. These impacts may contribute to the change in the "country" ambience of Upcountry.

The notable difference in cumulative impacts between the build and No Build conditions would be on agricultural resources. The U1 and U2 alternatives cross sugarcane and pineapple fields, thereby adversely affecting these operations. In addition, the U1 and U2 alternatives cross Omaopio and Pulehu Roads (the U3 alternatives would only cross Pulehu Road), which will affect the existing truck transport system for produce between the Kula farms and Kahului. In other environmental resource areas, there will be little difference between the cumulative impacts of the build and No Build conditions.

4.16 SECONDARY IMPACTS

According to 40 CFR 1508.8, secondary impacts are impacts that have the potential to occur "later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable." They can be viewed as actions of others that are taken because of the presence of the proposed project. For example, the presence of a U2-A alternative may influence some bicycle tour companies to modify their Haleakala bike tours so they take advantage of the new highway to end the tours in Kihei. Secondary impacts from highway projects often occur because they can induce development. These secondary impacts can include affects to open space, air quality, water quality, natural vegetation, historic sites, social environment and demands on infrastructure systems.

Secondary impacts are not anticipated because the build alternatives will have little influence on those who could propose development. Other factors, such as water supply, appear to be controlling development to a greater degree than limited roadway capacity. Further, proposed actions, such as housing, commercial, research, light industrial and institutional developments (see Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4.2d), would be completed regardless of whether Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is approved. For example, the Department of Hawaiian Home

Lands (DHHL) homesteads in Keokea (see Section 3.1.3) would be completed regardless of the proposed project. Similarly, Kulamalu (see Section 3.1.3) would be completed despite lack of implementation of a build alternative, although the U2-A and U2-B alternatives would support this development. Therefore, for most of the build alternatives (see below), secondary impacts are not anticipated.

As described in Section 4.1.1.2, the U1 alignments may facilitate a westward (makai) expansion of Pukalani and additional growth in Haliimaile. Therefore, the U1 alternatives may cause secondary impacts, as opposed to the No Build and other build alternatives. This potential land use development would be beyond what is designated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996). The secondary impacts from land development on the northwest (makai) side of Pukalani would include the potential for erosion due to site development, loss of agricultural lands, and increased population, which can lead to more traffic, and higher demand for utility and other public services.

4.17 CONSTRUCTION

4.17.1 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC

Almost all construction will take place on agricultural and pasture lands. Therefore, during construction, only slight delays to existing traffic flows, if any, are expected. Traffic impacts could occur at construction site ingress and egress areas, and when work is being conducted at the highway termini (e.g., at the intersections with existing roadways). These impacts may include lane closures and/or detours. A "Maintenance of Traffic Plan" will be prepared during the design phase to minimize impacts on traffic flows during construction.

4.17.2 AIR QUALITY

4.17.2.1 Potential Impacts

Air quality impacts during roadway construction generally consist of fugitive dust and mobile source emissions from construction equipment.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

Fugitive dust is airborne particulate matter and is usually relatively large in particle size. Construction vehicles operating around the construction sites and material blown from uncovered haul trucks, stockpiles, and exposed areas will generate fugitive dust.

The dispersion of fugitive dust depends on particle size, emission height, and wind speed. Small particles (30 to 100 micron range) can travel several meters before settling to the ground, depending on wind speed. Most fugitive dust, however, is made up of relatively large particles (i.e., particles greater than 100 microns in diameter). Given their relatively large size, these particles tend to settle within 6 to 9 m (20 to 30 ft) of their source. Therefore, because most of the construction will occur where there are no existing homes or commercial areas, fugitive dust impacts will be minimal.

Mobile Source Emissions

Construction vehicles will emit engine exhaust while in operation. However, this is expected to cause minimal impacts because carbon monoxide (CO), the principal pollutant of construction vehicles, is most serious under localized (microscale) conditions. Most of the construction activities will occur away from sensitive receptors, such as residences.

4.17.2.2 Mitigation

The following particulate control measures related to construction activities will be followed:

1. Site Preparation

- minimize land disturbance;
- use watering trucks to minimize dust;
- cover trucks when hauling dirt;
- stabilize the surface of dirt piles if not removed immediately;
- use windbreaks effectively;
- limit vehicular paths and stabilize temporary roads; and
- to the maximum degree possible, pave all unpaved construction roads and parking areas to road grade for a length no less than 15 m (50 ft) from where such roads

and parking areas exit the construction site, to prevent dirt from washing onto paved roadways.

2. Construction:

- cover trucks when transferring materials;
- use dust suppressants on traveled paths that are not paved;
- minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities; and
- minimize dirt track-out by paving site exit road just before entering the public road.

3. Post-Construction:

- restore to original conditions any disturbed land not used;
- remove unused material and dirt piles; and
- restore to original condition all vehicular paths created during construction and prevent future off-road vehicular activities.

4.17.3 NOISE AND VIBRATION

4.17.3.1 Potential Impacts

Construction will involve the use of heavy machinery that may cause temporary noise impacts to adjacent noise sensitive land uses. Table 4-14 presents maximum noise levels (L_{max}) produced by heavy mobile construction equipment and compressors measured at a distance of 15 m (50 ft). These noise levels are estimates based on minimal site-specific data. Therefore, because of the preliminary nature of this analysis, specific impacts cannot be accurately determined without a detailed construction plan. However, because construction will normally occur during daylight hours when occasional loud noises are more tolerable, and the construction site will be in relatively isolated areas away from noise sensitive land uses, extended noise disruptions to normal activities are not anticipated.

With rubber-tired vehicles, ground borne vibration is generally low. There may be some vibration with the passing of heavy duty trucks, but this movement is usually not perceptible except within the immediate right-of-way. Construction activities will not generate

unacceptable vibration impacts at nearby land uses because no unusual activities that would generate substantial vibration are anticipated.

**Table 4-14
Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Source	L_{max}(dBA) at 15 m (50 ft)	Model Tested
Backhoe	85	John Deere 609A
Front Loader	84	Caterpillar 980
Dozer	84	Caterpillar D7e
Grader	91	Caterpillar 16
Scraper	92	Caterpillar 660
Compressor	80-89	Various Tested
Pile Driver	95-100	Various Tested

Source: Federal Highway Administration, Highway Construction Noise: Measurement, Prediction, and Mitigation, 1976

4.17.3.2 Mitigation Measures

Specifications for allowable noise levels will be formulated and implemented to minimize adverse impacts on surrounding communities. Since the State Department of Health (SDOH) maintains community noise control standards (HAR Section 11-46) that apply to construction noise, these specifications will be submitted to SDOH for their review. The project will not deliberately exceed the stipulated noise limits unless a permit is granted by SDOH.

To minimize noise impacts from construction, the following mitigation measures will be followed:

- Design Considerations. During the early stages of construction plan development, natural and artificial barriers, such as ground elevation changes, will be considered for use as shielding against construction noise. Strategic placement of stationary equipment, such as compressors and generators, could reduce impacts at sensitive receptors.

- Source Control. Each internal combustion engine used for any purpose on the job or related to the job will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer.
- Time and Activity Constraints. Noisier activities will be limited to daytime hours when most people normally impacted are either not present or engaged in less noise sensitive activities.

These mitigation measures will be incorporated into the construction plan, and the contractor will comply with SDOH standard or permit specifications.

4.17.4 WATER RESOURCES

4.17.4.1 Potential Impacts

The primary potential for construction-phase water resource impacts will be associated with erosion and sedimentation associated with the project's clearing and earthmoving activities and alteration of existing drainage patterns.

4.17.4.2 Mitigation Measures

Stormwater runoff and erosion during project construction and landscaping will be mitigated through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) established before construction begins. Generally accepted BMPs applicable to this project include:

- use of silt curtains and silt fences;
- minimizing areas of disturbance;
- covering stockpiles;
- immediate planting of vegetation and/or mulching on highly erodible or critical areas, such as the upper elevation portions of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway where the climate is generally wetter and the topography steeper; and
- construction of dikes or diversions to avoid runoff across erodible areas.

The specific erosion control measures to be implemented will be approved by the SDOH when they issue the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater

Discharge Permit for this project and the County of Maui will also require specific measures when they issue the Grading, Grubbing, Stockpiling and Excavation Permit.

4.17.5 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND HAZARDOUS WASTE

4.17.5.1 Potential Impacts

Project construction will require excavation, filling and grading activity. As discussed in Section 4.9.2, the excavated materials are expected to be free of contamination and will be used elsewhere on the project for fill. As described in Section 2.1.2 the amount of cuts and fills will be balanced so that no fill material will need to be disposed outside the construction area, nor will fill material be imported from other areas.

The construction crew will generate solid waste. The materials or substances listed below may be present on site during construction:

- detergents;
- paints;
- metal;
- tar;
- petroleum-based products; and
- cleaning solvents.

4.17.5.2 Mitigation Measures

During construction, all waste materials will be collected and stored in a securely lidded metal dumpster. The dumpster will meet all State and County solid waste management regulations. All trash and construction debris from the site will be deposited in the dumpster. The dumpster will be emptied as needed. No construction waste materials will be buried on site. The Contractor will be responsible for implementing the correct procedures for waste disposal. Notices stating these practices will be posted in the office trailer; the Contractor will be responsible for ensuring that procedures are followed.

All sanitary waste generated during the construction phase will be collected from portable units as required.

The following material management practices addressing good housekeeping and hazardous products will be used to reduce the risk of spills or other accidental exposure of materials and substances to the environment. In addition, a Spill Prevention Plan will be proposed and followed by the contractor.

1. Good Housekeeping

- an effort will be made to store on-site only enough product required to complete the job;
- all materials stored on site will be stored in a neat, orderly manner in their appropriate containers and, if possible, under a roof or other enclosure;
- products will be kept in their original containers with the original manufacturers' labels affixed;
- substances will not be mixed with one another unless recommended by the manufacturer;
- whenever possible, all of a product will be consumed before disposing of the container;
- manufacturer's recommendations for proper use and disposal will be strictly followed; and
- a daily inspection will be conducted by the contractor to ensure proper use and disposal of materials on site.

2. Hazardous Products

- products will be kept in original containers unless they are not resealable;
- original labels and materials safety data will be retained; and
- if disposing of surplus product, manufacturer's or local and State-recommended methods for proper disposal will be followed.

3. Petroleum Products

All on-site vehicles and other machinery will be monitored for leaks and receive regular preventive maintenance to reduce the chance of leakage. Petroleum products will be

stored in tightly sealed, clearly labeled containers. Any asphalt substances used on site will be applied according to the manufacturer's recommendations. Vehicle servicing and maintenance activities shall not pollute the environment.

4. Paints

All containers will be tightly sealed and stored when in use. There will be the proper disposal of excess paint according to manufacturer's instructions or State and local regulations.

5. Spill-Control Practices

In addition to the good housekeeping and material management practices discussed previously, the following practices will be implemented for spill prevention and clean up:

- manufacturer's recommended methods for spill clean up will be clearly posted, and site personnel will be informed of the procedures and the location of the information and clean up supplies;
- materials and equipment necessary for spill clean up will be kept in the material storage area on site;
- all spills will be cleaned up immediately after discovery;
- the spill area will be kept well ventilated, and personnel will wear appropriate protective clothing to prevent injury from coming in contact with hazardous substances;
- regardless of their size, spills of toxic or hazardous materials will be reported to the appropriate State or local government agency;
- should they occur, the spill prevention plan will be adjusted to include measures to prevent spills from re-occurring and clean-up procedures for spills. A description of the spill, its cause, and the clean-up measures will be included; and
- the Contractor will coordinate spill prevention and clean-up efforts. In addition, the Contractor will designate at least three site personnel to receive spill prevention and clean-up training; these individuals will each be responsible for a specific

phase of prevention and clean-up. The names of responsible spill personnel will be posted in the material storage area and in the office trailer on site.

Although hazardous materials sites are unlikely to be encountered during construction, the contractor will report to SDOT and SDOH any undiscovered undocumented storage sites, hazardous materials releases or potential signs of contamination when soil is excavated. If any contaminants are encountered during construction, they will be handled according to applicable SDOH requirements.

4.17.6 AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

4.17.6.1 Potential Impacts

Construction activities in agricultural areas will damage crops and remove grazing land from agricultural use. Pineapple, sugarcane and ranching activities will be adversely affected.

4.17.6.2 Mitigation Measures

A "Maintenance of Cropland and Ranching Activities Plan" will be prepared. The details of the Plan will be developed during design in coordination with affected agricultural operators, such as HC&S, ML&P, Haleakala Ranch and Kaonoulu Ranch. Some of the measures to be addressed in the Plan include the following:

- provision of temporary road crossings (existing roads will be maintained where feasible);
- provision of irrigation and drainage systems (existing systems will be maintained as much as possible);
- appropriate fencing of construction site so that agricultural and ranching workers will be kept a safe distance away from construction activities;
- provision of stock-proof fencing around construction sites to safeguard and secure livestock; and
- provision of cattle crossings where appropriate.

4.17.7 HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.17.7.1 Potential Impacts

Construction has the potential to damage archaeological and historic sites, as described in Section 4.10. It also has the potential to damage sites that have not been identified.

4.17.7.2 Mitigation Measures

This Final EIS includes an MOA (see Appendix C) stipulating mitigation measures for historic and archaeological resources. The measures stipulated in the MOA will be implemented prior construction. In addition, marked buffer zones will be placed around known archaeological preservation features at and near the construction sites. For example, buffer zones will be established around Sites 5029 and 5031, demarcated with bright colored markers, so that they will not be damaged during the construction of the bridges over Kalialinui and Waiakoa Gulches. SDOT will consult with the SHPD to determine adequate buffer zones.

If additional historic or archaeological sites are uncovered during construction, work will stop immediately, and the SHPD will be notified without delay. Construction will resume only upon approval of the appropriate authorities.

4.18 PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The following permits or approvals will be required prior to the construction of the highway.

Federal

- USACE - Section 404 permit (Nationwide)

State

- SDOH - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (storm water from construction site)
- SDOH - Noise permit (if noise levels are expected to exceed allowable levels as stated in HAR 11-46-6(a), which will be known during the design phase)
- SDOH - Water Quality Certification

County

- Department of Public Works (DPW)- Grading, Grubbing, Stockpiling and Excavation permit
- DPW - Permit for Excavation of Highway

4.19 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES VERSUS LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Implementation of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will involve trade-offs between short-term environmental and economic losses, and long-term transportation and economic gains. Depending on the alternative, the long-term productivity of the build alternative will offset the short-term losses to varying degrees.

Adverse short-term construction-phase impacts from the construction of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will disappear soon after construction is completed.

Long-term conditions include:

- reduced traffic congestion on Haleakala Highway, Hana Highway, Dairy Road and Mokulele Highway;
- reduced travel times between Upcountry and Kihei-Makena or West Maui regions; and
- improved regional State Highway System.

Considering the long-term productive uses listed above, and the fact that adverse impacts from Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will be minimized, the project appears beneficial to the community and to the present and future land uses in the vicinity.

4.20 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Implementing the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project will require an irreversible commitment of natural, physical, human, and fiscal resources, as follows:

- agricultural lands will be permanently lost by construction of the project (see Section 4.2.1);
- archaeological resources will be damaged, destroyed, or lost in constructing the project (see Section 4.10.3);
- considerable amounts of fossil fuels; labor required for construction, planning, engineering design, landscaping, purchasing, and services; and construction materials will be committed;
- construction will also require a substantial one-time expenditure of government funds that will not be retrievable (see Section 2.1.2). The commitment of these resources will be appropriate because the benefits from the completed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway include the following:
 - convenience and substantial savings in time and vehicle fuel consumption for residents, businesses, researchers and scientists, and visitors through an improved transportation system; and
 - improved accessibility and safety.

These benefits are anticipated to outweigh the commitment of resources.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

CHAPTER FIVE
Comments and Coordination

CHAPTER 5 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

This chapter presents a record of the public and agency consultation and coordination activities conducted for the project, beginning with project scoping activities. It also summarizes the comments received on the project's Environmental Assessment (EA), Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN), Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS (see Appendix B), and the Draft EIS, which was distributed in August 1999, as well as other written and oral comments received throughout the EIS process.

5.1 PROJECT SCOPING PROCESS

5.1.1 AGENCY SCOPING AND COORDINATION

The project's scoping process was initiated on September 1, 1994 through the issuance of letters to the agencies, organizations and individuals shown in Table 5-1. These letters requested comments on the proposed project. (The project initiation letter is provided in Appendix A). Responses from agencies and organizations (see Table 5-1) identified the following key concerns:

- alignment selection;
- directness between the Maui R&T Park and Science City;
- proposed termini;
- land use and transportation impacts;
- existing travel demand and traffic congestion;
- improved commuter and tourist accessibility;
- socio-economic impacts on existing communities;
- disruption to agricultural lands and farming activities;
- endangered species; and
- archaeological features.

Table 5-1
Public and Agency Consultation During Scoping

Agency	Sept. 1, 1994 Request For Consultation	Responded to Consultation Request	Invited to Attend Scoping Meeting	Attended Scoping Meeting
FEDERAL				
Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Department of Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural Resources Conservation Service	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Department of Defense	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Department of the Interior	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fish and Wildlife Service	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Geological Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
National Park Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Environmental Protection Agency (Pac. Islands Contact)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
STATE				
Department of Accounting and General Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Department of Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Department of Defense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Department of Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Dept. of Business, Economic Development & Tourism (DBEDT)	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Hawaiian Homes Commission Land Division	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maui District Office	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dept. of Health (Environmental Management Division)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Table 5-1
Public and Agency Consultation During Scoping
(Continued)

Agency	Sept. 1, 1994 Request For Consultation	Responded to Consultation Request	Invited to Attend Scoping Meeting	Attended Scoping Meeting
OTHER PARTIES Haleakala Ranch Company Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company Kaonoulu Ranch Company Kihei Community Association Kihei-Upcountry Highway Task Force Committee Kula Community Association Ms. Laura Tamanaha Maui Chamber of Commerce Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc. Makawao Main Street Association Pukalani Community Association Shinwa International, Inc. Sports Shinko Company, Ltd.	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○		

A scoping meeting with government agencies was held on October 26, 1994. The agencies that were in attendance are shown in Table 5-1, and the meeting minutes can be found in Appendix A. Concerns raised at the scoping meeting included:

- congestion at the Maui R&T Park/Piilani Highway intersection;
- access to Hawaiian Home Lands;
- farmland impacts; and
- criteria to be used to select the alternatives that would receive detailed analysis in the Draft and Final EIS.

Coordination with various State and federal agencies continued throughout EIS preparation (see Appendix C), such as:

- State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) and Officer (SHPO):
 - meeting on January 31, 1996 to discuss their comments on the EISPN;
 - letter from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to the SHPO, dated February 16, 1999, requesting concurrence on the results of archaeological reconnaissance surveys, and "effect" and "adverse effect" evaluations;
 - letter from the SHPO to the FHWA, dated June 21, 1999, concurring with FHWA's determination on the eligibility of sites identified along the alternative alignments;
 - Letter from the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) to the SHPD, dated February 8, 2001, requesting review of the archaeological inventory survey and cultural impacts study;
 - Letter from the SHPD to the Cultural Surveys Hawaii, dated May 10, 2001, providing comments on the archaeological inventory survey report;
 - Letter from the FHWA to the SHPO, dated June 18, 2001, requesting concurrence on effect determinations and submission of draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA); and
 - Letter from the SHPO to the FHWA, dated September 28, 2001, approving the MOA.
- State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Office of Planning (OP):
 - Submission of the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) program consistency evaluation from the FHWA to the OP on January 29, 2001; and
 - Letter from the OP to the FHWA, dated March 30, 2001, stating that the CZM consistency determination would be deferred until after the Final EIS.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):
 - letter from the USACE, dated April 1, 1998, accepting cooperating agency status;

- meeting on February 9, 1999 to discuss applicable Department of the Army permit; and
- letter from the USACE, dated February 26, 1999, providing information on the applicable Department of the Army permit.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS):
 - NRCS on two occasions provided "relative value of farmland to be converted" scores for the alternatives (Form AD-1006).
- U.S Fish & Wildlife Service (Service):
 - letter from Parsons Brinckerhoff, dated November 25, 1996, requesting information on endangered and threatened species in the vicinity of the project;
 - letter from the Service, dated January 8, 1997, with information on possible endangered and threatened species in the project area;
 - letter from the FHWA, dated December 1, 1997, requesting concurrence on effect evaluations on endangered and threatened species; and
 - letter from the Service, dated December 24, 1997, concurring with the FHWA effect evaluations.

5.1.2 COORDINATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS

Following the agency scoping meeting and distribution of the EA (see below), project briefings were held for the Mayor of Maui County and other County officials on October 17, 1995, and members of the Maui County Council on October 18, 1995.

5.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

5.1.3.1 Issuance of the EISPN and NOI

An "Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice" (EISPN) was published in the September 23, 1995 edition of The Environmental Notice, published by the Office of Environmental Quality Control (see Appendix B). A "Notice of Intent" (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the November 9, 1995 edition of the Federal Register (see Appendix B). At the same time, the project's EA was completed and distributed (the distribution list is provided in Appendix B; the EA is provided in Appendix D).

With the EISPN and NOI duly published, the public had the opportunity to provide comments on the EA. Under State EIS law, an EA, when prepared in the context that an EIS will be

prepared later, is viewed as a public and agency scoping document and a vehicle for the agency (in this case the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT)) or applicant to establish contact with the public and agencies.

The Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway EA was distributed a couple of weeks before the first round of public information meetings (see Section 5.2) with the intent that it would provide background information to those attending the public information meetings.

In brief, the EA:

- presented 10 alternative roadway alignments;
- summarized potential project impacts that could be significant, pending further study;
- summarized potential project impacts that did not appear to be major, pending further study;
- presented candidate alignment screening criteria for review and comment; and
- stated that an EIS would be prepared.

The public review period closed on November 10, 1995, several weeks after the first round of public information meetings (see Section 5.2).

5.1.3.2 Responses Received During the EISPN Comment Period

The following agencies, organizations and individuals submitted written comments to the SDOT during the EISPN public comment period on the EA (September 23, 1995 through November 10, 1995). No comments were received during the NOI public comment period (November 9, 1995 through December 8, 1995). All names appearing below were included in the project mailing list to ensure notification of all subsequent EIS-related activities to interested parties.

FEDERAL AGENCIES

- U.S. Department of the Army, U.S. Army Engineer District
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Haleakala National Park
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration

STATE AGENCIES

- Department of Accounting and General Services
- Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division
- Office of Environmental Quality Control
- Office of State Planning (currently Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Office of Planning)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

- Robert M. Butterfield
- Ann F. Crowe
- Dowling Company, Inc. (Don Fujimoto)
- Jamie Fonseca
- Hawaiian Classic Perfumes (Dennis Edward Bell)
- Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (Richard F. Cameron)
- Hawaiian Estates Realty Ltd. (Suzanne Lee Freitas)
- Sam S. Hironaka
- The Incense Works (David J. Baar)
- International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 142 (William Kennison)
- Kevin Johnston
- Buck Joiner
- James Judge
- Hale D. Judson III
- Nancy Kanady
- Kizmet Brokerage (Sunny Crowley)
- Kula Community Association (Steve Sutrov)
- Elizabeth Marciel
- Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc. (Warren A. Suzuki)
- Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd. (L.D. MacCluer)
- Lenda McGehee-Simon
- William W. Monahan

- Edwin S. Murai
- O Cole
- Christopher Perreira
- Fred Peterson
- Sally Raisbeck
- Hans Riecke
- Fredrick W. Rohlfing
- Dennis Smith
- Gordon Stellway
- Edward S. Syrjala
- Leah Wesson
- Frank W. White

These written EISPN comments were reviewed and their contents are summarized below:

- Five letters (almost 12 percent) offered no comment on the Draft EA.
- Nearly 45 percent of those responding stated that they supported at least one of the ten alternative alignments proposed in the EA for the Kihei-Upcountry Highway. The alignments garnering the most support were Alternatives 1, 4B and 6A or 6B.
- Conversely, 26 percent of the letters opposed the project for reasons including:
 - disturbance of archaeological resources;
 - increased traffic in areas where no problem currently exists;
 - project cost;
 - safety concerns;
 - loss of quality of life in Upcountry;
 - increased crime in Upcountry;
 - increased subdivision development;
 - increased tourism;
 - need to improve existing roadways;
 - loss of agricultural lands and related jobs;
 - lack of national defense justification;
 - lack of mass tourism and tourist-related jobs;
 - lack of water Upcountry; and
 - limited need to travel to Kihei because of increased jobs in the Upcountry area.
- The most frequently made comments involved:
 - project cost;

- secondary growth or lifestyle changes in Kula;
 - traffic concerns;
 - need to improve existing highways;
 - desire to maintain agricultural land; and
 - lack of defense-related justification.
- Other comments requested clarification of information presented in the EA or studies and analyses beyond the scope of the Draft EIS document.

Some of the comments were useful in preparing this Draft EIS, while others were useful in the Screening Analysis Report, which is summarized in Chapter 2.0. The letters are reproduced in Appendix B accompanied by response letters from the SDOT.

5.2 PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS

Two rounds of public information meetings (four meetings total) were conducted as part of the project's public involvement efforts. Each round consisted of a meeting in Upcountry and a meeting in Kihei. The first set of meetings was scheduled in coordination with the issuance of the project's EA (see Section 5.1.3). Comments were accepted for several weeks after the meetings for those choosing to comment based on the meetings. The Upcountry meeting was held in the evening of October 17, 1995, at the Upcountry Community Center in Pukalani; the Kihei meeting was held in the evening of October 18, 1995, at Kihei Elementary School. Nearly 80 participants attended the Upcountry meeting, and 35 participants attended the meeting in Kihei. Sign-in sheets and meeting minutes are provided in Appendix A. Meeting attendees were added to the project mailing list.

The Upcountry meeting produced the following comments and concerns:

- the desire to improve linkage between the Maui R&T Park and Science City is not important or could be addressed through other means;
- the project has the potential for cost overruns;
- the project should include access to Hawaiian Home Lands parcels;
- the "no build" is the preferred alternative;
- an alternative consisting of widening existing roadways should be considered; and

- the project should assess potential impacts in the following areas:
 - tourists using the roadway;
 - Upcountry's rural lifestyle and social environment;
 - crime in Upcountry;
 - access to the proposed highway by emergency medical service vehicles;
 - agricultural activities, including small truck farms in Kula; and
 - secondary land use impacts in Upcountry.

The Kihei meeting produced the following comments and concerns:

- the link between the Maui R&T Park and Science City is important;
- the proposed highway would provide relief to many Upcountry residents who presently have to commute long distances to their jobs in Kihei, Lahaina, and Wailea; and
- the commuting link between Upcountry and Kihei will be more crucial in the future as developers construct housing in Upcountry.

The second set of public information meetings was conducted in the evenings of May 15, 1996 at the Upcountry Community Center in Pukalani and May 16, 1996 at Kihei Elementary School. Fifty-five participants attended the May 15 meeting and 25 participants attended the May 16 meeting. Sign-in sheets and meeting minutes are provided in Appendix A. Meeting attendees were added to the project mailing list.

The following comments and concerns expressed at the second Upcountry meeting augment the comments received at the first Upcountry meeting:

- agricultural impacts (to sugar cane fields) are not that crucial because this industry is not important to the future of the island;
- the Kihei terminus should be as far south as possible because the Mokulele/Piilani Highway intersection would be a choke-point if an evacuation from Kihei is needed;
- certain alternatives may cause unanticipated traffic problems on existing sub-standard roads; and
- certain alternatives may have potential impacts on the new high school in Pukalani.

The following comments and concerns expressed at the second Kihei meeting augment the comments received at the first Kihei meeting:

- the Kihei terminus should be placed as far south as possible to accommodate projected growth in the Makena area and provide a second evacuation route from Kihei;
- some of the alternatives will produce unacceptable noise levels in existing neighborhoods;
- two Kihei termini should be considered;
- the road should not cross the Maui R&T Park;
- some of the alternatives would cause traffic problems on existing sub-standard roads;
- a spur to Hawaiian Home Lands parcels should be provided; and
- the EIS should address visual and secondary land use impacts.

Public and small group meetings have continued since the second round of public information meetings. For example, meetings have been held with:

- Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company on January 9, 1996 and April 10, 1997;
- Maui Land and Pineapple Company on April 25, 1997; and
- Kula Community Association on February 19, 1998.

5.3 WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS

Following the May 1996 information meetings, the organizations and individuals listed below provided written comments (reproduction of these letters and responses from the SDOT are located in Appendix A). All names appearing below were added to the project mailing list to ensure notification of all EIS-related activities to interested parties.

- The Amaral Company (Zandra Souza Amaral)
- Keith Dinsmoor
- Isabel Gerhard-Kalahau
- Ed and Stephanie Hackenbruch
- Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (Richard F. Cameron)
- Ikua Purdy Road Committee (Sam S. Hironaka)

- John Janinski
- Maui Research and Technology Park (Brett M. Klyver)
- George Schubert
- Frank W. White
- Don Williams & Company (Don Williams)

Generally, the comments focused on the need for the project and suggested alternatives or alignments. Some were valuable in the selection of the alternatives studied in the Draft and Final EIS (see Chapter 2.0). Others requested that the EIS study the following issues:

- secondary land use impacts;
- evacuation from Kihei;
- impacts to agriculture; and
- noise impacts to existing neighborhoods.

Following the selection of the alternatives to be studied in detail in the Draft EIS (see Section 2.2), the SDOT mailed notices on May 6, 1997 (see Appendix A) to interested individuals, businesses and organizations informing them of this selection. This notice also appeared in the May 7, 1997 editions of the Honolulu Advertiser and the Maui News.

Following this notice and a meeting with the Kula Community Association (see Section 5.2), the organizations and individuals listed below provided written comments (reproductions of these letters and corresponding responses from the SDOT are in Appendix A). Names appearing below were added to the project mailing list, if they were not already on the list.

- Robert M. Butterfield
- Kimo Galbraith
- Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company
- Kula Community Association
- Barbara L. Luke
- Kula Community Association;
- RSK Enterprise LLC;
- Azeo Park

- Heinz Rominger and Diane Clarke

Generally, the comments focused on the need for the project, suggested alternatives or alignments, provided information on potential project impacts, and presented community views of the project.

5.4 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

5.4.1 AVAILABILITY OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The project's Draft EIS was announced in the August 8, 1999 edition of The Environmental Notice, and the August 20, 1999 edition of the Federal Register (see Appendix B). These announcements formally initiated the public comment period on the Draft EIS. In accordance with the stipulated review periods in State and federal law, the comment period on the Draft EIS officially ended on October 14, 1999. However, comments received after this date were considered official comments under the environmental review process.

Copies of the Draft EIS were mailed to federal, State and County agencies and elected officials who may have an interest in the project. Copies were also sent to five public libraries on Maui (Wailuku Regional, Kihei, Lahaina, Makawao and Kahului). In addition, copies of the Draft EIS were mailed to affected landowners, community organizations, and individuals who previously commented on the project or who requested copies. All organizations and individuals to whom SDOT sent copies of the Draft EIS were asked to provide comments. Appendix B lists all the parties who received copies of the Draft EIS.

5.4.2 PUBLIC HEARINGS

Three formal public hearings were held during the formal review period for the Draft EIS. These hearings were held during the evening, as follows:

- September 29, 1999 at the Kihei Aquatics and Community Center;

- September 30, 1999 at the Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center in Pukalani; and
- October 13, 1999, at Kahului School.

All three hearings were advertised in the "Hawaii State & County Public Notices", a weekly publication of Statewide distribution. The hearings were also advertised in the Maui News, the only daily newspaper serving Maui County. Also, more than 200 government agencies, individuals, community and civic organizations, and businesses on the project mailing list received notice of the public hearing by mail.

Initially, only the Kihei and Upcountry public hearings were scheduled. The third public hearing was added in response to community concerns that the second hearing conflicted with the County Fair. The decision to hold the third public hearing was made before the first two hearings were held. Therefore, a sign was placed at the first two hearings informing participants of the third public hearing at Kahului School.

A record of all hearing attendees was maintained, and a handout that included project information was distributed at the sign-in table (see Appendix B).

The format of the first two public hearings was an "open house". In an open house format, no formal presentation is made, but "science fair" types of displays provide information about the project, and experts are available to answer questions. The objective of an "open house" public hearing is to create a non-threatening, relaxed environment in which participants can easily learn about the project, and then make informed comments. An open house hearing is also more convenient to the public as they may attend the hearing at any time while the hearing is occurring, and receive the same information. In comparison, at a traditional hearing, the public must arrive at the hearing by a certain time to hear the formal presentation, and those wishing to comment on the project "testify" in front of an audience. In general, most attendees tend to comment at an "open house" style hearing in comparison to a "traditional" hearing.

The "open house" format of the first two hearings was previewed by the SDOT Administrator at a Kula Community Association meeting prior to the hearings. Later, the Maui News published an article about the project and the "open house" format of the public hearings.

During the open house, the room was set up to establish the following flow through the room:

- Sign-in;
- Watch project video;
- Visit "science fair" display section and talk with experts; and
- Provide written or oral comments.

The rooms used for the hearings were large enough to accommodate this flow.

Upon entering the hearing, participants were asked to sign-in so they would be included in the project's mailing list. They were then handed a project informational packet including instructions on how to obtain project information and participate in the public hearing. They were then asked to watch a 12-minute video about the project. Many chairs were provided, and the video was set to play continuously for the full duration of the public hearing. The project video provided basic information about the project so participants would be better oriented before visiting the display section. The video provided information on the study area, purpose and need of the project, the planning process, the alternatives being considered, potential environmental impacts, and next steps.

After watching the video, the participants visited the display section where they spent most of their time. Displays were organized into the following six stations, with a member of the project planning staff positioned at each station to exchange information:

- Purpose and need: why the project is proposed, and what transportation problems the project is intended to address;
- Alternatives screening: how the planning process arrived at the alternatives addressed in detail in the Draft EIS;
- Project description: detailed information (schedule, cost estimates, roadway sections) on the alternatives under consideration;

- Transportation impacts: comparison of the alternatives' transportation performance and effectiveness;
- Environmental impacts: comparison of the alternatives' environmental impacts; and
- Historic and archaeological impacts: information on the historic and archeological resources found in the project area and how they would be affected by the alternatives.

Each station was staffed by a person knowledgeable about the subject addressed by the station (e.g., the historic and archaeology station was staffed by the principal of Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc., the subconsultant who conducted this work). Station attendants wore name tags affiliating them with their station (i.e., "Ask Me About Environmental Impacts"), and engaged public hearing attendees in dialogue about the project.

After visiting the display section, participants were encouraged to provide comments. The comment area was physically separated from the other areas so that participants would not be distracted by the video or discussions taking place in the display area. Participants had several means of providing comments:

- Use a form that was provided (the form asked only for a name and address, and the commenter could write whatever they wish.);
- Provide oral comments directly to a court reporter; or
- Take forms with them for later completion and submission, or distribution to those not attending the hearings.

A drop box for completed forms was provided in the comment area. Two court reporters were also present who transcribed oral comments.

The third public hearing was held because of concerns that the second public hearing conflicted with the County Fair, which would detract from attendance. Also, some complained that the first two public hearings did not provide the public with the opportunity to hear others in the community state their opinions about the project due to the format of those public hearings. Therefore, the third public hearing was a "hybrid" of "open house" and "traditional" formats. The video, station displays and court reporter were available during the first part of

the hearing. During the second part of the hearing, a panel of SDOT and FHWA officials and project consultants sat in the front of the room and took testimony in front of an audience. The testimony was transcribed by the court reporter.

The first public hearing at the Kihei Community Complex drew 67 people; the second hearing at the Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center drew 129 people; and the third hearing at Kahului School drew 48 people. Total attendance was therefore 244, but some people attended more than one hearing.

Of the 244 who attended the three public hearings, a total of 163 provided comments. The most frequent mode of comment delivery was oral, with 93 persons providing oral comments to the court reporters. Written comments were the second most common mode of comment delivery, with 70 persons writing comments on the comment forms and turning them in during the hearings. The public hearings were successful in obtaining comments from 67 percent of those who attended the hearings. This high "comment productivity ratio" is attributed to the open house format of the public hearings.

Volume Two of this Final EIS, Draft EIS Comments and Responses, contains the complete transcripts of the oral comments made at the three public hearings, as well as copies of the written comments received at these hearings.

5.4.3 COMMENTS

This section provides a summary of all comments received during the Draft EIS comment period, including the comments received at the project's public hearings. Four hundred and thirteen (413) written and oral statements were received during the Draft EIS public comment period. Table 5-2 summarizes the methods in which these comments were provided, and the number of statements received through each method.

The comment letters, including completed forms, and their associated responses, are provided in Volume Two: Draft EIS Comments and Responses. They are arranged in the following order:

- Federal agencies:

- State agencies;
- County agencies; and
- Individuals and organizations

Table 5-2
Summary of How Draft EIS Comments Were Provided

<u>Method of Comment Delivery</u>	<u>Number of Statements</u>
<u>Comment Forms</u>	
<u>During public hearings</u>	70
<u>Mailed In-Between or After the Public Hearings</u>	131
<u>Total Number of Comment Forms</u>	201
<u>Oral Statements at Public Hearings</u>	
<u>Kihei Aquatic and Community Center</u>	19
<u>Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center</u>	52
<u>Kahului School</u>	22
<u>Total Number of Oral Statements</u>	93
<u>Written Statements Mailed to SDOT or FHWA</u>	
<u>Governmental Agencies</u>	17
<u>Others</u>	102
<u>Total Written Statements</u>	119
Total	413

Source: State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, November 1999.

Written comments (letters or forms) requiring responses were numbered in the left margin. The oral comments that require responses are paraphrased in the response letter from the SDOT. The paraphrasing of oral statements was done for the purpose of brevity, with no intention of modifying or obscuring the content of any comment received.

Some of the comments received led to changes in the EIS, such as clarifying information and analyses, and inserting new information that was brought to the attention of the project sponsors. The letters responding to the comments were sent in December 2001 and January 2002 (see Volume Two: Draft EIS Comments and Responses). Because of the controversial nature and high profile of this project, nearly every facet of the EIS triggered comments. However, most comments dealt with the alternative preference of the commenter.

Concern about traffic impacts also generated many comments, such as the fear that the U2 alternatives (A or B) would jeopardize the safety of King Kekaulike High School students by

increasing traffic volumes near the school. Other comments on traffic impacts predicted that the U2 alternatives would cause increased congestion in Makawao, and that they would lead to increased through traffic in Pukalani (the latter comment based on mistaken information that the U2 alternatives include a direct access to and from Pukalani). In addition, many commentors agreed with the findings in the EIS that some of the alternatives would cause an increase in through traffic on some of the local agricultural and residential roads, such as Omaopio and Pulehu Roads.

The comments on environmental impacts ranged from concern that the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would result in excess development in Upcountry, to exacerbating alien species invasion. Other environmental issues raised by the commentors included disagreement that the loss of productive agricultural land is worth the transportation benefits provided by the highway, and that the highway would generate automobile-related pollutants that could threaten previously unaffected areas. Some of the comments related to environmental concerns about particular alternatives, such as opinions that the U2-A alternatives would adversely affect a *heiau* (State Site 2701) and unknown burial caves, and that a U3 alternative would increase through traffic on local Kula residential roads. Other comments provided information about the population density of axis deer. This information became very useful in comparing the alternatives in terms of chances of vehicle-deer collisions. All of the comments were used in the preparation of the Final EIS.

CHAPTER SIX

List of Preparers

CHAPTER 6 LIST OF PREPARERS

Below is a listing of persons who were primarily responsible for preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), their titles, years of experience and educational background.

DOCUMENT PREPARATION

State of Hawaii Department of Transportation

Kenneth Au, P.E., Advance Planning Engineer
34 years experience in highway engineering and planning
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Stephen Chang, P.E., Project Manager
15 years experience in highway engineering and planning
B.S., Electrical Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Wayne Kawahara, P.E., Project Manager
13 years experience in highway engineering and planning
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. (Engineering Prime Consultant)

Warren S. Unemori, P.E., Project Manager
35 years experience in highway engineering
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Reed Ariyoshi, P.E., L.S., Engineer
19 years experience in engineering and land surveying
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Clifford Mukai, P.E., Engineer
15 years experience in engineering and CAD system development and administration
B.S., Civil Engineering, Oregon State University

Darren Unemori, P.E., Engineer
12 years experience in hydrology and highway engineering
M.S., Transportation Engineering, University of California at Berkeley
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of California at Berkeley

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. (Environmental Subconsultant)

David Atkin, Ph.D., Project Manager
20 years experience in environmental planning
Ph.D., Biology (Ecology), Princeton University
B.S., Biology (Marine), Stanford University

Jason Yazawa, AICP, Environmental Task Leader
8 years experience in environmental planning
M.U.R.P., Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii at Manoa
B.A., Economics, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Jan Reichelderfer, CPG, Environmental Planner
12 years experience in geology and environmental planning
Professional Certificate, Urban and Regional Planning, University of Hawaii at Manoa
M.S., Geology, University of Illinois, Urbana
B.S., Geology, University of Delaware, Newark 1982

Nami Ohtomo, Environmental Planner
6 years experience in environmental planning
M.P.P., Public Policy, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
M.S., Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
A.B., East Asian Languages and Civilizations, Harvard-Radcliffe Colleges

Wayne Yoshioka, P.E., Transportation Task Leader
21 years experience in transportation engineering and planning
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Mike Miyamoto, P.E. (pending), Transportation Engineer
14 years experience in transportation engineering
Graduate Courses, University of Lowell
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Lowell, 1980

Deneitra M.G. Hutchinson, Environmental Planner
10 years experience in environmental and transportation planning
M.S., Community and Regional Planning, University of Texas at Austin
B.F.A., University of Texas at Austin

Lisa Santiago, Air Quality Specialist
6 years experience in conducting air quality assessments
B.S., Mathematics, New York State University

Steven Wolf, Lead Noise and Vibration Specialist
25 years experience in conducting noise analyses
Graduate Work in Applied Mechanics, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
B.S., Mathematics, Long Island University, 1973

Kevin Keller, Noise and Vibration Specialist
8 years experience in environmental planning and noise analyses
B.A., Geography, California State University Fullerton

Eddie Sagarang, Graphic Designer
10 years experience in graphic design
B.A., Fine Arts, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Environmental Subconsultants

Winona Char, Botanist, Char & Associates
22 years experience in conducting botanical studies
M.S., Botanical Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa
B.S., Botanical Sciences, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D., Archaeologist, Cultural Surveys Hawaii
35 years experience in conducting archaeological studies
Ph.D., Archaeology, Washington State University
M.A., Prehistoric Archaeology, University of Edinburgh
B.A., History, University of Pennsylvania

Robert L. Spear, Ph.D., Anthropologist, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc.
26 years experience in conducting anthropological studies
Ph.D., Anthropology, University of Oregon
M.A., Anthropology, Western Washington University
B.A., Anthropology, Western Washington University

REVIEWER

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Honolulu

Domingo Galicinao, Structural Engineer
22 years experience in highway engineering and planning
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Pat V. Phung, Transportation Engineer
9 years experience in highway engineering and planning
B.S., Civil Engineering, University of Washington

CHAPTER SEVEN

Final EIS Recipients

CHAPTER 7 FINAL EIS RECIPIENTS

Listed below are agencies and organizations to whom copies of this Final EIS are being sent.

Federal Agencies

U.S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. Department of Defense
Army Corps of Engineers

U.S. Department of Interior
Biological Resources Division
Office of Environmental Project Review
U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resource Division

Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities
Region IX

U.S. Legislators

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye

The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka

The Honorable Patsy Mink

State of Hawaii Agencies

Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT)
Office of Planning
Library

Department of Defense

Department of Health

Department of Land & Natural Resources
Division of Forestry and Wildlife

Office of Environmental Quality Control

Office of Hawaiian Affairs

University of Hawaii
Environmental Center

State Senators

- The Honorable Robert Bunda, Senate President
- The Honorable Cal Kawamoto, Chair Transportation, Military Affairs and Governmental Operations Committee
- The Honorable Jan Buen, District 4
- The Honorable J. Kalani English, District 5

State Representatives

- The Honorable Calvin Say, Speaker of the House
- The Honorable Joseph M. Souki, Chair House Transportation Committee
- The Honorable Ron Davis, District 7
- The Honorable Bob Nakasone, District 9
- The Honorable Kika Bukoski, District 10
- The Honorable Chris Halford, District 11

County of Maui

- The Honorable James "Kimo" Akana, Mayor
- Department of Parks and Recreation
- Maui Police Department

Libraries

- Kihei Public Library
- Lahaina Public Library
- Makawao Public Library
- Wailuku Regional Library
- Hawaii Kai Regional Library
- Hilo Regional Library
- Kaimuki Regional Library
- Kaneohe Regional Library
- Lihue Regional Library

Pearl City Regional Library
Hawaii State Library
Legislative Reference Bureau
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Hamilton Library
Maui Community College Library

Media

The Maui News
South Maui Times
Honolulu Advertiser
Honolulu Star Bulletin

Major Land Owners Affected by the Preferred Alternative

Alexander & Baldwin
Haleakala Ranch
Kaonoulu Ranch

In addition to the above agencies and organizations who will receive a copy of this Final EIS, individuals and organizations who provided substantive comments (see Volume Two: Draft EIS Comments and Responses) will receive this Final EIS in CD-ROM. However, they will be provided with the option of receiving a hard copy of the Final EIS, or refusing the Final EIS in either format.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Bibliography

CHAPTER 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Technical Reports Prepared for the Draft EIS

Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. and Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., Alternatives Analysis Report, January 1997

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Air Quality Analysis Technical Memorandum, October 1998

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Community Impact Assessment, October 1998

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum, October 1998

Char & Associates, Botanical Survey Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway, May 1997

Char & Associates, Botanical Survey Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway, Additional Studies -- U2-A Alignment, October 1997

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, May 1997

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Alternate U2A, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, November 14, 1997

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Alternate U2A (new), An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, July 1998

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Alternate U2B, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, November 14, 1997

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui (TMK 2:2 and 2:3), June 1999

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Ka'ono'ulu Ahupua'a (TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009 2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016, and 3-09-001: por. 016), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, December 2000

Scientific Consultant Services, Inc., Identification and Assessment of Potential Traditional Cultural Impacts Within the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project Area, Maui, Hawai'i [TMK: 2-2 and 2-3], October 2000

EIS References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), A Manual on User Benefit Analysis of Highway and Bus-Transit Improvements, 1977

Campos, Frelie, "Kulamalu Plan Would Boost Area Population By 26%," Pacific Business News, September 1, 1997

Community Resources, Inc. for County of Maui Planning Department, Maui County Community Plan Update Program, Socio-Economic Forecast Report, Final Report, January 1994

County of Maui, General Plan, 1990 Update, September 27, 1991

County of Maui, Maui Toll Road Study, 1988

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Kihei-Makena Community Plan, 1998

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996)

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Proposed Kihei-Makena Community Plan, October 1993

County of Maui, Office of Economic Development, Maui County Data Book, December 1994

Department of Geography, University of Hawaii, Atlas of Hawaii, Second Edition, 1983

Eagar, Harry, "Long Planned Development Scaled Back, Ready to Start," The Maui News, September 5, 1997

Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Insurance Program, Flood Insurance Rate Map, 1990

Furumoto, Augustine S., N. Norby Nielsen and William R. Phillips, A Study of Past Earthquakes, Isoseismic Zones of Intensity and Recommended Zones for Structural Design for Hawaii, Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, 1973

Kaku Associates and Munekiyo & Associates, Inc. for State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Final Report, Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan, February 1997

Loomis Harold G., Tsunami Wave Runup Heights in Hawaii, Hawaii Institute of Geophysics, 1977

MacDonald, Gordon, Agatin T. Abbott and Frank L. Peterson, Volcanoes in the Sea: The Geology of Hawaii, University of Hawaii Press, 1983

Maui Electric Company, Limited, Waena Generating Station, Wailuku and Makawao Districts - Island of Maui, Final Environmental Impact Statement, November 1997

Mink, John F. and Stephen Lau, Aquifer Identification and Classification for Maui: Groundwater Protection Strategy for Hawaii, Water Resources Research Center, February 1990

Munekiyo & Arakawa, Inc, Application for Change in Zoning Kaonoulu Industrial Park, July 1994

Munekiyo & Arakawa, Inc. for Kulamalu Limited Partnership, Kulamalu Project, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, April 1997

Perry, Brian, "Council Gives First of Two Approvals to Kulamalu Project," Maui News, December 2, 1997

R.M. Towill Corporation for the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Bike Plan Hawaii: A State of Hawaii Master Plan, April 1994

State of Hawaii, Hawaii Revised Statutes, as amended

State of Hawaii, Department of Accounting and General Services, Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Site Selection for the New Kihei Public Library, Kihei, Maui, June 1991

State of Hawaii, Department of Accounting and General Services, Site Selection Study and Final Environmental Impact Statement New Kihei Elementary School, Kihei, Maui, April 1992

State of Hawaii, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, State of Hawaii Data Book, 1999

State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Annual Summary, Hawaii Air Quality Data 1999.

State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation and County of Maui, Planning Department and Department of Public Works, Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study Wailuku-Kahului Plan Final Report. May 1991

State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy, October 1996

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume I, October 1, 1993

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume II, October 1, 1993

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Delineation Manual, Department of Army Waterways Experiment Station, Technical Report Y-87-1, January 1987.

U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary

U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service in Cooperation with the University of Hawaii Agriculture Experiment Station, Soil Survey of Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, State of Hawaii, August 1972

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Piilani Highway Kihei to Makena Road/Kula Highway Administrative Action Final Environmental Impact Statement, February 1977

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, December 2, 1998

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 1988

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Visual Impact Assessment For Highway Projects Publication No. FHWA-HI-88-054, no date

United States, Code of Federal Regulations, as amended

University of Hawaii, Department of Geography, Atlas of Hawaii, Second Addition, 1983

Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., Kula-Kihei Road Study: County of Maui Wailuku, Maui Travel Demand Forecast & Benefit Cost Analysis, October 4, 1989

Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. and PBR Hawaii for the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Mokulele Highway / Puunene Bypass, Final Environmental Assessment, July 1997

Wilson Okamoto & Associates, Inc., Site Selection Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Upcountry Maui High School, December 1991

Wulzen, Warren and Paul H. Rosendahl with Helen Wong Smith, Archaeological Inventory Survey, 44-Acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision III, Land of Aapueo, Makawao District, Island of Maui, 1996

CHAPTER NINE

Index

CHAPTER 9 Index

A

Air quality	3-34, 4-36, 4-73
Alternatives.....	2-1, 2-2, 2-10
Alternatives Analysis	2-20, 2-36, 2-41, 2-42
Archaeological/Historical	3-49,4-55, 4-82

B

Benefit-Cost Analysis	2-27, 2-33
Bicycle.....	3-30, 4-35
Bridges.....	2-7, 2-16

C

Climate	3-34
Coastal Zone Management.....	3-7, 4-8
Costs	2-18
Comments, Agency and Public.....	5-1, 5-10, 5-12, 5-14
Crime.....	3-26, 4-22
Cultural	3-61, 4-59
Cumulative Impacts.....	4-65

D

Demographics.....	3-17
Drainage.....	3-33, 4-35

E

Earthquakes	3-49
Economy	3-22, 4-21
Energy	4-65
Environmental Justice	4-24

F

Farmland	3-3, 3-15, 4-14, 4-81
Fauna	3-45, 4-50
Flora	3-43, 4-48
Floodplain.....	3-43, 4-48

G

Geology.....	3-47, 4-53
--------------	------------

Government Plans, Policies, Permits and Controls

- County of Maui
 - General Plan.....3-9
 - Community Plans.....3-10
 - Zoning.....3-10
 - Special Management Area.....3-10
- Federal
 - Natural Resources Conservation Service.....4-18
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Section 404).....4-46, 4-82
 - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.....3-45, 4-51
- State of Hawaii
 - Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism.....4-8
 - Department of Health.....3-36, 4-47, 4-76, 4-77, 4-80, 4-82
 - Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Division of
 - Forestry and Wildlife.....3-45, 4-51, 4-64
 - DLNR, Historic Preservation Division.....3-51, 3-65, 4-55, 4-61, 4-70, 4-82
 - Hawaii State Plan, The.....3-6, 4-6
 - State Land Use Commission.....3-7
- Groundwater.....3-42, 4-47
- Gulches.....2-4, 2-6, 2-16, 3-41, 4-46

H

- Hazardous Materials.....3-47, 4-53, 4-78
- Housing.....3-20
- Hurricanes.....3-49, 4-54

I

- Income.....3-22
- Intersections.....1-8, 2-6, 3-26, 4-30

L

- Land Owners.....2-6, 2-13
- List of Preparers.....6-1

N

- Neighborhoods.....3-1, 4-20
- Noise.....3-37, 4-41, 4-75

P

- Parks and Recreation.....3-65, 4-61, 4-62
- Pedestrian Facilities.....3-30, 4-35
- Public Facilities and Services.....3-24, 4-22
- Purpose and Need.....1-5

R

Ranching..... 3-3, 3-14, 4-17, 4-81
Relocation 4-12
Right-of-Way..... 2-6, 2-13, 4-12
Roadways..... 3-26, 4-26, 4-73

S

Schedule 2-18
Screening Criteria..... 2-20, 2-36, 2-42
Section 106 4-55
Section 4F 4-62
Soils..... 3-47
Storms 3-49, 4-54
Surface Waters..... 3-41, 4-46

T

Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway 1-3
Threatened and Endangered Species 3-45, 4-51
Transportation Demand..... 4-26
Tsunami..... 3-49, 4-54

V

Visual and Aesthetic..... 3-67, 4-63

W

Water Supply System 3-32, 4-3, 4-35
Wetlands 3-42, 4-47

APPENDIX A

Early Scoping Comment Letters

Invitation to Agency Scoping Meeting

Minutes of the Agency Scoping Meeting

**Minutes and Sign-In Sheets of the October 18 and 19, 1995
Public Information Meetings**

**Minutes and Sign-In Sheets of the May 15 and 16, 1996
Public Information Meetings**

**Comment Letters and Responses Following the
May 15 and 16, 1996 Public Information Meetings**

**Public Announcement of the Alternatives
to be Considered in the Draft EIS**

**Comment Letters Received After the Draft EIS
Alternatives Announcement and Responses**

RECEIVED

SEP 2 1994

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

HWY-PA
2-2552

SEP - 1 1994

Page 2
SEP - 1 1994

HWY-PA 2-2552

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

We are undertaking planning studies for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project and have engaged the consultant services of Warren S. Umemori Engineering, Inc. The project proposes to construct a new roadway connecting the Kihei area with Upcountry Maui.

The objective of the planning study is to select an alignment for design and construction through our public involvement/environmental process. The process will consist of the following major activities:

- o Scoping
- o Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice
- o Public Informational Meetings
- o Issuance of the Draft EIS
- o Public Hearing
- o Issuance of the Final EIS

I have enclosed a map (dated August 19, 1994) of the project area showing preliminary alternative alignments which are being investigated by our consultant. As part of our early scoping efforts, we would appreciate any comments, concerns, or information which your organization may have regarding these alignments.

If you have any questions, please call Mr. Ronald Tsuzuki, our Head Highway Planning Engineer, at (808) 587-1830.

Sincerely,



Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation

Enclosure

cc: WSU



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96855-5410

September 12, 1994 10:23 AM '94

ATTENTION OF

Planning Division



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Haleakala National Park
P.O. Box 519
Maunaloa, Maui, HI 96768

October 25, 1994

Rex Johnson, Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-6087

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway Project (Project No. HPS-9203-1). The information provided in your letter dated September 1, 1994 was not sufficient to provide an evaluation at this time. Once detailed plans have been developed, the Corps will need to review the project to determine Department of the Army permit requirements and evaluate flood hazard designations as applicable under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Insurance Program.

Sincerely,

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

RECEIVED
SEP 15 9 54 AM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

RECEIVED
SEP 13 2 22 PM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING SECTION

RECEIVED
OCT 25 9 53 AM '94
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
HONOLULU

Dear Mr. Johnson:
Thank you for the invitation to the October 26, 1994 scoping session for the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway. Due to the temporary absence of Haleakala National Park Superintendent Don Reuser and several other key staff, we are unable to attend this session. However, we hope to be involved as consultants as the proposed development evolves. Please accept the following comments in lieu of our attendance at tomorrow's meeting.

Alternative 8 and 8A pass through or very near what is generally recognized by biologists as one of the most intact and diverse lowland dry forests remaining in the Hawaiian Islands that contains a number of listed or proposed endangered plant species recognized by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, i.e., the Pu'u-ohai-lea flowers. The other alternative to the west appear to pass through areas of relatively little known biological value and hence may be more acceptable from that perspective versus the alternatives to the east.

Direct displacement of dryland forests in this area by highway easements are not the only threats posed by the proposed development. However, non-native plants and animals and the effects of wildfire are other severe causes of loss. It is well known in Hawaii that the preponderance of wildfire are human-caused. In general the native shrublands that persist in this region are nearly invariably found in areas of rough 'a'a lava. However, the fire history of this region has been shown that even in these discontinuous fuels, fire fed by surrounding or intermixed slash fuels (principally alien grasses and kiawe) burns aggressively despite of barriers more than 60 feet wide, e.g., Honopitane Highway. Increased public access to areas that are peripheral to dryland forests may affect them by increasing fire frequencies in the region -- a severe perturbation.

Our assessment that the more western alternative routes may be "generally more acceptable" from a biological perspective is somewhat subjective, because these are private ranchlands without easy legal access. The private lands are largely unexplored and relic populations of endangered species may be found among any of the proposed routes. Hence these areas largely lack the basis of biological survey which would allow approval or disapproval of particular routes on that basis. Scientists of the National Park Service and the National Biological Survey have a strong interest in assisting exploration of the proposed alternatives so that values at risk can be identified and appropriate mitigation efforts made in the planning and route selection process.

Road planners recognize that without stringent limited-access rules road development is the purveyor of a sequence of growth. We recommend considering the proposed roadway carefully as to centralize development, thereby providing some protection to Maui's rural and wild areas.

Sincerely,
Karan Ardoin
Karan Ardoin
Acting Superintendent

RECEIVED
OCT 31 11 30 AM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING SECTION

JOHN WAIKIE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5077
December 1, 1994

REX D. JOHNSON
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
KANAHEI MOLT
GLENN H. OKUMOTO
JUSTICE T. OLSON
CALVINIAL TSUDA
BY REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.3757

RECEIVED

DEC 2 1994

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Ms. Karen Ardoin
Acting Superintendent
Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Haleakala National Park
P.O. Box 369
Makawao, Hawaii 96768

Dear Ms. Ardoin:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your comments of October 25, 1994, regarding the preliminary alignments being investigated for the subject highway project.

As the project progresses, we will send to the National Park Service, notices of public informational meetings/public hearings, and environmental documents for review and comments.

Sincerely,

Rex D. Johnson
Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Umemori Engineering, Inc.



US Department
of Transportation
Federal Aviation
Administration

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE

AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE
BOX 50244
HONOLULU, HI 96850-0001
PHONE: (808) 541-1243
FAX: (808) 541-3462

OCT 7 10 47 AM '94

October 6, 1994

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This is in response to your September 1, 1994 letter regarding the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway Project. The FRA has no facilities in the proposed project area; however, we would appreciate being kept informed during the environmental process particularly as the highway project relates to improved access to Kahului Airport.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,

David J. Weinhause

David J. Weinhause
Airport Engineer/Planner
Henry A. Suida
Airports District Office Manager

RECEIVED
OCT 10 4 10 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 11 1 17 PM '94
HIGHWAY DESIGN
PLANNING BRANCH

JOHN WAHDEE
CONTROLLER



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES

SEP 23 1 43 PM '94

ROBERT P. TAKUSHI
COMPTROLLER

LLOYD L. UEBASAMU
DEPUTY COMPTROLLER

LETTER NO. (P) 1840.4

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
P. O. BOX 111, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

SEP 23 1994

RECEIVED
OCT 3 1 40 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Honorable Rex Johnson
Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Subject: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
Pre-Environmental Assessment

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. Our concern is that Alternative Alignments 2, 4 and 6A which connect to Lipoa Parkway/Street will funnel additional traffic adjacent to the existing Kihel Elementary and Intermediate Schools.

Should there be any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. Ralph Yukumoto of the Public Works Division at 586-0488.

Very truly yours,

Robert P. Takushi
ROBERT P. TAKUSHI
State Comptroller

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 3 1 11 PM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

SEP 27 10 15 AM '94

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
241 DULANEY FIELD ROAD, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96814-4049

September 23, 1994

Engineering Office

Honorable Rex Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
Alii'aimoku Hale
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Subject: Kihel Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the above mentioned project.

We have no comments to offer at this time regarding the project.

Sincerely,

Edward V. Richardson
Edward V. Richardson
Major General
Hawaii Air National Guard
Adjutant General

RECEIVED
SEP 28 12 37 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

NATIONAL GUARD
HAWAII AIR NATIONAL GUARD
Honolulu, Hawaii

COMM-FM
5010-108



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P. O. BOX 2194
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

RECEIVED
SEP 27 1 47 PM '94

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
P. O. BOX 3378
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
P. O. BOX 3378
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

RECEIVED
OCT 9 2 43 PM '94

IN REPLY, PLEASE REFER ME
TO FILE NO. 94-193/epo

RECEIVED
OCT 10 11 05 AM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

September 30, 1994

September 29, 1994

MEMO TO: Honorable Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
FROM: Herman M. Aizawa, Ph.D., Superintendent
Department of Education
SUBJECT: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203

The Honorable Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation
State Department of Transportation
869 Puchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097
Dear Mr. Johnson:
Subject: Early Scoping Efforts
Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)

We have reviewed the preliminary alternative alignments being investigated for the subject highway and have no comment as to which is preferred. However, we believe consideration should be given to the amount of traffic generated which may affect Kihei Elementary School on Lipoa Street and Kihei II Elementary School on Pilihi Highway near the intersection of Alternate 6B. The new King Kekaulike High School near the mauka intersection of Alternate 4 would also be affected.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the subject project. We have no comments to offer at this time, but we would like to receive the Environmental Assessment to review when it is completed.

Should there be any questions, please call the Facilities Branch at 733-4862.

HMA:AH:hy
cc: A. Suga, OBS
R. Muzakami, MDO

Sincerely,
Peter A. Sybinsky
Peter A. Sybinsky, Ph.D.
Director of Health

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

JOHN W. ARUE
DIRECTOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

PO BOX 611
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96809

SEP 27 1994

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1 45 PM '94

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

RECEIVED
OCT 24 10 38 AM '94



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
33 SOUTH KING STREET, 8TH FLOOR
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

The Honorable Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

RE: HWY-PA 2.2552
Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)

My staff has reviewed the subject matter. From the limited information provided, Alternative 1 appears to be the more acceptable site. The highway would be constructed for most of its length in areas that have had high vegetative disturbance, and would be impacted the least biologically when compared to the other alternatives. Alternative 1 would provide the best service to the upcountry residents by hooking up to Hallimale Road. Of course, a more thorough biological survey will be needed and we will be able to provide substantial comments at that time.

Very truly yours,

Keith W. Arue
KEITH W. ARUE

cc: DOFAW
OCEA

RECEIVED
OCT 7 2 45 PM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

REF: HP-JEN

MEMORANDUM

OCT 20 1994

LOG NO: 24680
DOC NO: 9410KD05

TO: The Honorable Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation

FROM: KEITH ARUE, Chairperson and
State Historic Preservation Officer

SUBJECT: Historic Preservation Review of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui
Highway Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)
HAWAII DISTRICT, MAUI (FILE NO. HWY-PA 2.2552)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the schematic plan of eight alternative alignments for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway. The proposed routes connect Pihani Highway (four alternate locations), with Kula Highway (six alternate locations). Distance of the alternate routes varies from 8.59 to 9.72 miles east-west. The various routes are within a zone approximately 12 miles north-south, and they transect at least fifteen different ahupua'a.

In general, very little inventory survey work has been conducted in the undeveloped areas between Kula and Kihei. Sugar cane cultivation has occurred in Pulehuni and areas transected by ALT. 1 and the upper section of ALT. 2. Much of the area transected by the other routes has been ranch lands, with varying amounts of land surface alterations.

Site density in much of the relatively dry area between 400 and 1200 feet elevation is not expected to be high. However, traditional Hawaiian sites such as mauka-makai trails and associated temporary shelters, ahupua'a boundary walls, burial caves, special purpose resource gathering sites, and dry land agricultural features would be expected to occur in areas not



University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Environmental Center
A Unit of Water Resources Research Center
Crawford 317 • 2350 Campus Road • Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822
Telephone: (808) 956-7361 • Facsimile: (808) 956-3980

October 8, 1994
PH:0086

RECEIVED

OCT 13 1994

WARREN S. JENSEN ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Rex D. Johnson
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Pre-Planning Consultation
Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

The referenced document describes potential road alignments for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project. The document provided six alternate routes for the proposed project.

This review was conducted with the assistance of Richard Hayer, Maui Community College/Geography; and Chris Welch, Environmental Center.

Our reviewers found the proposed route alignments interesting, yet could discern no basis for the selection of these particular routes. Were the routes picked on the basis of topography only or were there other factors involved (such as land use consideration)? In order to fairly evaluate whether the seven choices given are indeed the "best seven choices", the criteria for ranking the particular alignments need to be defined.

In weighing the seven alternatives, our reviewers found four critical parameters necessary for evaluation: visitor trips, recreational usage by residents, transits to and from work, and travel between Kihei Industrial Park and the Haleakala Summit. The pertinent points in optimizing the location of the road would be for gas and time savings during the above mentioned operations.

Of course, other considerations come into play when deciding the best route. Alignments six and seven obviously do not optimize for travel time or gas savings except to a very select population. Further, these routes potentially have a substantial impact on the rural atmosphere present in the Kula area. The limitations of such alignments, in terms of time, fuel, and social impact need to be clearly spelled out in the Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Rex D. Johnson
Page 2

disturbed by modern farming or ranching. Historic period ranching features over 50 years in age will also be present.

A number of historic sites are known to exist in the major gulches of Kula, to the west of Kula Highway. Sites such as Hawaiian petroglyphs, burial caves, and habitation shelters occur in Kalupulani, Kaliahuni, Puhau, Kapapa, Waiakea, and Aiea Gulches. Known heiau sites occur on ridges to the west of Kula Highway in Cma'opio, Waiakea, Keokea, Waiohuli, Kaonohu, and Kamaole. The known heiau occur at elevations ranging from 1600 to 2800 AMSL. Upper portions of ALT. 4, 5 and 6 are in this general area of Kula.

Systematic surveys have occurred in Waiohuli and Keokea (ALT. 6A), where numerous historic sites associated with permanent habitation, agriculture, and ceremonial activities have been identified. Archaeological surveys conducted within relatively confined areas in Kamaole and Kanahena (ALT. 7) have confirmed the presence of permanent habitation and intensive agriculture in these areas as well.

A more detailed map of the proposed alternate routes will be needed in order to determine where specific routes are located in relation to the known historic sites. This level of work would be included in the scope of an archaeological overview, which would be part of the Environmental Impact Statement. Aerial reconnaissance and on-ground pedestrian survey work will also be needed, as the alternate route selection proceeds.

The location of known sites with preservation value in relation to proposed routes should be done in early planning stages so that these sites can be safely avoided. Likewise, it is preferable to identify areas with high site densities and/or significant cultural resources in early stages of planning.

Please contact Ms. Theresa X. Donham at 243-5169 if you have any questions.


KD:jen

Mr. Rex D. Johnson
October 8, 1994
Page 2

Our reviewers suggest that another heretofore undescribed alternative would be the construction of several feeder roads to the main road going up from Kihel. Currently, the Lipoa Street intersection is very heavily used. Compressing all of the traffic from upcountry through this junction is problematic. Since much of the traffic originates in Wailea, the alternative of providing a feeder to the Wailea resort should be considered. Thus, both Kihel and Wailea would be served and both would be impacted to a lesser extent (for example alternative 6B and the Lipoa Street connection would merge near Kihel). Consideration of a similar operation should be undertaken for the junctions near Hailewaile, Kula, Pukalani, and Makavao.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,


John T. Harrison
Environmental Coordinator

cc: OEQC
Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc. ✓
Roger Fujioka
Richard Mayer
Chris Welch

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
LINDA CROCKETT LINGLE
MAYOR
TELEPHONE 243-7888
OCT 27 2 25 PM '94



OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
HONOLULU, HAWAII
COUNTY OF MAUI
PLANNING BRANCH/HAULUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96788

October 18, 1994

RECEIVED
OCT 26 1 40 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU DIVISION

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
866 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-6087

Dear Mr. Johnson: Rex,

RE: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway Project No. HDPS-9203(L1)

In your letter to me dated September 1, 1994, you identified the major activities which were to be accomplished in the planning study and asked for our comments and concerns. My Planning Director had responded earlier on September 19, 1994, identifying those items which were of particular interest to his Department. I thought, however, that I would stress some issues of more general impact or concern.

In the scoping portion of the project, I believe we need to ensure an understanding of the socioeconomic effects of the road. In particular:

- The ability to live and work in the Upcountry environment will be enhanced. The shorter commute to both Kihel and Lahaina will provide better access to markets and jobs for farmers, craftsmen and employees.

- The selected route should be one to benefit both the present residents, as well as future residents. The development of the Hawaiian Homelands which extend from Keokea to Kihel must be considered. We need to ensure that the route chosen either connects to the Keokea Homelands or provides for a relatively inexpensive access to these homelands.

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
October 18, 1994
Page 2

The preservation of the lifestyle is also very important in selecting the route. A minimum of disruption to agricultural lands, especially cane lands is very important.

When considering the environmental impact of the project, we felt that the effects could be very large and wish that several issues be reviewed in detail.

This is a major interconnecting highway and will profoundly impact the character and timing of development at both ends of the highway. The statement must adequately address the change in the direction of community growth implied by construction of this highway.

The road will allow people to transit easily between the Upcountry rural home environment and the coastal urban work environment. The environmental statement should address the long-term effects of such a transportation system and identify or implement measures to improve energy efficiency and reduce environmental effects. We feel that bikeways and Park & Ride facilities need to be addressed.

I appreciate the work of your staff in this process, and I am hopeful that we can continue to progress on this very important project.

Please call me if you would like to discuss my comments in more detail.

Sincerely,



LINDA CROCKETT LINGLE
Mayor, County of Maui

NP:js
c:\letter\1201

Council Chair
Goro Hokama
Council Vice-Chair
Dennis Y. Nakamura
Council Members
Lynn Biron
Patrick S. Kawano
Lisa L. Lee
Michael "Junior" Moniz
Thomas P. Mouton



COUNTY COUNCIL
COUNTY OF MAUI
200 S. HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
September 12, 1994

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
TELEPHONE: 255-5000
FAX: 255-5000

Xao R. Fuhuta
Director of Council Services

SEP 14 10 35 AM '94

RECEIVED
SEP 15 9 54 AM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Mr. Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

SUBJECT: KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)

Thank you for your letter dated September 1, 1994, soliciting comments regarding the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway.

I have sent copies of your letter to the chairs of the Council's Planning Committee and Public Works Committee, for their comments.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,



Goro Hokama
Council Chair

chr:94D907a.kf

RECEIVED
PLANNING BRANCH
SEP 13 2 22 PM '94
HAWAIIAN HIGHWAY PLANNING BRANCH

Carol Eskin
 Gene Heineke
 Janet Yee-Choi
 Jerry Y. Hultner
 Laurel M. Roberts
 Steve Adams
 Sylvia K. Williams
 Alan L. Lee
 Rick Medina
 Thomas P. Uferow



Director of Council Services
 MAUI COUNTY
 TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

RECEIVED
 SEP 27 10 16 AM '94

Mr. Rex Johnson, Director
 Department of Transportation
 State of Hawaii
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, HI 96813-3097

COUNTY COUNCIL
 COUNTY OF MAUI
 200 S. HIGH STREET
 WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793

September 20, 1994

Mr. Rex Johnson, Director
 Department of Transportation
 State of Hawaii
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, HI 96813-3097

Dear Mr. Johnson: *Rex*

SUBJECT: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 PROJECT NO. HDPS-9203 (1)

Thank you for your letter requesting comments, concerns or information relating to the aforementioned subject matter.

For your information, your letter has been transmitted to the Council for referral to the appropriate standing committee.

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to state our concerns. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 243-7682.

Very truly yours,

Alice

ALICE L. LEE
Councilwoman

ALL:jfo

RECEIVED
 SEP 28 1 34 PM '94
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION
 PLANNING BRANCH



BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY
 COUNTY OF MAUI
 P.O. BOX 1108
 WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793

RECEIVED
 NOV 29 9 06 AM '94
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION

November 21, 1994

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
 Department of Transportation
 State of Hawaii
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Re: Comments on upcoming planning studies for the Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project

Thank you for your request for information and our comments on the upcoming planning studies for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway Project. We are aware of the areas of concern which affect water and deserve inclusion in the analysis for this project such as the following:

1. Water Transmission:

Water concentrates in and on the north slopes of Maui, while the majority of the new land-use approvals occur on the south shores, in the central valley and high on the western valley slope. Therefore, land-use approvals in those areas require and generate water transmission lines which crisscross the leeward from the north to the south. Requirements to pump more water up to water-less areas also grow.


The proposed highway would directly require no new transmission lines. However, the road would be a likely alignment for the future lines which are required to serve land-use approvals. New transmission lines which run to newly-approved projects can have wide effects on land-use pressures and growth under certain conditions. These effects are best reviewed by the Planning Department.

We would be willing to assist with technical support in any masterplanning efforts which are needed to anticipate the side-effects of land-use approvals and our subsequent facilities.

Please be advised that there may be a cost effect also. If a new road or other factors, including existing ones, induce growth at elevations above the existing water sources, the Board may be required to pass the unique, high cost of pumping onto high-elevation consumers. We are researching elevation-related cost and pricing issues now.

RECEIVED
 NOV 29 11 53 AM '94
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 PLANNING BRANCH

"By Water All Things Find Life"



November 21, 1994
Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director, Department of Transportation
Proposed Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway Project, page 2

2. Aquifer Protection:

Also, we suggest that aquifer protection be studied and included as part of the analysis of the highway project. The possible actions and results of petrol-based contamination, especially large container spills should be considered.

3. Water Conservation:

With the involvement of state funds and pursuant to state Act 73, erosion-control and revegetation plantings would be native Hawaiian species. We suggest species which are climate-adapted to the leeward, arid coastal vegetation zone. Such plantings can prevent the overuse of the EPA-standard drinking water of the area's Central water system. Examples are as follows:

- trees -
'Iliwili'i (Erythrina sandwicensis, 20'ht.)
'Hao (Rauwolfia sandwicensis, 20'ht.)
'Ohe makai (Raynoldsia sandwicensis, 20'ht.)
- shrubs -
'Koni (Morinda citrifolia, 20'ht., polynesian intro.)
'Alahe'e (Canthium odoratum, 12'ht.)
'Lama (Diospyros sandwicensis, 12'ht.)
'Maio (Myoporum sandwicense, 10'ht.)
'Kui'i (Nototrichum sandwicense, 8'ht.)
'Ma'o hau hele (Hibiscus brackenridgei, 8'ht., endangered)
'Naupaka kahakai (Scaevola sericea, 6'ht.)
'A'ali'i (Dodonaea viscosa, 6'ht.)
'Ma'o (Gonorrhus tomentosum, 5'ht.)
- Groundcovers -
'Uie (Osteomeles anthyllidifolia, 4'ht.)
'Pohinahina (Vitis rotundifolia, 3'ht.)
'Nehe (Lipochaeta laurum, 3'ht.)
'Nehe (Lipochaeta rockii, 2'ht.)
'Akoko (Lipochaeta succulanta, 3'ht.)
'Akia (Chamaesyce olowaluana, 2'ht.)
'Ohai (Solanum nelsoni, 3'ht.)
'Kalamāio (Wikstroemia uvae-ursi and K. species, 2'ht.)
'Akoko (Sesbania tomentosa, 1'ht., endangered)
'Ohai (Eractostia monticola, 1'ht.)
'Naupaka (Chamaesyce spp., 1'ht.)
'Koko'olau (Scaevola coriacea, 1'ht., endangered)
'Ihi (Biden mauriensis, 1'ht.)
'Ilima papa (Portulaca villosa, 5'-1'ht.)
'Pū'ūhi'iaka (Sida fallax, 5'ht.)
'Ma'u'aki'aki (Jacquemontia ovalifolia, subsp. sandwicensis, 5'ht.)
'Ma'u'aki'aki (Kimblettia cymosa, .5'ht.)

November 21, 1994
Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director, Department of Transportation
Proposed Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway Project, page 3

3. Water Conservation (concluded)

Planting with these or similar species, as site conditions and commercial-availability permit, saves drinking water. The plants survive on the sites' rainfall supplemented with low amounts of irrigation during the first year(s) and summers.

Further guidance in water conservation in landscaping may be found in the attached document or in the Maui County Planting Plan.

4. Water Availability and System Requirements:

The water supply for an irrigation system would require hook-up to the Central Maui water system. The system pulls water from Iao Aquifer. The aquifer is closing in on its maximum safe yield as set by the state Commission On Water Resource Management. Attempts to provide other water to the system have been delayed. Water meters for this project may not be available until new water for the system is developed. No guarantee of water is granted or implied as a result of these comments or the approval of land-use permits, because the Board determines precise water availability only at the time of meter application. The developer may be delayed in receiving water and a meter for the project, even if land-use permits are approved.

Once again, thank you for providing us with the opportunity and the materials to comment on the upcoming studies. If you would like to request further information or comments, please contact us at (808)243-7835.

Sincerely,



DAVID R. CRADDOCK, Director

DDS:svms/bab/np.als
enclosure
copy: B. Miskae

LEIWA CHANCELLER
1994



DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
COUNTY OF MAUI
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SEP 23 10 17 AM '94
COUNTY OF MAUI
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1100 S. HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793

September 19, 1994

Mr. Rex Johnson, Director
State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Re: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)
(HWY-PA 2.2552)

This is in response to your letter of September 1, 1994, regarding the above subject. We have the following comments:

1. The EIS must have a goal and needs assessment which states why this project is necessary and who or what function it will serve. Analysis should show the benefits the county will realize from this road and the criteria used for route selection. Would there be energy savings, a reduction of congestion, get people to jobs in a more efficient manner, how many people commute from which areas of "upcountry" to which areas of Kihai-Makena? What is the cost/benefit per route? Which route would carry the most number of people? Would it be more efficient for travelers from the airport to take this route than Hokuale Highway? Would people from Lahaina travel this route to get to "upcountry"? The EIS should also address the "growth inducement" potential along the alignment and at the terminus. Related to growth inducement would be the potential loss of some family farms because of increased demands to live upcountry and impacts on agriculture.
2. The route selected should connect existing population centers. Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7 would result in little or no savings of mileage/time between Kihai and existing population centers "upcountry" over existing routes. Alternative 6 is likely to encounter a significant number of archaeological sites; mitigation would prove expensive. Avoidance/preservation is preferable to mitigation.
3. Alternative Route 4 provides advantages of convenience to the REX Park and connecting central Kihai to Kula, Pukalani, and Makawao, however, increased traffic on Lipoa Street would need to be considered, and Lipoa Street, its intersections, and entries/exits from Pilihi Highway upgraded accordingly.

BLANW. MURKIE
Director
OWENY. OHANON
Deputy Director

RECEIVED
SEP 25 1 08 PM '94
HAWAIIAN TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING DIVISION

RECEIVED
HAWAIIAN TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING DIVISION
SEP 21 9 14 AM '94

4. The proposed Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, Part II, Policy Recommendations on transportation objectives and policies #2 states: "Support the planning of the proposed upcountry-kihei connector highway with the least negative impact to the upcountry lifestyle and character by locating the upcountry terminus in the vicinity of the intersection at Haliimaile Road and Haleakala Highway." Alternative 3 and 4 terminate in the "upcountry" area, with access from the bypass will allow the major population centers of Makawao, Haliimaile, Pukalani and parts of Kokomo-Haiku easier access to the proposed Upcountry-Kihai road.

5. The proposed Kihai-Makena Community Plan (K-M CP), Part III, Policy Recommendations on transportation policies and objectives states: "Support a new bypass highway mauka of Pilihi Highway, coordinated with a Maalaea-Kealia Pond bypass and an Upcountry-Kihai connector road, to be constructed as growth in the region warrants."

The K-M CP also seems to be consistent with Alignment alternative 2 and 4 which terminates in Kihai at Lipoa Street and Pilihi Highway intersection which is the future intersection of Road "C". The K-M CP under goals, objectives, and policies, on "Land Use" states: "A central business and commercial center for Kihai clustered around the South Kihai Road/Road "C" intersection" would seem a logical point to terminate the upcountry road.


6. One route that is not examined on the alternative alignments is the old county ROW which still shows in the tax map key books. The route may be more cost effective because it would be a shorter route, avoid larger gulches, one overpass may resolve the agricultural traffic conflict, and since the Makai terminus is near the intersection of Hokuale and North Kihai road, it would be more easily service people going to or coming from either Kihai or Lahaina.

If you have any further questions, please call myself or Julie Higa at 243-7735.

Very truly yours,

Brian Higas
Brian Higas
Director of Planning

cc: C. Chashi, D. Schneider, W. Spence, E. Anderson, B. Medeiros,
C. Suyama, J. Higa, File
A:\Upcountry\j



RECEIVED
 OCT 27 10 35 AM '54

RE: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, #HDPB-9203
 Mr. Rex Johnson
 Department of Transportation
 859 Punchbowl St.
 Honolulu, HI 96813-3097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am very interested in the planning process for this proposed road. To me it seems that the best thing would be to have several routes down from upcountry not just one connecting in to lower Pukalani, see attached. To have just one connection to upcountry seems shortsighted. By having just one connection you are just adding to the bottle neck that already exists below Pukalani.

I would like to be kept informed of any public meetings. Will you be able to add me to your mailing list for this project? Thank you.

Sincerely,
[Signature]
 Robert M. Butterfield

RECEIVED
 Oct 28 9 59 AM '54
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION

RECEIVED
 STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION
 OCT 28 2 36 PM '54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

TELEPHONE: (808) 877-0281
FACSIMILE: (808) 871-7663

HALEAKALA RANCH, INC.
HONOLULU

HALEAKALA RANCH
ESTABLISHED 1911

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL & SUGAR COMPANY
PLANNING BRANCH
P.O. BOX 255, PUUNENE, MAUI, HAWAII 96784

RECEIVED
OCT 10 4 10 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

October 5, 1994

Mr. Rex Johnson
Director of Transportation
State Department of Transportation
889 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Re: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway Project No. HDPS-9203 (1)

Thank you for your letter dated September 1, 1994 informing Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S) of the planning studies being done for the proposed Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway Project and requesting our input on the preliminary alternative alignments.

My comments are based on the map that was provided with your letter of August 19, 1994. HC&S' has specifically focused on the various alignment that have a detrimental effect on HC&S' viability.

Alternatives 1, 2, & 3

All three alternative routes traverse through HC&S' lands; lands that are currently in cultivation, therefore, severely disrupting field operations. The physical splitting of the plantation, intersecting canehauler road systems, drip irrigation systems, potential disruption of the major water distribution systems, and adverse effects on current agricultural practices will seriously affect HC&S' operating efficiency. This is a major threat to the future viability of HC&S and ultimately the island of Maui.

Along with the cost to the plantation, significant project costs can also be associated with these alternatives. Costs such as the purchase cost of land right-of-ways, relocating existing drip irrigation supply lines, realigning water transportation systems, canehauler roadways, and highway hauler crossings will significantly add to the cost of this project.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 19 10 00 AM '94
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

October 18, 1994

Ron Tazuzuki
Department of Transportation
Planning Branch
600 Kapiolani Blvd
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: KIHEL-UPCOUNTRY ROAD

Dear Mr. Tazuzuki:

Haleakala Ranch Company prefers that the Mauka connection be somewhere near Kula 200 and the Makai connection through R & T to Lipoa/Piilani intersection.

Yours truly,



Peter D. Baldwin
President

Mr. Rex Johnson
September 28, 1994 - 10/1/94
Page Two

Alternatives 4-Z

All of these alternatives would be acceptable by HC&S since it does not increase our cost of operations. Alternative 4 appears to skirt HC&S' operations and, therefore, does not isolate any cane. Alternatives 5, 6, & 7, which are outside of lands owned by A&B-Hawaii, Inc. will not affect our operations. In our opinion, Alternative 6A appears to be the best route because it is the most direct, the shortest length, crosses the fewest gulches, intersects with pasture lands, and provides access to Hawaiian Homes lands.

As we have consistently stated throughout the State/County Joint Task Force for the Kihel-Upcountry Highway process, HC&S and its parent company A&B-Hawaii, Inc. (ABHI) supports a proposed Kihel-Upcountry highway, provided that the chosen alignment does not interfere with HC&S' operations. This statement is made with full awareness that there are several alternative alignments which do not traverse through the plantation and are considered to be equally, if not more, viable.


Thank you for this opportunity to provide input into the early scoping efforts. As the planning study progresses, we will be awaiting an opportunity to provide more input.

If you have any questions regarding these comments or are in need of additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 877-6902 (phone), or 871-2149 (fax).

Sincerely,



Richard F. Cameron
Plantation General Manager


KULA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
October 10, 1994
P.O. Box 417
Kula, HI 91790

Mr. Rex Johnson, Director
State Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI. 96813-6097

Subject : Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project # HDPS-9203 (1) HWY-PA 2.2552

Dear Mr. Johnson,
Thank you once again for inviting the public into this important process. Our Association appreciates the opportunity to further study this project along with the DOT and all those who might benefit. We know this plane will never fly without widespread community acceptance. To achieve this acceptance it must be shown to benefit the many residents who travel down to work daily in a safe, efficient direction. Military purposes, visitor traffic, and definitely Hawaiian Home Lands are all important concerns, but losing our small farms, awakening our rural communities of Omaopio, Keokea, and Waialoa with the screams of development and transient traffic flows will be unacceptable to a few who live on this mountainside.

CONDITIONS OF OUR SUPPORT

We stand ready to support a final alignment only if:

1. The highway benefits the main upcountry resident commuter population base (Pukalani, Makawao, Haku)
2. Impacts to the future Socio-Economic environment of Kula is minimal
3. The route is safe and efficient (overpasses and underpasses, where needed)
4. Small farms and residents will not be displaced or disadvantaged
5. The route connects directly with Haleakala Highway (to eliminate the potential use of many narrow, steep, neighborhood roads as shortcuts.
6. The Kihel terminal should be located to aid Westside commuters and a future spur road access to the Hawaiian Homes Development if possible.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 17 2 27 PM '94
HAWAIIAN DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

RECEIVED
OCT 14 10 00 AM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

General Comments, Concerns, and Information On Schematic Plan of Alternative Alignments (W Unemered Map Revised Aug. 19, 94)

Alt. 1, 2, & 3

These routes would satisfy most of our conditions if all intersections were made to be safe. The Kula C.A. would favor them in numerical order.

Alt. 1. only intersects Pulehu Rd. and intersects directly into Hailimaile Rd, routing traffic from Makawao and Haiku straight to Kihel.

Alt. 2. crosses both Pulehu and Omaopio but intersects with Hailimaile Rd.

Alt. 3. this route would not benefit as many lacking the efficiency of 1 & 2, crossing both Pulehu and Omaopio, also not connecting with Hailimaile Rd, but meeting most of our conditions

Alt 4, 5, 6, 7

These suggested alignments would fail to meet most or all of the Kula C.A.'s conditions of support for the Kihel / Upcountry Highway

With much thought and debate the Kula C.A. concurs with the distinguished members of the Makawao / Pukalani / Kula Citizens Advisory Committee (Re:Kihel / Upcountry Highway)

And
The Maui County Planning Departments recommendations of the revisions of the M.P.K. Community Plan Update (Re:Kihel / Upcountry Highway.

That ;

Kihel-Upcountry Highway: The proposed highway between Kihel and the Upcountry region is significant in terms of its land use and transportation impacts. The CAC recognized that the selection of an alignment must consider the growth inducing impacts to the region's agriculture, rural character and open spaces. The need to maintain the unique Upcountry ambience is an essential parameter in analyzing alternative routing schemes. Recognizing that the evaluation of alternatives should weigh transportation costs and benefits as well as community and land use impacts, the CAC recommends that the Upcountry terminus intersect Haleakala Highway in the vicinity of Hailimaile Road. The CAC further recommends that a spur off of the proposed Kihel-Upcountry Highway be provided to facilitate access to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands development area.

The Kula C.A. also agrees with both the Upcountry CAC and the Maui Planning Dept. that the Makana-Ulupalakua Connector road be dropped as a capital improvement project thus, all planning, design, and funding be suspended.(ALT 7)

We also believe this route (ALT 7) would benefit very few, worsen traffic safety, disrupt quiet communities, and only benefit visitor traffic and private landowners.

Some citizens in our association do believe the losses outweigh the gains connecting these mauka and makai communities, and funds should be used to improve existing roads and highways to aid the traffic flow between Upcountry and the South / West Side. The Kula C.A. also believes this is a realistic alternative and should be studied.

The Kula Community Association has followed the Upcountry Highway discussions through the Toll Road concept of former Mayor Tavares (Dec. 1990) and the hard work of the Upcountry / Kihel Highway Task Force. We are full aware of the importance of choosing a workable alignment versus one plagued with problems or weighted by special interests.

Thanks again for listening, and could you please forward the origin / destination studies and any reports filed to you on this project to help us stay current.

Much Aloha
Sincerely,



Steve Sutrov
President,
Kula Community Association

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OCT 20 11 22 AM '94
HONOLULU, HAWAII
PLANNING DIVISION
ARCH

October 17, 1994 (2:07 PM '94)
Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Planning Study

RECEIVED
OCT 19 5 12 PM '94
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Rex D. Johnson, Director
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Director Johnson,

Mayor Lingle, County of Maui, has kindly distributed copies of your letter of September 1, 1994, regarding the above subject, to members of the Kihai-Upcountry Task Force. I hope it is appropriate for me, as a Task Force member, to respond directly to your request for comments relative to "early scoping".


Your letter states that the objective of the planning study is to "select an alignment" or as I believe it might also be described -- perform a route-location study. In light of this objective, my experience leads me to question the consultant's intent to include 6A, 6B, and particularly 7 among the "alternatives".

These "alternatives" would seem better described as additional potential highway routes. They appear to serve travel desires largely different from those served by a "Pukalani to Kihai" route as shown on the DOT "Island-Wide Long Range Highway Plan". "Alt 7" is, in fact, shown on the island-wide plan as a distinct, separate route described as the combined extensions of Kula and Piilani Highways.

"Alternative 6A/B", not yet included in the Island-Wide Plan, might provide another useful additional route but, because of the 1500' climb and longer travel distance, probably would be used by very few of the drivers traveling between Haiku-Makawao-Pukalani and Kihai-Wailua -- the high-volume traffic corridor.

Retaining these alternatives in this study would be mixing three steps in the planning process which should be discrete, sequential steps -- island-wide system determination, priority setting, and route-location. Priority, rather than route-location, study should weigh the relative importance of: -serving the heavy travel demand corridor, -serving the future needs of yet undeveloped homelands, -providing an interesting scenic/tourist connection via Ulupalakua.

Of course when the travel benefit/cost comparisons are made "Alternatives" 7 and 6A/B should drop out of serious contention, but why muddy the waters in the first place?

Sincerely,

John W. McDonald
RR2, Box 230C Kula Highway
Kula, Hawaii 96790

copy: Mayor Lingle

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
TRANSPORTATION



Shinwa Golf Group SEP 23 11 03 AM '94

September 22, 1994

Mr. Rex D. Johnson, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Attention: Mr. Ronald Tsuzuki

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Subject: Kihel-Upcountry/Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS 9203 (1)


We are taking this opportunity to respond to your letter dated September 1, 1994, with regards to the planning studies for the proposed Kihel-Upcountry Highway on the island of Maui.

Our review of the proposed alternative alignments, in particular alternatives 3 and 4, leads us to believe that these routes may impact two parcels owned by Shinwa International, Inc. Perhaps, the Schematic Plan of Alternative Alignments prepared by Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., revised August 19, 1994, can be supplemented with a map identifying the parcels affected by these proposed alignments.

Due to the proximity of these proposed alignments, we would appreciate your consideration to be included in any subsequent review processes.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,


Greg Wong
Vice President

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
SEP 29 11 34 AM '94
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

SHINWA GOLF HAWAII CO., LTD. • SHINWA GOLF RESORT SERVICE HAWAII, INC.
2255 Kundo Avenue, Suite 1600 • Honolulu, Hawaii 96816 • Telephone (808) 924-3900 • Facsimile (808) 922-8056

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
400 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5037
October 11, 1994

REX D. JOHNSON
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
KAMAU HOLT
DANIEL OKAMOTO
LARRY O'NEILL
CALVINIA THUDA

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.3146



Memorandum

TO: FILE
FROM: DENEITRA M. GREEN *[Signature]*
DATE: NOVEMBER 2, 1994
RE: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
SCOPING MEETING
OCTOBER 26, 1994, 1:30 P.M.
PB MAKAI CONFERENCE ROOM

IN ATTENDANCE:
DEPT. HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS - LINDA CHINN
MAUI COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS - GEORGE KAYA
MAUI COUNTY PLANNING - JULIE HIGA
DOH, CLEAN WATER BRANCH - DENENDER NA'KALA
SDOT - RON TSUZUKI
SDOT - KENNETH AU
SDOT - OWEN LIU
WSU - WARREN UNEMORI
PB - DAVID ATKIN
PB - DENEITRA M. GREEN
PB - CRYSTAL JOHNSON

Subject: Environmental Scoping Meeting
Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

We will be conducting an environmental scoping meeting with the environmental agencies and other interested parties that are expected to participate in the consultation and coordination of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The purpose of the scoping meeting is to provide a forum to discuss the scope of the environmental studies and EIS that will be prepared for the project.

The meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 26, 1994, at 1:30 p.m. in the office of Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas, Inc., Pacific Tower Suite 3000 at 1001 Bishop Street.

If you have any questions, please call Mr. Ronald Tsuzuki, our Head Highway Planning Engineer, at (808) 587-1830.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation

Enclosure

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was held to consult with appropriate agencies about the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project prior to the preparation of the environmental assessment (EA).

SDOT described the meeting's purpose and introduced the project team.

WSU defined the project location and points of significance, including the Maui R&T Park in Kihei and Science City at Haleakala. The project's history of more than 20 years was described. At least four different studies have been conducted, including the 1970 study conducted by Maui County, the Maui County Toll Road Study, the Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study, and the State/County Task Force Final Report. Eight Build alternatives were presented in terms of their termini, zoning designations, and current land uses.

WSU described the highway's design criteria. The proposed highway would be a rural arterial with limited access. The highway would have a maximum design grade of 7.0 percent. The typical section would require a 160-foot minimum right-of-way consisting of four 12-foot lanes, paved shoulders on either side, and a 30-foot median. The project's design year is 2022.

PB described the environmental process and the major milestones of the project.

PB explained that a coordination and consultation letter was mailed on September 1, 1994 to various agencies and interested parties, requesting data and comments. To date, SDOT has

received some responses to the initiation letter. Subsequent letters were then sent to invite appropriate agencies to this meeting.

The EA is expected to be issued in December 1994. Concurrent with its publication, an Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISP/N) will be published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) Bulletin and a Notice of Intent (NOI) will be published in the Federal Register. This will trigger both the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) processes.

The EA is expected to include the eight Build alternatives previously described, the No-Build alternative, a public transit/TSM alternative, and an alternative which explores the widening of existing roadways. It will identify those areas where impacts could be significant or where the level of impact is unknown. The EA is expected to recommend the preparation of an EIS. Two public information meetings, one in Kihei and one in the Upcountry area, are expected to follow the completion of the EA.

Screening criteria are presently being developed and input on the criteria was requested. Following the completion of the EA, the criteria will be applied to the alternatives to narrow them to three.

After completing the screening analysis, the draft EIS will be prepared. The following topics, among others, will be emphasized:

- farmland conversion;
- archaeology;
- endangered and threatened species;
- traffic impact;
- cost/benefit analysis; and
- social impacts.

The draft EIS is expected to be completed in January 1996. The draft EIS:

- will disclose the results of the screening analysis;
- will analyze the No-Build alternative;
- will analyze the three Build alternatives in detail; and
- will not disclose the preferred alternative.

Public hearings will follow the issuance of the draft EIS. After publication in the OEQC Bulletin and the Federal Register, a 45-day comment period will ensue.

The final EIS will disclose the preferred alternative and respond to the comments received on the draft EIS. The Record of Decision will be approved after allowance of a minimum 30-day review period from the publication date of the final EIS (in the Federal Register).

Parties on the mailing list will receive notices of meetings and the draft and final EISs. Today's meeting attendees are automatically included on the list. Suggestions of additional names for inclusion on the list should be made in writing to the Chief (SDOT) or by phone to Ron Tsuzuki (SDOT).

A comment sheet provided an avenue for the participants to express relevant concerns.

Finally, the scoping meeting concluded with general discussions, summarized below:

Comment: Since "directness to Haleakala" is one of the listed screening criteria, "access to the Maui R&T Park" should be included as a criteria.

Question: The State/County Task Force recommended that a spur be constructed to provide access to the Hawaiian Home Lands. Will this be included in the project?

Response: No. The spur does not satisfy the project's objectives.

Question: Does the Hawaiian Home Lands have plans for their area?

Response: Yes.

Comment: Alternative 6 would provide access to Hawaiian Home Lands from Upcountry.

Comment: Maui County Public Works Department has received calls concerning impacts to small family-owned farms.

Response: WSU explained that Alternative 4 would be the only alignment to traverse a small, family-owned farm parcel. Presently, the land is not being farmed but is being used for limited grazing.

Comment: The Kula Community Association wants the Upcountry terminus located below Pukalani.

Response: Engineering and traffic limitations may not make this alignment as feasible as others.

Question: When will the screening analysis be completed?

Response: The screening process will be completed in February or March, 1995.

Question: Will there be another public opinion survey, similar to the one that the Task Force administered?

Response: No. However, the public input process is ongoing. There will be opportunities for the public to comment, including the meetings to be held after issuance of the EA and the public hearings on the draft EIS.

Comment: A recommendation was made to change the Kihei terminus of Alternative 4 from the Maui R&T Park at Lipoa Street to Kaonoulu Street. This revision would better serve commuters from Lahaina.

Response: Comment to be considered.

DISTRIBUTION:

Meeting Participants
Herb Tateishi
Werner Beuggert



Memorandum

Memorandum to file
Page 2
10/31/95

Commenter - Susan Ray, South Maui Chiropractic Group

Supports Alternative 5 because of its cost. Why is the cost of Alternative 5 so much less than the others?

Commenter - Kenny Barr

Proposed highway would benefit Upcountry residents commuting to Kihei, Lahaina, or Wailea. Therefore, supports Upcountry terminus near Pukalani Bypass and Kihei terminus at the Maui R&T Park or further north.

Commenter - Phil Christopher Realty

Will costs associated with each alternative be modified to include land acquisition?

Commenter - Gene Thompson, Sun Maui Times

Questioned Hawaiian Home Lands opposition to constructing proposed highway. Thought it facilitated development of Hawaiian Homes parcel Upcountry.

DISTRIBUTION:

K. Au - SDOT
S. Chang - SDOT
B. Siarot - SDOT
W. Unemori - WSU
D. Hutchinison - PB
D. Atkin - PB
W. Beuggert - PB
W. Yoshioka - PB

TO:

FILE

FROM:

DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON *gmh*

DATE:

OCTOBER 31, 1995

RE:

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
OCTOBER 18, 1995: 7:00 P.M. PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
KIHEI SCHOOL CAFETERIUM

IN ATTENDANCE:

SDOT HIGHWAY PLANNING - RON TSUZUKI
SDOT MAUI DISTRICT - BOB SIAROT
WSU - WARREN UNEMORI
WSU - DARREN UNEMORI
WSU - CLIFFORD N. MUKAI
PB - DAVID ATKIN
PB - DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON

Approximately 35 meeting attendees (see sign-in sheets--attached)

MEETING SUMMARY:

The following summarizes oral comments presented during the public information meeting held at the Kihei School Cafeterium on October 18, 1995.

Commenter - Caita Ekood, Kihei Community Association

Enthusiastic about the project and supports the link between the Maui R&T Park and Science City at Haleakala.

Commenter - Greg Vainowski

1. Estimated that about 1,500 Upcountry residents presently commute to work daily, traveling 42 miles one-way.
2. People would need the proposed highway as growth and expansion of the Upcountry area continues into year 2020. As homes are built Upcountry, residents will need to travel to Kihei for hotel/tourist-related jobs.
3. Favors Alternative 5.

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 18, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
KIHEI SCHOOL CAFETORIUM**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE #
21	Sam Maumau	TROOP 55 B.S.A.	116 Koki St	871 3842 (PGR)
22	Channing Malaboff	TROOP 55 B.S.A.	382 Kinalio Rd	879-8097
23	Doug Webber	TROOP 55 B.S.A.	160 Keonekai Rd 4-206 Khei	874-7471
24	Robert Leonese	Self	Maui Meadows	
25	Susan S. Ray	S. Maui Chiropractic Group	2180 Haukai Place Kihai	875-4603
26	Jenny Barr	Maui Planning Commission <i>Small Maui</i>	P.O. Box 1637, KIHEI	879-650
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 18, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
KIHEI SCHOOL CAFETORIUM**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE #
1	WILL WILKINSON		3150 MAHEKAU RD KIHEI 9013	875-1375
2	Gloria Ackerman	Kihei Community Assoc	760 S. Kihei Rd # 201 Kihai	871-5266
3	Donald Kenyon		2169 ALUNA PL KIHEI	879 0665
4	CAROL FLOOD	KIHEI COMM ASS.	175 W. KIHEI RD KIHEI	877 1510
5	John Thompson	Self	2531 S. A. Linn, Kihai	877-2211
6	J. Malaboff	Self	39 Hale Mahu Pl Kihai H	669 5224
7	Elias Young	Troop 55 Scouts	215 Humana Pl.	874-4000
8	Patricia Roberts	Troop 55 B.S.A.	67 Ponihi	874-2101
9	Jessie Miller	Troop 55 B.S.A.	2740 Kaula St	874-3154
10	Jack Jones	Troop 55 B.S.A.	307 Kaula St	874-1112
11	Ken Moxham	Assoc. Technicians & Engineers	1871 Kilauea Loop Kihai	874-8040
12	Eve Anderson	Self	Maui Meadows	
13	Grian Perry			
14	LARRY BRIDGES	MAUI COUNTY PLANNING	250 HIGLEY WAY KIHAI	243-7735
15	Steve Vainowski	Steve Vainowski	1277 Kaula St Kihai HI	871-5770
16	John Thompson	Self	2531 S. A. Linn, Kihai HI	877-2211
17	Phil Christensen	Self	P.O. Box 2001 Kihai	871-7801
18	Phil Christensen	Phil Christensen Faculty	P.O. Box 38 Kihai	874-0106
19	Julie Goya			
20				

Memorandum



TO: FILE

FROM: DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON *[Signature]*

DATE: OCTOBER 31, 1995

RE: KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
OCTOBER 17, 1995; 7:00 P.M. UPCOUNTRY PUBLIC MEETING
UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER

IN ATTENDANCE: SDOT HIGHWAY PLANNING - RON TSUZUKI
SDOT MAUI DISTRICT - BOB SIAROT
WSU - WARREN UNEMORI
WSU - DARREN UNEMORI
WSU - CLIFFORD N. MUKAI
PB - DAVID ATKIN
PB - DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON

Approximately 80 meeting attendees (see sign-in sheets--attached)

MEETING SUMMARY:

The following summarizes oral testimony presented during the public information meeting conducted by the State Department of Transportation.

Commenter - Richard Cameron, Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Plantation Gen. Manager
Please see attached written comments.

Commenter - Charles Maxwell, Waiahuji Community Association

1. Alternative 6 was never part of the task force report.
2. Preference for a route that would touch the bottom of the Hawaiian Home Land property without taking Hawaiian Homes land.
3. Considers the "No Build", with widening improvements to existing roadways, a viable and possibly less expensive alternative than the build alternatives.

Commenter - Dan Evert

1. Concerned about the No Build not passing the screening analysis.

*Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence*

**KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 18, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
KIHEI SCHOOL CAFETORIUM**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE #
41	JAMES AARON		1450 S. KIHAI RD. #209	874-3931
42	Jack KERR		2531 S. K. RD. #2502	875-2508
43	SHAUN YUEN	TROOP 55 BSA.	500 KAWAHINE ST.	874-7358
44	CALOB RIVERA	" "		
45	ROBERT RIVERA	" "		
46	RAMON GARCIA	" "	213 HUMUPELA PL.	874-4020
47	KITTI FORD			
48	STEWART FREN			
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				

2. Suggested using telecommunications and high-tech communication improvements to reduce the need to travel between Maui R&T Park and Science City.
3. An update to the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan has just recommended maintaining the rural characteristics of the Upcountry area. The roadway would disrupt this way of life.

Commenter - Mary Evanson, Maui Conservation Council

Requested better maps in the draft EIS than were provided in the EA.

Commenter - Dick Mayer, Upcountry Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Vice-Chair

1. The presentation did not reference the alignment alternative for the roadway which is contained in the recently released CAC version of the update to the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan. The CAC recommended an alignment similar to Alternative 2, with its Upcountry terminus near Halimaile Road and the Kihei terminus near the Maui R&T Park.

2. Strongly supported the No Build alternative and wanted it considered a viable alternative throughout the development of the EIS.

3. Would like the project to consider the possibility of relocating defense operations from the Maui R&T Park to a site closer to Science City, or use telecommunications to reduce need for travel.

4. Is this an official scoping meeting? If not, you must have an official scoping meeting in case of a legal challenge.

5. Need to update 1991 and 1992 numbers used in the EA to reflect 1995 figures.

6. Clarify whether project is a four-lane or two-lane highway, and whether the construction costs being provided correspond to the four-lane or two-lane concept. The EIS will need to address cost of the four-lane highway. The cost estimate needs to include right-of-way costs and looks low.

7. The real reason for the road is tourist travel. Hopes that the EIS addresses impact of tourist travel through rural area.

8. Concerned about increased accessibility that the roadway will bring to the area. Crime is three to four times higher in Kihei than Upcountry and therefore road will increase crime rate Upcountry.

Commenter - Nancy Gillingham

1. On a scale of 1-10, what is the likelihood of the roadway being built?
2. If the project is not built within the next four years, will the project disappear?

3. How many residents live Upcountry and work in Kihei? Is there a need for the project? How many people travel between the Maui R&T Park and Science City? What are the future travel projections? Have there been travel studies? Will the State calculate the cost per commuter or scientist?

Commenter - Richard Pohle

1. Disagrees that there is a linkage need between Maui R&T Park and Science City.
2. Thinks that the true reason for the proposed roadway is to get Upcountry residents into Kihei.
3. While he supports the project, he believes that voters should determine whether the project should proceed via referendum.

Commenter - Sally Raisbeck

1. Believes that there is not enough traffic between Science City and Maui R&T Park to justify building a highway. The EIS should be very specific about the levels of the Maui R&T Park and Science City traffic; the number of people who would use the roadway; and time savings as compared to the No Build alternative. Sensed that there would be only a small travel time savings that would benefit only a few people.
2. Thought it might be less expensive to shuttle people between the two locations via helicopter.
3. Future expansion of the Upcountry area is limited because of Haleakala National Park.

Commenter - Calvin Nemoto, Pukalani Community Association

Questioned whether federal funds would be contributed if the No Build alternative were selected, and whether payment would be an 80% (federal)/20% (State) split.

Commenter - John McDonald, Kula Community Association

Requested greater analysis of the benefit/cost ratio. Wanted benefit/cost analysis included in the future studies. Recommends that the selected alternative be the most cost effective.

Commenter - Sidney James

Is it true that if Kihei-Upcountry Highway is built, Puunene Bypass will not be built?

Commenter - Phil Mulligan

1. Challenged survey that showed only 3 percent of population opposing the road. In general, Kula residents don't want the roadway. Therefore, the percentage of residents opposing the project must be greater than 3 percent.
2. Objects to roadway because of resultant adverse impacts.

Commenter - Steve Sutor, Kula Community Association

1. Which highway improvements will be included in the No Build alternative?
2. Is Alternative 7 part of the No Build alternative?
3. The Kula Community Association voted in favor of building a new roadway two years ago. At that time, they favored an alignment with an Upcountry terminus near Halimalie Road, similar to either Alternative 1 or 2. Now a roadway might be favored that has its lower terminus facilitating travel to Lahaina. However, since new members now sit on the board, they will need to re-vote on whether they favor the road or the No Build alternative.

Commenter - Masami Hironaka

1. Project could resemble H-3 project on Oahu and experience cost overruns. Link between Maui R&T Park and Science City is not the true justification for constructing the road since very few commuters would actually use the road, just as the defense-related reason was not the true reason for building the H-3 project. The real reason for the proposed highway is to help get tourists and residents around.
2. Senator Inouye has secured federal funds. If Maui residents don't want the road now, federal funding may be lost, and the island may not get a new roadway later when it is really needed.

Commenter - Laura Paresa, registered nurse

Quite concerned about access and response time for emergency medical service vehicles reaching accidents that might occur along the alignment.

Commenter - unknown

1. What is the actual cost of each alternative as a four-lane highway?
2. The project does not have to be constructed simply because funding is available. The Senator will not support a project the community does not support.
3. Level of social impact on Kula would be severe for the residents who live there. An urban environment would be introduced into an existing rural one.
4. The Omaopio area, in particular, would be most severely impacted. Since there could be an intersection between Omaopio Road and Kihei-Upcountry Highway, Omaopio Road

would have to handle increased traffic if the proposed highway is constructed, and since Omaopio Road is only 14 feet wide, there are safety concerns with respect to increased traffic volumes.

5. How much use would the proposed highway actually get?
6. How much travel time would the proposed highway save?

Commenter - Kenneth Okamura

1. Concerned about the impacts to agricultural activity Upcountry, the State's premier area for flowers and vegetables.
2. Disputes statement in EA, Section 3.1, which states that the project "might enhance farming." Sees proposed road as having only adverse impacts on farming. Predicts that the road would increase housing supply and water demand; accelerate the loss of agricultural lands; cause more tourists to become nuisances to farmers; disturb rural lifestyles; adversely affect access to the harbor for trucks carrying agricultural products from Upcountry via Omaopio Road; and create safety concerns at the intersection of Omaopio Road and Kihei-Upcountry Highway.

Commenter - Steve Burgelin, Casanova, Inc.

1. As a restaurateur, supports the proposed highway and notes that tourism benefits the entire Upcountry community, either directly or indirectly. For example, he stocks his restaurant with produce and flowers from several local vendors. Increased tourism would expand the Kula economy.
2. Is concerned about the pace of the project. Wants the road to open before he retires.
3. Kula is already a bedroom community, and Kula residents already need to commute to non-farm related employment centers. The opportunity for Kula residents to take non-farm related employment would grow with the proposed roadway because Kula residents would have increased access to employment opportunities and roadway congestion would be less.

**KIHEL-UP COUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
UP COUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE#
1	ARIL ARAKAKI	HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS	335 Marchant H. Hon. H. 769	586-3815
2	CAROLYN DARK	" " "	" " "	586 38 21
3	SILVIA TAMMAYANA		650-A Kula HI 96710	878-1933
4	Valia Maui		82 Makani Rd 96768	572-8683
5	Guili Maalili		" " "	" " "
6	SALLY RAISBECK		427 Libelba St Wailuku	244-9604
7	KITII FORD	STEWART FORD CRE	44-23 KANGUE Bay Dr - KANAOHE	235-7600
8	Glenn E Ford	" " "	" " "	" " "
9	MARY EVANSON	Maui Conservation Council	Box 694 Maunaloa HI 96766	578-9724
10	Randall Moore	HC & S	PO Box 266, Punahoa HI	877-6468
11	Das Auloi	DHHL	1063 E. Main St	243-5243
12	Charles K. Maxwell	Waiahoi Comm. Association	157 Alca Place (Kula)	572-8038
13	DAVID KEALA	DEPT OF EDUCATION	504th St Kula HI	242-4403
14	CHRISTINA ALKAI	U.S. UNEMPLOYED	2145 WELLS ST SUITE 403	878-2031
15	Celestine & MASAKI KANDA		685-B Onaopio Rd Kula	878-2789
16	Jaimie Fonseca		105 Kula Kani Dr. Kula	243-7735
17	DAVIN BLAINE	County of Maui	200 S High St - Wailuku	878-3859
18	DENNIS SMITH		96A1 POUPOU KULA	877-3881
19	Warren Suzuki	121 SP Kula Land & Planning Co. Inc.	Kula, Maui	878-6302
20	Edmond Tavares		110 Waihi meke pl Kula	

Memorandum to file
Page 6
10/31/95

Commenter - unknown

Would like to see an additional alignment (Alternative 11) that presents improvements to existing roadways that go beyond the proposed No Build roadway improvements and are not included in the Maui Long-Range Highway Plan.

DISTRIBUTION:

K. Au - SDOT
S. Chang - SDOT
B. Siarot - SDOT
W. Unemori - WSU
D. Hutchinson - PB
D. Aikin - PB
W. Beuggett - PB
W. Yoshioka - PB

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE #
41	JOHN W. HOWIE, JR.		PO Box 601, Puunene, HI	96572-6801
42	Richard S. Howell	Kula Community Assoc	PO Box 417 Kula 96190	878-27151
43	RICHARD AMERSON	H.C.A.S.	P.O. Box 266, Puunene	877-3196
44	Masami Hiramoto		175 Kula Rd Kula 96740	878-3532
45	James F. Hildebrand		143 Hualapai Rd Kula 96740	572-9511
46	Nancy Gillingham		208 Copp Rd Kula 96740	878-1469
47	John W. Hilden		119 Mahalo St Kula	878-1105
48	Natasha Pender		346 Malan Street Pukalani	572-6114
49	Clay Couture		291 Elilani Pukalani	572-3055
50	Melissa Couture	Pukalani Home Assoc	291 Elilani Pukalani	572-3055
51	SEN ANFRY Chumbley		SOT 408	
52	Mike Singalunas		P.O. Box 396 Kula, HI	8786516
53	Steven R. Newhouse		R.R. 2 Box 165 KEOKEA	876 0156
54	Bob Johnson	County of Maui	P.O. Box 575 Hilo, Hawaii	243-7710
55	John W. McDonald	Kula Comm. Assoc.	250C Kula Hwy, Kula	878-6906
56	Gretchen Ladlay		2634 Volani Pukalani	5725552
57	Samuel A. ...		1111 ...	
58	...		P.O. Box ...	
59	...		1508 Pukalani Rd Kula	878-1003
60	Wayne Bradome	farmer	PO Box 1263 Kula HI	878 6785

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	PHONE #
21	Calvin Nemoto	Pukalani Community Assoc	261 Lihoukalanu St, Pukalani 96760	572-8986
22	Brian Perry (Perry)	The Maui News	100 Mahalo St, Pukalani	242-6340
23	Ken Kimura	...	11-3 Box 648 Kula	878-1295
24	Perry O. Azantes	HAWAII OPERATING ENGINEERS EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION FUND	144 Luce Hall Kula 96743	242-9444
25	E. L. Tanji	Hon. H. J.	P.O. Box ...	242-4864
26	Jenny ...	Sol.	P.O. Box 145 Kula	878-6871
27	Nancy ...	Malana Realty	151 Hiwalaui Loop Puk	572-6523
28	Sue Stevens	Kula 205	172 Aulu Dr Pukalani	572-7196
29	CHARLIE JENCKS	COUNTY OF MAUI DEPT		243-7841
30	Rev. David Baar		P.O. Box 427 Kula	878-6082
31	Meredith	P.O. Box 2411 Hwy 400	572-6669
32	1112 ...	878-502
33	...	Comp. Assoc. ...		243-7190
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS / ZIP CODE	PHONE #
81	DICK MAYER	UPCOUNTRY CAS. V-CHAIR	RR1 BOX 518 KULA 96770	875-1874
82	Mahealani	Mahealani Com. Assn.	Box 1203 Mahealani	572-7342
83	MICHAEL MONTGOMERY	SELF	PO Box 1781, Mahealani 96768	572-1780
84	DAN EVERT	SELF	2760 Mahealani Pukalani	572-9741
85	JOHN MATHIAS	UPCOUNTRY A and B	P.O. Box 2446, Mahealani 96768	572-6611
86	WILLIAM D SMITH		P.O. Box 927, WAILUKU 96793	878-6176
87	Cynthia Conrad	-	34 Hualani Loop Pukalani, 96768	572-6548
88	STEPHANIE	CAC	324 ALANI ST Pukalani 96768	572-2611
89				
90				
91				
92				
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				
100				

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
OCTOBER 17, 1995 • 7:00 P.M.
UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER**

PLEASE PRINT

#	NAME	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS / ZIP CODE	PHONE #
61	JOSEPH P COCKE JR.	RESIDENT	372 AULI DR. MAHELANI 96768	572-0222
62	Julie Kaga	Resident / Mahealani	187 Aloh Place 96768	242-7735
63	Clyde Sullivan	Resident	1135 Mahealani Drive	878-6186
64	Laura Pavesa	Resident	27 Aclaa. Rd Pukalani	572-0193
65	TOM & NANCY HOFFMAN	RES.	220 H. AHILAHINA PL, KULA	876-0448
66	Honey Hildebrand	Resident	217 Kula Highway Kula 96740	878-2096
67	David & Sydney Sakuma	Residence	Box 657 Ono Pua Kula 96790	878-1497
68	RY BARBIN	Maui Rep. - Sen. INUIGE	24 N. CALVERT ST, WAILUKU	742-9702
69	NIKH. LANANDA		P.O. Box 1704 MAHELANI 96768	572-8287
70	C. F. GREEP	Puamoa / Kula Assn	P.O. Box 995 Kula 96774	574-5310
71				
72				
73				
74				
75				
76				
77				
78				
79				
80				

BENJAMIN CAYetano
GOVERNOR



KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
JERRY A. WATSUDA
GLENN M. DANOTO

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5087

REPLY REFER TO

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

NOTICE

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS**

The Department of Transportation (DOT), Highways Division announces that it will hold two public information meetings on the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway project. The first will be conducted on May 15, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. at the Upcountry Community Center in Puuhalani. A second meeting will be held the following night, May 16, 1996, at 7:00 p.m. in the Kihei School Cafeteria, (250 Lipoa Street). The meetings follow-up the October 1995 meetings which presented the conclusions of the Environmental Assessment and ten alternative alignments for the proposed roadway. The purpose of the May meetings is to inform the public of the screening analysis that has been conducted since October, and to present the three alternative alignments proposed for detailed study in the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway would be a 15.4 kilometer (9.6-mile) highway that would link the coastal area of Kihei (Pilihi Highway) to Upcountry Maui at either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway. The highway would be generally aligned in an east-west (mauka-makai) direction.

For additional information, please contact Ron Tsuzuki of DOT at 808-587-1830.

Kazu Hayashida, Director
Department of Transportation



Kihei-Upcountry Highway Project Maui, Hawaii

State of Hawaii • Department of Transportation • Highways Division
U.S. Department of Transportation • Federal Highway Administration

Project Description

The Hawaii Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are sponsoring the construction of a rural, limited access arterial roadway that would connect the coastal area of Kihei to the Upcountry area of Maui. The proposed highway would range between 14.1 kilometers (8.8 miles) and 16.9 kilometers (10.5 miles). It would link the coastal area of Kihei (Piilani Highway) to Upcountry Maui at either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway.


Tier One Screening

Criterion	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4A	Alt 4B	Alt 5	Alt 6A	Alt 6B	Alt 7	Alt 8
Design Feasibility	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benefit-Cost (ratio)	0.98	1.00	1.12	0.95	1.41	1.58	0.41	0.26	-0.04	1.14

Tier Two Screening

Criterion	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4A	Alt 4B	Alt 5
Agricultural Impact (cane and pineapple field encroachment (hectares))	55.2	28	32.6	16.4	21.6	5.9
Operations	B	B	B	B	B	B
Cost (\$ million)	3	3	2	2	2	1
Conformance With Community Plans Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Plan Kihei-Makana Plan	N	N	N	N	N	N
Endangered & Threatened Species	1	1	2	4	3	5
Access to Hawaiian Home Lands	W	B	W	B	W	W
Visual Impact (million cubic meters of earthmoving)	2	2	2	3	2	1
	1.5	1.3	1.4	2.4	1.4	1.1

Legend: 1-5 - Best to Worst Y - Yes N - No B - Better W - Worse ~~W~~ - Cause for Elimination



Comments

If you wish to comment, please mail or deliver comments by May 31, 1996, to the following address:

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813



Memorandum

Draft Memorandum to file
June 10, 1996
Page 2

DRAFT

TO: FILE

FROM: DENETRA M.G. HUTCHINSON

DATE: JUNE 10, 1996

SUBJECT: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

DATE & TIME: WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 1996

LOCATION: PUKALANI UPCOUNTRY COMMUNITY CENTER

IN ATTENDANCE: SDOT: BOB SIAROT
SDOT: RONTSUZUKI
WSU: WARREN S. UNEMORI
WSU: DARREN UNEMORI
WSU: CLIFFORD MUKAI
PBOD: DENETRA M.G. HUTCHINSON
PBOD: DAVID ATKIN
PUBLIC: SEE ATTACHED SIGN-IN SHEET

MEETING SUMMARY

SDOT conducted a public informational meeting on the status of the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway project. This meeting was a follow-up to the October 1995 meeting in which ten alternatives were introduced to the public. Approximately 57 individuals were in attendance.

Bob Siarot presided over the meeting that began with introductions of the project team members. Next, Warren Unemori summarized the project's progress and findings to date. David Atkin described the screening analysis and how ten alternatives were screened down to three recommended for study in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

COMMENT SESSIONS

A brief intermission followed the presentation to allow the participants to view the exhibit boards. After 15 minutes, the meeting was opened for comments. Whenever possible, the commentator is identified in parentheses preceding the question or comment.

(Gage Schubert, Kula Glen)

C: Where is the growth in population density projected to occur. Concerned about how the through traffic along Alternative 5 will affect the Kula Glen area.

(Peter Sisco)

C: What is the purpose of the proposed road? Who will it serve?

(Brett M. Klyver, Maui Research & Technology Park)

C: Read written testimony (see attached).

(Richard Kellom)

C: Suggested that Alternative 1 be reconsidered since agricultural impact may not be that important to the future of the island. Considering the cost, Alternative 1 is only \$2 million more costly than Alternative 2. But, Alternative 1 would intersect only one existing roadway (Pulehu Road), while Alternative 2 would intersect two roadways (Pulehu Road and Omaopio Road).

(Steve Sutrov)

C: Ultimately favored the No Build Alternative. However, also felt that Alternative 1 needed to be reconsidered since agricultural impacts should not be so heavily considered. Compared Alternative 1 to Alternative 2 which would intersect two existing roads, to the one road that Alternative 1 would affect.

(Unidentified)

C: Agreed with screening conclusion that Alternative 1 should not be considered. Favors Alternatives 2 and 4B. These two alignments would provide commuters a choice of routes.

(Buck Joiner, Kihei Community Association)

C: Prefers Kihei terminus as far south as possible since existing access to Kihei is via North Kihei only. The Mokuiele/Piilani Highway intersection is presently a choke-point. The proposed Kihei terminus could be a second evacuation route. In the Upcountry area, a preference was made for a terminus above Pukalani, not Haliimaile Junction, which is presently too congested.

(Sam Clark, President of Haiku Community Association)

C: Concerned about future traffic volumes on Kaipakalua Road. This is an older sub-standard road that would not be able to handle additional traffic if Alternative 2 is selected.

(Nancy Hoefken)

C: Favors Alternative 5 because lots of congestion currently exists in Pukalani. Is especially concerned because of the new high school in Pukalani near the mauka terminus of 4B and the students having accidents because they are not experienced drivers.

(Sam Hironaka)

C: Favored Alternative 7 because of low cost, donation of ranch land for roadway, no gulches to cross, the extension of existing Piilani Highway (which has been long-

Draft Memorandum to file
June 10, 1996
Page 3

planned), tourist benefits, far south Kihai terminus, minimal 4.5 miles of highway, and secondary escape route for Kihai.

MEETING ADJOURNED

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: 5/15/96

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

UPCOUNTRY, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
Buck Janner	3043 MALINA KIHEI 96743	Kihei Community Assoc	876-2825
MARSH KASPER DVM	POB 297 Kula 96790	Kula Cop Comm	875-6131
Mary Evanson	PO Box 694 Makiki 96766	SELF	578-9724
Randall Moore	PO Box 266 Paunoi	HC #5	877-6968
ROBERT KIVUK	219 HALANANI ST. PAIKALANI 96768	HC #3	877-6923
Test Street	130 HOLELE PL. MAKI 96762		5731845
DAVID DARLING	RR 2 Box 7 Paunoi 96760	Self	876-1271
THURGOOD-TAHU	PO BOX 510 Kula 96790	SELF	876-1678
LESLY Simpson	PO Box 145 Kula 96790	Self	878-6971
Bill Tom	100 Malanani St. Waihanu 96737	Maui News	242-6360
NIKHILANANDA	P.O. Box 1704 MAKAWAO, 96765-1704	MAUI County/Amunui 2123	572-8787
Tom Morrow	PO Box 2123 Kahului 96732	Maui County Council	243-7674

PAGE 2 OF 5

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: 5/15/96

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

UPCOUNTRY, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
DAVID KEALA	340 ELIZABETH ST. PAIKALANI	Dept. of Education	967-5001
JOEY TAVANAKA	RR 1 BOX 564 Kula, HI 96791		875-1733
BRETT M. KLYVER	PO Box 967, Kihei 96753	Maui Research & Info	875-0856
George Schubert	PO Box 548 Kula 96790	Kula Gen Community	878-1843
Paul Hironaka	PO Box 266 Paunoi 96760	HC #5	877-6981
ANDREW HACKENBACH	973 ANAKA HANALEI 96768		573-3994
Christopher DeWitt	PO Box 511 Hahaione 96738	Operating Engineers Int 3	515-9101
JIM CLARK	60 KAPUNA RD HAIKU 96781	HAIKU Comm Assoc	272-2519
JIM CLARK	"	"	"
William K. Watanabe	275 Kawehi Pl. Kula HI 96790		875-2658
WILLIAM CLARK	33 CROWN RD. WAIHANU 96737		242-707
ANDREW HACKENBACH	PO Box 494 Kula 96790		878-6531

PAGE 1 OF 5

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: May 14, 1976

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING
UPCOUNTRY, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
John A. Alameda	1222 E. Kula Hi 96790	SEPTA	878-2562
Frank Esker	2531 S. Kihei Rd. Kihei HI		878-2758
Steve Thompson	Same	So. Mo. Times	878-2758
Steve Sisk	124 Aiea Kula Rd. Kula 96790	P. C. A. 2000	878-2709
PETER SISCO	111 KOLONANE PL. KULA	UNORGANIZED	878-6749
KENNA CLAYTON	P.O. Box 187 Kula	Maui Land & Dev	871-3875
Kenneth Gordon	223 Ulukani Road Kula		876-6615
Doug & Ellen Kuy	126 Ika Dr. Kula	Retired	878-6604
Tom M. Ellis	157 Ika Dr.		878-6604
LEONARD SATOH	110 KOLONANE PL. KULA	MAUI COMMUNITY	878-2904

PAGE 4 OF 5

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: May 15, 1976

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING
UPCOUNTRY, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
Ken K. Kurawaka	1871 Hui Pa Loop Waiuku 96792	Ausim Teatama Assoc. Inc.	244-8044
John W. M. Donald	2300 Kula Hwy. Kula		878-6756
Paul Vichera	105 Poho Dr. Kula		
Doug Sheehan	" "	Maguire Benoit Co.	878-2877
Manu Mahabates	275 Kawehi Kula		
DE TANIWA	STATE SENATE	STATE	586-7110
KAY KIMURA	P.O. Box 444 Kula HI		878-6631
John M. M. M.	161 Waikeke Pl. Kula HI	Waikeke Kula Co.	878-0105
John F. M. M.	99 Kaulauna St. Waikeke	State Hwy. Road Com.	244-5136
RICHARD F. (Ames)	P.O. Box 266 TULUWENE HI 96784	HCA	877-3195
Anthony DeBose	152A IKA PL. KULA HI 96790	SECT	878-2780
John T. M. M.	P.O. 1417 Waikeke HI	SECT	144-1500

PAGE 3 OF 5

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: 5/15/96

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING
UPCOUNTRY, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
William Spence	256 S. High Street, Kihikihi	Maui Planning Dept	515-7755
Kathy D'Amore	152-A Kea Place		512-7180
Isabel Washburn	116 Moana Dr Kihikihi	paperworks	512-1312
RICHARD LOZAN	763-S KAHANAHANA RD. KIHEI		578-3044
TIM HOFFERKEN	220 H AHINAHINA PL KIHEI		576-0415
Debra Sullivan	PO Box 931 Kihikihi Maui 96719		215 2174



Memorandum

Draft Memorandum to file
June 10, 1996
Page 2

DRAFT

TO: FILE

FROM: DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON

DATE: JUNE 10, 1996

SUBJECT: KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

DATE & TIME: WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1996

LOCATION: KIHAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

IN ATTENDANCE: SDOT: BOB SIAROT
SDOT: RON TSUZUKI
WSU: WARREN S. UNEMORI
WSU: DARREN UNEMORI
WSU: CLIFFORD MUKAI
PBOD: DENEITRA M.G. HUTCHINSON
PBOD: DAVID ATKIN
PUBLIC: SEE ATTACHED SIGN-IN SHEET

MEETING SUMMARY

SDOT conducted a public informational meeting on the status of the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway project. This meeting was a follow-up to the October 1995 meeting in which ten alternatives were introduced to the public. Approximately 24 people were in attendance.

Bob Siarot presided over the meeting that began with introductions of the project team members. Next, Warren Unemori summarized the project's progress and findings to date. David Atkin described the screening analysis and how ten alternatives were screened down to three recommended for study in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

COMMENT SESSION

As David concluded his portion of the presentation, participants began asking questions. Since this portion of the meeting was unstructured, most comments have not been attributed to individual speakers, but whenever possible, a name is provided.

C: Why is the cost benefit for Alternative 5 so high?

- C: The Kihai terminus be should be placed as far south as possible because of projected growth in the Makena area (similar to Alternative 6B). An alignment near the regional park is preferred.
 - C: The increased noise levels created by the highway would affect the subdivision mauka and north of Kaonolu Street. Favors Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7 because noise impacts on this subdivision would be farther away.
 - C: Two Kihai connections should be considered, one north and the other south. Perhaps alignment should extend in the direction of Wailea.
- (Brett M. Klyver, Maui Research & Technology Park)**
- C: Questioned the State legislative appropriation to study Alternative 7.
- (Buck Joiner, Kihai Community Association)**
- C: Appreciates that Alternative 5 is the least expensive, but is concerned about constructing Alternative 5 because it would deposit large volumes of traffic onto Kimo Drive in the Upcountry area. Believes that Kimo Drive is unable to handle large volumes of traffic.
 - C: Also opposes alignment that would intersect at Halimaile Road because this already congested intersection would worsen.
 - C: Would like to see Kihai terminus as far south as possible.
 - C: Supports Alternative 4B as a way to encourage the counter flow of traffic. Is aware that some oppose because of potential impact to high school, but believes that issues with high school would only occur at the open and close of the school day.
- (Gene Thompson, Maui Sun Times)**
- C: Agrees that an alternative which terminates at the Maui R&T Park is not a good idea. Supports Alternative 5.
 - C: Concerned about cost differential of Alternative 4A vs. Alternative 4B. Does not think the cost is reasonable.
 - C: Kihai terminus should be a far south as possible to provide a back door out of Kihai in the event of disaster (i.e., fire). The road is currently unpassable or closed during bad storms.
 - C: Supports alignment that would use Lipoa Street.
 - C: Requested spur to Hawaiian Home Lands.

- C: Because of the many commuters between Haiku and Makawao, there needs to be a way to reduce travel time. Favors a hybrid Alternative 1/Alternative 2, but not at the expense of traversing the Maui R&T Park.
- (William Spence, Maui Planning Department)**
- C: Planning Department offered the latest versions of community plans for analysis. Upcountry community favors alternative in the vicinity of Haliimaile Road.
- C: Recognized A&B planned development along Omaoio Road.
- C: EIS should address visual and secondary impacts since the highway would be more than a connector. It would open up growth in the corridor.
- C: Supports Alternative 4B because it would provide an escape route from Kihei.
- C: Recommended hybrid of Alternatives 3 and 8 (mauka portion of Alternative 8 and makai portion of Alternative 3). It would reduce agricultural impacts.
- C: If the road is moved too far south, would contradict legislative mandate of connecting to the Maui R & T Park.

MEETING ADJOURNED

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: May 16, 1996

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

KIHEI, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT.

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
TACK ESTER	2531 S.K.R. #2502 K.H.		879-2748
Don Williams	1213 1178 Kihikihiki Hwy #193	KCA	284-3040
Sharon Linnell	365 Healeke St. Kihoe	Ch. B. & S. Robinson	879-7415
LILLIE KENNEDY	P.O. Box 1487 Kihoe	KCA	879-5577
Deeja Schlicht	P.O. Box 548 Kula 96792	Kula (KCA) Community Assoc.	878-1543
Walter F. ...	102 Halapua Rd. Kula 96792	"	879-7777
Carla Hart	467 Katalau Pl. Kihoe 96793	KCA	879-3697
DARYL DAVIS	15 KUKI ST., KIHOE, HI 96753	KCA	879-9356

Page 2 of 3

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: May 16, 1996

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

KIHEI, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT.

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
Carol Fland	170 W. IKAHAI PL. KIHOE	KCA	879-1277
DAWE SHEPHERD	3329 KEHALA DR. KIHOE	KCA	879-9372
Mitsumi Hirayama	3490 HOOKIPA PI. KIHOE	-	879-5276
BRETT KLYVER	P.O. Box 967 Kihoe	Maui RPT Park	875-0856
Kitty Lesneski	311 PAKALANA PL., KIHOE	KCA	879-6356
Hank	" " " "	KCA	"
Vivian ...	P.O. Box 495 Kihoe HI 96753	KCA	879-5215
SCIAN MISCHE	268 MEHALA CIRCLE KIHOE 96753		879-2789
NANCY KANADY	2274 S. Kihoe Rd. Kihoe	KCA	879-4598
Annie Kemper	1539 Halapua St. Kihoe 96753	KCA	879-4621
William Spence	250 S. High St., Kihikihiki 96793	Maui Planning Dept	213-7735

Page 1 of 3

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DATE: May 16, 1996

KIHEI - UPCOUNTRY
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING

KIHEI, MAUI

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	ADDRESS	ORGANIZATION	PHONE NO.
Kim O' GALBRAITH	P.O. Box 1728 KIHEI	NONE	8796611
Gloria Adlawan	760 S Kihei Rd #201 Kihei 96753	NCA	879-8266
Robert J. JAMES	2531 So Kihei Rd	S/H TIMES	579-2758
Beak JAMES		KIHEI COMMUNITY ASSN	
Suzanne Miskos	268 William Cir, Kihei		579-2784

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

THE AMARAL COMPANY

Zandra Souza Amaral
365 Hoalike Street
Kohala, Maui, HI 96763

Telephone (808) 879-7445
Fax 1-808-879-7445

MAY 23 2 11 PM '96

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 31 11 38 AM '96
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

May 21, 1996

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: Alternate 2 for the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway above Ohukai Road.

Dear: Mr. Hayashida:

The above mentioned route for the Kihai-Upcountry Highway, is strongly opposed by the Ohukai residents. I, Zandra Souza Amaral appeared on behalf of some of our community members to make clear our objections to this intended route. Our concerns are; but not limited to:

- A. The noise impact on our community.
- B. The history of speeding cars endangering the safety of our children.
- C. The overall safety of our community and our children.

As I stated at the public hearing on May 16, 1996, noise from above the ranch is amplified and is heard clearly in our residential community. At this time the noise is limited to cows and shots from hunters. However, if OUR STATE GOES THROUGH WITH THEIR plans of placing the Kihai-Upcountry route using ALTERNATE 2 (behind the water tank) it would cause severe noise impacts on our community caused by cars racing up and down the highway at all hours of the day and night. Not to mention us having to deal with four buses shuttling tourists at 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning up to Haleakala to view the sun rise. I doubt sincerely that anyone in OUR state government would appreciate being awoken by traffic noise at 4:00 in the morning and we certainly would not appreciate it either.

As a residential community we feel that placing such a highway on Alt. 2 would cause undue hardship and strain as well as cause a problem with safety, on our already strained community. We have had problems with speeding traffic in the past. We felt we alleviated this problem by us successfully working with the Department of Public Works. With the support of our community and Our County's Public Works Committee we were successful in putting "Speed Humps" in place on June 2, 1992.


Again in 1993, we were faced with unsafe conditions. Our homes were burglarized because of security and safety problems being caused by loitering parked cars at the mauka end of Ohukai Road which did not have adequate lighting and street signs. On September 14, 1992 our County Department of Public Works installed two "No Parking Anytime" signs along with a street light." Our community firmly believes that: WORKING TOGETHER WITH OUR GOVERNMENT WE CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

We as a community need to ask, why does OUR state need to place a highway in an area that would affect existing residential communities when they have more viable solutions? Such as routing the highway further into the Makana/Wailea area. Placing the route in the Makana/Wailea areas would have much less impact on existing residential communities. It would also fulfill the goal of our Federal Government in connecting the Haleakala Observatory with the Technical Park. And foremost it would eliminate potential law suites against our state in the event of endangerment and the JISE or LACK OF USE of prudence in planning by our state, thereby costing all of us a lot more money in the long run. Let us not plan for today with no regard for the future, we've done it in the past and we all paid very dearly for those mistakes.

We ask that The Department of Transportation work with us and not use "Alternate 2" for the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway. Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at 879-7445.

We look forward to your expedient response in assisting us in maximizing harmony and security in our communities.

Sincerely,



Zandra Souza Amaral

cc: Mr. Reed Ariyoshi / Oroni Engineering
Mr. Bob Sirori / State Department of Transportation, Kah., HI
Council Members: Mr. Wayne K. Nishiki (Kihai District) and
Mr. Robert M. Monden (Up-Country District)

Request: **NOT** using Alternate 2 as a route for the Kihel-Upcountry Highway.

- REASONS:
- A. The noise impact on our community.
 - B. The danger of speeding cars endangering safety of our children.
 - C. The overall safety of our residential community and children.

Signatures of persons affected by "Alternate 2" for the Kihel-Upcountry Highway.

Approve	Object	Signature	Street Address
X		Zi... ..	365 Houliake Street
X		Sue Ching Nelson	250 Houliake St
X		Mama Bullock	341 HOALIKE ST. KIHAI, HI. 96753
X		Suh... ..	333 Houliake St. Kihai, HI 96753
X		Jeanne L... ..	229 Houliake St. Kihai
X		Alana... ..	324 Houliake St. Kihai
X		Marie... ..	335 Houliake St. Kihai
X		Mary... ..	321 Houliake St. Kihai
X		313 Houliake St. Kihai
X		307 Houliake St. Kihai
X		304 Houliake St. Kihai
X		211 Houliake St. Kihai
X		209 Houliake St. Kihai
X		204 Houliake St. Kihai
X		258 Houliake St. Kihai
X		253 Houliake St. Kihai
X		257 Houliake St. Kihai
X		230 Houliake St. Kihai
X		211 Houliake St. Kihai
X		216 Houliake St. Kihai
X		211 Houliake St. Kihai
X		208 Houliake St. Kihai
X		202 Houliake St. Kihai
X		A. C... ..	314 Houliake St.

Submitted by: Zandra Amara & Kihai Residence
 Street Address: 365 Houliake St., Kihai, HI 96753
 Date: 5/5/96 Phone: 879-7445

Approve	Object	Signature	Street Address
X		509 LAULOA ST. KIHAI, CA 96753
X		359 Houliake St.
X		356 Houliake St.

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
SERIAL MATSUDA
GLENNAL OKAMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2-0788

JUN 25 1996

RECEIVED

JUN 26 1996

WARREN S. UNICORP ENGINEERING, INC.

Ms. Zandra Souza Amaral
The Amaral Company
365 Hoalike Street
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Dear Ms. Amaral:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your input in our planning process. The comments expressed in your May 21, 1996 letter made us aware of the concerns of yourself and your neighbors on the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project and its proposed alternatives. The purpose of an informational meeting is to inform the public of our progress/direction and to solicit opinions that have not made themselves evident or that we were not aware of. Your concerns and recommendations will be considered in the development of this project.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

ALOHA PUALANI
15 WAIALANA PLACE
KIHEI, MAUI, HI 96753
(808) 874-9265

JUN 20 11 50 AM '96

RECEIVED
JUN 20 4 43 PM '96
DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU, HAWAII

6/15/96
MR. KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR, HAWAII DEPT. OF TRANS.
869 PUNCHBOWL ST.
HONOLULU, HI 96813

RE: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY, MAUI
DEAR MR HAYASHIDA:

AS AN OWNER OF A VACATION RENTAL BEACH RESORT IN KIHEI, MY GUESTS FREQUENTLY CONSIDER DRIVING AROUND THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE ISLAND ON THEIR WAY BACK FROM DAY TRIPS TO HAWAII, MOST OF THEM RETURN THE SAME WAY THEY CAME BECAUSE:
1) OF THE ROAD CONDITIONS IN THE KAUPO AREA, AND
2) THERE IS NO DIRECT ROUTE BACK TO THE KIHEI - WAILEA AREA FROM UPCOUNTRY, TO BETTER SERVE OUR THOUSANDS OF VISITORS I AM IN FAVOR OF THE MOST SOUTHERN ROUTE #7 FROM MAKENA TO WAIPALAKUA, IF THE UPCOUNTRY TERMINALS WAS AS FAR SOUTH AS POSSIBLE THE FAST MAJORITY OF TRAVELERS WOULD RETURN TO THE COAST FROM HANA WITHOUT IMPACTING THE RESIDENTS OF KULA AND WAIPALAKUA. ONE UPON A TIME, THIS ROAD WENT THROUGH, AND I WOULD THINK IT WOULD BE THE CHEAPEST ALTERNATIVE TO CONSTRUCT,

IF THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY IS TO SERVE THE COMMUTERS FROM MAHUKO + PUKALANI TO KIHEI + WAILEA THEN PERHAPS A MORE NORTHERN ROUTE IS PREFERABLE, HOWEVER, THE TOURISTS WILL STILL FOREVER BE ASKING WHY THERE ISN'T A ROAD FROM WAIPALAKUA TO WAILEA.

VERY TRULY YOURS
Kazu Hayashida

SEKUNIA J. CAYTELLO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JUL 1 - 1996

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPT. DIRECTOR
GENERAL COUNSEL

REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1175

RECEIVED

JUL 17 1996

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Ms. Isabel Gerhard-Kalalau
2170 S. Kihei Road #25
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Dear Ms. Gerhard-Kalalau:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your interest and support of the proposed highway.

Our consultants are currently working on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. A public hearing will be held after the draft EIS is completed and circulated. We will inform you either by mail or by means of the news media when a meeting or hearing is scheduled.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HAWAII

MR. KAZU HAYASHIDA, DIRECTOR
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU HI 96813

MAY 20 11 20 AM '96

DEAR MR. HAYASHIDA,

WE RECENTLY ATTENDED THE MAY 15TH INFORMATIONAL MEETING AT PUKALANI. OF THE ROUTES DISCUSSED FOR THE NEW UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY, WE FAVOR ALT. 2, WITH TWO MODIFICATIONS. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE HIGHWAY WITH TWO TERMINUSES UPCOUNTRY. ONE AT HALIIMALE ROAD, AND ONE WHERE ALT. 4B ENDS. THIS WOULD GREATLY RELIEVE CONGESTION AT THE END OF THE HIGHWAY WHICH WE FEEL WILL BE A MAJOR PROBLEM IF THERE IS ONLY ONE EXIT/ENTRANCE TO THE ROADWAY. ON THE KIHEI END, WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE TERMINUS AS FAR SOUTH AS POSSIBLE. INSTEAD OF COMING THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF THE MAUI RAT PARK, MOVE IT TO CONNECT BY THE KIHEI REGIONAL PARK WHERE ALT. 6B WAS PROPOSED.

WE HAVE HEARD AT VARIOUS TIMES THAT THIS ROAD WILL BE ONLY 2 - OR POSSIBLY 3 - LANES WIDE. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE! MAKE THIS ROAD 4 LANES! 2 OR 3 LANES WILL BE OBSOLETE THE DAY YOU OPEN THE HIGHWAY! WE DO NOT WANT TO BE IN A MEETING 5-10 YEARS FROM NOW AND BE TOLD THAT TO WIDEN THE HIGHWAY TO 4 LANES IS GOING TO COST ANOTHER 50 TO 60 MILLION DOLLARS. EVEN THOUGH BUILDING 4 LANES NOW WILL COST MORE, IT WILL BE MUCH CHEAPER IN THE LONG RUN.

DO IT ONCE! DO IT RIGHT!

WE HOPE YOU WILL TAKE THESE SUGGESTIONS TO HEART, AND THAT WE END UP WITH A HIGHWAY WE CAN ALL VIEW WITH PRIDE AND NOT ONE THAT WE VIEW WITH SCORN AND SHAME.

THANK YOU.

ED AND STEPHANIE HACKENBRUCH
HALIIMALE, HI 96768

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 21 11 14 AM '96
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

SENIOR CIVILIAN
COMMISSION



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JUN 18 1996

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
SENIOR DIRECTOR
JERRY M. MATSUDA
OLENIKI OKAMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.0613

RECEIVED
JUN 3 2 26 PM '96
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

A&B HAWAII, INC.
HONOLULU

TELEPHONE: (808) 577-0281
FACSIMILE: (808) 571-7683

JUN 3 10 23 AM '96

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL & SUGAR COMPANY

P.O. BOX 266, PUNENE, MAUI, HAWAII 96784

RECEIVED

JUN 19 1996

Ed and Stephanie Hackenbruch
973 Akaaka Street
Halimale, Hawaii 96768

Dear Ed and Stephanie Hackenbruch:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your letter received on May 20, 1996, regarding the proposed alignments.

While having more lanes and fanning out into multiple termini may be desirable, additional considerations or cost constraints may affect the feasibility of these proposals. In addition, the alignment ultimately selected is expected to sufficiently handle the projected traffic demand between Upcountry Maui and South and West Maui through the year 2022. Although the projected traffic demand only warrants a two (2) lane highway to year 2022, adequate right-of-way will be acquired in conjunction with this project to accommodate a four (4) lane highway in the future.

Nonetheless, please be assured that your comments are appreciated and will be taken into consideration.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
JUN 6 12 31 PM '96

HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

May 31, 1996

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Three Alternative Alignments

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the three Alternative Alignments for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway that were presented at the public meeting on May 15, 1996. Since HC&S cultivates 36,000 acres of sugarcane here in the central valley of Maui, the location of this project is very important to our farming operations.

Alternative 2, dissects several HC&S' fields, roadways, irrigation systems and drainage systems, in addition to taking cane land out of production, this will significantly disrupt our operations. This route would require HC&S to change its operational practices making it extremely costly and inefficient. Keeping HC&S 'wholes' will require far more extensive mitigating measures which go beyond the cost of acquiring the right-of-way itself. Due to the significant effect on agricultural operations associated with this route, HC&S cannot support this alternative.

With proper mitigation, HC&S could support Alternative 4B since it would affect our operations to a lesser degree isolating a much smaller section of the farm. Therefore, the cost of mitigative measures would be far less than Alternative 2.

HC&S supports Alternative 5 since it does not cross through any of our fields and therefore would have minimal effects on our operations.

We request that the potential impacts on HC&S' existing operations be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for this project and that HC&S be consulted and recognized in the preparation of the EIS. Mitigating measures

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
May 31, 1996
Page two

should be identified in the EIS, as these will be bona fide costs of the respective alignments. Attachment 1 shows a summary of the impacts to HC&S of two of the identified alignments.

We look forward to future discussions with the DOT and its consultants on this proposed highway project. We believe that by working together, we can identify an appropriate roadway alignment which will benefit all parties -- farmers, residents and businesses on Maui. The over 1,000 farmers at HC&S have an important stake in the chosen alignment.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely,



Richard F. Cameron
Plantation General Manager

Attachment

ATTACHMENT 1

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Three Alternative Alignments

The Public Meeting on May 15, 1996 showed three alternate roadway alignments for the proposed highway. Alternative 2 would have a serious effect on HC&S' operations.

Alternative 2 -- From Haleakala Highway at Haliimaile Road to Maui R&T Park at Kihei.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 78 acres; transverses 4 miles through HC&S property.
- b. This route crosses one primary (paved) hauler road and two secondary hauler roads.
- c. This route crosses three small ditches and numerous drip irrigation pipelines.
- d. This route isolates approximately 1,200 acres of cane land. HC&S would need underpasses or traffic lights to cross the new highway.
- e. Drainage -- This route will cross at least three major gulches, Waiakoa, Pulehu and Kailiinui Gulches, and several smaller ones which will require the State to build bridges to traverse these gulches adding additional cost to these projects.
- f. Endangered species -- This route crosses three gulches that contain the endangered plant species *Abutilon menziesii*. The largest concentration of these plants is at the Kailiinui Gulch.

Alternative 4B -- From Kula Highway, near Kula 200, to Piilani Highway at Kaonoulu Street.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 19 acres; transverses 1 mile through HC&S property. This route isolates approximately 60 acres of cane land since it is near the top edge of the farm land.
- b. This alternative route crosses two major ditches, the Hamakua Ditch and the Reservoir 40 Ditch.
- c. Drainage -- This route will cross at least three major gulches, Waiakoa, Pulehu and Kailiinui Gulches, and several smaller ones which will require the State to build bridges to traverse these gulches adding additional cost to these projects.

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
DIRECTOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
JERRY M. MATSUDA
GLENN M. OHMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.0662

JUN 17 1996

d. Endangered species - This route crosses three gulches that contain the endangered plant species *Abutilon menziesii*, but this route is farther away from the endangered species than Alternative 2.

In the above mentioned alternatives, the disruption would require mitigative measures such as:

- Land for right of way - HC&S' lands needed for the highway would be "prime" agriculture land that will need to be purchased.
- Splitting of fields - Compensation for the increased cost of field operations due to the additional hauling time mileage, concrete crossings for haulers and tracked equipment. Field isolation and possible abandonment may also have to be compensated for.
- Cane hauler roads intersects - There will be a need for underpasses or traffic lights at these hauler roads to minimize hauling delays and provide a measure of traffic safety. Additional cane hauler roads that are parallel to the new road may be necessary.
- Proximity to highway - Compensation for the additional costs of operation to control dust and cane smoke and the potential to restrict the use of chemicals currently being used would reduce operating efficiencies.
- Irrigation system intersects - Several pipelines, ditches, supply lines and mainlines would need to be relocated and cross the new road.

Mr. Richard F. Cameron
Plantation General Manager
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company
P. O. Box 266
Puunene, Hawaii 96784

RECEIVED

JUN 14 1996

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Dear Mr. Cameron:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your May 31, 1996 letter regarding the effects of our proposed alternatives for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project on the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company's operations. We have met previously with you and have found these discussions to be very helpful in developing our project.

We will keep you informed of major developments in the project and look forward to any assistance you can provide.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

/bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

Project file 10/1/96 6/14/96

10/1/96 6/14/96

May 28, 1996
Page 2

Link to Ulupalakua.

Yes, many of us who have homes or farms in the Keokea-Ulupalakua-Kanaio-Kaupo-Kipahulu area will benefit. Please remember, though, that when the highway to Kapaeha was built, the Cameron family benefited a great deal.

It is important to note that Waikiki has 5 roads leading in and out of the area. Waikiki also has the convenience of the City Bus. KIHEI, THE FASTEST GROWING COMMUNITY ON MAUI, HAS ONLY ONE WAY IN AND OUT OF THE AREA.

The extension of Piliiani makes a lot of common sense because the highway was designed and approved more than 20 years ago. There are no questions re the right of way, engineering and construction will be relatively reasonable.

The closing of the old road became an issue in the mid 1980s. The Kihei and Kula Community Associations, The Maui County Council including now Mayor Linda Lingle were 100% behind the reconstruction of the road. Unfortunately, tourists don't vote on Maui. And we don't have enough votes in our area to help our cause.

We would also appreciate your consideration and study of using the existing Kanaio-Kalama Park Road to the Hana Road. There are more than 18 homes and farms on this road. One of these farms is highly successful with an investment exceeding \$1 Million and more than 2,000 bearing avocado and Citrus trees. Currently, there is no reasonable public access to the Kanaio-Kalama Park Road since the closure in 1984. Water is adequate.

Thank you for your consideration of your request.

Sincerely,

IKUA PURDY ROAD COMMITTEE

Sam S. Hironaka

Sam S. Hironaka, Coordinator
Dr. Ralph Hertz, William A. Dillon, Sue Medeiros Wagoner, and Harold Makimoto.

Enclosures:

1. Advertisement, Maui News 10/30/88
2. Maui News - Front Page 11/16/88
3. Letter 4/25/88 from David Morihara, Pres. Kula Community Assn.
4. Maui News Editorial 11/2/88 - Endorsing Road.
5. Letter dated 9/14/87 from Ulupalakua Ranch to Dr. Fujio Matsuda.
6. Letter dated 4/13/88 "Gov. John Waihee.
7. Letter dated 6/8/94 from Wm. Kennison, ILHU Business Agent
8. Letters to Maui News 12/4/88 from Mark Rudd, Don Swanson and Charles C. Hestand.
9. Letter to Maui News 3/23/89 from Frances Purdy.
10. Maui News Ad - 3/3/89 Benefits and Distances.

IKUA PURDY ROAD COMMITTEE
c/o Sam S. Hironaka
99 Naniluna Place
Wailuku, HI. 96793
Phone: 244-5136
May 28, 1996

RECEIVED

MAY 31 1 41 PM '96

Mr. Kazu Hayashi, Director
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation
889 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI. 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Re: Kihei to Upcountry Maui Highway

On behalf of the Ikua Purdy Road Committee, we sincerely ask your assistance in building a new road to replace the 100 year old road which was closed in March 1984.

The decision on the selection of one of the 3 routes met with negative reaction at the hearings held on May 15 and 16.

PUBLIC OPINION IS SWINGING VERY STRONGLY IN FAVOR OF COMPLETING THE PIIANI HWY. FROM WAILEA TO ULUPALAKUA.

There are thousands of tourists who drive or ride to Hana, Lindburgh's grave in Kipahulu and stop at the Tedeschi Winery in Ulupalakua every week. These visitors feel frustrated when they see their hotels in Wailea just below the hill, but must drive another one and a half hours instead of just 5 minutes. We all know how important it is to stress visitor satisfaction and enjoyment during these times of budget constraints

Ironically, at the May 15 meeting, Buck Joiner, Chairman of the Maui Road Committee, did not endorse any of the 3 routes. But he strongly advocated a road out of Kihei as FAR SOUTH ON PIIANI as possible to PROVIDE AN ESCAPE ROUTE IN CASE OF DISASTER.

It is ironic because it was this same Mr. Joiner who torpedoed the road from Wailea to Ulupalakua in a letter to the Maui News on 9/23/93 because "The Highway was a Political Porker" (See attached copy). Mr. Joiner then proudly announced in another letter to the Maui News on 12/12/93 that the "Extension of Piliiani Highway is DEAD". (See attached copy). It is sad indeed that one person (a relative newcomer) could halt a project, -- especially after our legislature appropriated \$7.4 million for the extension. Your engineers and staff were already at work on the right of way and design when the project was halted. Mr. Joiner now wants the road which he killed. The road would have been completed by now were it not for a single man.

Certainly, we are all for a route which will benefit the largest number of residents in the Pukalani-Makawao area. But such a highway will be many years away.

In the meanwhile, please help our tourists get back to their hotels in Wailea and Kaanapali an hour and half sooner by completing the SHORT

Enclosures:

11. Maui News Front Page 4/12/84
12. Maui News Front Page 10/28/88
13. Maui News Front Page 1/14/87
14. Star Bulletin 10/31/88
15. Maui News Front Page 4/6/89
16. Maui News Front Page 4/12/89
17. Maui News Front Page 1/14/87
18. Maui News Front Page 4/13/88
19. Maui News Front Page 9/22/93
20. Maui News Front Page 12/12/93

CC: GOVERNOR BEN CAYETANO
HOUSE SPEAKER JOSEPH SOUKI
SENATOR JOE TANAKA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON TOURISM
MR. HUGH ONO, CHIEF, HIGHWAY DIVISION, STATE OF HAWAII
MR. ROBERT SIAROT, MANAGER, MAUI DISTRICT OFFICE, STATE HIGHWAYS DIVISION


Additional Enclosures:

21. Piihāni Highway Administrative Action - Final - Environmental Impact Statement by the U.S. Dept. of Transportation and the State of Hawaii Dept. of Transportation dated February 15, 1977.
22. Maui News May 16, 1996 - None of Routes up Haleakala's Side Stand Out.

ENCLOSURE #15

THE MAUI NEWS - Sunday, October 30, 1988

LEASE SIGN THIS PETITION



ROAD BUILT IN 1880'S CLOSED MARCH 1984. LOCAL RESIDENTS USED ROAD EXTENSIVELY FOR RECREATION TO SOUTH MAUI. MAINTENANCE COST BECAME TOO MUCH FOR COUNTY BUDGET WHEN TOURISTS AND EMPLOYEES BEGAN USING THIS CONVENIENT ROAD.



ROAD TO BE RENAMED IN MEMORY OF MAUI PURDY, 1873-1945, WORLD FAMOUS RODEO CHAMPION, ULUPALAKUA RANCH FOREMAN.

BENEFITS:

SAFE IMPROVED ROAD (NOT A SUPER HIGHWAY) WOULD...

RELIEVE TRAFFIC - PUKALANI TO HANA HIGHWAY	KULA HOSPITAL - MINUTES FROM KIHEI IN CASE OF DISASTER	EVACUATION - FROM SOUTH MAUI IN CASE OF NATURAL DISASTER	30 MILES - SHORTER FOR KEOKEA FAMILIES TO PICNIC AT STATE MAKENA BIG BEACH
FOR PUKALANI AND ALL UP COUNTRY EMPLOYEES A SHORTER, FASTER, HASSLE FREE PLEASANT DRIVE TO SOUTH MAUI AND EVEN TO LAHAINA	SHORTER ROUTE SUPPORTS STATE AND MAUI IN DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURE FLOWERS, VEG. FRUITS, VINEYARD AND WINERY	EVEN LAHAINA FAMILIES WILL ENJOY A SHORTER SCENIC DRIVE TO KULA	FAMILIES AND FARMERS FROM KAUPU AND KIBAHULU WILL BENEFIT TOO WITH SHORTER, FASTER ROAD TO CENTRAL MAUI

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS:

COUNTY OF MAUI - SEEK FINANCIAL HELP FROM STATE	LEGISLATURE - EARMARK SPECIAL VISITOR TAX FUNDS FOR NEW ROAD	STATE AND MAUI - WORK TOGETHER TO BUILD LEAST COSTLY ROAD
---	--	---

ADVANTAGE:

MAUI DISTRICT OFFICE, STATE HIGHWAYS DIVISION

BENJAMIN J. CAYENNE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
JERRY M. MATSUDA
GLENN H. OMOYO

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.0612

JAN 13 1996

RECEIVED

JUN 14 1996

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. John Jasinski
P. O. Box 103
Kula, Hawaii 96790-0130

Dear Mr. Jasinski:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your letter dated May 17, 1996, regarding the proposed alignments. Please be assured that your comments are appreciated and will be taken into consideration.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

JOHN JASINSKI
P.O. Box 103
Kula, HI 96790-0130

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU, HI

MAY 23 10 42 AM '96

STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 21 11 14 AM '96
HIGHWAY DESIGN
PLANNING DIVISION
HONOLULU

May 17, 1996.

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director
State Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr Hayashida,

I'm a resident of upper Kula on Maui, and would like to offer some opinions on the proposed highway alignment between Kihei and Upcountry Maui.

First, I would choose the least expensive plan. Because of budgetary constraints in tight times, the 8.7 mile route from Kaonoulu, Kihei to Waiakea, Kula would take my vote.

Next, any option of where the road starts in Kihei should consider the congestion already resulting from the quick-paced construction of homes in Kihei district. I think the new road should intersect Kihei as far south as possible so as not to add to the troubles of Gridlock now resulting in north Kihei. My choice again would be the Kaonoulu Street (or anywhere further south) alternative.

And last, where the alignment road joins Upcountry should again be as far away from present or potentially new overcrowded areas of our highways. I disagree with any elective below Pukalani because of traffic jams that already occur now during rush hour. How will this be in a few years when more homes are built in upcountry Maui? The best options then would be to send the upcountry commuter traffic away from these spots by diverting the flow of traffic away from where it's already overcrowded. People instead of going down the hill into a traffic mess would detour uphill shortly before heading to their business or beach in Kihei. Therefore, either intersections of the alignment road upcountry at King Kekaulike High School or anywhere south would be preferable. I suggest joining the road at the intersection of Hwy. 37 and Hwy. 377 near Rice Park. This would allow easiest access for tourist traffic to bypass the central Maui traffic mess and get to Haleakala National park in an expeditious way from the South Maui resorts.

Thank you for your time in considering my views.

Aloha Kazou,

7.7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100



MAUI
RESEARCH AND
TECHNOLOGY
PARK

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 24 12 41 PM '96

HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

May 20, 1996

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

Last Wednesday and Thursday, I testified at the informational hearings held by the state to discuss the different alternatives for Maui's Upcountry-Kihai link. As the Maui Research & Technology Park developer and the representative for the park's owners, I spoke against having the Upcountry Road run through the park to the intersection at Lipoa and Pilihi Hwy. I repeat our position to you now that, while we are not opposed to the Upcountry-Kihai road, we do not want it running through the park.

During the early 1990's, with the park's first Master Plan, our initial thought was that an Upcountry road running through the park would be appropriate. This thinking continued because our initial development master plan was, in reality, a light industrial park similar to the Wailuku Milliyard. As the true nature and character of the park took shape and as the first buildings were occupied with specific user types, it became clear that the original master plan was too limited in scope and unable to take advantage of the many opportunities high technology represented. The result has been that we have now re-oriented our master plan to represent a true research park campus (see attached). As you can see, a major road such as is planned for the Upcountry-Kihai link would split our campus in half and drastically weaken the special appeal high technology users are seeking in their moves to Maui.

With the opening of the Maui High Performance Computing Center, one of the world's largest "supercomputers" as our anchor tenant and with other tenants moving into the park to take advantage of this facility and the park's telecommunication infrastructure, it is imperative to Hawaii's and Maui's future technology growth that the State take no action that would adversely impact the success of this project. An Upcountry road running through the park would be just such an action. As the new Master Plan clearly shows, the park is redesigned around a large roundabout or "Green" with key facilities such as the international teleconferencing center, three new premier office buildings, a support services core and an educational facilities, all tending to this new campus environment. Your proposed road would split the campus in two,

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
May 20, 1996
Page 2

destroying the roundabout and representing a major obstacle for the interaction of many new elements in the park, including the pedestrian walkways and bike paths.

We, therefore, ask that you NOT include the alignment of the Upcountry Road through the park as an alternative for your consideration. It represents the most expensive and longest of all of the options. It has a direct and immediate negative impact on all further development in the park. It destroys the nature and character of the technology campus environment we are attempting to create. And it will cause a number of users, desiring to relocate to the park with valuable jobs and investment capital for our community, to re-think their commitment of bringing high-tech industries here.

The Maui Research & Technology Park's mission is to be the information center of the Pacific Rim nations and one of the state's most valuable economic assets. The Governor's State of the State address and his Economic Recovery Report both stressed the park's importance to Hawaii's future economic recovery. We would all hate to see the State's department of Transportation take actions that could destroy that mission.

Sincerely,
MAUI R & T PARTNERS
Brett M. Klyver
Brett M. Klyver
Director of Development

BMK:pg

cc: Warren S. Unemori

RECEIVED
MAY 23 12 12 PM '96
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

BENJAMIN CAVETINO
ENGINEER



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JAN 18 1996

KAZUHIKASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
ASHTAKI MATSUDA
GLENN H. OSBORN

REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2-0638

RECEIVED

JUN 19 1996

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Brett M. Klyver
Director of Development
Maui Research and Technology Park
535 Lipoa Parkway, Suite 111
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Dear Mr. Klyver:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)


Thank you for your input in both May informational meetings and your letter of May 20, 1996, on the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project No. HDPS-9203(1). We are now aware of your wish not to include the alignment of our project through the Maui Research and Technology Park and will take your concerns into consideration.

Changes and adjustments are part of the environmental process and we appreciate your comments.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Umemori Engineering, Inc.



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GAGE A. SCHUBERT
RECEIVED

103 HOLOPUNI RD. HAWAII MAUI, HI 96790 MAY 22 10 03 AM '53 50E/878-1843

MAY 17, 1956

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State Of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 23 11 15 AM '53
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Gentlemen: RE: Alternative Alignments Study
Maui Highway: Kihei to Upcountry

As a resident of Kula, living in an agriculturally zoned subdivision that is directly connected to the Pulehu Rd./Omaopio Rd. corridor that connects "Up-Country" Maui to the District of Kahului and the airport, I am much concerned with the highway alignments being considered.

During my many years residency in northern California I took and active role in community planning and its interface with Caltrans. I have seen the havoc created by well-intentioned studies that failed to anticipate the rampant growth that seems to inevitably follow the introduction of new highways in to previously undeveloped lands.

The public response to the two meetings held during the last few days (in Pukalani and in Kihei) was remarkably small. As an "old hand" regarding such public-impact issues, I can only guess that the newspaper reports of the scheduled meetings were not read by a wide audience or that those that did learn of the meetings had too little time to rally their forces; of course the other possible explanation relates to public apathy!

Clear and concise data was presented to the public attending these meetings. I found it easy to understand and compliment the engineers on their patience and care during their presentation.

I was not surprised to learn that the criteria followed in determining the "best" alignments was motivated to a large extent by expense. It was daunting, however, to perceive so easily how much political power was clearly being applied vis-a-vis the interests of the big land owners.

Most of those attending the meetings saw clearly that an alignment that would begin at the south end of Filani, near the Maui Meadows subdivision, and entrances to the Wailea project, and continue directly to a point northwest i.e. down Hill of the Haleakala Road connection with Haleakala Highway would meet the needs of most of the electorate, with the least impact on "human needs".

Kihei-Upcountry Highway Project, Cont'd. page two

Many of those who have studied the increasing traffic burden to pre-existing roadways through out Maui have reasoned that a rural, limited access roadway from Piihoni Highway to Haleakala Highway is most important for many important reasons, chief among them, providing a secondary exit from the Kihei/Wailea area in the event of storm or catastrophe.

But the rallying cry of "No Growth" has been key to the recommendation.

NOT IN MY BACK YARD, (NIMBY) is the popular sentiment.

If the Maui Planning Department and the State Department of Transportation could only agree to agree, the issues of criteria would focus on conformance with Community Plans, thereby supporting planned growth and the varied issues that are not motivated by the long range profit plans of a few large companies.

None of us have forgotten that the site of King Kaukalike High School was selected via profit and political issues. Traffic safety, nearness of the residences of students and the general impact of such a large institution at the intersection of such narrow, pre-existing roads were clearly not issues at all!

Though I live on Holopuni Rd., less than a mile from the proposed terminus of ALT. 5 at Kula Highway, I am less focused on the likelihood of traffic roar, increased density of traffic, even that which will inevitably spill into my neighborhood from Pulehu Rd., for what concerns me greatly is the inevitability of new subdivisions and commercial development adding to traffic.

Kula is an agriculturally zoned or ruraly zoned area. Residences like mine are mandated to grow crops to maintain pre-existent ag rules.

ALT. 5 and ALT. 4-B (as well as 4-A), raise the certainty of development that the county would be hard-pressed to curtail, and which would lead to broad residential development along this alignment, and particularly as it would abut the existing roads of Pulehu and Omaopio.

ALT. 4B would introduce traffic focused on access to Haleakala Highway, at an intersection that already has a very sensitive traffic issue building at this time, i.e. King Kaukalike School. As was pointed out by me at the Kihei School Meeting on May 16, there is a 25 Mile per hour speed zone for a City block or two stretching south from the intersection of the Pukalani By-Pass with Kula and Haleakala Highways.

Within two to three years a full compliment of several thousand students will be attending that high school. Parents will be driving their students to this school at seven am, commuters from much of southern Kula will be lined-up at the existing traffic light seeking an easy flow of traffic towards the Pukalani By-pass and down into Pukalani. Add to this already critically dense flow tourists in private car and bus and one begins to perceive the flaw in positioning the terminus of ALT. 4B in that location.

And that is just focused on current development at the 5-tree intersection. Already county approvals are in the works for development of the so-called Pukalani Triangle, a pineapple field bounded by Makawao Avenue on the west, Pukalani By-Pass on the north and Old Haleakala Hwy on the south. And then there are the developments that Sports Shinko envisions for lands directly west of the high school.

All in all, this location promises far worse traffic snarls than ever ALT. 5!

Upcountry critics will probably not focus on the issue of low-income housing as it affects the employment of families living in Haiku and surrounding areas. There is little doubt however that many residents of northeastern edge of Upcountry as well as those communities that about Hana Highway have sought employment at the resorts in Wailea and Mckenna.

Aligning the new highway, so that its terminus with Haleakala Hwy. is near Halimale Road will enable many residents of the area to avoid the near terminal traffic congestion that even now exists at the intersection of Dairy Road and Hana Hwy., without factoring-in the impact of traffic as future Dairy Road development comes on-line.

A cursory glance at any map of the Halimale, Makawao, Haiku districts yield the information that there are now many rural roads that connect these communities with one another. Though none of these roads would meet current federal standards, most of them carry traffic throughout the day for residents and visitors alike.

It is a logical and fair assumption that no one locale would be seriously impacted by a focused flow of traffic, excepting perhaps the small community of Halimale, but since it already is a near totally company-oriented community I believe that this particular "company" would undertake cooperation with the County in order to widen Halimale Rd., at least the financial impact would be forseeable.

In conclusion, may I summarize my views:

Though cost will undoubtedly determine the future augmentation of this highway project, I urge the State D.O.T. to factor-in as much focus on the future impact of traffic and development as is possible to do.

Maui may be tilting away from agriculture, tourism-interests are ever more important for the future of the state, and jobs will be necessary to bring that about.

An increasing job market pre-supposes increased residential development, and that undoubtedly mandates more and better roadways.

Maui needs carefully planned roadways, perhaps not more roadways as such. Your Project description says that the Federal Highway Administration is joining the State D.O.T. in sponsoring the construction of a rural, limited access arterial roadway.

If the arterial roadway does indeed maintain its rural character and limited access, all would be perfect for Maui and its future interests.

But we all understand just how big an "IP", that really is!

Thank you for considering my views.

Sincerely,



cc: Linda Crockett Lingle
Mayor, County of Maui

David W. Blane
Director of Planning

JANDA CROCKETT LINGLE
Mayor



COUNTY OF MAUI
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
310 S. HOLOPUNI ROAD
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793

May 23, 1996

DAVID W. BLANE
Director
GWEN CHAMBERLAIN
Deputy Director

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JUN 18 1996

KAZUHIYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
JERRY M. MATSUDA
GLENN L. ODOMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.0614

RECEIVED

JUN 19 1996

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Gage Schubert
108 Holopuni Road
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Schubert:

RE: Proposed Kihei to Upcountry Highway

Thank you for your letters dated May 17 and 19, 1996, expressing your concerns and encouraging this Department's involvement with this project. We share many of your concerns and have been involved since the project's inception.

The State Department of Transportation (DOT) recently held two informational meetings, May 15 at the Pukalani Community Center, and May 16 at the Kihei School Cafeteria. A Planning Department representative attended both meetings with the purpose of monitoring project status and assessing public sentiment.

Your letters express a concern with the possibility of unwanted and uncontrolled growth along the project's right of way. In a letter written during the scoping phase of the EIS process, this Department pointed this out as a possible impact and asked that it be analyzed in the document. The letter brings out other issues as well. A copy is enclosed.

Again, thank you for expressing your opinions, and I assure you that this Department will continue to be involved in this project. If you need any additional information, please contact William Spence of my staff at 243-7735.

Very truly yours,

DAVID W. BLANE
Director of Planning

DWB:wts
Enclosure
cc: Julie Higa
Ron Suzuki, DOT
Central File
C:\DOCS\CORSPOND\GAGE\LTR

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 30 1 51 PM '96
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Mr. Gage Schubert
108 Holopuni Road
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Schubert:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your letter dated May 17, 1996, regarding the proposed alignments. We feel that the detailed alternatives screening process, as well as a continuing process for public input, will assist us in developing "carefully planned roadways." Please be assured that your comments are appreciated and will be taken into consideration.

Very truly yours,

KAZUHIYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION
PUA KEA FARM / 206 COOKE ROAD, KUAHAE, HI 96790 / 808-878-6705
MAY 29 10 23 AM '96

SEUNG-I CAVENTO
SECRETARY



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097
JUL 19 1996

KAZUHIYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
JERRY M. MATSUO
GLENN M. OKUMOTO

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2-1176

May 28, 1996
Mr. Kazuo Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:
With reference to the Alternative Alignment
for the Kihai-Upcountry Highway, the best
choice would be alternative 1 with an
overpass and on/off ramps at Halimaile
Haleakala Highway intersection.

Thank you,
FRANK W. WHITE

Mr. Frank W. White
Pua Kea Farm
206 Cooke Road
Kula, Hawaii 96790
Dear Mr. White:
Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your comments concerning Alternative #1 and an
overpass with on/off ramps at the Halimaile/Haleakala Highway
intersection.

The traffic volume projected for the foreseeable future in
Upcountry Maui at the location mentioned cannot justify a
grade-separated structure. Nevertheless, your comments and
interest in this project are appreciated.

Very truly yours,

KAZUO HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1996

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
JUN 5 1 54 PM '96
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31

RECEIVED
RECEIVED
 MAY 24 12 42 PM '96
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION
 PLANNING BRANCH

DON WILLIAMS & COMPANY
 COMMERCIAL REALTORS
 May 17, 1996

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
 State of Hawaii DOT
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Kihai-Upcountry Highway Project - Maui, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Thank you for this opportunity to provide the following comments.


It appears by the comments made at the May 16, 1996 Kihai meeting that the Pūlani Highway terminus would be better located at one end or the other of the Maui R & T Park, not through the middle on Lipoa Street. Actually, I suggested two terminuses one north and south of the park but was informed that only one terminus is allowed within the funding guidelines. Perhaps the private sector could be induce somehow to add half of the two road intersection "Y" above the R & T Park.


For the Upcountry terminus, perhaps convince Maui Land and Pine to sell, dedicate or otherwise transfer enough property in Pūlani to provide an acceptable buffer zone to existing residential sub-divisions. This would allow an Upcountry terminus in the Pūlani area without negative impacts to neighborhoods while providing positive economic impacts. This concept uses the most mauka portion of Alternative #8 (the portion above Alternative #2) and then continues down Alternative #2 and then to a terminus at Pūlani Highway near the sewer treatment plant and the Kihai regional park. The north portion of the "Y" theory mentioned above could then be completed by the private sector.


With the valid concerns on all sides of this issue, the above combination of alternatives may provide a balance of satisfaction to all concerned.



Thank you for your continuing dedication to resolving this very difficult situation.

You are welcome to contact me with your questions and comments.

Aloha,

 Don Williams, CCIIM

 **RECEIVED**
 DISTRICT FAX NUMBER (814) 824-3444
 P.O. BOX 393933 • DALLAS, TEXAS 75339 • (214) 824-3388
 P.O. BOX 1178 • WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793 • (808) 244-3040





NOTICE

The latest information regarding the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project follows below.

Due to comments received from our last public meetings, we have made adjustments to our then-recommended alignments No. 2A, 2B, 4B and 5. The new alignments are illustrated in the above map and are named by the U-(Upcountry) termini in combination with a K-(Kihei) termini.

- U1 - Haleakala Highway at Haliimaile Road intersection
- U2 - Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road
- U3 - Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch
- K1 - Piilani Highway at Kaonoulu Street intersection
- K2 - Piilani Highway at proposed Road "F" intersection (south of Kihei Regional Park)

These alignments are currently being investigated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) now being prepared.

We wish to thank you for your input into this environmental process and look forward to your continued support and interest as this project develops.

Please contact the Highways Division, Planning Branch, at (808) 587-1843 if additional information is desired.

Glenn M. Okimoto for
KAZU HAYASHIDA
 Director of Transportation

(Hon. Adv.: May 7, 1997)

(A-44229)

NOTICE

The latest information regarding the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project follows below:

Due to comments received from our last public meetings, we have made adjustments to our then-recommended alignments No. 2A, 2B, 4B and 5. The new alignments are illustrated in the above map and are named by the U-(Upcountry) termini in combination with a K-(Kihai) termini.


- U1 - Haleakala Highway at Halimaile Road intersection
- U2 - Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road
- U3 - Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch
- K1 - Piihoni Highway at Kaonoulu Street intersection
- K2 - Piihoni Highway at proposed Road "F" intersection (south of Kihai Regional Park)

These alignments are currently being investigated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) now being prepared.

We wish to thank you for your input into this environmental process and look forward to your continued support and interest as this project develops.

Please contact the Highways Division, Planning Branch, at (808) 587-1843 if additional information is desired.

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
 Director of Transportation



**Selected Alternatives Termini and Alignment Segments
 KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION
PO Box 122
Pukalani, HI 96788
May 8, 1997

RECEIVED
MAY 9 11 30 AM '97
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

BENJAMIN J. CAYetano
CHIEF



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
GENEVA OKAMOTO
Brian K. Hinaai

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.5978

SEP - 5 1997

SEP - 2 1997

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director of Transportation
Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl St
Honolulu, HI 96813

RECEIVED

SEP 3 1997

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Please keep me on the mailing list for information related to the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway.

I sincerely hope that you don't build the U-1 or U-2 upcountry connections. There is way too much congestion in these areas. Please spread out the traffic.

I STRONGLY urge you to look seriously at the U-3 - K-2 option.

You have a tough job. No matter what is decided there will be a lot of people who don't agree with you. I wish you luck.

Sincerely,

3/6

Robert M. Butterfield

HAWAII
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 12 11 17 AM '97
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Mr. Robert M. Butterfield
P. O. Box 122
Pukalani, Hawaii 96788

Dear Mr. Butterfield:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for informing us of your position on the alternative alignments for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project. We will maintain your name on our mailing list and will consider your input during the ongoing environmental process.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Umemori Engineering, Inc.

RECEIVED

SEP 3 1997

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31

Kihei, Maui

Dear Kazuo Hayashida;
I am against all your proposed "Upcountry" roads as they don't make sense! First, future growth will be towards Makaha & past Wailea. Your main tourist areas in these areas all want to go to Haleakala and the "wine country". Why put the road in Kihei where traffic is already congested and where to Pukalani? (Just to please the upcountry people?)

A road up at the end of Pukalani highway would be the shortest, easiest and most useful road. It has been my mind you build it out 5 years ago but its the best way!


The State can acquire the needed land without that much environmental problem. We need some action now on roads on this island as ours are the worse! Its very past time someone starting repairing and adding new roads to ease the traffic problems which are getting worse every day. It has been way too long since roads have even been repaired and

Kihei the #1 island in the world to visit. but can't even drive on decent roads. I can name dozens of main roads in and out of every city that are terrible to drive on and killing our cars!

I don't even remember seeing a road repaired in the last 4 years unless it was a new sub-division. Please acquire and use all the funds possible to relieve this dangerous situation.

I've lived in Hawaii over 40 years and am watching every thing I love slowly disappear with "progress" but new roads are vital. It's been way too long so how about some action from there?

Mahalo & Aloha
 Himo Lallysath
 Box 1728 8796611
 Kihai HI 96733



Selected Alternatives Termini and Alignment Segments
 KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

RECEIVED
AUG 19 1997



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

KAZUYASUKA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
OLENIALOANUI
Brian K. Hinara

WIREKY AGENCY
HWY-PA
2-5734

RECEIVED

AUG 20 1997

WARREN J. OVERSIGHT ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Kimo Galbraith
P. O. Box 1728
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Dear Mr. Galbraith:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your letter expressing your feelings on the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project No. HDPS-9203(1). We are always interested in the public's opinion to assist us in developing our project. However, "a road at the end of Piihoni", while one of the original alignments under consideration, was dropped due to its low economic feasibility. Your input in the planning process is a vital link in our project development.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

A&R-HAWAII, INC.
HONOLULU, HI
G. STEPHEN HOLIDAY
SR VICE PRESIDENT

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL SUGAR CO.
G. STEPHEN HOLIDAY
PLANTATION GENERAL MANAGER
TELEPHONE: 788-1712/1713

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL & SUGAR COMPANY
P.O. BOX 366, PUUNENE, MAUI, HAWAII 96764

August 04, 1997

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

In June 1997, as a result of comments received from public hearings held in 1996, we were informed of new alignments being proposed by DOT for the Kihei-Upcountry Highway project.

We are aware that these alignments will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project, which is currently being prepared. Accordingly, we would like to provide you with our preliminary comments for your consideration in the preparation of this document:

- 1) The points of origin in Kihei currently have no impact on HC&S' operations and therefore we have no concerns or preferences;
- 2) Haleakala Highway at Haliimalie Road intersection (U1): As we have commented upon in the past, this routing alternative would bisect HC&S' property. As a result, this route would serve to isolate 1,000 acres of cane land under the cultivation and would require the installation of underpasses or traffic lights to enable HC&S to continue to cultivate these acres. This alignment also intersects canehaul roadways which are primary thoroughfares for our haulers and crosses essential irrigation ditches and pipelines. Our ability to move equipment and to irrigate our crop must be preserved. As a side note, this alignment would also require the construction of bridges to cross the several gulches, which will increase the cost of the highway. Unless satisfactory mitigative measures are implemented, HC&S strongly opposes this route.
- 3) Kula Highway East of Pukalani Bypass Road (U2): This highway alternative also traverses through HC&S' property, although to a somewhat lesser degree than the above mentioned alignment (U1). This

RECEIVED
AUG 10 25 AM '97
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

alignment, which runs along the top edge of our farm land, would isolate approximately 60 acres of cane land, and again, would require mitigative measures to maintain HC&S' access to these lands. The route also crosses two major water ditches, the Hamakua Ditch and the Reservoir 40 Ditch, which will need to be protected and remain operative, even during construction. This alignment also crosses at least three major gulches and several smaller gulches, which again will require bridges and will add to the cost of the projects. Again, unless satisfactory mitigative measures are implemented, HC&S strongly opposes this route.

- 4) Kula Highway South of Pulehu Gulch (U3): Of the three alternatives being presented, this alternative (U3) has the least impact to HC&S. The route does not cross through any of our fields and therefore would have minimal effects on our operations.

We have attached a map to help illustrate the impacts of the roadway alignments on the plantation.

The alternatives U1 and U2 will cause significant impacts to HC&S and, this will require significant mitigative measures, which have been previously outlined to the department, to ensure minimal disruption to HC&S' current operations. We trust that these impacts and mitigations will be addressed in the upcoming draft EIS. If you need further clarification of these measures, please feel free to call me for the information.


We continue to welcome open and early discussions with the DOT and its consultants on this highway project. Though our working together, early on in the process, we believe that an alignment which will benefit all parties--farmers, residents and businesses on Maui--can be identified. Over 1,000 employees at HC&S have a lot at stake on your choice of alignments.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten Signature]
G. Stephen Holaday

Enclosure

cc: M. J. Ching



SEN. JAMES CAVETANO
GOVERNOR



KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
GLENNAL OOMOTO
Brian K. Hlnaai

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

AUG 25 1997

BY REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.5883

RECEIVED
MAY 11 11 01 AM '97
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAY DIVISION

Kula Community Association
P.O. Box 417
Kula, Maui, Hawaii 96790

"The specific purpose of this corporation is to improve the quality of life for the residents of Kula, to promote civic welfare and generally to benefit the community of Kula."

Mr. G. Stephen Holaday
Plantation General Manager
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company
P. O. Box 266
Puunene, Hawaii 96784

Dear Mr. Holaday:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your August 4, 1997 letter summarizing Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company's (HC&S) position on the proposed alternatives for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project.

We are confident that, through our previous meetings and correspondence, we have been made aware of HC&S' operations and position on the alternatives and will strongly consider them in our analysis of this project.

As stated previously, we will keep you informed of major developments in the project and look forward to any assistance you can provide.

Very truly yours,

HUGH Y. ONO
Administrator
Highways Division

√bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

RECEIVED

AUG 24 1997

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

To: Maui County Council
From: Alan Kaufman, KCA president
Date: 2 May 1997

The Board of Directors of the Kula Community Association has asked that I inform you about results of a just completed community survey. The survey was mailed to every household in the Kula area. A total of 318 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 45%.

18% AS OF 7/1/01

It has been the position of the KCA Board of Directors to support water rate increases provided that the proceeds are used to expeditiously initiate and complete needed system repairs. Of those responding, 81.2% agreed with this position, 8.9% disagreed, 6.7% were undecided, and 3.2% did not respond.

The community was also polled on the preferred location of the Upcountry terminus of the Kihai-Upcountry Road. Halimale was favored by 30.8%, the "No Build" option by 27.2%, Pulehu/Omaopio area by 19%, Five Trees/Kula 200 by 15%. Undecided by 5.7%, and 2.3% did not respond to the question. The position of the KCA Board of Directors has been to favor the "No Build" option, or if the road is to be built, to put it at Halimale. It appears this position accurately reflects the opinion of the Kula Community.

As these issues are addressed, the KCA Board of Directors hopes the opinions of our community will receive due consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan Kaufman

Copy: Mayor Linda Lingle
Bob Starot, Division of Highways
Senator Dan Inouye
Kazu Hayashida

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
MAY 12 11 13 AM '97
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

SEP -2 1997

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
GLENN H. OKAMOTO
Brian K. Minaai

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.5979

RECEIVED

SEP 3 1997

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Alan Kaufman, President
Kula Community Association
P. O. Box 417
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Kaufman:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for informing us of the Kula Community Association's position on the alternative alignments for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project. We will consider your input during the ongoing environmental process and in the development of this project.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

✓bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

September 10, 1997

Mr. Kenneth Au
DOT Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Kihai-Upcountry Highway Project

Dear Mr. Au,

This letter is long overdue. I spoke with you by phone several months ago about the above project. I still, as I conveyed to you, feel that the best route for the highway is from K-2 to the upper end of Kekaulike Highway. This is the most direct way to the crater, which over 2,000,000 people a year visit. This is also the most direct route for those working in the crater. Four hundred lots will be subdivided in the Hawaiian Homelands area in upper Kula in the very near future. This will necessitate the improvement of the roads in this area. Since a number of these people may be employed or seek employment in the Wailea area the upper Kula connection makes a lot of sense.

Recently we were informed a developer in our neighborhood is planning a town with a twenty acre shopping center. It appears on his maps with what looks like the U-2 alternative on your map. Since we have a not yet completed high school, King Kekaulike, only a few hundred feet below this proposed development, I question why the State would support such a situation. This man and his fellow investors have rubbed elbows with several State and County people, leading many of us to think a back room deal was struck. Although only a few weeks ago in a meeting with residents he stated he would be building 324 homes, he jumped to 400 and is now at 450. I'm enclosing a master plan of his project obtained from the County Planning Department here on Maui.

I hope you will look it over and understand as I have that the scope of this project is detrimental to the safe environment the students in Kekaulike deserve. I did a traffic study Monday, Sept. 8, 1997 from 2:00pm to 4:00 pm. The numbers I came up with were astonishing. The vehicles going in numbered 188, going out

262, students walking alongside (there is no sidewalk) the Kula Highway numbered 41, vehicles going up or down, 1,720, and industrial vehicles, 22, for a total count of 2,194 vehicles during the two hour period. I intend to do more traffic studies as I realize one is not sufficient to be a true study of traffic. The developer of the above project I mentioned, did a traffic study, however it was done in 1996 when two classes attended Kekaulike High. Since then a number of those students have obtained a drivers license. The high school at present contains freshmen through juniors, with it becoming a four year high school for the 98/99 school year. In speaking with the principal I was told the school is full with each class that comes in. The freshmen class this year consists of 400 students. There are a total of 1,040 students in the school at present. Since the school is bordered by Haleakala Highway on one side and Kula Highway on the other I believe adding another highway in the same area would be like sentencing a few students every year to certain death. While observing the traffic, a tourist made a U-turn on the highway while another went in the school turning lane, and realizing he made a mistake, quickly cut out almost hitting a town-bound vehicle.

Some parents are upset and feel they can do nothing to stop this since this man seems to have everyone in his back pocket. They feel if anything happens to them or their children as a result of the tremendous amount of traffic coming into the neighborhood of the school, they will sue the developers of Kulamau, the County of Maui and the State. I believe good planning is important and with good planning we can avoid the above.


Since the Kūhei to Upcountry Highway is a plan for the future the U-2 and U-3 areas are the least efficient at allowing for traffic flow. The U-2 site would be a good recipe for traffic gridlock.

If you would like to go over the area in depth I would be happy to meet with you. We have had several accidents in the area since the school opened. The most recent resulted in a death. My home phone is 572-0729.

Sincerely,

Barbara J. Luke

Barbara J. Luke



Selected Alternatives Terminated and Alignment Segments
KŪHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPT. DIRECTOR
BILLY K. UNEMORI
GLENN H. OYAKI

REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.6436



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5597

SEP 24 1997

RECEIVED

SEP 25 1997

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Ms. Barbara Luke
111 Aulii Drive
Pukalani, Hawaii 96768-8207

Dear Ms. Luke:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project,
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your input on the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project. Through letters like yours, we hope to get an idea of the public's feelings during this environmental process.


In regards to the Kulamalu development, the Department does not favor one alignment over another at this time. A minimum of six alignment combinations are possible and viable. However, while an astute businessman will take advantage of areas opening up due to a new highway, the Department does not select an alignment specifically to encourage development.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida
KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

/bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

BYVALUERS J. CAVEYANO
DCE/MCA



050352Z DMC/KTY/PM

REV FEB 20, 1997

SUMMARY	Kihei Upcountry Road					Kula Vision				Water		
	Haliimaile	5 Trees	Pulehu	No build	Undecided	Agree	Disagree	No need	Revise	Agree	Disagree	Undecided
MEMBERS N=27	13.33 49.4%	3.33 12.3%	1.33 4.9%	8 29.6%	1 3.7%	23 85.2%	0 0%	0 0%	2 8.7%	23 85.2%	0 0%	3 11.1%
NEW & RENEW MEMBERS N=169	53.5 31.7%	29 17.2%	27 16%	45.5 26.9%	9 5.3%	147 87%	1 0.6%	0 0%	10 5.9%	149 88.2%	8 4.7%	9 5.5%
NOT MEMBERS N=118	30 25.4%	16.5 14%	31.5 26.7%	32 27.1%	8 6.8%	99 83.9%	3 2.5%	2 1.7%	5 4.2%	83 70.3%	20 16.9%	9 7.6%
TOTAL N=314 %	96.83 30.8	48.83 15.6	59.83 19	85.5 27.2	18 5.7	269 85.7	4 1.3	2 0.6	17 5.4	255 81.2	28 8.9	21 6.7

Kula Community Association P.O.B. 417 Kula, HI 96790

Survey results as of 27 April 1997 [FINAL]

of Kula residences [96790 zip code]: ~2100

surveys returned: 314

% returned compared to total of Kula residences: 15%

Questions asked:

- I believe the Upcountry Terminus of the Kihei Upcountry Road should be: (circle one)
a. Haliimaile b. Five Trees/Kula 200 c. Pulehu/Omaopio d. No build e. Undecided
- "The vision for the Kula Community is to preserve open space, support agriculture, maintain a rural ambience in residential areas and ensure that, as changes occur in the region, infrastructure and services will support the rights and needs of all residents."
- The position of the KCA Board of Directors has been to support water rate increases *PROVIDED* that the Department of Water Supply use the proceeds to expeditiously initiate and complete needed system repairs.

kclawren.doc

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

NOV 10 8 23 AM '97

RECEIVED
NOV 13 6 45 AM '97

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

RECEIVED
NOV 13 12 48 PM '97

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Kula Community Association
P.O. Box 417
Kula, Maui, Hawaii 96790
<http://falcon.t-link.net/~kca/>

"The specific purpose of this corporation is to improve the quality of life for the residents of Kula, to promote civic welfare and generally to benefit the community of Kula."
"The vision of the Kula Community Association is to preserve open space, support agriculture, maintain a rural residential atmosphere, and to work together as a community..."

To: Maui County Council Members, Everett Dowling, Kazu Hayashida (State Department of Transportation), Bob Sirof (Division of Highways), Mayor Lingle
From: Alan Kaufman, DVM, Kula Community Association President
Date: 8 November 1997

At the 6 November meeting of the Kula Community Association Board of Directors, I was directed to remind our elected representatives, and other interested parties, of the survey undertaken by our Association this year regarding the Kihei-Upcountry Highway. Survey results indicated that two thirds of our community either does not want this highway built, or if it is to be built, to have the upcountry terminus at Haliimaile. I am attaching a copy of the results of that survey for your review.

There is concern by the KCA Board that the Kulamalu development will encourage the placement of the terminus in Kulamalu, the approximate location identified as the 5 Trees area in the community survey. Because of this concern the Board has resolved:

"... that approval of the Kulamalu project be conditional on the Upcountry terminus of the Kihei-Upcountry highway not being located in the Kulamalu development area."

This resolution passed, 13 in favor, none opposed, with 2 abstentions.

At the meeting it was pointed out that the County may not have the authority to prevent the State from designating the preferred location of this highway. Regardless, the Board felt the Council should not grant approval of this development without the provision expressed above in place.

Thank you for your consideration.

BEAULIEU L. CAYETANO
DIRECTOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5087

DEC - 3 1997

KAZUYUKI SASAKI
DIRECTOR

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.7244

RECEIVED

DEC 03 1997

WARREN S. CLEMEN (CAYETANO), ETC.

Mr. Alan Kaufman, President
Kula Community Association
P. O. Box 417
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Kaufman:

Subject: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your November 8, 1997 letter informing us of the results of the Kula Community Association's survey. We appreciate the input on your community's opposition to U-2 and U-3 and will consider it in our project evaluation.

Very truly yours,

KAZUYUKI SASAKI
Director of Transportation

/bc: Warren S. Unemori

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING DIVISION
JAN 21 11 23 AM '98
HONOLULU, HAWAII

RSK Enterprise LLC
Pauahi Towers Ste. 1570
1001 Bishop St.
Honolulu, HI 96813
January 6, 1998

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Kihel/Upcountry Highway

Dear Mr. Hayashida

As one of the General Partners of the Kulamalu Limited Partnership, I was dismayed to learn that your department has replaced alternative U2 (Kulamalu) with a new alternative, U2A. I feel that alternative U2 is a better route and should remain as the primary alternative for the following reasons:

1. Should alternative U2 be selected, the owners of the Kulamalu property have offered to dedicate the appropriate right-of-way land area and provide the design, to federal standards, for the section through the Kulamalu project area. Assuming a constant right-of-way width of 160 feet, we estimate that approximately 21.4 acres of land will be needed. Please note that in November of 1997 a 3 acre Kulamalu parcel was sold at a price of over \$200,000 per acre. As such the dedication of a 21.4 acres right-of-way required for an alternative U2 will result in a significant savings to both federal and state taxpayers.
2. We are aware that your department is concerned about the approximately 1100 linear feet (2% of the entire highway length) of alternative U2 which has a 10% roadway grade. The Kulamalu property has been classified as "urban" by the State Land Use Commission since October of 1969. Based upon the design criteria of the AASHTO Green Book ("A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 1990"), it would be appropriate to characterize the area as mountainous urban and to utilize a design speed of 40 mph (posted 35 mph) and a maximum grade of 10% (Table VII-4, page S25). A more detailed explanation from Austin, Tsutsumi & Associates is attached for your review.
3. Kulamalu will be proceeding with construction of a two lane roadway from Kula highway to the Kamehameha School campus in early 1998 at a cost of approximately \$6,200,000. This substantial amount represents additional project savings should alternative U2 be selected.
4. Although alternative U2A provides for a more direct approach to Haleakala Highway, there are several major issues relating to this route.

RECEIVED
JAN 20 2 34 PM '98
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION


Mr. Kazu Hayashida
January 6, 1998
Page 2


- A. Alternative U2A bisects an established residential community between Kaakakai Gulch and the terminus. This would require the condemnation of a number of parcels with various owners. Additionally, parallel roadways adjacent to the highway would need to be constructed to service the existing lots since the highway will be classified as a limited access highway.
- B. Alternative U2A requires an additional gulch crossing over Kaakakai Gulch, adding substantial cost to this route. Additionally Kaakakai gulch is known to be rich in Hawaiian cultural artifacts.
- C. Kulamalu has developed their masterplan accommodating alternative U2. Should alternative U2A be selected, the section of this alignment traversing the Kulamalu property results in several remnant parcels that would be unusable to the developer and therefore should be included in the right-of-way acquisition. Due to the additional project replanning and redesign efforts, as well as the overall impact to the master plan, Kulamalu will not dedicate the right-of-way land area and design funds for the U2A alternative. Furthermore, Kulamalu will expect to receive condemnation proceeds based upon the fair market value of this urbanized and fully zoned property.

We feel that alternative U2 provides the Federal Highways Administration and the Department of Transportation with a far more economical route than alternative U2A and respectfully request that you reconsider designated alternative U2 as the primary route in the final EIS for the Kihnei/Ujcountry Highway project. Based on the above reasons we feel that this alignment is the only viable route through this area.

In closing we want to make it clear that Kulamalu will not support alternative U2A, but on the other hand is willing to be supportive of U2 due to it's minimal impact to the development. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or if you or your staff wish to further discuss this matter.

Sincerely,
RSK Enterprise LLC


Ronald Kobayashi,
Its Principal



Grades

The length and steepness of grades directly affect the operational characteristics of an arterial. Table VII-1 gives recommended maximum grades for rural arterials. When vertical curves for stopping sight distance are considered, there are seldom advantages to using the maximum grade values except when grades are long. Grades below the maximum are always desirable, the minimum grades being considered primarily to provide natural roadside drainage.

Type of Terrain	Design Speed (mph)			
	40	50	60	70
Level	5	4	3	3
Rolling	6	5	4	4
Mountainous	8	7	6	5

Table VII-1. Relation of maximum grades to design speed for rural arterials.

Number of Lanes

The number of lanes required is determined by volume, level of service, and capacity conditions. A divided arterial, as discussed in this chapter, refers to four or more lanes.

Superelevation

When the use of curves is required on a rural arterial alignment, a superelevation rate compatible with the design speed must be used. Superelevation rates should not exceed 0.12; however, where ice and snow conditions are a factor, the maximum superelevation rate should not exceed 0.08. Superelevation runoff denotes the length of roadway needed to accom-

Rural and Urban Arterials (Rural)

plish the change in cross slope from a section with adverse crown remove a fully super-elevated section and vice versa. Adjustments in design run lengths may be necessary for smooth riding, drainage, and appearance. Chapter III provides a detailed analysis and tables for super-elevation for various design speeds.

Pavement Crown

Pavement crown is constructed to provide cross-slope drainage for a pavement. Two-lane rural pavements are normally designed with a center crown and cross slopes ranging from 1.5 to 2 percent with the higher value being most prevalent. Multilane pavements are crowned at the pavement centerline or sloped one way. When drainage is carried across adjacent lanes, cross slope may be increased from one lane to another.

Vertical Clearances

New or reconstructed structures should provide 16-ft clearance over entire roadway width. Existing structures that provide 14-ft, if allowed local statute may be retained. In highly urbanized areas, a minimum clearance of 14-ft may be provided if there is one route with 16-ft clearance. Structures should provide additional clearance for future resurfacing of the overpassing road.

Structures

The full width for the approach roadways should normally be provided across all new bridges. Long bridges, defined as bridges having an over length in excess of 200 feet may have a lesser width. On long bridges, off to parapet, rail or barrier shall be at least 4 feet measured from the edge of nearest travel lane on both the left and right. See Chapter X for more information on bridge widths.

Bridges to remain in place should have adequate strength and at least width of the traveled way plus 2-ft clearance on each side, but should be considered for ultimate widening or replacement if they do not provide at least 3-ft clearance on each side or are not capable of HS-20 loadings. As interim measure, narrow bridges should be considered for special non-bridge treatments such as signaling and pavement marking.

ATA AUSTIN, TSUTSUMI & ASSOCIATES, INC. CIVIL ENGINEERS & SURVEYORS
CONTINUING THE ENGINEERING TRADITION SINCE 1934
#97-514
MAR 26 1997
Dowling Company, Inc.
March 24, 1997

Kuamalu Limited Partnership
P.O. Box 758
Wailuku, Hawaii 96783
Attention: Mr. Don Fujimoto
Gentlemen:

Subject: Justification for Variance From Route Design Criteria, Kuamalu Road

The design criteria utilized for designing new roadways is based upon the character of the terrain and adjacent land uses of the areas in which the roadway is located.
The new Upcountry-Kula Road from Kula to Kula is being planned and designed as a rural highway in mountainous terrain, since that is the general character of the route. Under that route description, the State Department of Transportation, Highways Division, has apparently selected a design speed of 60 miles per hour (posted 45 mph) and the maximum grade is 7 percent, as determined by Table VII-1, Relation of maximum grades to design speed for rural arterials, page 496, of the AASHTO Green Book (A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 1990).

The mauka terminus of the new road is through the planned Kuamalu development. Through the development, the adjacent land uses will consist of a school and businesses, as well as subdivision roads connecting to the Upcountry-Kula Road. Under these conditions, it would be appropriate to characterize the adjacent land use as mountainous urban and to use a lower design speed for the highway. Therefore, the design criteria could be adjusted to utilize a design speed of 40 mph (posted 35 mph) and maximum grade of 10 percent, as shown in Table VII-1, Maximum grades for urban arterials, page 625. Further, since the Kuamalu development is the upcountry terminus of the new road, it is desirable to reduce the highway speed limit approaching Kula Highway to provide the transition from the open highway to the Stop condition at Kula Highway.

Any variance from the general design criteria for the new roadway must be requested to and concurred by the State Department of Transportation, Highways Division. Attached for your information are copies of the tables cited above. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,
AUSTIN, TSUTSUMI & ASSOCIATES, INC.
By *Howard H.W. Mau*
HOWARD H.W. MAU, P.E.
Principal Transportation Engineer

HHW: CDC
Attachments
cc: Ken Kurokawa/ATA Maui - w/encs.

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
1555 ALI'OLE STREET, SUITE 201, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96817-2021
PHONE: (808) 534-2500 FAX: (808) 534-1787

RECEIVED
MAR 26 1997
Dowling Company, Inc.

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
889 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB 27 1998

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR

SENIOR DIRECTORS
BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GLENN H. OKAMOTO

BEERLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.8227

RECEIVED

MAR 02 1998

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Ronald Kobayashi
Its Principal
RSK Enterprise LLC
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Kobayashi:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your comments and recommendations for the Upcountry termini of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project. We have been in constant contact with your representative, Don Fujimoto of Kulamalu Limited Partnership, and have kept him abreast of all developments. A copy of our February 3, 1998 letter to him is attached.

I would like to clarify a couple of points in your letter.

1. Alignment U2 has been redesignated U2B.
2. Alignment U2B has not been dropped. Investigations are still ongoing. A decision of which alignment will be selected for further study will be made after the circulation and comment period of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for our subject project.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

Attachment

/bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

Design Speed

Design speed for urban arterials generally range from 40 to 60 mph, and occasionally may be as low as 30 mph. The lower (40 mph and below) speeds apply in the central business district and intermediate areas. The higher speeds are more applicable to the outlying business and developing areas.

Design Traffic Volumes

The design of urban arterials should be based on traffic data developed for the design year, normally 20 years. The design hourly volume (DHV) is the most reliable method to determine design requirements. Sometimes, capacity is used as a design tool. The limitations and restrictions that are often encountered are recognized in capacity design, and a prescribed level of service for those conditions is provided. Refer to Chapter II for information on traffic and capacity.

Levels of Service

For acceptable degrees of congestion, rural and suburban arterials and their auxiliary facilities, i.e., turning lanes, weaving sections, intersections, interchanges, and traffic control systems (traffic signals, etc.), should generally be designed for level-of-service C. Heavily developed sections of metropolitan areas may necessitate the use of level-of-service D. When level-of-service D is selected, it may be desirable to consider the use of one-way streets or alternative bypass routes to improve the level of service.

Sight Distance

The provision of adequate sight distance is important in urban arterial design. Sight distance affects normal operational characteristics, particularly where roadways carry high traffic volumes. The sight distance values given in Table VII-3 are also applicable to urban arterial design.

Grades

The grades selected for an urban arterial may have a significant effect on its operational characteristics. Steep grades affect truck speeds and overall

capacity. On arterials having large numbers of trucks and operating near capacity flat grades should be considered to avoid undesirable reductions in speeds. Steep grades also result in operational problems at intersections, particularly during adverse weather conditions. For these reasons it is desirable to provide the flattest grades practicable while providing minimum gradients as required to ensure adequate longitudinal drainage in curbed sections. (See Table VII-4.)

	Design Speed (mph)			
	30	40	50	60
Type of Terrain	Maximum Grade (percent)			
Level	8	7	6	5
Rolling	9	8	7	6
Mountainous	11	10	9	8

Table VII-4. Maximum grades for urban arterials.

Alignment

Alignment of the urban arterial is ideally developed strictly in accordance with the design speed selected particularly when a principal arterial is located on a new location and is not restricted by normal right-of-way requirements. There are many cases, however, where this is not possible and deflections must be made in intersections. It is desirable to use the highest alignment design possible because urban arterials are often not super-elevated in the low-speed range.

Cross Slope

Adequate cross slope for proper drainage is important on urban arterials. The normal problems related to splashing and hydroplaning are compounded in heavy traffic volume operations at intermediate to high speeds. Cross slopes should range from 1.5 to 3 percent, the lower values being in the center lanes with the cross slopes increasing about 1 percent for each additional lane over which water must drain until the maximum 3 percent is reached. Even

Azeo Park
7th grade, Haleakala Waldorf School
214 Kawefu PL
Kula Maui HI
96790
core@lava.net

Kazu Hayashida
The State Director of Transportation
757 Kinalau PL 1003
Honolulu HI
96813-2638

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

I've written you to persuade you to reconsider building the roads U-1, U-2, U-3, K-1, K-2, from Kihei to the Upcountry area to prevent serious damage to the quality of life in Kula.

U-1 will cause more traffic in the Makawao and Pukalani areas. This will eventually force you to upgrade Makawao Avenue, which is now not ready to receive more traffic. If you haven't been in Makawao lately, you may not know it is also usually very crowded.

Ending Highway U-2 near the King Kamehameha High School is a bad idea. After school, this area is full of kids walking home, school busses and traffic. Students crossing the road may get hurt with the added traffic.

Tourists coming up Highway U-3 from the hotel and beach area will flood Kula. They will cause tourist stands to pop up every where and tourist bus stops. The result will be destroying one of the only areas with real rural life on the island.

Also, adding these roads will result in a population increase. This will directly affect our water supply. Sometimes, during the summer we receive notices to not use the water carelessly, and to not wash the cars until the semi-drought is over and even worse for the farmers not to water. More

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

FEB 13 7 54 AM '98

FEB 13 12 51 PM '98

RECEIVED
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

houses means more people will need water. We do not have the water for another subdivision.

The traffic increase will cause a buildup in traffic which during school hours will be dangerous and unpleasant on the Lower Kula Highway #37. Traffic moves slowly on that road near schools. Two schools are located in Kula, and both are right next to Haleakala Highway where the posted speed limit is 25 MPH. Every morning my brother and I bike to school. We travel north along the Upper Kula Highway. I don't want to see the road crowded since there is no bike lane.

Going in the downhill direction, people traveling from the Upcountry area traveling down to Kihei will result in Kihei being even more crowded. Kihei is already so crowded; I once saw this Lady in her car trying to turn right from the beach, and it took her twenty minutes. So, I assure you that the traffic and the bad air from it is unnecessary from the point of view of many.

Some people want the road so they don't have to drive as much. This is not good reason to ruin a beautiful land.

In short, this is not the time to add a major new road into Upcountry. It would be good to put the time, money and resources into building up the upcountry so it can handle the highways in the future.

Please answer back with your input, Sincerely

Azeo Park

•Enclosure

BEULAH W. J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB 27 1988

KAZUHAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
GENERAL COUNSEL

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.8228

RECEIVED

MAR 02 1988

WARREN S. UMEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Azeo Park
214 Kawehi Place
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Park:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your interest in our Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project. We are in our environmental evaluation process and encourage public comments and recommendations on the alternative alignments.

We are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for circulation later this year that will address your concerns. Copies will be available for review at your local libraries. A public hearing will also be held at locations in Kihei and Upcountry Maui where the public can again make known their comments on the EIS.

I believe the high school you mentioned at the U-2 terminus is the Kekaulike High School not the King Kamehameha High School.


If you have further questions, you can write to me at the following address: 869 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

Again, thank you for your comments.

Very truly yours,

KAZUHAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

/s/ Warren S. Umemori Engineering, Inc.



Y : I 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.8513



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

MAR 24 1998

RECEIVED

MAR 25 1998

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
SOLICITOR

Heinz Rominger
Diane Clarke
108 Kulalani Drive
Kula, HI 96790
(808)976-05375

RECEIVED
MAR 21 07 24 1998
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
February 24, 1998

Director Kazu Hayashida
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Sir

On February 19, 1998 my wife and I attended a meeting of the Kula Community Association. One of the topics of discussion was the Kihei-Upcountry road.

We were informed that the Association has taken the following position:

- 1. There should be no road
- 2. If a road is to be build, it should be as far from Kula as possible.

There is a very vocal minority in favor of the 1st alternative, so much so that it really was not possible to voice a dissenting opinion. This is quite surprising in light of the fact that the Association itself undertook a survey of residents with the following result:

- 27% did not want a road at all
- 67% wanted a road, but were split between the different routes
- 6% had no opinion

While it is true that the single largest group did not want a road, one cannot help but be impressed by the overwhelming majority in favor of the project. However, this group was split among the various routes.

Having established that the vast majority of the respondents would like a road, it is probably wiser to leave the actual routing to the professionals working in and for the Department

The Kula Community Association is not speaking for us in this matter and we do not believe that the democratic process was helped by their stance. On our part we are going to speak to our friends and neighbors to make sure our views are also heard and to this end we would appreciate to be placed on the project mailing list.

Heinz Rominger
Heinz Rominger

Diane Clarke

Diane Clarke
HONORARY CHAIRMAN
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

MAR 3 11 07 AM '98
RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

FEB 30 10 24 AM '98

Mr. Heinz Rominger
and Ms. Diane Clarke
108 Kulalani Drive -
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Dear Mr. Rominger and Ms. Clark:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Project HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your interest in our Kihei-Upcountry Maui highway project. We encourage public comments and recommendations regarding the alternative alignments. Your February 27, 1998 letter will help us better gauge the public's feeling on our proposals.

We are preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that is scheduled for distribution later this year. Copies will be available for review at your local libraries. Public hearings will then be held in Kihei and Upcountry Maui where the public can again make known their comments on this project. Your names have been placed on our mailing list and you will be notified of the availability of the DEIS and the specific details of the public hearings.

If you have further questions you can write to me or contact Kenneth Au by calling Maui's toll free voice access number 984-2400 extension 71843.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

cc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

APPENDIX B

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Preparation Notice

Federal Register Notice of Intent

Environmental Assessment Distribution List

**Agency and Public Comment Letters Responding
to the EISPN and Responses**

State Draft EIS Notice

Federal Register Notice of Availability of Draft EIS

Draft EIS Transmittal Letter and Recipients

Public Hearing Materials and Sign-In Sheets

Maui Notices

SEPTEMBER 23, 1995

EIS Preparation Notices

(15) Central Maui Expansion of Sanitary Landfill Project

District: Wailuku
TRAC: 3-8-03-4
Applicant: County of Maui, Department of Public Works & Waste Management
 200 South High Street
 Wailuku, Hawaii 96793
Contact: Charles Jencks (243-7845)

Accepting Authority: County of Maui, Department of Public Works & Waste Management
 200 South High Street
 Wailuku, Hawaii 96793
Contact: Charles Jencks (243-7845)

Consultant: Masa Fujioka & Associates
 99-1205 Halawa Valley Street, Suite 302
 Aiea, Hawaii 96701-3281
Contact: Jennifer Klovano (484-43366)

Public Comment Deadline: October 23, 1995
Status: First Notice, pending public comment.

The County of Maui has determined that the existing Central Maui Sanitary Landfill is reaching its capacity and that an additional solid waste disposal site is needed. Instead of searching for a new landfill location, the County proposes to expand the existing Central Maui Sanitary Landfill. The proposed project includes Phases IV, V and VI. Phase IV is currently being used by a quarry operation and Phases V and VI are currently occupied by sugar cane but are scheduled for quarry operations in the future. Expanding the landfill into areas where the quarry operation is completed eliminates the need for large-scale excavation, and is a good use of quarried area.

This site is centrally located with respect to the major population centers of Maui, yet it is also in a rural, agricultural district. This combination of a central yet rural location and compatible physical characteristics makes the site operationally and environmentally well-suited for the expansion of the landfill.

The project will have both beneficial and adverse environmental impacts. The primary beneficial impacts are the continuation of a centrally located landfill site that will eliminate the difficulties of locating a new site, and the accommodation of the County's solid waste disposal needs through at least the year 2016. The landfill will also protect the public health by preventing the existing landfills from exceeding their design capacity.

Potential adverse impacts include contamination of groundwater and surface water resources and windblown litter, and effects on traffic, noise, air quality, historic and archeological features, scenic resources, and flora and fauna. Impacts to these resources and mitigation measures to eliminate or minimize adverse impacts will be thoroughly discussed in the EIS. Overall assessment of the impacts indicates that the benefits significantly surpass the adverse impacts.

(16) Kihei-Upcountry Highway Project From Piliuni Highway to Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway

District: Makawao
TRAC: Various
Applicant: Department of Transportation Highways Division
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Contact: Kenneth Au (587-2150)

Accepting Authority: Governor, State of Hawaii
 c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
 220 South King Street, Suite 400
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Consultant: Warren Uemeroi Engineering, Inc. (242-4403)
 2145 Wells Street, Suite 403
 Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Public Challenge Deadline: October 23, 1995
Status: First Notice, pending public comment.

Maui Notices

SEPTEMBER 23, 1995

determine which to address in detail. The draft EIS will not select a preferred alternative from those analyzed in detail. Selection of the preferred alternative will occur after issuance of and public hearings on the draft EIS.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties.

Withdrawals

(17) Hailu Well Pump Station

The Final Environmental Assessment/Negative Declaration for the subject action has been withdrawn. The Notice of Availability of the Negative Declaration was published in the August 8, 1993 OEQC Bulletin.

The Maui Board of Water Supply has rescinded the negative declaration. For further information, please contact the County of Maui, Board of Water Supply; David Craiddick (243-7816).

The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) addressing the construction of a new four-lane divided rural arterial with limited access. The length of the roadway would be approximately 15.4 kilometers (9.6 miles), and would link the coastal area of Kihei (Piliuni Highway) to Upcountry Maui (either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway), reducing the existing journey by approximately 15.3 kilometers (9.5 miles). The roadway, referred to as Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, would be generally aligned in an east-west (mauka-makai) direction. Ten alternative roadway alignments have been developed.

The roadway would satisfy several goals:

- Enhance access between the Maui Research and Technology Park and related scientific facilities at the summit of Haleakala, called Science City;
- Provide a more efficient route for commuters traveling between Upcountry and Kihei;
- Help alleviate traffic congestion on existing road ways by providing more roadway capacity; and
- Facilitate tourist travel between Kihei and the summit of Haleakala.

Potential impacts of the proposed highway are expected to be relatively minor in the areas of water quality, air and noise emissions, and visual impact. However, the level of impact could be more severe in the following areas:

- **Social and Economic Activity** - due to possible changes to the residential character of the Upcountry area; increased land values; and increased tourist activity.
- **Traffic** - due to the creation of new intersections and roadway crossings, and the redistribution of traffic volumes.
- **Farmlands** - due to possible disturbance of important farmland soil types and farming operations.
- **Endangered and Threatened Species** - due to possible impacts on endangered plant species.
- **Historic and Archeological Resources** - due to possible impacts on native Hawaiian archeological resources.

An EIS is deemed appropriate because the project's potential level of impact in several areas is presently unknown, and could be significant. The EIS will evaluate ten alternative alignments and, on the basis of selection criteria,

Environmental Impact Statement: Kihai-Upcountry, Maui, Hawaii

[Federal Register: November 9, 1995 (Volume 60, Number 217)] [Notices]
[Page 56632-56633]
>From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Kihai-Upcountry, Maui, Hawaii

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared for a proposed highway project to connect the Kihai and Upcountry areas of Maui, Hawaii.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Abraham Wong, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Office Address: 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room #3202, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813; Mailing Address: P.O. Box 50206, Honolulu, Hawaii 96850. Telephone: (808) 541-2700.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT), will prepare an EIS addressing a proposed new, four-lane divided rural arterial with limited access. The roadway would be approximately 15.4 kilometers (9.6 miles) long, and would link the coastal area of Kihai (Piilani Highway) to Upcountry Maui (either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway), reducing the existing journey by approximately 15.3 kilometers (9.5 miles). This roadway, referred to as Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, would be generally aligned in an east-west (mauka-makai) direction. The roadway would satisfy several goals: enhance access between the Maui Research and Technology Park in Kihai and the related scientific facilities at the summit of Haleakala, called Science City; provide a more efficient route for commuters traveling between Upcountry and Kihai; help alleviate traffic congestion on existing roadways by providing more roadway capacity; and facilitate tourist travel between Kihai and the summit of Haleakala.

[[Page 56633]]

Alternatives under consideration include taking no action, ten alternative roadway alignments, and a Transportation System Management alternative. Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments have been sent to federal, State and local agencies, and to private land owners, organizations, and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have an interest in this project. A meeting to discuss the scope of the EIS was held October 26, 1994, in Honolulu, Hawaii. In addition, a public hearing will be held after publication of the draft EIS. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing. To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the above address.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Issued on: October 31, 1995.

R.J. McCormick,
Field Operations Engineer.
[FR Doc. 95-27838 Filed 11-8-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-22-M

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Department of Budget and Finance
250 South Hotel
Honolulu, HI 96813

The Honorable Linda Crockett Lingle
Mayor
County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
National Park Service
National Register of Historic Places
P.O. Box 37127
Washington, D.C. 20013

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
National Park Service
730 Smms Street, Suite 401
Golden, Colorado 80401

Department of Parks and Recreation
County of Maui
200 S. High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Department of Business, Economic Development
& Tourism Library
250 S. Hotel
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dr. Herman M. Aizawa
Superintendent
Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Mr. Abe Aiona
Trustee
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kaulaia Blvd., 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Harry Eagar
The Maui News
P.O. Box 550
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Department of Water Supply
County of Maui
200 S. High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Thomas Atizumi, Chief
Department of Health
Environmental Management Division
919 Ala Moana Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Michelle Anderson
R.R. 2 Box 224 B
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Gary Gill, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 S. King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Economic Development Agency
County of Maui
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Edward Ayau
Bunial Program Coordinator
Maui Island Bunal Council
Historic Preservation Division
33 So. King St., 6th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dan & Awar, Jr.
Hortstead District Supervisor I
Maui District Office
Hawaiian Lands
1063 E. Ham Street, Rm. C-206
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Bryan Harry, Director
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
P.O. Box 50165
300 Ala Moana Blvd.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

John Harrison, Env. Coordinator
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Environmental Center
2550 Campus Road, Crawford Rm 317
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dand Blane, Director
Planning Department
County of Maui
200 S. High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

The Honorable Rosalyn Baker
Senator, 4th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 411
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Hawaii State Library
478 S. King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Hawaii State Archives
Iolani Palace Grounds
Honolulu, HI 96813

Sam Callego, State Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services
Kalaninokou Building
1151 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Michael Buck, Administrator
Division of Forestry and Wildlife
1151 Punchbowl Street, Rm. 325
Honolulu, HI 96813

Edward Henry, Jr., Administrator
Conservation and Environmental Affairs
1151 Punchbowl Street, Rm 131
Honolulu, HI 96813

Richard F. Cameron
Plantation General Manager
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company
P.O. Box 265
Puneha, Maui, HI 96784

Nathaniel Conner, State Conservationist
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Soil Conservation Service
300 Ala Moana Blvd., 4316
P.O. Box 50004
Honolulu, HI 96850

The Honorable Avery B. Chumbley
Representative, 11th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 1202
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Don J. Hubbard
Historic Preservation Administrator
Department of Land and Natural Resources
33 So. King St., 6th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Honolulu Advertiser
City Desk
P.O. Box 3110
Honolulu, HI 96822

Mary Hopkins, Exec. Director
American Lung Association of Hawaii
245 North Kukui Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Charles Jencks, Director
Department of Public Works
& Waste Management
County of Maui
200 S. High Street
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793

Kahala Regional Library
90 School Street
Kahala, HI 96732

Karecove Regional Library
45-829 Kamehameha Hwy
Karecove, HI 96744

Mr. Charles Keau
Native Hawaiian Task Force
Parks and Recreation Department
2356A Main Street
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793

Hilo Public Library
P.O. Box 647
Hilo HI 96721-0647

Honolulu Star Bulletin
City Desk
P.O. Box 3380
Honolulu, HI 96802

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
U.S. Senator
300 Ala Moana, Rm 7325
Honolulu, HI 96813

James R. Judge
2233 Vineyard Street, Suite B
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793

Kamuela Regional Library
1041 Koko Head Avenue
Honolulu, HI 96816

Kaunaloa Regional Library
4344 Hardy Street
Lihue, HI 96766

Kihei Public Library
131 S. Kihei Road
Kihei, HI 96793

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Yukio Kitagawa, Chairperson
State of Hawaii
Department of Agriculture
1428 South King Street
Honolulu, HI 96814

Kula Community Association
P.O. Box 417
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Lahaina Public Library
680 Waiif
Lahaina, HI 96761

Legislative Reference Bureau
State Capitol, Rm 004
Honolulu, HI 96813

Maui Community College Library
310 Kaahumanu Avenue
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793

The Honorable David Moinaha
Representative, 10th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm 1210
235 S. Beretana Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dr. Seiji Naya, Director
Department of Business, Economic Development
& Tourism
250 S. Hotel Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Brett M. Kyner
Maui R. & T. Park
P.O. Box 967
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Lahaina News
P.O. Box 10427
Lahaina, HI 96761

Ms. Alice L. Lee
Council Chair
Council of the County of Maui
200 S. High Street
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793

Makawao Public Library
1159 Makawao Ave
Makawao, HI 96768

Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 187
Kahului, Hawaii 96732-0187

The Honorable Bob Navacone
Representative, 27th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm 1009
235 S. Beretana Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Greggory Pau, Director
Office of State Planning
250 S. Hotel Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST**

Pearl City Regional Library
1138 Waimano Home Road
Pearl City, HI 96762

The Honorable Rick Reed
Senator, 6th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 309
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Major General Edward V. Richardson
Adjutant General and Director of Civil Defense
State of Hawaii
Department of Defense
3949 Diamond Head Road
Honolulu, HI 96816

Robert Smith, Ecological Region Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Office
300 Ala Moana Blvd., Suite 6307
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, HI 96855

The Honorable Joseph M. Souki
Representative, 6th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 904
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Steve Sutor
Kula Community Association
P.O. Box 417
Kula, Hawaii 96793

The Honorable Joe Tanaka
Senator, 5th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 304
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

U.S. Department of Defense
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Building 230
Fort Shafter, HI 96858-5440

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of the Inspector
Interior Building, Rm. 2024
1849 C. Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

William Meyer, District Chief
U.S. Geological Survey
Water Resources Division
677 Ala Moana Blvd., Suite 415
Honolulu, HI 96813

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities (A-104)
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

University of Hawaii at Manoa
Hamilton Library
2550 The Klail
Honolulu, HI 96822

University of Hawaii at Manoa
Water Resources Research Center
2540 Dole Street
Homes Hall 283
Honolulu, HI 96822

Kak Watson, Chairman
Hawaiian Home Commission
P.O. Box 1879
Honolulu, HI 96805

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST**

U.S. Department of Energy
Division of NEPA Affairs
Forrestal Building, RM 3E-069
Atn. Carol Bergstrom
1000 Independence Ave., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

Eryan Hary, Director
U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
P.O. Box 50165
300 Ala Moana Blvd
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Jacqueline Wayland
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3921

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX Library
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-3921

University of Hawaii at Manoa
Sinclair Library
2425 Campus Road
Honolulu, HI 96822

Waialua Library
251 High Street
Waialua, HI 96793
Atn. Susan Werner

The Honorable Michael B. White
Representative, 7th District
The Seventeenth State Legislature
State Office Tower, Rm. 1105
235 S. Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DISTRIBUTION LIST**

Michael D. Wilson, Chairman
State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Kealahou Building
1151 Punchbowl Street, Rm. 310
Honolulu, HI 96813

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

87100001 J. CAIETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JUL 21 1999

REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2-4535

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
SUAN K. UHAIKI
GENERAL MANAGER

RECEIVED

JUL 22 1999

SEE ATTACHED LISTING

MAIL ROOM

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

In accordance with the requirements of the State Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) rules (Title 11, Chapter 200 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules) and Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes, we are providing you a copy of your letter submitted during the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project's EIS Preparation Notice comment period, along with a response to your letter, if necessary. Comments have been numbered to identify the points made in each letter, and the associated response.

Your letter and our responses are included in the upcoming Draft EIS for this project. As some of our responses may reference sections in this Draft EIS, we will send you a copy upon its publication.

Thank you for your participation in this project. If you have any question, you may contact Kenneth Au at (808) 587-1843 or you can reach him by calling Maui's toll free voice access number 984-2400 extension 71843.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

Enclosure

SC:gm

cc: Abraham Y. Wong (FHWA), OEQC
Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.
HWY-PA

Various

HWY-PA 2-4535

Similar letter sent to the following:

Planning and Operations Division
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Mr. Donald W. Reeser, Superintendent
United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service
P. O. Box 369
Makawao, Hawaii 96768

Mr. Don Hibbard, Deputy State
Historic Preservation Officer
Historic Preservation Division
Department of Land and Natural Resources
601 Kamokila Boulevard, Room 555
Kapolei, Hawaii 96707

Mr. Robert M. Butterfield
P. O. Box 122
Pukalani, Hawaii 96788

Ann and R. Dougal Crowe
R. R. 2, Box 96-A
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Don Fujimoto
Vice President
Dowling Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 1417
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Jamie Fenseca
105 Kulakina Drive
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Stephen Holaday
Plantation General Manager
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company
P. O. Box 266
Puunene, Hawaii 96784

HWY-PA 2.4535

Various

President
Kula Community Association
P. O. Box 417
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Ms. Elizabeth Marciel
168 Alea Place
Pukalani, Hawaii 96768

Mr. Warren A. Suzuki
Vice President
Maui Land and Pineapple Company, Inc.
P. O. Box 187
Kahului, Hawaii 96732-0187

Mr. L. Douglas MacCluer
Plantation Manager
Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd.
870 Haliimaile Highway
Haliimaile, Hawaii 96768

Mr. William W. Monahan
R. R. 2, Box 250A
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Christopher Perreira
P. O. Box 23241
Honolulu, Hawaii 96823

Mr. Frederick W. Rohlfing
Executive Director
Maui Open Space Trust
RR1, Box 398
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Dennis Smith
Box 1089
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Gordon Stellway
P. O. Box 206
Pukalani, Hawaii 96788

HWY-PA 2.4535

Various

Mr. Sam S. Hironaka
99 Nanihuna Place
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. David J. Baar
The Incense Works
P. O. Box 427
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. William Kennison
International Longshoremen's &
Warehousemen's Union
896 Lower Main Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Kevin Johnston
2780 Olulani Street
Pukalani, Hawaii 96768

Mr. Buck Joiner
Kihei Community Association
3443 Malina Place
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Mr. James R. Judge
2233 Vineyard Street, Suite B
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Hale D. Judson III
P. O. Box 115
Makawao, Hawaii 96768-0115

Ms. Nancy Kanady
2274 South Kihei Road
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Sunny Crowley, President
Kizmet Brokerage
P. O. Box 1028
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Various

Mr. Edward S. Svrjala
P. O. Box 149
Centerville, Massachusetts 02632

Ms. Leah Wesson
84 Kiiakia Place
Pukalani, Hawaii 96768

Ms. Sally Raisbeck
427 Libolibo Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Hans Reicke
77 Apalapani Lane
Haiku, Hawaii 96708

Mr. Fred Petersen
277 Ohina Place
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Ms. Genevieve Salmonson, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
235 South Beretania Street, Suite 702
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-2419

HWY-PA 2.4535

EISPN Commentors Who Do Not Require Responses

Darice B. N. Young
Realty Contracting Officer
Federal Aviation Administration
U.S. Dept. of Transportation
P.O. Box 50109
Honolulu, HI 96850-4993

Sam Callejo, Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services
1151 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

David Blane, Director
Office of Planning
Department of Business, Economic Development &
Tourism
235 South Beretania St., 6th Flr.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dennis Edward Bell, President
Hawaiian Classic Perfumes, Inc.
P.O. Box 2184
Kihei, HI 96753

Suzanne Lee Freitas
221 Labo Pl, B-5
Kahului, HI 96732

Lenda McGehee-Simon
(provided substantive comments but
address could not be located)

Edwin S. Mural
2791 Oluiani St.
Pukalani, HI 96768

O Cole
3300 Alanui Wailea Ekahi 1 3d
Kihei, HI 96753

Frank F. White
Pua Kea Farm
206 Cooke Road
Kula, HI 96790



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY/DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
 U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU DEPT. OF
 TRANSPORTATION
 FT. SHERIDAN, HAWAII 96813-5400

October 17, 1995 Oct 19 3 17 PM '95

MEMO
 ATTENTION

Planning and Operations Division

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
 Department of Transportation
 Highways Division
 State of Hawaii
 600 Kapiolani Boulevard
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Final Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for the Kihei Upcountry Road Project, Kihei, Maui. 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, a DA permit will be required as there are intermittent streams located within the project area. Please contact our Regulatory Section at 438-9258 for further information and refer to file number PO96-016.

b. The flood hazard information provided on page 13 of the environmental assessment is correct.

Sincerely,

H. Paul Mizue
 H. Paul Mizue, P.E.
 Acting Chief, Planning
 and Operations Division

RECEIVED
 STATE DEPARTMENT
 OF TRANSPORTATION
 OCT 20 2 23 PM '95
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION
 PLANNING BRANCH

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Responses to EISPN Comments

U.S. Department of the Army, Army Engineer District, Honolulu

1. Thank you for the information. Because of its regulatory jurisdiction, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency for the project's EIS.

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
 STATEWIDE TRANS.
 PLANNING OFFICE
 Oct 20 11 33 AM '95



United States Department of the Interior



NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Haleakala National Park
P.O. Box 359
Maunaloa, Maui, Hawaii 96768

IN REPLY REFER TO

L76

November 3, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Thank you for asking the National Park Service to comment on the
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.

Enclosed are our initial comments of 10/25/95 and additional
information, including that submitted by the National Biological
Service, concerning resources that could be impacted by the
alternatives (2, 4A, 6A and possibly 6B) through or near Pu'u Kaili.
The Pu'u Kaili area is being considered by State of Hawaii, Natural
Area Reserve Commission as a potential Natural Area Reserve.

Regarding the other proposed highway routes, we have no comment.

Sincerely,

Donald W. Reeser

Donald W. Reeser
Superintendent

cc: Natural Area Reserve Commission

RECEIVED
NOV 14 8 47 AM '95
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU DIVISION

RECEIVED
NOV 14 11 43 AM '95
HONOLULU DIVISION
HIGHWAY PLANNING BRANCH
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION



United States Department of the Interior



NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
Haleakala National Park
P.O. Box 367
Maunaloa, Maui, Hawaii 96768

IN REPLY REFER TO

October 25, 1994

Rex Johnson, Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for the invitation to the October 26, 1994 scoping session for the proposed Kihei-
Upcountry Maui Highway. Due to the temporary absence of Haleakala National Park
Superintendent Don Reeser and several other key staff, we are unable to attend this session.
However, we hope to be involved as consultants as the proposed development evolves. Please
accept the following comments in lieu of our attendance at tomorrow's meeting.

Alternative 6 and 6A pass through or very near what is generally recognized by biologists as one of
the most intact and diverse lowland dry forests remaining in the Hawaiian Islands that contains a
number of listed or proposed Endangered plant species recognized by the US Fish and Wildlife
Service, i.e., the Pu'u-o-kali lava flows. The other alternative to the west appear to pass through
areas of relatively little known biological value and hence may be more acceptable from that
perspective versus the alternatives to the east.

Direct displacement of dryland forests in this area by highway easements are not the only threats
posed by the proposed development, however. Non-native plants and animals and the effects of
wildland fire are other severe causes of loss. It is well known in Hawaii that the preponderance of
wildland fires are human-caused. In general the native shrublands that persist in this region are
nearly invariably found in areas of rough 'a'a lava. However, the fire history of the past 50 years
has shown that even in these discontinuous fuels, fire fed by surrounding or intermixed flash fuels
(principally alien grasses and kiawe) burns aggressively inspite of barriers more than 60 feet wide,
e.g., Honopiihoni Highway. Increased public access to areas that are peripheral to dryland forests
may affect them by increasing fire frequencies in the region -- a severe perturbation.

Our assessment that the more western alternative routes may be "generally more acceptable" from
a biological perspective is somewhat subjective, because these are private ranchlands without easy
legal access. The private lands are largely unexplored and relictuall populations of endangered
species may be found among any of the proposed routes. Hence these areas largely lack the basis
of biological survey which would allow approval or disapproval of particular routes on that basis.
Scientists of the National Park Service and the National Biological Survey have a strong interest in
assisting exploration of the proposed alternatives so that values at risk can be identified and
appropriate mitigation efforts made in the planning and route selection process.

Road planners recognize that without stringent limited-access rules road development is the
purveyor of a sequence of growth. We recommend considering the proposed roadway carefully so
as to centralize development, thereby providing some protection to Maui's rural and wild areas.

Sincerely,

Karen Ardoin

Karen Ardoin
Acting Superintendent

RECEIVED
OCT 31 11 05 AM '94
HIGHWAY PLANNING BRANCH
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU

RECEIVED
OCT 26 10 59 AM '94
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
HONOLULU

**U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Haleakala
National Park**

1. The information about the lowland dry forest, a resource containing a number of endangered plant species, is included in the Draft EIS. Alternatives 6A and 6B would have passed through or near this forest. However, both of these alternatives were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). The build alternatives addressed in detail in this Draft EIS would not affect individuals of endangered plant species in this forest. A botanical survey conducted for this project (see Sections 3.8.1 and Appendix J) found no other endangered or threatened plant species along the alternative alignments. Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the FHWA has determined that the proposed project will have no effect on listed endangered or threatened plant and animal species in the project area. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has concurred with this determination.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
Federal Aviation
Administration

Rail Estate & Utilize Branch
Western-Pacific Region
P.O. Box 30106
Honolulu, Hawaii 96860-0000

October 18, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
600 Kapiolani Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Your "Notice of Public Informational Meetings and Availability of Environmental Assessment (EA)" for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project also forwarded a copy of the EA of May 1995 for our review.

The Federal Aviation Administration has no objections or comments regarding your proposed project.


We appreciate this opportunity to review your proposal. Please contact me at 541-1236, if there are ways we may be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Darice B. N. Young
Realty Contracting Officer, AHNL-56

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 20 12 55 PM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

MICHAEL D. WILSON, SUPERVISOR
 DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 TRANSPORTATION BUREAU
 NOV 14 1 59 PM '95
 AQUATIC RESOURCES
 CONSERVATION AND
 ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
 CONSERVATION AND
 RESOURCES DIVISION
 FORESTRY AND WILDLIFE
 HISTORIC PRESERVATION
 LAND MANAGEMENT
 STATE PARKS
 WATER AND LAND DEVELOPMENT



HONOLULU, HAWAII
 OCT 23 10 07 AM '95

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 OCT 24 8 39 AM '95

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 STATE PLANNING DIVISION
 OCT 24 3 08 PM '95

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 OCT 24 8 25 AM '95

(P) 1720.5

OCT 23 1995

October 30, 1995

TO: Governor, State of Hawaii
 Office of the Governor

SUBJECT: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
 Piilani Highway to Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway
 EIS Preparation Notice

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. We have no comments to offer at this time.

Should there be any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. Ralph Yukumoto of the Public Works Division at 586-0488.

SAM CALLEJO
 State Comptroller

RY:Jy
 c: State Department of Transportation, Highways Division
 Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

MEMORANDUM

TO: ROGER C. EVANS, Administrator
 Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs
 FROM: DON HIBBARD, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
 State Historic Preservation Division
 SUBJECT: National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Review of an Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice
 Kihei-Upcountry Highway, Makawao District, Maui
 Highway Project No. HDPS-9203 (I). OCEA File No. 96-135

We have previously reviewed the preliminary plans for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Federal Highway project, and submitted comments to R. D. Johnson (Memorandum dated October 20, 1994). At the time of our review, eight alternative highway corridors were proposed. The number of potential corridors is now ten, however, the project location region has not been substantially modified.

The information provided in the final EA regarding historic and archaeological resources (3.36, page 15) is extracted primarily from our memo to Mr. Johnson. Regarding the process of identifying significant historic sites that may be impacted by the project, the EA states that "An archaeological inventory survey would be required to determine the potential level of project impacts on archaeological resources" (page 15). It is not stated in the EA whether the inventory survey will be conducted as part of the EIS.

While we agree that an archaeological inventory survey will be required once the road corridor is selected, it is not cost effective to have an archaeological inventory survey of each road corridor alternative. It would be far too expensive. Instead, we have recommended that an overview study be conducted as part of the corridor selection process, with a survey to follow later for the selected corridor. The overview should be included in the EIS, assuming a highly expensive inventory survey of all corridors is not being planned as part of this document.

RECEIVED
 DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
 OCT 25 10 43 AM '95
 HIGHWAYS DIVISION
 PLANNING BRANCH

LOG NO: 15677
 DOC NO: 9510KD23

Roger Evans
Page 2

State of Hawaii, Department of Land and Natural Resources, State
Historic Preservation Division

1. Archaeological and historical reconnaissance surveys were conducted on the alternatives considered in the Draft EIS, as recommended by the commentor, and the results are provided in Sections 3.10 and 4.10, and Appendix 1. An inventory survey will be conducted on the Preferred Alternative to be identified after issuance of this Draft EIS.
2. The recommended scope of work provided by the commentor was used in the project's archaeological and historical reconnaissance surveys.

2 The overview study would basically (1) review archival records and review prior archaeological survey work in the corridors and in adjacent and similar environmental areas, (2) and then predict likely land use and historic site patterns for prehistoric/early historic times and later 1800s times, so types of sites and densities of sites can be predicted for each corridor, (3) determine if some corridor areas have had their land surface extensively altered, making the survival of sites unlikely, and (4) determine through prior archaeological studies and through new aerial reconnaissances and/or brief foot reconnaissances if the predictions of the remaining corridors are accurate. This would provide a basis for evaluating likely site patterns and densities in each corridor and for selecting the final corridor. Some interviews with knowledgeable Hawaiians who are familiar with past land use of the region would also help in this overview, so traditional cultural places and/or archaeological sites that might have considerable significance could be identified. Final corridor selection can take this issue into consideration.

Thus, we urge the Department of Transportation to conduct an overview study as part of the corridor selection and feasibility process. The overview study should be included among the documents available for public and agency review prior to the final corridor selection. An archaeological inventory survey would then be conducted for the selected corridor area.

As a state funded undertaking, the project must comply with Chapter 6E, H.R.S. Also, as a federally funded project, the Kihai-Upcountry Highway project must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We recommend that DOT and FHWA coordinate with our office as soon as possible, so state and federal compliance concerns can be met in a timely and cost-efficient manner.

KD/jen

c: Kazu Hayashida, Director of Transportation-Federal Highways Administration

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF HAWAII
PLANNING OFFICE



OCT 24 3 08 PM '95

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Responses to EISPN Comments

State of Hawaii, Office of Environmental Quality Control

STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
229 SOUTH KING STREET
FOURTH FLOOR
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

October 21, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for the
Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. We have the following comments.

1. The proposed highway is expected to increase visitor traffic to the Haleakala National Park. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must analyze the impacts of this project on Haleakala National Park.
2. The proposed highway would facilitate access to Upcountry Maui and affect the character of the existing residential areas. The Draft EIS must examine the impacts of the roadway on the existing communities in Upcountry Maui.
3. The proposed highway would provide potential access to new areas and increase the use of lands adjacent to the roadway. The Draft EIS must analyze the extent of development with and without this new roadway. Please also determine the significance of these impacts in relationship to the existing community plan.

If you have any questions, please call Jeyan Thiruganage at 586-4185. Mahalo.

Sincerely,

Gary Gill
Director

c: Warren Unemori

RECEIVED
PLANNING DIVISION
OCT 25 4 43 AM '95
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
STATE OF HAWAII

Robert M. Butterfield

1. Thank you for your interest in this project. Your name has been placed on the project mailing list. You will receive the Draft EIS and information on the scheduling of the project's public hearings.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

NOV 1 10 16 AM '95

RECEIVED

1995 NOV -6 PM 1:24
DOT-HQ
MAUI DISTRICT OFFICE

P. O. Box 122
Pukalani, HI 96788
28 October 1995

RE: Kihei - Upcountry Road

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director, State Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl St
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

My personal preference is that a Kihei-Upcountry road not be built. The money should be used to improve the existing roads. Maui needs this road about as much as a whale needs a bathing suite. I could not attend the meetings. I wrote for a map showing the proposed routes but I have not received it yet. I wanted to get in my comments before the deadline, so . . .

1. Roads from the Airport to Kaanapali and Kihei need to be 4 lanes.
2. Something needs to be done about the terrible design of the Hana/Dairy Road area. Ever try to make a left out of K-Mart? There needs to be a left turn lane from K-Mart all the way to Hana Highway.
3. And my personal pet peeve: to get to Kanaha Beach Park via the shortest least congested route from east Maui, I have to travel around the airport loop. Why can't Aalele Street cross Keolani Place and connect directly to Amala Place?

If a road must be built please, please, please. Don't have it connect anywhere near lower Pukalani or "5 trees" (Haleakala Hwy - Kula Hwy). There is much too much congestion in that area already. The connection should be south of 377 - 37 (south of Naaleae Road). Over a million visitors a year visit the summit of Haleakala, most coming from Kihei-Lahaina. This will give them an alternate route and spread out traffic so no one road is totally impacted. Mile 14.5 on Hwy 37 looks good to me for a connection point if it must be done.

Thanks for listening. Good luck.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Butterfield

Robert M. Butterfield

STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 15 1 28 PM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Robert M. Butterfield

1. The improvements suggested are included in the Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996) and are therefore included in this project's No Build condition.
2. The alternative suggested is similar to Alternatives 6a and 6b (see Section 2.2.1.1). These two alternatives were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because they had inadequate benefit-cost ratios.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPT.
OF TRANSPORTATION

NOV 14 11 43 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

R.R. 2, BOX 5-A
KULA, HAWAII 96190
Phone/Fax: (808) 878-1338

November 9, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

We wish to add our voices to the many in our community who strongly object to the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway Project on Maui. Taking the list of "Purposes of the Project" in your order, following are our opinions:

1. The defense-related activities in Kihai and Science City on Haleakala will never involve the number of personnel to justify the expenditure of \$33.7 million to \$72.8 million! When speed of transport is necessary helicopters can and will be used. The legislative mandate, if such has been passed, is in error and should be repealed.

2. A roadway linkage to Kihai will encourage the growth of a suburban bedroom community to Kihai while destroying the last agricultural area for small farmers left on Maui! Our farmers and their produce are important to Hawaii. There is no question that many small farmers will not be able to survive the economic impact of the growth that would ensue.

3. The existing transportation demand and capacity for Upcountry is just fine. There are no traffic delays on Kula Highway since the Pukalani Bypass opened. Putting in a Kihai link will create a capacity problem.

4. Economic development is addressed in #2. Upcountry needs to be protected from regional growth of population and tourist activities to protect the agricultural jobs!

5. With funds for human services, education, control of crime, etc. being severely cut or removed, this is not the time to build new highways. There is great need for improvement of highway service from Kahului and Kihai to Lahaina. Should a severe storm, a tsunami or an airplane crash occur, those arteries would be paralyzed..as they have been from simple traffic congestion in the past.

7. It is clear that the "Purposes of the Project" are diametrically opposed to the life of Upcountry Maui as a rural-farm community. It is equally clear that the work of your department is needed elsewhere. Our plea is for reason to prevail in the protection of Upcountry and that sound planning and work be done to correct existing problem areas.

Sincerely,

Roger D. Crowe
R. Douglas Crowe

cc: Sen. Daniel K. Inouye

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

NOV 13 10 20 AM '95

RECEIVED
NOV 14 8 52 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Ann F. Crowe
Ann F. Crowe

R. Dougal and Ann F. Crowe

all potential impacts as best as possible so that full information is available prior to identification of the project's Preferred Alternative

1. The Draft EIS does not contain information on the number of workers traveling between the Maui R&T Park and Science City. However, this number is probably very small in comparison to the one million visitors who travel to the summit annually, and residents who travel between their Upcountry residences and employment/recreation areas in Kihai-Makana and West Maui. These latter two travel markets would benefit from a Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, with improved transportation for workers traveling between the Maui R&T Park and Science City being a byproduct of the new road.
2. Potential land use development impacts are discussed in Section 4.1.1. Potential impacts to large agricultural businesses and the small Kula farms are discussed in Section 4.2.1.
3. Section 1.2.3 describes the existing traffic conditions at major intersections and roadway segments along the route between Kihai and Upcountry. As described in Section 4.4.1.1, the proposed project would improve overall regional traffic conditions because the new highway would divert a large portion of the travel demand that would have used the Haleakala Highway-Kula Highway-Mokulele Highway route between the Kihai and Upcountry regions.
4. As described in Section 1.2.2, economic development activities are expected to occur in the Kihai-Makana and West Maui regions, as part of efforts to expand Maui's visitor industry and to diversify its economy by developing high technology industries. None of these economic development activities are being proposed in the Upcountry region where agriculture is expected to remain the primary source of employment. However, the Upcountry region, particularly the Pukatani, Makawao and Halimaile areas, is expected to accommodate more residences. Therefore, the link between Upcountry's residential communities and the employment centers of Kihai-Makana and West Maui will become more important in the future.
5. Highway projects are funded by federal and State fuel taxes. By law, these funds can only be used for highway projects and operation. Highway funds cannot be used for non-highway purposes, and therefore highway projects do not compete against other government services, programs and projects, such as education, crime control, etc.
6. The Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan includes widening sections of Honopilihi Highway and construction of a Lahaina Bypass. Both projects are considered part of the proposed project's No Build Alternative.
7. The project's purposes and needs, as described in Chapter 1, are based on existing and future travel demand, land use and economic development patterns, defense-related needs and the need to increase evacuation capacity of the Kihai-Makana region. However, it is understood that in achieving or satisfying these purposes and needs the highway could have adverse effects on the "rural-farm community" of Upcountry. It is, therefore, the purpose of the Draft EIS to disclose

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

Dowling Company, Inc.

Nov 14 10 12 AM '95

Dowling Company, Inc.

November 9, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813


Dear Mr. Hayashida

Re: Kihei-Upcountry Highway

We support the Department's proposal to link the Upcountry area with Kihei, however, we have some reservations regarding alignments 4A and 4B. Based upon the map provided in the Environmental Assessment, it appears that these alignments pass through TMK 2-3-8-05. We are currently under contract to purchase this property. This parcel has been urbanized and zoned (R-2, PD, and MF) since the late 1970's. It would be more beneficial to the State to route the highway through non-urbanized lands, thus, lowering the cost of right-of-way acquisition.

Thank you for allowing us to comment on this project. Please call me if you have any questions regarding our position.

Sincerely,


Don Fujimoto
Vice President

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
Nov 15 1 29 PM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

RECEIVED
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION
NOV 13 10 46 AM '95

Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement Responses to EISPN Comments

Dear Sir,

As a resident of Kula for
twenty-eight years my comment
is we have no new highway.
My choice if we were to make
one choice it would be to connect
close to Puukalani # 8.
It seems the most CENTRAL
and cost effective.

Please don't ruin Kula side
the rest of the island has been!

Please keep me posted w/
all news of this project.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Jamie Fonseca

RECEIVED
NOV 14 11 00 AM '95
HIGHWAY
PLANNING SECTION

STATE DEPARTMENT
EISPN COMMENTS

Jamie Fonseca

1. Alternative 8 was eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it is constrained to an existing government right-of-way that does not conform to modern highway design standards.

2. Your name has been placed on the project mailing list. You will receive the Draft EIS and information on the scheduling of the project's public hearings.

RECEIVED
NOV 14 8 51 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

ABB-HAWAII INC.
HONOLULU

TELEPHONE: (808) 877-0081

HAWAIIAN COMMERCIAL & SUGAR COMPANY

P. O. BOX 266, PUUNENE, MAUI, HAWAII 96784

October 17, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Re: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Environmental Assessment

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Environmental Assessment. My name is Richard Cameron, Executive Vice President and General Manager of Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S). HC&S cultivates 36,000 acres of sugar cane here in the central valley of Maui.

Allow me to highlight a few of our general areas of concern at this time and leave with you an attachment which more fully describes our concerns with several of the proposed alignments for this proposed highway.

We find that the Environmental Assessment fails to adequately address the impacts the several of the proposed alignments will have on HC&S' farming activities. In particular, alternatives 1,2,3, and 8, which dissect HC&S' fields, roadways, irrigation systems and drainage systems, in addition to taking cane land out of production, will significantly disrupt our operations. The result will be the need for operational changes by HC&S which will be extremely costly and will decrease our efficiency. Accordingly, mitigating measures will be needed to keep HC&S "whole". The Environmental Assessment fails to identify and address these costs, which should be considered as costs of the highway project, in addition to the cost of acquiring the right-of-way itself.

1

2

RECEIVED
OCT 21 4 12 PM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HI 96813

OCTOBER 20, 1995
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I WISH TO EXPRESS MY STRONG SUPPORT FOR ANY KIHEI TO UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY.

I DO WANT TO ADD THAT I HOPE THAT ANY SUCH ROAD WILL CONNECT KIHEI WITH THE KULA HIGHWAY, TO MAKE THE MOST DIRECT ROUTE POSSIBLE FROM KIHEI TO THE SUMMIT OF HALEAKALA, AS WELL AS AFFORDING EASY ACCESS TO UPPER KULA AND ULUPALAKUA.


IT IS TIME FOR US TO FACE THE FACT THAT THIS IS 1995, AND THAT WE DO OURSELVES AND OUR CHILDREN A GREAT DISSERVICE TO IMPEDE PROGRESS.

THE POPULATION OF MAUI MUST CONTINUE TO GROW AT LEAST AS FAST RELATIVELY AS THAT OF THE REST OF THE USA. HOUSING WILL BE NEEDED AND IT IS LOGICAL THAT MORE AND MORE PEOPLE WILL NEED TO LIVE UPCOUNTRY.

A KIHEI TO KULA DIRECT ROAD WILL EASE TRAFFIC PRESSURE ON HANSEN ROAD, DAIRY ROAD, THE MOKULELE HIGHWAY, AND THE HALEAKALA HIGHWAY.

LET US FACE THE FUTURE AND MOVE INTO THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY.

YOURS TRULY,



DENNIS EDWARD BELL
PRESIDENT
HAWAIIAN CLASSIC PERFUMES, INC.
PO BOX 2184
KIHEI, MAUI 96753
TEL/FAX 808 874 5500

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 30 11 13 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

ATTACHMENT 1

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Environmental Assessment

2

For example, throughout Section 3.0, impacts, HC&S' sugar operations appear to be ignored as an existing "agricultural activity" in the subject (impacted) areas. Section 3.3.3, Farmlands, makes no mention of sugar as a major crop in the area. Just as the alignments which transverse grazing lands are identified, it should be pointed out that alignments which 1,2,3, and 8 transverse lands currently being cultivated in sugar. Additionally, the conclusion stated in Section 3.1, that "agricultural, social and economic activity may be enhanced by providing a more direct route between agricultural areas and the Kihei urban center" is completely untrue for HC&S. In fact, just the opposite is true - - HC&S prefers a highway route that does not divide our agricultural operations.

3

Accordingly, we request that the potential impacts on HC&S' existing operations be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for this project and that HC&S be consulted and recognized in the preparation of the EIS. Mitigating measures should be identified in the EIS, as these will be bona fide costs of the respective alignments. We offer Attachment 1 to this testimony as a summary of the impacts to HC&S of four of the identified alignments.

We look forward to future discussions with the DOT and its consultants on this proposed highway project. We believe that by working together, we can identify an appropriate roadway alignment which will benefit all parties -- farmers, residents and businesses on Maui. The over 1,000 farmers at HC&S have an important stake in the chosen alignment.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns.

Sincerely,



Richard F. Cameron
Plantation General Manager

The Environmental Assessment illustrates ten alternate roadway alignments for the proposed highway. Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 8 would have a serious effect on HC&S' operations.

Alternative 1 -- From Haleakala Highway at Haliimaile Road to Pilihi Highway at Kaonoulu Street.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 116 acres; transverses 6 miles through HC&S property.
- b. This route crosses six primary (paved) hauler roads and two secondary hauler roads.
- c. This route crosses the Kauhikoa Ditch, six small ditches and numerous drip irrigation pipelines.

Alternative 2 -- From Haleakala Highway at Haliimaile Road to Maui R&T Park at Kihei.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 78 acres; transverses 4 miles through HC&S property.
- b. This route crosses one primary (paved) hauler road and two secondary hauler roads.
- c. This route crosses three small ditches and numerous drip irrigation pipelines.

Alternative 3 -- From Haleakala Highway, between Haliimaile Road and Pukalani to Pilihi Highway at Kaonoulu Street.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 78 acres; transverses 4 miles through HC&S property.
- b. Hamakua Ditch -- This alternative passes close to the Hamakua Ditch. Serious costs associated with its relocation or replacement by a pipeline. Large siphon pipes cross two deep gulches and some long tunnels pass under pineapple fields. Several existing drip irrigation systems would be adversely affected if the ditch was relocated at a lower elevation. If the highway is located directly below the ditch, several existing drip irrigation pipelines, filter stations and pump stations would be affected.

Alternative B -- Route is along "old government right-of-way" from Haleakala Highway to Mokulele Highway.

- a. Land area for right-of-way is 165 acres, transverse 8.5 miles through HC&S property.
- b. This route crosses four primary (paved) hauler roads and one secondary hauler road.
- c. This route crosses the Hamakua Ditch, the Kauhikoa Ditch, the Lowrie Ditch, five small ditches and numerous drip irrigation pipelines.

In each of the above mentioned alternatives, the disruption would require mitigative measures such as:

- Land for right of way -- HC&S' lands needed for the highway would be "prime" agriculture land that will need to be purchased.
- Splitting of fields -- Compensation for the increased cost of field operations due to the additional hauling time mileage, concrete crossings for haulers and tracked equipment. Field isolation and possible abandonment may also have to be compensated for.
- Cane hauler roads intersects -- There will be a need for underpasses or traffic lights at these hauler roads to minimize hauling delays and provide a measure of traffic safety. Additional cane hauler roads that are parallel to the new road may be necessary.
- Proximity to highway -- Compensation for the additional costs of operation to control dust and cane smoke and the potential to restrict the use of chemicals currently being used would reduce operating efficiencies.
- Irrigation system intersects -- Several pipelines, ditches, supply lines and mainlines would need to be relocated and cross the new road.
- Drainage -- These highways will cross at least three major gulches, Waiakoa, Pulehu and Kalialimui Gulches, and several smaller ones which will require the State to build bridges to traverse these gulches adding additional cost to these projects.

Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S)

1. Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 8 were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). Alternative 1 was eliminated because this alternative would produce a substantially greater displacement of cultivated fields than any other alternative. Alternative 2 was eliminated because it would bifurcate the Maui Research & Technology Park. However, modifications to this alternative (Alternatives 2B and 2C) were developed in response to this and other letters from HC&S. These two alternatives are still under consideration (Alternatives U1,K1 and U1,K2). Alternative 3 was eliminated because of its poor operational aspects and because it would displace a substantial amount of cultivated fields. Alternative 8 was eliminated because it is constrained to an existing government right-of-way that does not conform to modern highway design standards.
2. The impacts to HC&S sugarcane land are discussed in Section 4.2.1 and measures to minimize or mitigate impacts to sugarcane operations are discussed in Section 4.2.4. The costs of these measures are included in the cost estimates presented in Section 2.1.2.3.
3. Additional consultation with HC&S was conducted during the preparation of the Draft EIS. Information provided by HC&S in this and other letters, and through consultation, was valuable in preparing the Draft EIS. While Alternative U1 still adversely impacts HC&S, it has been refined to reduce somewhat the level of impact.



DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

Hawaiian Estates Realty Ltd.

Nov 12 10 04 AM '95

22' LEO PL B-5

HONOLULU, MAUI HAWAII 96813

(808) 871-8655
FAX 871-2166

RECEIVED

11 8 46 AM '95

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

NOVEMBER 3, 1995

MR. KAZU HAYASHIDA, DIRECTOR
STATE OF HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

DEAR MR. HAYASHIDA:

RE: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY PROJECT, MAUI

I AM A REAL ESTATE DEVELOPER AND HOME OWNER IN UPCOUNTRY MAUI,
THEREFOR VERY AWARE OF THE NEED TO HAVE A ROAD CONNECTING KIHEI
WITH UPCOUNTRY. I ENCOURAGE YOU TO DO ALL THAT IS POSSIBLE AS
DIRECTOR TO SUPPORT THIS PROJECT.
THANK YOU FOR ALL YOU DO.

SINCERELY,

SUZANNE LEE FREITAS

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
Nov 14 11 43 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

**Kihei-Upcountry Highway Project
Maui, Hawaii**

State of Hawaii • Department of Transportation • Highways Division
U.S. Department of Transportation • Federal Highway Administration

About the Project

The Hawaii Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are sponsoring the construction of a rural, limited access arterial roadway that would connect the coastal area of Kihei to the Upcountry area of Maui. The proposed 15.4 kilometer (9.6 mile) highway would link the coastal area of Kihei (Piihahi Highway) to Upcountry Maui at either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway. The highway would be generally aligned in an east-west (mauka-makai) direction (see map). Two lanes of an ultimate four-lane highway is being proposed for initial construction.

WONDERFUL

Purposes of the Project

- legislative mandate: provide improved connection between defense-related activities at the Maui Research and Technology Park and Science City at Haleakala.
- roadway system linkage: provide more efficient travel between the employment center of Kihei and residential areas upcountry:
- existing transportation demand and capacity: ease congestion and traffic delays
- economic development: support future regional growth of population, jobs, and tourist activities.

What is Proposed

- an ultimate four-lane rural arterial that would connect Piihahi Highway with either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway within an area bounded on the east by Haleakala and Kula Highways, starting at the Haleakala/Haliimale Road intersection, continuing south past the Kula Sanitarium, toward Ulupalakua, and turning northwest to adjoin Piihahi Highway, the western boundary.
- Ten alternative alignments are presently being analyzed. Based on potential impacts on social and economic activity, traffic, farmlands, air emissions, visual environment, endangered and threatened species, and historic and archaeological resources, DOT has determined that preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) is appropriate.

TIME IS MONEY

Major Project Milestones

- | | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Activity | Completion |
| • Planning | September 1996 |
| • Design | 1997 - 1999 |
| • Construction | 1999 - 2003 |
- ASAP*

Comments

An Environmental Assessment has been issued, and the public comment period ends November 10, 1995. If you wish to comment, please mail or deliver comments to the following address:

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Sam S. Hironaka
99 Naniuna Place
Haliuku, HI. 96793
Phone: 808 244-5136
October 4, 1995

Mr. Kenneth Au, Advance Planning Engineer
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Highways Division
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI. 96813

Dear Mr. Au: Re: Your Invitation for Written Comments
Highway for the Up-Country-Kihel Link

Thank you for your willingness to review comments for the above. We believe very strongly that the most important road to encourage and benefit tourism, ease growing traffic problems and help local residents and farmers is the COMPLETION OF THE PIIILANI HIGHWAY AT HALEEA. The very short and relatively inexpensive road to complete the circle around Haleakala from Hana to Haliuku will do more to satisfy our tourists than any other project. On the other hand, each day of delay means a growing number of disgruntled visitors, particularly after a long day of driving to Hana, Kipahulu and Ulupalakua. Best estimates are that there are about 12,000 guests at the Tedeschi Winery a month. Many people could save an hour of driving time back to Haliuku or Kaanapali with the Piilani extension.

The local people who work or play at Haliuku from the Kula-Makawao area will also benefit with less traffic problems, shorter driving time, etc. Residents from South Maui and Lahaina will also benefit in going to see friends or relatives at Kula Hospital, visit Haleakala or going fishing on the other side. Farmers will benefit too.

It may be of interest for you to learn that the 85 year old road which connected Makana to Ulupalakua was closed in March 1984 because "TOO MANY TOURISTS BEGAN USING THE ROAD TO HAVE A TASTE OF WINE, AND THE COUNTY COULD NOT MANAGE TO MAINTAIN THE ROAD IN A PROPER MANNER. Liability was a major concern and Oil to bind the dirt together was too expensive in those days. Closing an existing road because too many people began using the road doesn't make much sense.

Yes, ultimately, a road from the Pukalani or Kula area down to Kihel makes sense. But we understand that such a project will require unforeseen difficult solutions.

In the meanwhile, the Environmental Impact Study completed on February 15, 1977 by Your Department and the U.S. Dept. of Transportation known as "PIILANI HIGHWAY PROJECT NUMBERS F-031-1 (4), F-031-1 (1) and F-037-1 (10) Kihel to Makana Road/ Kula Highway, Maui, Hawaii, provides all the answers. The study made sense in 1977 and today it is much, much stronger because of ever growing traffic problems with the greatly increased number of hotels, condos, tourists and residents of Maui. If you are unable to find a copy of this somewhat ancient study in your files, I shall be glad to make a copy of this 152 page Report to you.

Thank you for your consideration of this very important matter.

Very truly yours,

Sam S. Hironaka

Sam S. Hironaka

cc: Mr. Robert Sitarot, District Director
Rep. Joseph M. Souki, Speaker of the House

Encl.: Copy of Letter dated June 3, 1994 from William Kennison, Business Agent
ILWU Local 142, Maui Division

896 Lower Main St.
Haliuku, HI. 96793
Phone 244-9191

Editor, Maui News

It is the goal of the ILWU to improve the life of its members, and at the same time, help our employers as well as the community in general.

According to the State Highway Dept. the road from Keokea to Ulupalakua was greatly improved recently - the first time in nearly 100 years, after the road was transferred from the County to the State last year. All that remains now is only a short 4 miles to hook up the Up Country Area to the growing employment center of hotels in Haliuku.

We learned from the State DOT that the Piilani Highway was scheduled to be completed to Ulupalakua in March 1980 after the first section in Kihel was completed. The State Legislature appropriated more than \$7 Million in 1992 to complete Piilani to the Kula Highway.

The Benefits are many:

1. Up Country employees of Haliuku will save as much as 68 miles each day from Ulupalakua; 52 miles from Keokea; about 40 miles from Kula and 15 miles from Pukalani and Makawao.
2. Our Tourists, whose goodwill and business we need to provide jobs to our members will love the short cut when they go to Haleakala and Hana. They will save 34 miles just one way, when they go around the island to Hana and return to Haliuku.
3. Even the Maui Hi Tech Park staff will save 25 miles round trip to Haleakala from Kihel. Tourists from Kaanapali will also save mileage and time when going to Haleakala and Hana.

Every car taking Piilani Highway will mean one less car to alleviate the traffic jams now on Pukalani and Mokulele highways.

We're for the Kihel to Up Country Road too. But it may be many years before we see the road. In the meantime, Piilani is easy, short and cheap by comparison. It goes through 100% pasture land. The right of way is all set. Basic engineering was done in 1977 when the EIS was completed and approved by both the Federal and State Highway Departments. The terrain is relatively smooth with no gulches. The uphill climb is good - it goes up to only the 1,800 ft. elevation at Ulupalakua. We, of the ILWU wish to preserve our sugar and pineapple lands for our workers and companies, and also to support our employees who work in the Haliuku area. Preservation of farm lands for our farmers is a must.

The 4 Mile Piilani Extension is a WIN, WIN situation for everyone, including our construction workers who need jobs on Maui. We need the support of Everyone on Maui!

William Kennison

William Kennison, Business Agent,
ILWU Local 142, Maui Division

June 3, 1994


Sam S. Hironaka

1. The alternative suggested is similar to Alternative 7 for this project. This alternative was eliminated in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it had an inadequate benefit-cost ratio.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION

NOV 14 11 43 AM '95

HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH



DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

NOV 13 10 12 AM '95

RECEIVED
NOV 14 8 53 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

8 November 1995

Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

I am writing with reference to the proposed Kihai-Upcountry highway project now under study. As a longtime resident of Kula in Upcountry Maui, I have had ample opportunity to observe the obvious: that a more direct link between the Upcountry area and Kihai/Waieanaa would have a very considerable impact on the nature of the mainly rural and agricultural community which I call home.

1 I view the building of such a link as eventually inevitable, and I also think that there is much to the argument that the highway would put an end to the rural/agricultural nature of Kula, Keokea and Ulupalakua. There are very few residents or farmers in the area who want the road to bring to their community the urbanization that might ultimately occur. On the other hand, there are many residents of Makawao, Puakalani and Haiku who now commute daily to Kihai and who would very much benefit from a more direct link to their places of employment.

2 I therefore think very strongly that if the road must be built, it should be along the corridors set forth currently as Alternates 1, 2 or 3. There is hardly any useful purpose in spending far more money to produce a route which will divert traffic up into the Kula area and force the great majority of those who will use the highway to have to drive further up Haleakala in order to then go down to Kihai. Keeping the eastern terminus of the road close to where most Kihai-bound traffic now actually originates will best serve both those who use the road and those who wish to preserve the country character of the greater Upcountry community.

Thank you for reading and taking note of my views.

Sincerely,

David J. Baar
Managing Director

cc: Warren Umemori Eng.

THE INCENSE WORKS
POST OFFICE BOX 427, KULA, HAWAII 96790
PHONE (808) 877-7753 • FAX (808) 876-2122

The Incentive Works

1. Potential impacts to Upcountry's communities and agricultural activities are discussed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.2.1, respectively.
2. The proposed project would not cause urbanization in Kula because development in Kula is constrained by water availability (see Section 4.1.1.2).
3. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). Alternative 1 was eliminated because this alternative would produce a substantially greater displacement of cultivated fields than any other alternative. Alternative 2 was eliminated because it would bifurcate the Maui Research & Technology Park. However, Alternative 2 was modified to Alternatives 2B and 2C, and these two alternatives are still currently under consideration and are now called Alternatives U1.K1 and U1.K2. Alternative 3 was eliminated because of its poor operational aspects and because it would displace a substantial amount of cultivated fields.



DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S & WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION
LOCAL OFFICE 451 ATKINSON DRIVE • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96814 • PHONE 949-1161

MAUI DIVISION: 100 WEST LONDONDRAVE ST., MAUI, HAWAII 96720 • OAHU DIVISION: 451 ATKINSON DRIVE, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96814
MAUI COUNTY DIVISION: LOWER MAUI STREET, HONOLULU, MAUI 96793 • KAUI DIVISION: P. O. BOX 1310, LUKA, KAUI 96766

LOCAL 142

November 6, 1995

Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Kihel-Upcountry Highway Project on Maui, Hawaii
Dear Mr. Hayashida:


The ILMU Local 142, Maui Division enthusiastically endorses the Alternative 4-B to the Kihel-Upcountry Highway Project. We have many members who live in the upcountry area who work in Kihel. This highway will be very beneficial to these members as well as for the economy of Maui.

We have looked at other alternatives but find that this Alternative 4-B will have the least amount of impact on our sugar cane lands.

Therefore, we would appreciate your support on the Alternative 4-B project.

Sincerely,

ILMU Local 142
Maui Division


William Kennison
Business Agent

WK:jkn

RECEIVED
NOV 10 1 20 PM '95
HONOLULU DIVISION

NOV 10 8 01 AM '95
HONOLULU DIVISION
C NDR

...AN INJURY TO ONE IS AN INJURY TO ALL...

International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, Local 142

1. Alternative 4B was modified to Alternatives U2-A,K1 and U2-B,K1. The major change to this alternative is that its Upcountry terminus was shifted north to the "Five Trees" intersection.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

OCT 30 10 39 AM '95

2780 Olulani St.
Pukalani, HI 96768
November 1, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

I think that the road from Wailea - Kihei should be tie in around Koekea. It seems the most direct from Kihei and ties in closely for those going to Haleakala Crater. It spreads the use out and gets congestion away from the new Pukalani high school area.

Sincerely,



Kevin Johnston

RECEIVED
OCT 30 3 17 PM '95
DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAY DIVISION

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 31 11 11 AM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Kevin Johnston

1. Alternatives 6A and 6B both had an Upcountry terminus in Keokea. Both alternatives were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because they had inadequate benefit-cost ratios.

3443 Malina Pl., Kihai, HI 97653, phone (808) 974-BUCK, Nov. 13, 1993

OPINION - to THE MAUI NEWS

While I was in the Caribbean and Florida doing hurricane relief, I missed the two meetings on the Upcountry/Kihai Highway. However, there seems to have been a few unfavorable letters in the Maui News regarding this project and so people seem to think this is a brand new idea. Having been involved in road and traffic issues more or less for the past decade, I'd like to refresh some memories.

First of all, we recognize some omissions in the commentaries, (build almost nothing anywhere near anything). It is truly difficult to grant such credibility to such extremist.

Roger I. Knox of Kula suggested that the Kihai Community Association or somebody conduct a survey of public opinion. I'd like to reference the Final Report by the Upcountry/Kihai Task Force which covered a period of sixteen months, involved more than 70 people on the task force, and numerous public meetings. We did surveys out the wazoo! We surveyed hotel employees in South and West Maui. We surveyed all major businesses. We put a survey in The Maui News. We had about 1500 responses. There was, and I believe, continues to be almost unanimous support for this project. Those 1500 votes from people who would use the road, vastly outweigh the few nay sayers that are now showing up. The main contention was, and continues to be, the location of the terminus for the highway and it is absolutely necessary to consider all possibilities, even those that are blatantly ridiculous.

To recognize the need for this road, it is necessary to be a bit of a visionary. Maui is growing and it will continue to grow, hopefully in an intelligent, planned, managed manner. Someday we hope to have a four year college or university. Someday South Maui will need a High School. Someday a R&I Park. And South Maui will soon have a 150 acre recreational park. It would seem reasonable that the people Upcountry would want, and should have, access to all of these facilities. The Upcountry/Kihai Highway would do that.

Of a more pressing nature, please consider the extreme vulnerability of South Maui to catastrophe. If a large fire started in North Kihai, fanned by trade winds blowing South, it could easily block both S. Kihai Rd. and Pilihi. There is no escape route from Kihai. A fire of this magnitude is a possibility, and we do not have the resources available to control it. Remember the Oakland fire consumed almost 4000 homes and apartments and it can happen here. A highway to Upcountry leaving Kihai at the R&I Park or South of that point, would provide an exit route to save lives as well as access for fire fighters to get in front of the fire.

Also, if Maui takes a direct hit by a major hurricane, large sections of South Kihai Road will cease to exist. Pilihi Highway will be in constant grid lock and relief and recovery efforts will be severely impacted. An Upcountry/Kihai highway would be invaluable in this situation. Similarly, the highway could provide an additional exit/access route for Upcountry disasters.

It is easy to see a nay sayer and throw verbal rocks. It is much more difficult to recognize the need for marked growth and appropriate disaster preparation, and to make it happen. Recognize also that the political and financial climate is changing drastically. If the Upcountry/Kihai Highway is not built now, in the future, the cost will be higher and the availability of funds will be considerably less. The Upcountry/Kihai Highway will be a long range benefit to Maui, expensive, but worth it.

Burt is Chairman of the Maui County Traffic Safety Council, a member of the State Traffic Safety Council, and participates in all County and State Road and Highway Planning Groups for many years.

C C KAIO HAYASHIDA
Chairman, Traffic Safety Council

Nov 17 9 57 AM '93

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

RECEIVED

JAMES R. JUDGE
2233 VINEYARD STREET, SUITE B
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
TELEPHONE: (808) 242-4955
FAX: (808) 242-4368

Buck Joiner

1. Increasing the coastal evacuation capacity of the Kihai-Makena region is one the purposes of the project.

October 23, 1995

Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Attention: Mr. Kenneth Au
Aliiamoku Hale, 5th Floor
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Kihai/Kula proposed highway

Gentlemen:

- 1 I would like to become a consulting party and go on record with the following comments about the environmental effects of the proposed highway:
 - 2 The routing of any proposed highway that would cross both Pulehu and Omaopio Roads would destroy the rural character of the area.
The topography of the Pulehu and Omaopio areas is that of a natural amphitheater, such that all of the road and traffic noise would be clearly broadcast to the higher areas.
At the present time, when any of the sugar cane fields are burned and harvested, you can distinctly hear the crackling of the flames and the squeaking of the heavy equipment operating over three miles away. All traffic noise would be similarly amplified.
 - 2 In addition, having a proposed highway bisect both Pulehu and Omaopio Roads would create a traffic hazard. You must understand that both Pulehu and Omaopio Roads are used by many farmers, either taking their products to market or moving heavy equipment from field to field. Farming requires heavy, slow moving equipment, which would make crossing a higher speed limit highway extremely difficult, if not extremely dangerous.
The most important thing to understand about the proposed highway is that both Pulehu and Omaopio Roads are very narrow, winding roads that simply were not engineered or built to take the increased traffic that would feed into any new highway.

Department of Transportation
Page two
October 23, 1995

It is obvious that all Pukalani and Kula residents who live or work south of the Kula 200 subdivision would utilize either Omaopio or Pulehu Roads to gain access to any new highway, as it would be closer for them.

Traffic presently backs up at the bottom of Pulehu Road, at Hansen Road, and we could expect the same to occur at any intersection with the proposed new highway. Attempting to cross a 55-mile an hour highway would create a worse backup than the present crossing of a 35-mile an hour Hansen Road.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding the above.

Very truly yours,


JAMES R. JUDGE

JRJ:jfoa675

pc: Mr. Masa Uradomo

James R. Judge

1. Your name has been placed on the project mailing list. You will receive the Draft EIS and information on the scheduling of the project's public hearings.
2. Potential impacts to travel patterns on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads are discussed in Section 4.4.1.1. Mitigation measures to address these impacts are discussed in Section 4.4.4.
3. Traffic noise levels were predicted at a site representative of Omaopio residences. For the results, see Section 4.6.2.
4. See #2.

10/23/95

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2 02 PM '95
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

To whom it may concern:
I am writing concerning the proposed upcountry kihei road. We do need this road, and a lot of upcountry folks feel the way.

I like the idea of people from out in Haiku and the Kaiti myle people benefiting from this road. Therefore, a route that starts on Haleakala Hwy and heads towards kihei is the preferred route. This will interest this highway in Chasing, Dulehu, or wherever it goes any feeder road, so those folks will benefit too.

As for a tie over if kihei, I see many points on all sides. The long term will need to have a leg, head towards the upcountry area.

So if this Central North-Kihei route is the best, it will be well used and appreciated by many people, upcountry and down.

Thank you for your consideration.

[Signature]

MR. HALE D. JUDSON III
P.O. BOX 115
MAKAWAO, HI 96768-0115

PH # 572-0839

Hale D. Judson III

1. The U1 and U2-A alternatives connect with Haleakala Highway.
2. There is no central Kihei terminus option. Alignment alternatives ending at the Piilani Highway/Lipoa Street intersection, which is roughly in central Kihei, were considered earlier but dropped in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). Maui Research & Technology Park officials requested that the highway not bifurcate the Park, which would occur if the highway's Kihei terminus is at the Piilani Highway/Lipoa Street intersection.

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2 02 PM '95
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

NOV 10 10 43 AM '95
REGISTRATION
DIVISION

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 7 2 30 PM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

November 3, 1995

State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: New road between Kihei and Upcountry

Dear Dept. of Transportation:

I am strongly in favor of having this road completed as soon as possible. The newspaper coverage of the hearings made no mention of what I perceive as the most serious reason for having this road. Should Kihei ever be subjected to tsunami flooding, we would have no way of reaching other parts of the island. All of our grocery stores are in the flood plain, and could be wiped out. We need another road to provide us a way of exiting to higher ground in case of disaster.

Why are we looking a gift horse in the face. Lets take advantage of this wonderful opportunity to expand our road system with help of federal funding and reap the fringe benefits of opening a new part of the island for sightseers, visitors and residents. Kihei deserves this. We are the last community on the island to get a public swimming pool and a decent community center and decent school buildings. Please don't deprive us of this chance to bring increased infrastructure to our area with the help of the federal government funds.

Aloha from Maui,
I favor the route from Makana to Keolu area but would support any of the alternative routes
Nancy Kanady

Nancy Kanady
2274 So. Kihei Rd.
Kihei, HI 96753

879-5595

Nancy Kanady

1. Improving the coastal evacuation capacity of the Kihei-Makena region is one of the purposes of the project (see Section 1.2.6).



Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

November 10, 1995

RECEIVED

NOV 13 2 15 PM '95

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Ladies and Gentlemen

I strongly support a Kihai to Upcountry, Maui Highway.

There are so many reasons why I feel this is urgently necessary. The population on Maui is only going to increase. Over the past 20 years I have seen amazing growth, and unfortunately a tremendous lack of planning for this growth.

We rely and encourage tourism as a lead source of our economy. With these tourists come huge numbers of automobiles on the road, and accidents due to sightseeing. To be able to by-pass the lead roads for Kamaaina's--so they can just drive to the Crater and beyond--quickly from their hotels in Kihai, would significantly reduce highway deadlock, and I believe road fatalities and insurance claims (thereby lowering rates--hopefully).

Now with the Hawaiian land claims on the planned new extension by-passing Dairy Road by the new shopping center, the traffic lights on Dairy Road and Hana Highway should be unpassable during AM & PM commutes times, as well as the lunch hour...Which basically means only a few hours per day, will traffic flow normally through that section. By opening the Upcountry road---we could re-route a significant number of vehicles....The land debate could continue for years, but not be intolerable. (Plus better negotiating for the state on land swaps--if it isn't urgent).

I will be joining many Upcountry residents soon, and hope to one day soon save the 45 to 60 minutes I will be forced to drive by driving so far around.

Please guide us into the 21st Century safely and efficiently, by extending Lipoa Road up from the Research and Tech park in Kihai to Kula in the most direct and cost efficient manner. If you have a better plan -- I will support the one that goes in the fastest.

I encourage you to do this Now----Not in ten years. It will create much needed jobs and lessen the impact on our environment (via reduced gas purchasing, shipping and pollution). Please plan for planting of trees and bike pathways. (Link to Kihai 2000 and the Kealahou (Student benchmark project)).

With Regards,

Sunny Crowley

Sunny Crowley - President
Kizmet Brokerage
P.O. Box 1028
Kula, Maui, HI 96790

Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Responses to EISP Comments

Sunny Crowley, Kizmet Brokerage

1. The roadway would include landscaping and paved shoulders that are 1.8 m (6 ft) and 2.4 m (8 ft) wide, sufficient for use by bicyclists.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

NOV 16 3 58 PM '95

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
KULA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 417 KULA, HAWAII 96790
NOV 20 2 34 PM '95

November 10, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

Thank you for this opportunity to allow our Association to offer input on the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway. Our board of directors has been canvassing our community for opinions on the different alignments and options. Our current conclusions are very similar to the recommendations we submitted to the SDOT on 10/10/94 (copy enclosed). We found support for a single alignment, the 'NO BUILD' option, along with a (TSM) and Public Transit Alternative. We also came up with varied comments on the Environmental Assessment of this project.

Please allow us to continue with our observations and suggestions.

We understand the reasoning behind the 'Legislative Mandate,' and agree the defense-related activities at Science City and Kihai's MRT Park should have no bearing on preference on which alignment is studied. Even the 'no build' option should qualify for the funds by getting the workers to and from the summit in a safer and more efficient manner.

We believe that a new highway between Kihai and Upcountry would greatly improve the traffic flow up and down the mountain. We also agree that the 'NO BUILD' road improvements and a future public transportation system would do the same, and more likely be the logical first step to take. Public transportation might only help a small percentage of the commuters, but it would guarantee to eliminate thousands of rented cars, adding road room for years to come.

Our board had trouble with the high estimates of growth stated in the E.A. from 1987 to 2010, jobs on south side up 83%, population Upcountry up 41%, and the visitors count up 123%.

In the past 8 years unemployment has doubled, hotels and many other businesses have streamlined operations, laying off many workers. Along with a fairly flat tourism market, no new hotels are being planned for the future for the Kihai-Wailea-Makana area.

Most agree that the more Maui is developed the sooner our visitor counts and related jobs will stabilize, not increase.

Growth Upcountry in the Kula to Ulupalakua region will be restricted because of the lack of water. Hawaiian Homelands, farmers, and drought protection for the current residents are the priorities for any future water source development.

4 Maui's real attraction is its open space. Our parks will hopefully be protected and increase in size and number, but our Ag lands; sugarcane, ranches, and truck farms are the most important assets of our unique community for the resident and visitor alike. We all must consider the trade-off if this highway is plotted through these areas.


5 In our current Upcountry Community Plan Recommendations, commercial and light industrial lands are being designated to supply jobs and services to limit the need to travel down the hillside. We also expect a major increase in home run businesses. This concept of Upcountry becoming a more complete community is a realistic one.

6 Our Board of Directors has concluded that we would support only the alignment connecting Haliimaile Road and a northerly connection in Kihai, with conditions. We are concerned as many residents and farmers are that this alignment will cause unsafe and undesirable traffic to filter off the new highway onto Omaoio and Pulahu Roads. This potential impact would have to be resolved with those concerned to gain our full support.

8 Our Board of Directors has also concluded that we support a 'No Build' Alternative as stated in the Maui Long-Range Plan. We believe all of these road improvements should be studied and funded except for one, Alternative 7 (Pūani Highway to Ulupalakua). The State should in no way consider this connection within the No Build plan, or otherwise. Our Association and community have voiced steady opposition to this roadway, knowing full well the major social impacts it would cause. Our serene low density agriculture areas would experience a change in character threatening our country communities across the mountainside. Those few that support this road alignment can never justify the harm it would do.

We hope these thoughts and recommendations help clarify some areas that we believe to be important, and possibly overlooked in the assessment of the Kihai-Upcountry Highway Project.

Sincerely,


Steve Sutrov, President
Kula Community Association



**KULA COMMUNITY
ASSOCIATION**

October 10, 1994

Mr. Rex Johnson, Director
State Dept. of Transportation
869 Puuhoehoe Street
Honolulu, HI. 96813-5097

Subject : Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project # HDPS-9203 (1) HWY-PA 2.2552

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you once again for inviting the public into this important process. Our Association appreciates the opportunity to further study this project along with the DOT and all those who might benefit. We know this plane will never fly without widespread community acceptance. To achieve this acceptance it must be shown to benefit the many residents who travel down to work daily in a safe, efficient direction. Military purposes, visitor traffic, and definitely Hawaiian Home Lands are all important concerns, but losing our small farms, awakening our rural communities of Omaoipio, Keokea, and Waiakoa with the screams of development and transient traffic flows will be unacceptable to all but a few who live on this mountainside.

CONDITIONS OF OUR SUPPORT

We stand ready to support a final alignment only if:

1. The highway benefits the main upcountry resident commuter population base (Pukalani, Makawao, Haiku)
2. Impacts to the future Socio-Economic environment of Kula is minimal
3. The route is safe and efficient (overpasses and underpasses where needed.)
4. Small farms and residents will not be displaced or disadvantaged
5. The route connects directly with Halealaka Highway (to eliminate the potential use of many narrow, steep, neighborhood roads as shortcuts.
6. The Kihai termini should be located to aid Westside commuters and a future spur road access to the Hawaiian Homes Development if possible.

General Comments, Concerns, and Information On Schematic Plan of Alternative Alignments (W. Unamori Map Revised Aug. 19, 94)

ALT 1, 2, & 3

These routes would satisfy most of our conditions if all intersections were made to be safe. The Kula C.A. would favor them in numerical order.

Alt. 1 only intersects Pulehu Rd. and intersects directly into Haliimaile Rd, routing traffic from Makawao and Haiku straight to Kihai.

Alt. 2 crosses both Pulehu and Omaoipio but intersects with Haliimaile Rd.

Alt. 3 would not benefit as many people, lacking the efficiency of 1 & 2, crossing both Pulehu and Omaoipio, also not connecting with Haliimaile Rd, but again meeting most of our conditions

ALT 4, 5, 6, 7

These suggested alignments would fail to meet most or all of the Kula C.A.'s conditions of support for the Kihai / Upcountry Highway


With much thought and debate, the Kula C.A. concurs with the Distinguished members of the Makawao / Pukalani / Kula Citizens Advisory Committee (Re.Kihai / Upcountry Highway) And

The Maui Country Planning Departments recommendations of the revisions of the M.P.K. Community Plan Update (Re.Kihai / Upcountry Highway.

That :

Kihai-Upcountry Highway: The proposed highway between Kihai and the Upcountry region is significant in terms of its land use and transportation impacts. The CAC recognized that the selection of an alignment must consider the growth inducing impacts to the region's agriculture, rural character and open spaces. The need to maintain the unique Upcountry ambience is an essential parameter in analyzing alternative routing schemes. Recognizing that the evaluation of alternatives should weigh transportation costs and benefits as well as community and land use impacts, the CAC recommends that the Upcountry terminus intersect Halealaka Highway in the vicinity of Hali'imaile Road. The CAC further recommends that a spur off of the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway be provided to facilitate access to the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands development area.

The Kula C.A. also agrees with both the Upcountry CAC and the Maui Planning Dept. that the Makana-Ulupalakua Connector road be dropped as a capital improvement project thus, all planning, design, and funding be suspended. (ALT 7)



We also believe this route (ALT 7) would benefit very few, worsen traffic safety, disrupt quiet communities, and only benefit visitor traffic and private landowners.

Some citizens in our association do believe the losses outweigh the gains connecting these mauka and makai communities, and funds should be used to improve existing roads and highways to aid the traffic flow between Upcountry and the South / West Side. The Kula C.A. also believes this is a realistic alternative and should be studied.

The Kula Community Association has followed the Upcountry Highway discussions through the Toll Road concept of former Mayor Tavares (Dec. 1990) and the hard work of the Upcountry / Kihai Highway Task Force. We are full aware of the importance of choosing a workable alignment versus one plagued with problems or weighted by special interests.

Thanks again for listening, and could you please forward the origin / destination studies and any reports filed to you on this project to help us stay current.

Much Aloha
Sincerely,

Steve Sutrov
President,
Kula Community Association

Kula Community Association

1. The transportation systems management (TSM) alternative, which includes improvements to Maui's para-public transit system, was eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it would not satisfy the project's goals.
2. The projections in the environmental assessment were taken from socioeconomic forecasts prepared for the County of Maui in 1994. Since that time, State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) completed their year 2020 projections, which are an update of previous projections for the year 2010. In comparing both projections for the year 2010, the County population, employment and daily visitor census projections are 3.5 percent, 5 percent, and 14 percent higher than the DBEDT projections, respectively. Therefore, the comment is justified in questioning the County of Maui projections. However, more recent DBEDT projections indicate that the county's population, employment and daily visitor census would still increase substantially, by 22 percent, 25 percent and 52 percent from 1990 to 2010, respectively.
3. We agree that water availability has historically and will continue to be the major constraint to development in Kula (see Section 4.1.1.2).
4. One of the impacts of the proposed project is the conversion of open space, currently used for sugarcane and pineapple cultivation and cattle grazing, to a paved roadway (see Section 4.1.1).
5. Travel demand between Upcountry and the rest of Maui (for employment, shopping, or other trip purposes) is still expected to remain relatively high for the foreseeable future because no new major employment centers or commercial facilities are being planned for Upcountry, except those within the proposed Kulamalu development.
6. Both an Upcountry terminus at the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile intersection and a Kihel terminus at the Piihahi Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection are still under consideration.
7. Potential impacts to travel patterns on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads are discussed in Section 4.4.1.1. Possible mitigation measures to address these impacts are described in Section 4.4.4.
8. Alternative 7 was eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it has an inadequate benefit-cost ratio.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

Oct 23 10 10 AM '95

October 19, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

The October 18, 1995 article in THE MAUI NEWS, "Upcountry-to-Kihel road has its ruts" gave some shocking figures. The cost of this highway between Kihel and Upcountry was quoted as \$50 million. The time saved for individuals traveling this route was quoted as (a whopping!) 25 minutes. The cost for agricultural companies involved is described as "extremely costly".

Why can we not look at the situation more creatively? The travel time to Kihel is prolonged by the lack of the fourth lane of Haleakala Highway, the intersection of Hana Highway/Dairy Road, and the need to improve Piihahi Highway to four lanes beginning at Dairy Road. Surely the addition of the fourth lane to the Haleakala Highway; an imaginative and ingenious improvement of the Dairy Road intersection, perhaps an overpass; and adding the two lanes to Piihahi Highway would alleviate the traffic congestion that is a headache for everyone, both those in Kihel and upcountry residents.

I am sure the Waiohuli Hawaiian homelands community would be relieved to know that a large construction project and highway was not crossing their land.

Maui has the basis of a very successful public transportation system run by Maui Economic Opportunity. It would be a simple matter of upgrading their funding and expanding their facilities to have a full-scale public system. In view of our shaky economy, would it not be more economical and sensible to use our highway funds in a wise and responsible manner? Do we really need an "H-3" on Maui?

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Marcie
Elizabeth Marcie
(Mrs. David Marcie)

cc: THE MAUI NEWS, THE HONOLULU ADVERTISER/ STAR BULLETIN, State Department of Transportation, Senator Daniel Inouye

RECEIVED
OCT 24 8 39 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION


RECEIVED
OCT 26 11 02 AM '95
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

**Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Responses to EISPN Comments

Elizabeth Marcie)

1. Many of the improvements suggested are recommended in the Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan and therefore are considered part of the proposed project's No Build Alternative. The impacts of the No Build Alternative are evaluated in the Draft EIS.
2. Improvements to Maui's para-public transit system were considered under the Transportation Management Systems (TSM) Alternative. The TSM Alternative was eliminated in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it would not satisfy the project's goals.



DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

Nov 8 10 12 AM '95

02 PM '95

MAUI LAND & PINEAPPLE COMPANY, INC.
HIGHWAY BRANCH

November 6, 1995

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Environmental Assessment

Pursuant to our review of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed highway project and our attendance at the public informational meeting held at the Upcountry Community Center on October 17, 1995, we offer the following comments:

1. Alternatives 2, 3, 4A, 4B, 5 and 8 will adversely impact the operations of Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd. (MPCo) in varying degrees. For each of the alternatives the EA should address the adverse impacts on existing farming operations and efficiency, existing irrigation systems, existing pineapple layouts, existing farm roadway systems, existing pineapple hauling operations, etc. In addition, for those alternatives that will bisect existing pineapple fields, the question on whether or not it would be economically feasible to continue to farm the smaller remnant parcels created by the proposed highway should be answered.
2. The EA should analyze the negative cost impacts on the existing pineapple farming operations for each alternative.
3. The EA should address the mitigating measures that will be necessary due to the adverse impacts on the existing pineapple farming operations.
4. The economic state of pineapple operations has been marginal. There is a current shortage of viable pineapple farming lands and the loss of any lands caused by the proposed highway will have further negative impacts.

RECEIVED
NOV 11 10 11 PM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU DIVISION

Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc.

1. Potential impacts to Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Ltd. fields are discussed in Section 4.2.1. Measures to minimize these impacts are discussed in Section 4.2.4.

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
November 6, 1995
Page 2

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our comments. If you have any questions or wish to discuss any of our comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

W.A. Suzuki

Warren A. Suzuki
Vice President/Land Management

/dc

c: Gary Gifford
Doug MacCluer
Kees Nohara
Doug Schenk



RECEIVED

OCT 6 1 57 PM '95

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd.

Haliimaile Division

October 3, 1995

DOT Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Attention: Kenneth Au

Dear Mr. Au:

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON UPCOUNTRY-KIHEI HIGHWAY LINK

It is my opinion that the link between Upcountry and Kihei is unnecessary and will have a negative effect on the Upcountry area. Crime reports indicate that the Upcountry area still has the lowest crime rate on the island of Maui.

- 1 The road between Kihei and Upcountry will lead to the expansion of development in the area which is now the buffer between the tourist and commercial areas of Kihei and the quiet bedroom communities of Kula and Pukalani. To create this corridor will be to the detriment of the Upcountry and is, in my opinion, unnecessary.
- 2 The present traffic is manageable and growth in the future will be dependent upon additional water which does not now, or in the very near future, seem to be available.
- 3

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

L. D. MacCluer

/sj

Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd.

1. Section 3.3.6 provides information about current crime rates for both the Kihei-Makana and Upcountry communities. In comparison to Kihei-Makana, Upcountry has lower overall crime rates. The effect of the road on crime rate is discussed in Section 4.3.3.
2. Potential land use development impacts are discussed in Section 4.1.1.
3. Section 1.2.3 describes existing traffic conditions. Consultation with the Maui Board of Water Supply supports the comment that future development in Upcountry depends on the water supply.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 9 12 42 PM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING



RECEIVED
Oct 6 1 57 PM '95
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU DIVISION

Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd.
Halimalele Division

October 3, 1995

DOT Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Attention: Kenneth Au

Dear Mr. Au:

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON UPCOUNTRY-KIHEI HIGHWAY LINK

1 It is my opinion that the link between Upcountry and Kihei is unnecessary and will have a negative effect on the Upcountry area. Crime reports indicate that the Upcountry area still has the lowest crime rate on the island of Maui.

2 The road between Kihei and Upcountry will lead to the expansion of development in the area which is now the buffer between the tourist and commercial areas of Kihei and the quiet bedroom communities of Kula and Pukalani. To create this corridor will be to the detriment of the Upcountry and is, in my opinion, unnecessary.

3 The present traffic is manageable and growth in the future will be dependent upon additional water which does not now, or in the very near future, seem to be available.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

L. D. MacCluer

/sj

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 9 12 42 PM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd.

1. Section 3.3.6 provides information about current crime rates for both the Kihei-Makena and Upcountry communities. In comparison to Kihei-Makena, Upcountry has lower overall crime rates. The effect of the road on crime rate is discussed in Section 4.3.3.

2. Potential land use development impacts are discussed in Section 4.1.1.

3. Section 1.2.3 describes existing traffic conditions. Consultation with the Maui Board of Water Supply supports the comment that future development in Upcountry depends on the water supply.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

NOV 14 10 14 AM '95

RECEIVED
NOV 15 10 03 AM '95
TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION

8 November 1995

Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii Dept. of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Hayashida,

I am writing with reference to the proposed Kihel-Upcountry highway project now under study. As a longtime resident of Kula in Upcountry Maui, I have had ample opportunity to observe the obvious: that a more direct link between the Upcountry area and Kihel/Makana would have a very considerable impact on the nature of the mainly rural and agricultural community which I call home.

I view the building of such a link as eventually inevitable, and I also think that there is much to the argument that the highway would put an end to the rural/agricultural nature of Kula, Keokea and Ulupalakua. There are very few residents or farmers in the area who want the road to bring to their community the urbanization that might ultimately occur. On the other hand, there are many residents of Makawao, Pukalani and Hailu who now commute daily to Kihel and who would very much benefit from a more direct link to their places of employment.

I therefore think very strongly that if the road must be built, it should be along the corridors set forth currently as Alternates 1,2 or 3. There is hardly any useful purpose in spending far more money to produce a route which will divert traffic up into the Kula area and force the great majority of those who will use the highway to have to drive further up Haleakala in order to then go down to Kihel. Keeping the eastern terminus of the road close to where most Kihel-bound traffic now actually originates will best serve both those who use the road and those who wish to preserve the country character of the greater Upcountry community.

Thank you for reading and taking note of my views.

NOV 14 8 PM '95
RECEIVED
TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION
BRANCH

Sincerely,

Lenda McGehee-Simon
Lenda McGehee-Simon
Artist/teacher

Lenda McGehee-Simon

1. Potential impacts to Upcountry's communities and agricultural activities are discussed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.2.1, respectively.
2. The proposed project would not cause urbanization in Kula because development in Kula is constrained by water availability (see Section 4.1.1.2).
3. Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). Alternative 1 was eliminated because this alternative would produce a substantially greater displacement of cultivated fields than any other alternative. Alternative 2 was eliminated because it would bifurcate the Maui Research & Technology Park. However, Alternative 2 was modified to Alternatives 2B and 2C, and these two alternatives are still currently under consideration and are now called Alternatives U1,K1 and U1,K2. Alternative 3 was eliminated because of its poor operational aspects and because it would displace a substantial amount of cultivated fields.

October 20, 1995
State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
889 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RECEIVED
OCT 25 2 12 PM '95
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED KIHAI-UP-COUNTRY HIGHWAY
by William W. Monahan
RR2 Box 250A Kula, Hawaii 96780

To gain a perspective on the proposed highway link from Kihai to Up-Country, Maui, one must go back to the creation of the Kihai Research & Technology Park. For five years I worked for the Maui Economic Development Board (MEDB) where my chief responsibility was the development of the Park. From its very inception, we knew that it was critical to allied to the Park the defense contractor that manages the satellite tracking facility on Haleakala. During the negotiations, it became evident that the contractor and the Air Force were vehemently opposed to placing their administrative center in the Park. They could see no advantage to the Park location until Senator Inouye along with MEDB persuaded them that the move would be in their best long term interest.

The infrastructure of the Park was completed, an office building was constructed, and the defense contractor and Air Force dutifully relocated. Now after the fact came the opportunity to get funds through the defense budget for a highway to link the R&T Park with Haleakala. The military significance of the road was always recognized as negligible if not non-existent. The money to build it was what you would call pure "pork". MEDB was then "appointed" to coordinate efforts to determine the best route.

The issue really came before the public during the planning sessions of the Up-Country Community Advisory Council (CAC) to the Maui Planning Department. I was a member of that CAC. The entire report of the CAC, which met over twenty times, is replete with the message that Up-Country Maui is a precious environmental resource that should be protected for the benefit of all who live in or visit Hawaii. A highway that would create a loop from Kihai to Kula and then back down Haleakala Highway was totally rejected because it would encourage sub-division development, and it would create a tourist attraction that would change the entire nature of Up-Country. For example, it is estimated that some 500-900,000 tourists now drive annually out and back to Hana. The road to Hana has become a popular tourist attraction. The number driving a Kihai/Kula loop could well be over two million. After considering the opinions presented by MEDB, the CAC stated its preference for no highway at all. If construction of the highway was inexcusable, then its Up-Country link should be placed as far north as possible at the junction of Haliimaile Road and Haleakala Highway. I fully concur with this conclusion by the CAC.

One need only look as far as Oahu to see what happens to rural areas when they are accessed by highways. Development is not very far behind and the rural nature of the area is gone forever. Kula should be viewed as a park. It is not just for the pleasure of those who live there, but for everyone. I have been a life time resident of Hawaii, first on Oahu and now on Maui. I have watched beautiful Oahu turn into a congested nightmare. Please, resist the pressure of developers and land owners and do something right for these islands. Don't allow a Kihai/Kula loop to happen.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
OCT 24 11 24 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

William W. Monahan

1. The alternatives (6A, 6B and 7) that would create a "loop" were eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E). The two U3 alternatives would create a semi "loop" because their Upcountry terminus would be located near the Pulehu area. However, it is unlikely that a U3 alternative would induce residential subdivision development in Kula because of limited water availability (see Section 4.1.1.2).
2. An Upcountry terminus at the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile intersection is still under consideration.

Christopher Perreira
Nov 6 2024
10:34 AM

Nov 6 11:17 AM '95

Comments on the Draft EISPN to Maui Highway

I'm not able to see the whole of parcel
The site is a 200' wide highway with
a median strip. This will be the first highway on Maui
that meets federal highway standards. It will be a
two-lane highway with a median strip. The highway
will be built to the standards of the Department of
Transportation. I would like to see the Department of
Transportation in charge of the highway. This would
be a great way to get the highway built. Please
contact me if you have any questions. Thank you.

Christopher Perreira

1. Alternative 3 was eliminated from further study in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because of its poor operational aspects and because it would displace a substantial amount of cultivated fields. Alternative 5 is still under consideration, and is now called Alternative U3.K1.
2. As described in Section 2.1.2, right-of-way would be reserved for a four-lane divided highway, even though the proposed project would only construct a two-lane highway. It is not anticipated that a four-lane divided highway will be needed by the design year 2020. The design of the two-lane highway would be such that the future expansion to a four-lane divided highway would have minimal impacts to traffic conditions.

RECEIVED Nov 6 10:34 AM '95 DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION HIGHWAYS DIVISION	RECEIVED STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HIGHWAYS DIVISION PLANNING BRANCH Nov 6 11:17 AM '95
---	---

Fred Petersen

1. The alternative suggested is the proposed project's Alternative 7 (see Section 2.2.1.1). This alternative was eliminated in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it has an inadequate benefit-cost ratio.

Conference Memo 10-1-95
Kihel



Dear Kenneth

I'd like to comment on the road from Kula to Kihel, just do it! I think you should put the road through the Ulupalakua Ranch (the old road) to connect near Maunaloa. I think a lot of the people that would use the road are workers and tourists. That would put all these people in the water area and not in Kihel - Kihel is very crowded already.

Jibison

Aloha
Fred Petersen

file: kihei to kula link

427 Liholiho Street
Wailuku HI 96793

October 1, 1995

Kenneth Au
State DOT Highway Division
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu HI 96813

Sally Raisbeck

1. Thank you for your interest in this project. Your name has been placed on the project mailing list. You will receive the Draft EIS and information on the scheduling of the project's public hearings.

Dear Mr. Au:

1 I would like to be a consulted party for the Environmental Impact Statement for the Kihei to Kula highway link. Please send me a copy of the Draft EIS, if it exists, or of the Environmental Assessment.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Raisbeck

Sally Raisbeck

SALLY RAISBECK
-427 Liholilo Street, Wailuku HI 96793 (808)244-9604
October 19, 1995

kiheikula 1
Ralsbeck to Hayashida, October 19, 1995, page 2

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu HI 96813
(808)587-2150

Given the fact that people living on Maui do work by computer in London, i.e. telescopes can be remotely controlled from laboratories all over the world, it would seem that the need for people to travel from the base facilities to Science City is considerably less now than when the base facilities were in Puunene. In ten years that need will be considerably less than it is now.

RE: DRAFT EIS FOR KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

4. What time saving would be made in the entire trip from Science City to Kihei by any of the new proposed highways?

Dear Mr. Hayashida:
I attended the Upcountry Information Hearing on the Kihei-Upcountry Highway, and have also read the Environmental Assessment. I have the following comments.

Section 1.2 of the EA says that a 45 mile journey would be reduced by 9.5 miles, which must still be traversed regardless of the new road. The roads eliminated are mostly high speed roads, Piliani Highway, Mokulele Highway, Hana Highway, Haleakala Highway. Only the stretch of Hansen Road is two-lane and slow.

A. RATIONALE FOR FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT

I worked four years as a computer programmer on a laser project for Massachusetts Institute of Technology, dividing my time between the facilities in Science City and the base facilities at that time in Puunene. At that time and I suspect now, most of the people working at Science City went up for their shift, stayed there the entire shift, and returned to their homes. Only a handful needed to travel between Science City and the base facility during the course of the day, for purposes connected with work.

If we estimate an average speed of 55 mph for 7.5 miles and 30 mph for 2 miles, the saving of 9.5 miles in distance would mean a time saving of about 12 minutes.

The base facilities were transferred from Puunene to the Kihei Maui R&T Park, 10 miles further distant from Science City, primarily for the pork-barrel reason that after the state had spent millions to build the R&T Park, they lacked tenants. By agreeing to transfer the base facility, the defense contractors did a favor for the state.

5. If the federal defense benefit of this highway consists of saving 12 minutes on a journey for only a handful of people, is it worth the 80% federal funds for this highway? Is the highway needed for the stated reason, or is it a purely pork-barrel project?

As a federal taxpayer, I would much rather have my federal taxes go for health care than for this highway. As a state taxpayer, I would much rather have my state taxes go for schools and libraries than for this highway.

The true driving force for this highway is to open Upcountry to the kind of real-estate development that has taken place in Kihei. Most people Upcountry do not want that to happen.

The following questions should be considered in the Draft EIS:

1. How many people work at Science City? At the base facility in Maui R&T Park? Note that only a small part of the people working at Maui R&T park are connected with the facilities in Science City.

6. If only a few people need to travel between the two sites for work-related purposes, is a new highway the best way to facilitate their travel?

At the Information Hearing, I suggested half-jokingly that helicopter trips between Kihei and the edge of the National Park, plus a van shuttle to the top, would be faster and more cost-efficient than a new highway, for the federal defense linkage requirement. The National Park begins at about 7000 feet elevation, and this alternative would eliminate a portion of the time-consuming Crater Road, as well as the portion of the route the new highway is expected to cover.

2. What estimate can be made of how many will be working there in 10 years, 20 years?

The estimate should consider the fact that Science City lies within a National Park and is not able to expand spatially.

The EA does not specify elevations for the various alignments, but most seem to end between about 2000 feet elevation and 3000 feet elevation. The difficulty of travelling between Kihei and Science City lies primarily higher than that, from 4000 feet up to the summit at 10,000 feet.

3. How many of those now working at Science City have a need to travel to Kihei for the purposes of their work during their shift? From Kihei to Science City?

At present data communication facilities are out to bid for a link between Science City and the base facilities at Maui R&T Park.

The helicopter or equivalent alternatives should be explored, especially since the data link may cause the need for such transportation to dwindle even further in a few years. Such a transportation link would avoid the impacts on farmland, lifestyle, and archaeological sites that a highway would have.

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
Oct 25 10 43 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Raisbeck to Hayashida, October 19, 1995, page 3

Kihelkula 1

Sally Raisbeck

Mokulele Highway

- 8 | Another No-Build Alternative would be to improve Hansen Road, and possibly improve various intersections on the current route. This also should be explored.
- 9 | As suggested by someone at the Information Hearing, another quick and cheap way to reduce travel time between Science City and the base facilities would be to relocate the base facilities to their old home near Punene, or even to Pukalani.

B. OTHER QUESTIONS

7. | What are the criteria that will be used to decide on the alternatives to be considered in the Draft EIS?
- 10 | At the Information Hearing, the slide showing these criteria was very difficult to read. Could the criteria be mailed to all those who attended the Information Hearings or who requested the EA?
8. | Will those charged with preparing the EIS include conclusions of the relevant Community Plans now being considered by the Maui County Council?

11 | A number of very public-spirited citizens spent large amounts of time preparing the General Plan, the Upcountry Community Plan, and the Kihel-Makana Community Plan, as part of the official planning process of Maui County. They have been reviewed by the Planning Department, the Planning Commission, and are now being reviewed by the County Council. Public hearings were held at each stage of the process.

12 | The principles enunciated in those documents represent the consensus among the citizens of Maui for the future of their areas and should be considered in the EIS.

9. | As noted by Dick Mayer at the Information Hearing, will the Draft EIS consider the entire four-lane proposal, as required by law, not merely the interim two-lane proposal?

13 | The EIS on the airport expansion attempted to break the project into 22 discrete pieces, in order to avoid considering the impacts of the whole project. This was improper, and care should be taken to assess the entire impacts of this project.

10. | Will the Draft EIS include detailed information about the sources of funding for the proposed highway? Also detailed information about the proposed costs?

I hope these questions and comments will be of assistance in the Draft EIS.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Raisbeck

Sally Raisbeck

1. We have no information about the number of persons employed in Science City. As of June 1997, there were 315 people employed in the Maui R&T Park. We have no information on the number of persons employed in the R&T Park's "base facility" (assuming the Air Force tenant). Science City receives technical support from key defense contractors located in the Maui R&T Park. We have no information on the number of persons providing this technical support.

2. We have no information allowing us to estimate the number of persons that would be employed in Science City in 10 or 20 years. The commentor is correct to note that Science City has limited growth potential. The Maui R&T Park is projected to grow to 168 ha (415 acres) by the year 2020. Assuming the same employee density, the number of employees in the R&T Park may grow to close to 4,000. This estimate has not been corroborated by Maui R&T Park officials.

3. We assume that everybody who travels between Science City and the Maui R&T Park has to make these trips. Whether the number of persons making these trips would decrease in the future because of improvements to Maui's telecommunications system is not known.

4. Sections 4.4.1.1 and 4.14 contain information on trip lengths with or without the proposed project. The analysis in Section 4.14 compares trip lengths under each of the alternatives using two selected centroids: "Five Trees" Intersection and the Piilani Highway/Lipoa Street intersection. The route offered by the alternatives would be one leg of the trip from Kihel to Science City. Under present conditions, the travel distance of this leg is approximately 36 km (22.5 miles), and at an average speed of 64 km/h (40 mph), this trip would take approximately 34 minutes. Assuming the same travel speed, the Build alternatives would reduce the duration of this trip by a range of 11 to 17 minutes. Therefore, depending on the alternative selected, the trip duration from Kihel to Science City would be reduced by the same amounts.

5. If the proposed project qualifies for 80% federal funding, the decision of whether the project is "worth" its cost rests with the State Legislature and the Governor. The proposed project has other benefits, as described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS, which would be taken into account during this decision. State and federal funds for highway projects are raised through fuel taxes. By law, these funds can only be used for highway projects and operations. They cannot be used for projects or programs that are not highway related.

6. Reducing the travel distance and time between Science City and the Maui R&T Park is only one use of the highway. The highway would also reduce travel distance and time for visitors traveling between Kihel-Makana/West Maui and Haleakala National Park, and residents traveling between Upcountry and Kihel-Makana/West Maui for employment, entertainment and other purposes.

7. The use of helicopters to transport personnel between Science City and the Maui R&T Park is beyond the scope of this study. Currently, there are no plans to develop heliport facilities that would make this suggestion possible.
8. While improvements to Mokuieie Highway are included in the No Build Alternative, improvements to Hansen Road are not.
9. Relocating the base facilities to Puunene or Pukalani is beyond the scope of this study. We know of no plans for such a relocation.
- 10 The criteria that were used to select the alternatives under consideration in the Draft EIS are described in Sections 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.2.
11. Information on County plans is provided in Section 3.1.4.2. Project consistency with these plans is discussed in Section 4.1.2.2.
12. The proposed project would only construct a two-lane highway because traffic projections indicate that two lanes should be sufficient by the design year 2020. However, we are planning at this time to reserve right-of-way for a four-lane divided highway so that we can lessen the impacts when two additional lanes are needed beyond 2020. The impact analyses of the EIS are based on this proposed action.
13. To ensure that a highway project is not broken into smaller discrete pieces, the proposed action must (1) connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters in a broad scope; (2) have independent utility or independent significance, i.e., be usable and be a reasonable expenditure even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made; and (3) not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements. The Build alternatives under consideration meet these criteria.
14. Section 2.1.2.3 provides information on the estimated costs of the Build alternatives. The expected sources of funding would be the federal highway fund (80%) and the State highway fund (20%).

HANS RIECKE
77 APALAPANI LANE
HAUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96708

RECEIVED
OCT 31 1 21 PM '95
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

October 30, 1995

State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway

Gentlemen:

I support the planning and construction of the Kihai - Upcountry Highway and urge you to consider the following:

1. Plan the Upcountry terminus in such a way that residents living in Makawao and beyond will also benefit from this new highway. I found it significant that Makawao Avenue which terminates just above Pukalani was not even shown on the map (Figure 1-1) in your Environmental Assessment. This is a major road serving thousands of people and should be considered in your assessment.
2. Make the present Lipoa Street intersection the Kihai terminus of the new highway. It is centrally located in Kihai and has already some of the necessary infrastructure in place.
3. Route the new highway to make the Hawaiian Homeland area accessible from it without going through it.
4. Design the shoulders as bikeways.
5. Take advantage of the scenic and aesthetic opportunities the location of this highway has to offer. Provide lookouts and rest stops in as many places as possible. In the design of this highway the aesthetic quality should be considered as important as the customary engineering aspects. Top designers should be engaged to design the landscaping, signage, bridges, embankments, etc. Excessive cuts and fills should be avoided so that the road blends into the existing countryside rather than dominate it.

Very truly yours,

Hans Riecke

Hans Riecke, FAIA
Member of the State/County Joint Task Force

cc: Mayor Linda Crockett-Lingle

Word Highway 1/89

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 1 11 24 AM '95
HIGHWAY DESIGN
PLANNING BRANCH

**Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Responses to EISP Comments

Hans Riecke

- 1 Residents of Makawao would benefit from the proposed project because it would improve their transportation to and from Kihai-Makana and West Maui. The figure has been corrected.
- 2 Lipoa Street will not be a Kihai terminus because Maui R&T Park officials requested that the highway not come through the Park.
- 3 None of the alternatives considered in the Draft EIS would be located on or near Department of Hawaiian Home Land (DHHL) homesteads in Keokea. DHHL would have to construct their own access road to the new highway if they desire a connection and SDOT would have to provide permission for the connection.
- 4 The roadway would have 1.8 m (6 ft) and 2.4 m (8 ft) paved shoulders (see Section 2.1.2.2), sufficient for bicyclists. Whether the roadway would be designated as a bikeway has not been determined.
- 5 Opportunities would be explored to develop scenic lookouts. Landscaping would also be provided to improve the aesthetics of the highway (see Section 4.8.4) both for travelers and those viewing the highway from downslope areas. The roadway would be designed to minimize and balance cuts and fills.

Frederick W. Rohlfing

RR # 1, P.O. Box 398
E-mail: frondwp@maui.net
Kula, (Maui), Hawaii 96790

RECEIVED

NOV 8 10 37 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

Telephone 808-878-8927
Fax 808-878-2159

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION

NOV 13 6 53 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

November 7, 1995

State Dept. of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Pritchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96823

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

Having been a property owner on Maui since 1970, a resident of Kula, Maui since 1984, President and/or member of the Board of the Kula Community Association since 1991, and a member of the Joint Task Force of the State and County of Maui that has studied the project, I have major concerns with this multi-million dollar proposal. The initial rationale for a new road grew out of an alleged defense requirement to connect the Air Force defense contractor office building in the Kihai R & T Park with the satellite tracking facility on the summit of Haleakala. The location of the defense contractor was itself a "bootstrap operation" to assist in shoring up the R & T Park rather than the choice of the contractor or the USAF. Hence from the outset the "defense" case for the road has rested on a foundation of senatorial "pork". (Indeed, some have characterized the project as Maui's H-3 boondoggle).

There has, moreover never been any significant demonstration of support for such proposed road by people living in Upcountry Maui. In fact, in prior discussions at public meetings of a possible toll road connecting the two areas during the administration of Mayor Hannibal Tavares, the overwhelming majority of the people of Kula strongly opposed any connecting route with small minorities favoring a Makana-Upulakua connection along the route of the dirt road that formerly was utilized by local people or the connection to Pukalani. In statements at recent meetings and letters to the editor or the like, it is clear that the people of Kula, Keokea, Omaopio, and Upulakua are even more concerned today that their rural/farm area life style would be negatively impacted by thousands of Maui's visitors tooling through the area in their rent-a-cars not only on the new highway but also on existing narrow and, in some cases dangerous substandard county roads. One has only to look to the traffic to and from Hana - estimated at slightly less than one million vehicles a year- to realize even more would drive the circle route through Upcountry if it was made easier for them.

The task force report and EA pose a dilemma to the people of Upcountry. The various alternatives that provide a routing straight up the hill, from selected points in Kihai to several Kula points would clearly cause the aforesaid undesirable influx of tourists and

3 the inevitable "Oahu-ization" (urbanization) of Upcountry Maui. If, on the other hand the road were built across Haleakala from Kihei to the Halimaili/Haleakala Hwy intersection it would bisect numerous large and small farms and existing back roads such as Omaopio and Pulehu and require construction of overpasses to avoid the kind of poor transportation planning that was demonstrated in connection with the Pukalani Bypass project. (That performance led to a number of accidents and severe injuries before traffic signals were installed at Makawao Rd.) Farmers on the lower slopes of Haleakala would at the least be inconvenienced and at worst put out of business. Despite this latter possibility, The Upcountry Citizens Advisory Committee in its comprehensive Community Plan Review took the view, with which I concur that "If there HAS TO BE a new Kihei-Upcountry road" (e.g. despite opposition from the people directly affected), its Upcountry terminus should be at the junction of Halimaili Rd and Haleakala Hwy. It would then at least service the people living in the largest Upcountry Maui population centers of Makawao and Pukalani.


4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

The **BOTTOM LINE**, however is that the best alternative in the EA is # 2.1 - e.g. the **NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE**.

In this day of "budget shortfalls" and cuts in Federal and State funding across the gamut of social programs and the lack of funding to alleviate the impacts from overcrowded prisons it is both ironic and sad that an unnecessary, largely unwanted and wasteful highway project has gotten as far as it has.

Without admitting to the rationality of the political reality driving the expenditure of taxpayer funds for construction work, if the money contemplated for this project were devoted to improving Mokulele Hwy, Hansen Road and Haleakala Hwy, it would make travel between Upcountry and Kihei, and also Kahului and Kihei much safer and less time consuming without the extremely disruptive socio-economic impacts that would inevitably result from the major disruptive new route. I urge that the E.I.S. examine the benefits from applying the federal and State funds sought for this project for improvement of existing routes in Maui County or for other more necessary public construction projects in our State.

As with the "Field of Dreams" - if you build it, they will come! Please don't let that happen to our Upcountry home.

Sincerely,


Frederick W. Rohlfing

1. As described in Chapter 1, there are other purposes and needs for the proposed project than the R&T Park/Science City connection.
2. Potential impacts to Kula's agricultural activities, communities and neighborhood roads are discussed in Sections 4.2.1, 4.3.1 and 4.4.1.1.
3. As described in Section 4.1.1.2, land development in Upcountry, particularly in Kula, would continue to be constrained by water availability. The proposed project would not change this condition.
4. Overpasses would not be constructed at the intersections with Omaopio and Pulehu Roads. Measures to mitigate changes in traffic patterns due to the new highway intersecting these roads are discussed in Section 4.4.4.
5. An Upcountry terminus at the Haleakala Highway/Halimaili intersection is still under consideration.
6. Highway projects are funded by federal and State fuel taxes. By law, these funds can only be used for highway purposes. Therefore, highway projects do not compete against other government services, programs and projects, such as prison construction and education.
7. Improvements to Mokulele and Haleakala Highways are included in the Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan (February 1996), and therefore are included as part of the project's No Build Alternative. The proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is not a competing project.
8. The project's EIS is required to consider all reasonable alternatives that would address its purposes and needs, as described in Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS. Consideration of other projects that do not relate to the stated purposes and needs are beyond the scope of this EIS.

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION

OCT 31 10 11 AM '95

Copy HAYASHIDA

Dennis Smith
Box 1089
Kula, HI 96790
878-3859

RECEIVED
NOV 1 10 51 AM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU, HI

October 30, 1995

Letters to the Editor
Maui News
100 Mahalani
Wailuku, HI 96793

Dear Editor:

The Upcountry Road info meeting recently held in Pukalani was hopefully a wake-up call to the Department of Transportation from numerous Upcountry residents who clearly oppose this misguided project. The DOT hasn't exactly distinguished itself on Maui and a lot of us suspect Mr. Nagoo is alive and well somewhere inside the department busily influencing policy.

How can we possibly justify spending 70 million dollars to enable a handful of big boys to more quickly reach their big toys on the summit of Haleakala? The 70 million is just for openers, and, get this, does not include the cost of land acquisition and/or right of ways. As indicated in a letter to the editor last week this whole thing smells like a Maui version of Oahu's H-3 disaster.

Your voice can make the difference. Public input is being sought through November 10th so it's important you quickly share your outrage with Senator Inouye (the road's prime mover) and with Kazu Hayashida (DOT chief) in the form of a letter or phone call demanding the abandonment of this expensive folly.

If we have that kind of money to throw around let's throw it at something infinitely more important like education and human services, both of which continue to suffer from crippling budget cuts.

Dennis Smith

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 3 11 40 AM '95
HIGHWAYS DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Dennis Smith

1. Facilitating improved access between the Maui R&T Park and Science City is only one purpose of the project. See Chapter 1 of the Draft EIS for the other purposes and needs. Roadway cost information is provided in Chapter 2.
2. Highway projects are funded by federal and State fuel taxes. By law, these funds can only be used for highway purposes. Therefore, highway projects do not compete against other government services, programs and projects, such as prison construction and education.

October 2, 1995

DOT Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI. 96813

ATTENTION: KENNETH AU

Dear Kenneth,

I noticed that the EIS for the ten alternate bypass routes for the new Kihel to Upcountry highway have been recently published. I AM OPPOSED TO ALL TEN ROUTES FOR ARCHEOLOGICAL, TRAFFIC, COST, SAFETY, AND LOSS OF QUALITY OF LIFE REASONS.

It is incredible to learn that the ONE AND ONLY reasonable routing for this highway has not even been considered! Here is the route that is cost effective, sensible, and capable of delivering the least impact to traffic on Maui:

The route should start at the intersection of Highway 350 and the new Pihani Highway in Kihel. Thereafter, two new lanes should be built on sugar land, parallel to Highway 350, with a dividing median. This would create a safe four lane highway. Proceeding north to Puunene, the new highway would fork prior to Puunene, and maintain four lanes through sugar lands to the bottom of Highway 37. This would avoid more impact on Hansen Road. At the bottom of Highway 37, a new fourth lane would be added, turning Highway 37 from a three lane debacle into a safer four lane highway. Thereafter, the four lanes would narrow at the new Pukalani Bypass above Hallimale and proceed from there AS IS into the greater Upcountry area.

Cheaper, because the highway goes through sugar land, and the route is level. Most of the roadbed is already down, and widening would be so easy to do.

Safer, because Highway 350 would become a divided highway, while now it is very unsafe. Safer and cheaper, because now Highway 37 is a three lane death trap, and the cost of daily coning is exhorbitant.


Environmentally safe, since the existing roads and new roads would not create any disturbances to helaus and other significant archeological structures.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE! CORRECT THE TRAVESTY YOU HAVE CREATED WITH THREE LANING HIGHWAY 37! KEEP OUR EXPENSIVE

BYPASSES AS BYPASSES FOR THEIR INTENDED USE! GET RID OF THESE AWFUL PROPOSED ROUTES!

Please feel free to call me for more information or clarification. I will provide my consultation free of charge for the public good.

Sincerely,


Gordon Stellway
572-1377

Gordon Stellway

- 1 The alternative suggested is similar to the No Build Alternative (see Section 2.1.1), except for the connection between Mokulele Highway and Haleakala Highway. A similar alternative that would improve the No Build condition was developed called the "Widening of Existing Roadways Alternative" (see Section 2.2.1.1). This alternative was eliminated in the alternatives screening analysis (see Section 2.2.1 and Appendix E) because it would not satisfy the project's goals.

Edward S. Syjida
P.O. Box 149
Centerville, Ma.
02632
November 24, 1995


Mr. Abraham Wong
Federal Highway Administration
P.O. Box 50206
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Wong:

- 1 I have only recently become aware of the proposal for a new limited access highway to the up-country area of Maui. I am requesting that my name be added to the Service and Distribution List for this project through the Record of Decision. I would also be interested to know if scoping documents were prepared for the public hearing in October. If so are they available? My specific comments will be reserved pending a review of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.
- 2

I appreciate any assistance that you may be able to tender to me with this request.

Sincerely,



Edward S. Syjida

Leah Wesson
84 Kilakila Place
Pukalani HI 96768

Nov 3 10 33 AM '95

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAY DIVISION

November 3, 1995

State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Edward S. Syrjala

1. Your name has been placed on the project mailing list. You will receive the Draft EIS, and information on the scheduling of the project's public hearings.
2. Chapter 5 and Appendices A and C of the Draft EIS contain information about the project's scoping activities.

RE: New road between Kihei and Upcountry

Dear Dept. of Transportation:

I am strongly in favor of having this road completed as soon as possible.

For Maui to continue to support it's population we must have safe roads. It is ridiculous to drive 20 miles and overcrowd other roads to get to a place 8 miles away. Living upcountry and working in Kihei, I have driven coned highways for years. We must continue to improve our out-dated highway system.

Please take advantage of any opportunity to expand our road system with help of federal funding and reap the benefits for our residents. Please don't deprive us of this chance to bring increased infrastructure to our area, it is so outdated and we need this road so badly. I favor the Halimaile to Lipoa connection points as it accesses Makawao and Haiku as well as the rest of upcountry.

Warmest Aloha,

Leah Wesson

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 8 2 33 PM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

PUA KEA FARM 206 COOKE ROAD KULA, HAWAII 96790 808-878-6705
RECEIVED

Leah Wesson

1. An Upcountry terminus at the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile intersection is still under consideration. However, a Kihel terminus at the Pihani Highway/Lipoa Street intersection is not being considered (see Section 2.2.1).

NOV 13 2 18 PM '95
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAY DIVISION

STATE DEPT of TRANSPORTATION

I wish to state that the proposed Kihel - Upcountry Highway is not necessary, especially in these austere times. As a "Refugee Highway" it makes no sense, and neither the State of Hawaii nor the Federal Government has the money to build it — both are unable to balance their books.

Frank,

Frank W. White
FRANK W. WHITE

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
NOV 14 7 21 AM '95
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
DIRECTOR OF HEALTH

LAWRENCE MILKE
DIRECTOR OF HEALTH



RECEIVED

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
P.O. BOX 3378
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

NOV 15 12:15

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
November 9, 1995 QUALITY CONTROL 95-188/epo

State of Hawaii Department of Health

1. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has indicated that the project would require U.S. Department of Army Nationwide permit. Therefore, a Water Quality Certification would be required from the State of Hawaii Department of Health. The USACE is a cooperating agency for this project.

To: The Honorable Benjamin Cayetano
Governor, State of Hawaii
c/o Director, Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

From: *Lawrence Milke*
Lawrence Milke
Director of Health

Subject: Final Environmental Assessment
Upcountry Highway Project
Kihei, Maui

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject document. We have the following comments to offer:

Any work in any of the streambeds may require approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE). The applicant should contact the COE to identify whether a federal permit is required. If a federal permit is required, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification is required from the Department of Health's, Clean Water Branch.

If you have questions, you may call Mr. Herbert Matsubayashi, Chief Sanitarian, Maui District Health Office at 243-5255.

c: H. Matsubayashi (MDHO)

Maui Notices

August 8, 1999
 Construction of the project will commence upon the receipt of applicable regulatory permits and approvals. Pursuant to Chapter 343, HRS, an Environmental Assessment has been prepared since the subject property is within the boundaries of the Lahaina National Historic Landmark.

Draft Environmental Impact Statements

(4) Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway

District: Makawao
TNRK: 2-2-2-1, 3, 4, 15, 16, 17, 54, 114; 2-3-2-7, 8, 16, 17, 18, 75, 113; 2-3-7-8; 2-3-8-3, 4, 5, 28; 2-3-9-15, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; 2-3-11-1; 2-3-42-16; 2-5-1-1, 2, 3, 9; 2-5-2-1, 2, 5; 3-9-1-16

Applicants: Department of Transportation Highways Division
 869 Punchbowl Street
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
 Contact: Kenneth Au (587-1843)
 and
 U.S. Department of Transportation
 Federal Highways Administration
 300 Ala Moana Boulevard
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96850
 Contact: Abraham Wong (541-2700)
Approving Agency/Accepting Authority: Governor, State of Hawaii
 c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
 235 South Beretania Street, Suite 702
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Consultant: Warren Unemori Engineering, Inc.
 2145 Wells Street, Suite 403
 Waiuku, Hawaii 96793
 Contact: Warren Unemori (242-4403)
Public Comment Deadline: September 22, 1999
Status: DEIS First Notice pending public comment. Address comments to the applicants with copies to the approving agency or accepting authority, the consultant and OEQC.
Permits Required: Sec. 404; NPDES; WQC; CZM consistency; grading, grubbing, stockpiling & excavation; excavation of highway

The State of Hawaii Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration are issuing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project. This proposed two-lane limited access highway would directly link Kihei, Makana and Upcountry Maui by connecting Pilihi Highway with either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway.

The alternatives under consideration are all eight combinations of two Kihei and four Upcountry terminus options. The Kihei termini are named K1 and K2, and are located at the Pilihi Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection, and the Pilihi Highway / Ke Alii Aliani Street intersection, respectively. The Upcountry termini are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3, and are located at the Haleakala Highway / Halimalie Road intersection, at the Haleakala Highway / Pukalani Bypass / Kula Highway ("Five Trees") intersection, on Kula Highway almost a half-mile south of the Five Trees intersection, and on Kula Highway just south of Pulehu Gulch, respectively. The names of the alternatives correspond to the terminus names. For example, the alignment from the Five Trees intersection to the Pilihi Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection is called Alternative U2-A-K1.

The project would facilitate transportation between Kihei and Upcountry, thereby addressing growth in regional transportation demand, economic development trends, and coastal evacuation deficiencies. In addition, there is federal interest in the project because it would facilitate transportation between defense-related research activities at Science Technology Park in Kihei. The project would have both adverse and beneficial impacts. Potential impacts include substantial travel time savings, loss of open space, interference with agricultural activities, changes in transportation patterns, and savings in energy consumption. The nature of the impact varies with the alignment alternative.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed project are addressed and all significant issues are identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties.

J. Deadline Date: 60 days from the issuance date of this notice.
 All documents (original and eight copies) should be filed with: David P. Rogers, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426.
 The Commission's Rules of Procedure require all intervenors filing documents with the Commission to serve a copy of that document on the official service list for the project. Further, if an intervenor files comments or documents with the Commission relating to the merits of an issue that may affect the responsibilities of a particular resource agency, they must also serve a copy of the document on that resource agency.
 k. The proposed project would utilize the existing U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Coralville Dam and would consist of: (1) 2 new 80-foot-long, 108-inch-diameter steel penstocks; (2) a new 50-foot-long, 30-foot-wide, 30-foot-high powerhouse containing 2 generating units having a total installed capacity of 1,500-kW; (3) a new exhaust apron; (4) a new 400-foot-long, 14.7-kV transmission line; and (5) appurtenant facilities.
 Applicant estimates that the average annual generation would be 9.3 GWh and that the cost of the studies to be performed under the terms of the permit would be \$750,000. Project energy would be sold to utility companies, corporations, municipalities, aggregators, or similar entities.
 1. A copy of the application is available for inspection and reproduction at the Commission's Public Reference Room, located at 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426, or by calling (202) 208-1371. This filing may be viewed on the web at <http://www.ferc.fed.us/online/fims.htm> (call (202) 208-2222 for assistance). A copy is also available for inspection and reproduction at the address in item h above.
Preliminary Permit—Anyone desiring to file a competing application for project must submit the competing application itself, or a notice of intent to file such an application, to the Commission on or before the specified comment date for the particular application (see 18 CFR 4.36).
 Submission of a timely notice of intent allows an interested person to file the competing preliminary permit application no later than 30 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing preliminary permit application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.

Preliminary Permit—Any qualified development applicant desiring to file a competing development application must submit to the Commission, on or before a specified comment date for the particular application, either a competing development application or a notice of intent to file such an application. Submission of a timely notice of intent to file a development application allows an interested person to file the competing application no later than 120 days after the specified comment date for the particular application. A competing license application must conform with 18 CFR 4.30(b) and 4.36.
Notice of Intent—A notice of intent must specify the exact name, business address, and telephone number of the prospective applicant, and must include an unequivocal statement of intent to submit. If such an application may be filed, either a preliminary permit application or a development application (specify which type of application). A notice of intent must be served on the applicant(s) named in this public notice.
Proposed Scope of Studies under Permit—A preliminary permit, if issued, does not authorize construction. The term of the proposed preliminary permit would be 36 months. The work proposed under the preliminary permit would include economic analysis, preparation of preliminary engineering plans, and a study of environmental impacts. Based on the results of these studies, the Applicant would decide whether to proceed with the preparation of a development application to construct and operate the project.
Comments, Protests, or Motions to Intervene—Anyone may submit comments, a protest, or a motion to intervene in accordance with the requirements of Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 CFR 385.210, 211, 214, and 215. The Commission will consider all protests or other comments filed, but only those who file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules may become a party to the proceeding. Any comments, protests, or motions to intervene must be received on or before the specified comment date for the particular application.
Filing and Service of Responsive Documents—Any filings must bear in all capital letters the title "COMMENTS," "NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION," "COMPETING APPLICATION," "PROTEST," "MOTION TO INTERVENE," as applicable, and the Project Number of the particular

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Environmental Impact Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564-7167 DR (202) 564-7153.
Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements Filed August 09, 1999 Through August 13, 1999 Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.
EIS No. 990283, DRAFT EIS, NPS, PA, NJ, Delaware Water-Gap National Recreational Area (DWCNRA) Trail Plan, General Management Plan, Implementation, Delaware River, PA and NJ, Due: October 04, 1999.
 Contact: J. Robert Kirby (570) 588-2418
EIS No. 990284, DRAFT EIS, BLM, NV, Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area (RRCNCA), General Management Plan (GMP), Amendment to the Las Vegas Resource Management Plan, Las Vegas, NV, Due: October 04, 1999, Contact: Gene Arnesen (702) 647-5068.
EIS No. 990285, DRAFT SUPPLEMENT, NPS, FL, Big Cypress National Preserve, General Management Plan, Implementation, New Information on

application to which the filing refers. Any of the above-named documents must be filed by providing the original and the number of copies provided by the Commission's regulations to: The Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426. An additional copy must be sent to Director, Division of Project Review, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, at the above-mentioned address. A copy of any notice of intent, competing application or motion to intervene must also be served upon each representative of the Applicant specified in the particular application.
 Agency Comments—Federal, state, and local agencies are invited to file comments on the described application. A copy of the application may be obtained by agencies directly from the Applicant. If an agency does not file comments within the time specified for filing comments, it will be presumed to have no comments. One copy of an agency's comments must also be sent to the Applicant's representatives.
 Linwood A. Watson, Jr., Acting Secretary.
 IFR Doc. 99-21620 Filed 8-19-99; 8:45 am) BILLING CODE 6711-01-4

the Special Alternative for the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan, Collier, Deade and Monroe Counties, FL, Due: November 13, 1999, Contact: Wally Hubbard (941) 695-2000

EIS No. 990286, DRAFT EIS, DOE, CA, AT, UT, WY, ID, OR, WA, Transmission System Vegetation Management Program, Implementation, Managing Vegetation, Site Specific, Right-of-Way Grant, CA, ID, MT, OR, UT, WA and WY, Due: October 09, 1999, Contact: Stacey Mason (503) 230-5455

EIS No. 990287, DRAFT EIS, NPS, NJ, Great Egg Harbor National Scenic and Recreation River, Comprehensive Management Plan, Implementation, Atlantic Gloucester, Camden and Cape May Counties, NJ, Due: October 04, 1999, Contact: Mary Vavra (215) 597-9175

EIS No. 990288, DRAFT EIS, FTA, NY, Manhattan East Side Transit Alternatives Study, (MESA), Improved Transit Access Lower Manhattan, Lower East Side, East Midtown, Upper East Side and East Harlem, Major Investment Study, New York, NY, Due: October 08, 1999, Contact: Steven F. Faust (212) 668-2170

EIS No. 990289, DRAFT EIS, FHV, HI, Kihel-Uppcountry Maui Highway, Transportation Improvements, Funding and COE Section 404 Permit, County of Maui, HI, Due: October 04, 1999, Contact: Abraham Wong (808) 541-2700

EIS No. 990290, DRAFT EIS, FRW, CO, Southeast Corridor Multi-Modal Project, To Improve Travel between Central and Southeast Corridors, Light Rail Transit (LRT), Colorado Metropolitan Area, Denver, CO, Due: October 04, 1999, Contact: Vincent P. Barone (303) 989-6730

EIS No. 990291, FINAL EIS, NOAA, FL, Spiny Dogfish Equulus Acanthias Fishery Management Plan, Implementation, Northwest Atlantic Ocean, Labrador to Florida, Due: September 10, 1999, Contact: Hannah Goodale (978) 281-9315

EIS No. 990292, DRAFT EIS, BIA, AZ, NMI, Programmatic EIS-Navajo Ten Year Forest Management Plan Alternatives, Implementation, AZ and NM, Due: October 04, 1999, Contact: Harold d. Russell (520) 729-7228

EIS No. 990293, DRAFT EIS, AFS, MT, Fairhead National Forest, Swan Lake Ranger District, Meadow Smith Project, Vegetative Treatments and Other Activities to Maintain and Restore Large-Tree Old Growth Forest Characteristics, Lake and Missoula Counties, MT, Due: October 08, 1999,

Contact: Keith Soderstrom (408) 837-7510

Due: August 17, 1999

William D. Dickerson,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities

(FR Doc. 99-21719 Filed 8-19-99; 8:45 am)

WELLD CODE 680-68-01

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

(OPPTS-51932; FRL-6098-4)

Certain New Chemicals; Receipt and Status Information

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Section 5 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) requires any person who intends to manufacture (defined by statute to include import) a new chemical (i.e., a chemical not on the TSCA inventory) to notify EPA and comply with the statutory provisions pertaining to the manufacture of new chemicals. Under sections 5(d)(2) and 5(d)(3) of TSCA, EPA is required to publish a notice of receipt of a premanufacture notice (PMN) or an application for a test marketing exemption (TME), and to publish periodic status reports on the chemicals under review and the receipt of notices of commencement to manufacture those chemicals. This status report, which covers the period from July 5, 1999, to July 30, 1999, consists of the PMNs and TMEs, both pending or expired, and the notices of commencement to manufacture a new chemical that the Agency has received under TSCA section 5 during this time period.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christine Augustyniak, Associate Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, DC 20460, telephone numbers 202-554-1404 and TDD: 202-554-0551; e-mail address: TSCA-Hotline@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Does this Action Apply to Me?

This action is directed to the public in general. As such, the Agency has not attempted to describe the specific entities that this action may apply to. Although others may be affected, this action applies directly to the submitter of the premanufacture notices addressed in the action. If you have any questions regarding the applicability of this action

to a particular entity, consult the person listed in the "FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT" section.

II. How Can I Get Additional Information, Including Copies of this Document and Other Related Documents?

A. Electronically: You may obtain copies of this document and certain other available documents from the EPA Internet Home Page at <http://www.epa.gov/>. On the Home Page select "Laws and Regulations" and then look up the entry for this document under the "Federal Register - Environmental Documents." You can also go directly to the "Federal Register" listings at <http://www.epa.gov/homepage/fedregs/>.

B. In person: The Agency has established an official record for this action under docket control number OPPTS-51932. The official record consists of the documents specifically referenced in this action, any public comments received during an applicable comment period, and other information related to this action, including any information claimed as confidential business information (CBI). This official record includes the documents that are physically located in the docket, as well as the documents that are referenced in those documents. The public version of the official record does not include any information claimed as CBI. The public version of the official record, which includes printed, paper versions of any electronic comments submitted during an applicable comment period, is available for inspection in the TSCA Nonconfidential Information Center, North East Rm. B-607, Waterside Mall, 401 M St., S.W., Washington, DC. The Center is open from 12 noon to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays. The telephone number of the Center is 202-260-7099.

C. By phone: If you need additional information about this action, you may also contact the person identified in the "FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT" section.

III. Why is EPA taking this Action?

Section 5 of TSCA requires any person who intends to manufacture a new chemical (i.e., a chemical not on the TSCA inventory) to notify EPA and comply with the statutory provisions pertaining to the manufacture of new chemicals. Under sections 5(d)(2) and 5(d)(3) of TSCA, EPA is required to publish a notice of receipt of a PMN or an application for a TME, and to publish periodic status reports on the chemicals under review and the receipt of notices of commencement to manufacture those

Dear Participant:

Attached for your review is a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) which was prepared pursuant to the EIS law (Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343) and the EIS rules (Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 200).

TITLE OF PROJECT: Kihel-Uppcountry Maui Highway

LOCATION: ISLAND: Maui DISTRICT: Makawao

TAX MAP KEY NUMBERS: 2-2-2:1,3,4,15,16,17,54,114; 2-3-2:7,8,16,17,18,75,113; 2-3-7:8

2-3-8:3,4,5,28; 2-3-9:15,28,29,30,31,32; 2-3-11:1; 2-3-32:16; 2-5-1:1,2,3,9;

2-5-2:1,2,5; 3-9-1:16

AGENCY ACTION: X APPLICANT ACTION:

YOUR COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED OR POSTMARKED BY (minimum 45 day comment period): September 22, 1999

PLEASE SEND ORIGINAL COMMENTS TO THE:

APPLICANT: Federal Highway Administration

ADDRESS: 300 Ala Moana Boulevard

P.O. Box 50206

Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

CONTACT: Mr. Abraham Wong PHONE: (808) 541-2700

COPIES OF THE COMMENTS SHOULD BE SENT TO OEQC AND THE FOLLOWING:

APPROVING AGENCY OR ACCEPTING AUTHORITY: Governor, State of Hawaii

ADDRESS: C/O Office of Environmental Quality Control

235 S. Beretania Street, Suite 702

Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

CONTACT: PHONE:

CONSULTANT: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

ADDRESS: 2145 Wells Street, Suite 403

Haliuku, Hawaii 96793

CONTACT: Mr. Warren Unemori

PHONE: (808) 242-4403

If you no longer need this EIS, please recycle it. Thank you for your participation in the EIS process.

**Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
DRAFT EIS Distribution List**

Federal Agencies
 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
 U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service
 U.S. Department of Commerce National Marine Fisheries Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 U.S. Department of Defense Army Corps of Engineers
 U.S. Department of Energy Division of NEPA Affairs
 U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service National Park Service (Haleakala National Park) Office of Environmental Project Review
 U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resource Division
 U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration Federal Transit Administration
 Environmental Protection Agency Office of Federal Activities Pacific Islands Contact Office Region IX
 Federal Emergency Management Agency Office of Natural and Technological Hazards Programs

U.S. Legislators
 The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
 The Honorable Daniel K. Akaka

The Honorable Patsy Mink

State of Hawaii Agencies
 Department of Accounting and General Services
 Department of Agriculture
 Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) Director
 DBEDT Library
 Office of Planning
 Energy Resources and Technology Division
 Department of Defense
 Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
 Department of Education
 Department of Health
 Department of Land & Natural Resources
 State Historic Preservation Division
 Land Management Division
 Division of Forestry and Wildlife
 Department of Transportation Airports Division Harbors Division
 Office of Environmental Quality Control
 Office of Hawaiian Affairs
 University of Hawaii Environmental Center
 Water Resources Research Center

State Senators
 The Honorable Norman Mizuguchi, Senate President

**Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
DRAFT EIS Distribution List**

Libraries
 Hawaii State Library
 Hawaii Kai Regional Library
 Hilo Regional Library
 Kaimuki Regional Library
 Kaneohe Regional Library
 Lihue Regional Library
 Pearl City Regional Library
 Wailuku Regional Library
 Kihei Public Library
 Lahaina Public Library
 Makawao Public Library
 Wailuku Library
 Legislative Reference Bureau
 University of Hawaii at Manoa Hamilton Library
 Maui Community College Library

State Representatives
 The Honorable Cal Kawamoto, Chair Transportation and Governmental Affairs Committee
 The Honorable Jan Buen, District 4
 The Honorable Joe Tanaka, District 5

County of Maui
 The Honorable James Akana Lingle, Mayor
 County Council of Maui
 Board of Water Supply
 Department of Fire Control
 Department of Parks and Recreation
 Department of Public Works and Waste Management
 Economic Development Agency
 Planning Department
 Maui Police Department

Media
 Honolulu Advertiser
 Honolulu Star Bulletin
 The Maui News
 South Maui Times

Major Land Owners Affected by at Least One Alternative
 Alexander & Baldwin
 Dowling Company, Inc.
 Haleakala Ranch

**Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
DRAFT EIS Distribution List**

Kaonoulu Ranch

Malama Mohala Corp.

Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc.

**Businesses and Other
Organizations**

American Lung Association of Hawaii

Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar
Company

Kihei Community Association

Kula Community Association

Makawao Community Association

Makawao Main Street Association

Maui Outdoor Circle

Maui Research and Technology Park

Wailea Community Association

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Why is this Project Needed?

September 25: Kihai Community Center and Services Center • September 30: Mayor Heaheala Torres Community Center • October 11: Kahului School


What is the Project? Where would it be located?

The Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) propose to construct a new two-lane limited access highway that would directly link Kihai-Makana and Upcountry Maui. Different alternatives for the highway range between 9 and 11 miles long and would connect Pihani Highway in Kihai to either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway in Upcountry.

The highway would be constructed on the western slope of Haleakala (see map below). This land is currently used for sugarcane and pineapple cultivation and ranching. The communities near the proposed project include Kihai, Wailea, Makana, Pukalani, Makawao and Kula.

What is the Status of the Project?

A State and Federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared and announced in August 8, 1999 edition of the State Environmental Notice and the August 20, 1999 edition of the Federal Register. The purpose of the Draft EIS is to disclose the environmental and social impacts that could result from the project, and provide the public with an opportunity to comment on the project. After the close of the public comment period, HDOT and FHWA will evaluate the information received and select a "Preferred Alternative," which could be the "No Build." HDOT will announce the selection after it is made, and the selection will be disclosed in the project's Final EIS.



Why is this Project Needed?

Improve Maui's Roadway System
The circuitous route between Kihai and Upcountry is 16 to 24 miles long, even though the straight-line distance between the regions is only 9 to 12 miles. A highway directly linking these regions could cut travel time and distance up to 50%.

Relieve Congested Conditions on Other Roadways
Many major intersections along the route between Kihai and Upcountry currently operate at or near capacity during peak travel periods. A Kihai to Upcountry highway would divert some of this traffic onto an alternative route, reducing overall congestion.

Address Increasing Travel Demand
Travel demand (Maui Long-Range Land Transportation Plan, February 1996), is projected to increase 70% from 1990 to 2020. Many of these trips would be generated by the visitor industry, including industry workers and visitors. Many of these trips would occur between Kihai and Upcountry.

Coastal Evacuation
Kihai-Makana is vulnerable to hazards such as tsunami, tropical storms and fire. The limited number of evacuation routes and their close proximity to one another suggests there could be substantial congestion in north Kihai during an evacuation emergency. Therefore, another evacuation route is needed.

Research Activities at the Maui R&T Park and Science City
Activities at the Maui R & T Park and Science City are helping to diversify Maui's economy by attracting high-tech industries and creating attractive jobs. The proximity of the R & T Park and Science City produces interesting synergies, which are being used by some enterprises and help attract new endeavors. The road would facilitate transportation between these two high-tech centers.


Support Maui's Visitor Industry
Kihai-Makana is one of Maui's principal visitor attractions. This area has an economic relationship with Upcountry Maui because of Upcountry's tourist attractions, such as Haleakala National Park, and is a popular residential area.


What are the Alternatives?

In addition to the "No-Build," eight alternative alignments are being considered that consist of all possible combinations of two Kihai and four Upcountry terminus options (see map). The Kihai termini are named K1 and K2. K1 is located at the Pihani Highway / Kaonolu Street intersection; K2 is located at the Pihani Highway / Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection. The Upcountry termini are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. U1 is located at the Haleakala Highway / Haliimaile Road intersection; U2-A is located at the Haleakala Highway / Pukalani Bypass / Kula Highway ("Five Trees") intersection; U2-B is located on Kula Highway almost one-half mile south of the Five Trees intersection; and U3 is located on Kula Highway just south of Pulehu Gulch. The names of the alternatives correspond to the termini names, and are listed to the right.

The U2-A alternatives (U2-A,K1 and U2-A,K2) would require the modification of the "Five Trees" intersection (see sketch). Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway would replace the Haleakala Highway leg (Pukalani side) and Haleakala Highway would be re-aligned to link and form a T-intersection with Pukalani Bypass approximately 1200 feet north of the "Five Trees" intersection.

1. NO-BUILD
2. U1,K1
3. U1,K2
4. U2-A,K1
5. U2-A,K2
6. U2-B,K1
7. U2-B,K2
8. U3,K1
9. U3,K2





What are the Adverse Impacts of the Project? How Can These Impacts be Avoided or Mitigated?

The project's Draft EIS contains detailed information on the alternatives' beneficial and adverse impacts. It also includes measures that would help avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts. Apart from impacts to large-scale agriculture, the project would not result in severe environmental impacts. Below are brief descriptions of the project's major impacts. Measures to mitigate or minimize these impacts are also provided.

Farmland

Certain alignments would cross and displace active sugarcane and pineapple fields. Not only would productive farmlands be lost, operations would also be hindered. The U1 alternatives would cause the greatest impact to sugarcane operations, although the U2-A and U2-B alternatives would also displace and divide active sugarcane fields. The U3 alternatives would not affect sugarcane cultivation. All the alternatives would cross and displace pineapple fields. The U3 alternatives would cross a County agricultural park.

Farmers affected by right-of-way requirements would be monetarily compensated for land acquisition and crop damage, if necessary. To retain the productivity of isolated or divided fields, mitigation measures would be implemented, such as modifying or reconstructing existing haul roads and irrigation and drainage systems. Unworkable or remnant agricultural land would be purchased.

Traffic Patterns

A U1, U2-A or U2-B alternative may encourage some motorists traveling between Kula and Kihel to use the substandard Omaopio or Pulehu Roads. Increasing use of these roads would interfere with farm vehicle movements and local traffic, and may increase traffic-related noise. This change in traffic patterns would be more likely under a U1 alternative because its terminus is located further from Kula.

A U3 alternative may encourage some motorists traveling to the Haleakala summit to use local residential roads running between Kula and Haleakala Highways. This may increase traffic-related noise along these roads and interfere with local traffic.

Traffic conditions at the intersections of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads would be monitored after completion of the project to determine whether one or both warrant signalization. Signalization would be provided directing motorists to the proper route to the Haleakala summit.

Archaeological Resources

The highway would affect a number of archaeological sites important for data recovery, but not of such significance to require preservation. Depending on the alternative, up to 12 such sites may be affected.

An inventory survey will be conducted along the Preferred Alternative, which would be identified following receipt of public comments on the Draft EIS and from the public hearings. Before construction, data recovery of sites would be performed, and buffer zones would be fenced around known archaeological sites for protection during construction of the highway. If additional sites are uncovered during construction, work would stop immediately and the appropriate State and County officials would be notified.

Visual Resources

The view of Haleakala from Kihel would be affected by a paved roadway and associated embankments climbing the slope. To lessen this impact, landscaping consistent with the climatic conditions would be provided to improve the appearance of the roadway.

What are the Benefits of the Project?

The project would result in substantial travel time savings for motorists traveling between Kihel and Upcountry Maui. Depending on the origin and destination, the new highway could reduce trip length up to 50%. If a K1 alignment is selected, motorists traveling between Upcountry and West Maui would also benefit. As people spend less time traveling, quality of life improves.

The Maui highway system would operate better as a whole because a large portion of trips would be diverted onto the new highway, thereby improving traffic operations on other roadways, such as Mokulele Highway, Dairy Road, Hana Highway and Haleakala Highway. A K1 alternative would divert more traffic because it serves the West Maui region better than K2 alternative.

Kihel-Makena would get another coastal evacuation route. A K2 alternative, with its more southerly terminus, would be better than a K1 alternative with regards to evacuation efficiency.

Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway would offer motorists spectacular scenic vistas.

What is the Cost of Each Alternative?

The total estimated cost of each alternative is provided below. These costs include construction and right-of-way acquisition.

Estimated 1997 Dollar Cost (millions)

Alternative	Total
U1, K1	\$64.8
U1, K2	\$78.8
U2-A, K1	\$69.1
U2-A, K2	\$82.8
U2-B, K1	\$72.0
U2-B, K2	\$86.3
U3, K1	\$53.1
U3, K2	\$66.4

When Will the Project be Constructed? How Long Will it Last?

If this project proceeds, construction is expected to begin in 2001 and would last about three years.

What Will Happen After the Public Hearings?

HDOT and FHWA will select a Preferred Alternative which will be announced and identified in the Final EIS. If the Final EIS is accepted by the Governor of the State of Hawaii and the Division Administrator of the FHWA, a Record of Decision (ROD) will be prepared that will specify all mitigation commitments. The issuance of the ROD by the FHWA marks the completion of the project's planning phase. Next, design and right-of-way acquisition would begin, which is expected to last approximately two years.

How Can I Comment?

You can provide comments at this public hearing. You can either write your own comments (a comment sheet is available from the sign-in attendant), or you can provide oral comments to a court reporter stationed at this hearing. If you write your own comments, you may drop them in the comment box or send them later to:


Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director of Transportation
State Department of Transportation
Highways Division
869 Punchbowl St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Written comments will be accepted through October 28, 1999.

Where Can I Get More Information About this Project? Who Can I Contact If I Have Questions?

The Draft EIS for this project, which is available at Waituku Regional Library, Kinei Public Library, Lahaina Public Library, Makawao Public Library, Kahului Public Library and the Maui District Office of the State Department of Transportation, contains more information about the project. You may also contact Mr. Kenneth Au, HDOT Advance Planning Engineer, at (808) 587-1843 (or Maui's toll-free voice access number 984-2400, ext. 71843), if you have any questions.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway How to Use This Public Hearing



Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway ❖ Public Hearing
 September 29, 1999 ❖ Kihei Community Complex and Aquatics Center

❖ PLEASE PRINT ❖

Name	Organization	Address	Telephone
KING GABRIATH	NONE	Box 1728 Kihei	879-96611
FRATER AVEY B. CHAMBLEY	HAWAII STATE SEIATE	100 AULANA RD # 301 Kihai	879-4801
Tony DUNSO	resident	480 Olinda Rd Makawao HI 96768	876-0252
Davi JORG		160 Kamekai Rd 24-104 Kihai 96753	879-0005
ATHY SCHEPHER	NONE	1587 N. ALANI PL Kihai 96753	879-8744
SANDY & JACK MCGOWAN	"	2495 S. Kihai Rd. Kihai HI 96753	879-5680
BUCK JONES	KIHEI COMMUNITY ASSN.	3443 MALINA PL. Kihai HI 96753	879-2828
Barla HART		467 Kalanui Pl. Kihai	874-3692
Leslie WILLIAMS	MEDB	508 Kulani Dr.	875-2337
DWANE KIM	MEDB	824 Anaa Pl Wailuku HI 96793	879-7572
LEVIN & ALLEN ARVEDSON	President + MHTC Pastors	9 S. Hiela Place Wailuku HI 96768	879-6072
Steve Goodfellow	Goodfellow Bros Inc	P.O. 220 Kihai HI	879-5205
DARLENE SZAMA		3091 MAPU PL, Kihai HI 96753	879-9317
MICHELLE WAIYANAGAWA	MEDB	2803 PULUHAI ST Kihai HI 96753	875-9780
RUSSELL B KAKABY	KCA Board Member	2274 So Kihai Rd Kihai HI (152-4-201)	879-5599
RONALD P. STUMPF	COMMUNA President	874 Kumulani Dr. Kihai	879-0425
ERIC NAKAGAWA	USUE	2191 S. Kihai Rd #2123 Kihai, HI 96753	874-9377

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway ❖ Public Hearing
 September 29, 1999 ❖ Kihei Community Complex and Aquatics Center

❖ PLEASE PRINT ❖

Name	Organization	Address	Telephone
Mara Snaith	Kihei Times	30 Haupu St, 408 Waiuku 96793	249-8332
Mal Holm Mal Holm	Cult and Service Center	733 N. Koloseg Ave. Kula HI 96734	262-9492
WYTAINE JACKES		1032 S. Kihei Rd	874-0611
John N Jackes		1032 S. KIHEI RD	874-0611
AARON UNO	WALKER INTL.	P.O. Box 1568 KAHULUI HI	877-3430
JOE & PATTY DELMENDO		3520 KEAHI PL. KIHEI HI 96753	875-1123
Tim Hurley	The Maui News	100 Mahalani St. Waiuku	242-6343
Steve Sutrod	Citizen	124 Amakula Rd. Kula 96790	878-2739
DAN SCHEPER	Citizen	1587 N. ALANIU KIHEI 96753	875-8744
Jean Phillips	CITIZEN	523 EKALIKAI KIHEI 96753	879-1410
SAM S. THRONICKA	IKUA ROAD ROAD COM.	99 NANILUNA PL. WAIUKU 96793	242-5136
HERB GRIES	KIHEI CITIZENS ASSOCIATION	P.O. Box 695 PUNAHU 96784	874 0696
Norm Sperry	Citizen	380 Holoalea St Pukalani 96768	572-0279
EtHEL BERRY	Citizen	P.O. Box 1581, Kihei. 96753	877-6587
Justin Mosekahi	Citizen	PO BOX 241 Kihei 96753	879-0143
WACT KIM	"	1450 S. KIHEI RD G-202	
S Mukerji	M.E.D.B	590 Lipoa Pkwy	875-2338

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway ❖ Public Hearing
 September 30, 1999 ❖ Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center

❖ PLEASE PRINT ❖

Name	Organization	Address	Telephone
Jen Kuchingster		RP-3 Box 648 Kula Maui HA	878-1295
Charles R. Hale		72 Kapahi St. Makani	573-0272
Scott Matsumoto	KFB	P.O. Box 3440 Haou	575-6640
John J. Wilson	Kula Community Assoc	121 Holoowai, Pono Kula HI	878-6940
Maria Smith	Kihei Times	30 Hauloli St Lūyōf Waiūka, 96783	249-8332
Madge Smith		Box 569 Kula, HI 96790	878-3365
Luenelepe Barrett	Ko-Feta	104 Hahuli pl. Hi (Maui) 96780	878-0235
David Ohto	Pukalani Asso.	2678 Akalani Lp Pukalani 96788	572-1012
Ken Anusky	HAWAIIAN TRNG	Box 100, MAUI, HI	572-9289
Nayne Nishidg		3177 Jolani St PUKALANI	572-6328
Lemee T. Tamaha		71 PAMAKANI PL. PIAKAWAO HI. 96769	572-8691
Gregory McCreath	SELF	388 Uluwāhāhi Pukalani	572-8669
John Starn	MELO	PO Box 33, Makawao HI 96708	573-0081
CHARLES WILSON		882 NAWALEA SP. HAWAIIAN	572-5100
Richard A. Serrella		219 Pukalani. SH. Pukalani HI. 96768	572-6372
Steven Sotoni	ESDONT	124 Ainalaia Rd. Kula 96790	878-2739
ED CRUZINA	KUNAHUA RIDGE HOMESITES ASSN	23 PUNAHUA ST, PUKALANI	873-9028
Geina Flammet		2102 Naalae Rd, Kula 96790	876-6284

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway ❖ Public Hearing
September 30, 1999 ❖ Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center

❖ PLEASE PRINT ❖

Name	Organization	Address	Telephone
VERNON O. ADRIKES <small>REG. DENNIS HAWAII</small>	HAWAII OPERATING ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION STABILIZATION FUND	350 HOVANA ST. KAHULUI, MAUI, HI 96732	428 871-0909 FAX 871-0747
Roger Dennis Hawley Joseph & Jerry Kerubi	Zog City	P.O. Box 756 Kula, Hawaii 96790 P.O. Box 1179 Paiea	None 579-6761
Marilyn D'Enbeau	Makawao Main St. Assoc	P.O. Box 1864 Makawao HI	572 2765
Lucretia Lammada	OPMAGRO	RR 1 BOX 656-A 96790	878-1933
Charles F. Maxwell	Pakalani: Iki Ai Pakai	157 KATE OPAKA	375-8035
Rita D'FREY	THE MAWAO GROUP	P.O. Box 2300 Mawao 96794-2300	539-7175
Tony Pareasa	Concerned Resident	27 Aeloa Rd - Paia	268-2123
Aileen Kauffman DVM	Kula Resident	P.O. Box 297 Kula	878 6692
Richard Kanada	Resident	2808 Maunani St	572-0069
Paul & Linda Javier	Resident	3088 Lihdani St. Paialani	572-9965
Gretchen LAOLEY	" / PCA	2634 Talani St "	572-5150
Christina Green	Pro. La	160 Asahi St	572-8244
Louise Smith	Retiree	RR 1 Box 530 Keino Drive	878-1564
Ted Sierad		130 Halele Pl. Makawao	573 1245
North. Pat. Antares	Student	238 Maunani St Paialani	572-1993
Judy Matalama	resident	PO Box 24 Kula	
Thomas Westmeyer		233 Naalae Rd, Kula 96790	878-3314
Leslie Gise	Resident	233 Maalae Road Kula 96790	878 3514
Alan + Terry M. Donald	"	2500 Kula Hwy "	578-6922

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway ❖ Public Hearing
 September 30, 1999 ❖ Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center

❖ PLEASE PRINT ❖

Name	Organization	Address	Telephone
Prof Constantino	Pukalani Comm Assn.	Pukalani	572-8298
Thomas F. Burt		2771 Ohulani St Pukalani HI 96768	573-0026
MARGARET J. B. SUTREY		124 AINAKULA RD KULA HI 96790	878-2739
Emily J. Agusti		361 Kekani St. Pukalani HI 96768	572-6945
HELEN NIELSEN		SR 182 HANA 96713 / 3150 WAILUAKOANUI RD, KALEPA, HI	
JONATHAN STARR	MAUI BIOS	SR 182 HANA 96713	
SCOTT SPLEHN			KALEPA@HAWAII.NE
Rene Lindeman		296 ULUOKAANI PUEAHI HI 96768	573-0684
HATHER GOMES		114 KAWAUNA PI KULA HI 96790	876-1567
SHAWNI GOMES		689 OMAOPI ROAD KULA HI 96790	810-1253
Sheri Morrison		W	11
Kelly Chambers	King Kekaulike HHS	PO Box 2882 W. Lulea	270-2887
Ry BAREBIN			
Jeanne Koo	MEQB	24 N. CHURCH ST. #407	242-9702
TAMARA PUELTO		590 Lyane Pkwy #103 Kula	875-2300
RICHARD H POHLE		RR4 Box 43 Kula 96790	8783116
Kristine Andrews		RR1 BOX 426 KULA 96790	878-2750
PATRICK SAPA		2726 Kaliahari Circle Pukalani	572-0177
HERB SQUIRES		2726 AWA LANE DR. PUEAHI	572-4577
Louise Elizabeth		PO BOX 644 KULA 96790	585-1440
		624 Omapike Rd, Kula 96790	878-2952

APPENDIX C

Cooperating Agency Letter

Endangered Species Act Coordination Letters

Farmland Protection Policy Act Coordination Letters

National Historic Preservation Act Coordination Letters

Clean Water Act Coordination Letter

Coastal Zone Management Letters

Other Agency Consultation Letters



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U. S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
ATTENTION: DISTRICT ENGINEER

ONLY TO
ATTENTION OF

April 1, 1998

RECEIVED

APR - 1998

Operations Branch

Mr. Pat V. Phung, P.E.
Transportation Engineer
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3202
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Phung:

Thank you for your letter of March 18, 1998, regarding the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project located on Maui, Hawaii. The proposed action is likely to require a Department of the Army (DA) permit due to work in jurisdictional waters of the U.S. In accordance with regulations at 40 CFR 1501.6 and the Memorandum of Understanding for Surface Transportation Projects in the State of Hawaii, the Corps accepts your invitation to be a cooperating agency in this project for NEPA and regulatory purposes.

Ms. Lolly Silva of my Operations staff will be the point-of-contact for initial coordination. Ms. Silva can be reached by telephone at 438-9258, extension 17, by facsimile at 438-4060, or by email at laurane.silva@pod01.usace.army.mil.

Sincerely,

George P. Young, P.E.
Chief, Operations Branch

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Parsons
Brinckerhoff

Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1007 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
908-531-7084
Fax: 908-528-2088



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
PACIFIC ISLANDS ECoreGION
300 ALA MOANA BOULEVARD, ROOM 3108
BOX 50088
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96850
PHONE: (808) 541-3441 FAX: (808) 541-3470

JAN - 9 1997

November 25, 1996

Brooks Harper, Field Supervisor
Ecology Services
Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Section 7 Consultation

Dear Mr. Harper:

We are currently preparing a NEPA environmental impact statement for the subject project. We request that the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service) identify the listed and proposed to be listed endangered and threatened species in the vicinity of the proposed project. A map showing the project area and the alignments of the alternatives is enclosed.

The Service was previously contacted in September, 1994. In October, 1994, the Service indicated that there are no endangered, threatened, or candidate species of birds recorded in the project area. However, we cannot find a record of this consultation in our files. For your information, the National Park Service in an October 25, 1994 letter, identified lowland dry forests in the area which contain a number of listed or proposed endangered plant species recognized by the Service (see Enclosure).

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at 566-2235.

Sincerely yours,

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

Enclosures: Project Area Map
Letter from the National Park Service dated October 25, 1994

cc Steven Chang, HDOT, HWY-PA
Pat Phung, FHWA
Winona Char, Char & Associates

Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence

In Reply Refer To: APM

Mr. Jason Yazawa
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Information on endangered and threatened species within the vicinity of the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway, Maui, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Yazawa:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your request dated November 27, 1996, for information on endangered and threatened species within the vicinity of the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway, Maui, Hawaii. Several alternative routes are proposed. This information was requested to assist in the preparation of a NEPA environmental impact statement for the proposed project located in Kihei, Maui.

The Service has reviewed the map provided with your request and pertinent information in our files, including maps prepared by The Nature Conservancy's Hawaii Natural Heritage Program and the Service's National Wetland Inventory maps. Based on a review of these maps, the Service offers the following comments for your consideration.


The alternative route beginning at K2 on the provided map, passes within a mile of Puu o Kali, one of the few remaining examples of dryland forest in the State. The Service is concerned that this alternative might impact this important ecological area as well as three federally endangered plants (*Abutilon menziesii*, *Hibiscus brackenridgei* sp. *brackenridgei*, and *Bonania menziesii*). Other rare plant species (*Acacia koala*, *Achyranthes splendens* var. *splendens*, *Canavalia pubescens*, and *Nesohuma polymorpha*) are also reported from the area. In addition, there is a reservoir within 1/3 mile of the proposed route junction of U1 and U2, near Omaopio Road. This reservoir may be used by migratory or endangered waterbirds that could be impacted by this proposed route. Our records indicate that the federally endangered Hawaiian coot (*Fulica americana alai*) was last seen in the vicinity in 1986. The Service wishes to note the absence of rare, threatened, or endangered species locations on the Hawaii Natural Heritage Program's maps does not imply the absence of

JAN 1 - 1997

these species *per se* but may reflect the paucity of biological surveys in some areas. We therefore suggest that, where appropriate, surveys be conducted along the proposed route. The Service will be happy to assist in determination of appropriate sites to be surveyed.

The Service appreciates your concern for endangered and threatened species, and we look forward to reviewing any environmental documents that are produced in relation to the proposed project. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact our Program Leader for Interagency Cooperation, Ms. Margo Stahl, or Fish and Wildlife Biologists Christa Russell or Dr. Annie Marshall at 808/541-3441.

Sincerely,


Margo Stahl
Field Supervisor
Ecological Services



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Hawaii Division
360 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3202
Honolulu, HI 96830
December 1, 1997

Mr. Brooks Harper
Field Supervisor
U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Ecoregion
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3108
P.O. Box 50088
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attn.: Ms. Margo Stahl

Dear Mr. Harper:

Subject: Kihai-Upecountry Maui Highway Project
Island of Maui, Hawaii
Project Coordination Under Section 7, Endangered Species Act

On January 8, 1997, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) provided a letter regarding the subject project stating that the K2 roadway alignment alternatives pass within a mile of Puu o Kali, a dryland forest area which may contain Federal Trust species (see enclosure). The Service also reported that the U2 alternatives pass near a reservoir which may be used by migratory or endangered waterbirds. Since the January 8, 1997 letter, alignments U2-A and U2-B were developed as alternatives to the mauka portion of the original U2 alignment. However, the section of the U2 alignment near the reservoir was not affected.


Recent botanical surveys which covered all alignment alternatives being addressed in the project's forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which is being prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the State of Hawaii EIS law, did not identify any listed, proposed or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, or any plant species of concern (see enclosed reports). Specifically, none of the plant species identified in the Service's January 8, 1997 were found. Therefore, the FHWA finds that the proposed project will have no effect on the plant species identified in the Service's January 8, 1997 letter or other listed, proposed or candidate threatened or endangered plant species known at the time the surveys were conducted.

The concern about potential impacts to endangered or migratory waterbirds resulted in telephone consultations between your staff and Parsons Brinckerhoff on April 2 and May 9, 1997. Service staff indicated that the January 8, 1997 letter did not require faunal surveys of the alignments and the reservoir. Additional consultation with the Maui Nature Conservancy (telephone conversation

ENCLOSURE
HEC-KI

The Service appreciates your concern for endangered and threatened species. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact our Program Leader for Interagency Cooperation, Ms. Margo Stahl, or Fish and Wildlife Biologist Dr. Annie Marshall at 808/541-3441.

Sincerely,



Brooks Harper
Field Supervisor
Ecological Services

cc: Mr. Jason Yazawa, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

United States
Department of
Agriculture


Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

210 Iml Kala Street
Suite 209
Honolulu, HI
96793-2100



July 25, 1995

Ms. Jan Reichelderfer
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813



Dear Jan,

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway Alternatives

Jan, attached are Forms AD-1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, covering the nine alternatives. Part III of the form was to be filled out by the federal agency involved, meaning the FHWA. I filled out the acreages noting the highway lengths times the 160 feet right of way you noted. If those figures are different, you need to inform me and I would need to recalculate the information.

Call me at (808) 244-3729 for any information.

Sincerely,

Neal S. Fujiyara
Neal S. Fujiyara
District Conservationist

The Natural Resources Conservation Service
is an agency of the
United States Department of Agriculture

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

U.S. Department of Agriculture
FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Name Of Project: **KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALT. HIGHWAY**
 Proposed Land Use: **FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION**
 Date Of Land Evaluation Report: **JUNE 5, 1995**
 Federal Agency Involved: **FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION**
 County And State: **MAUI, HAWAII**
 Date Request Received By SCS: **JUNE 9, 1995**

PART II (To be completed by SCS)
 Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No Acres Impacted: **498**
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Amount Of Farmland At Risk In FPPA: **67,200**
 Major Crops: **SUGARCANE, PINEAPPLE** Acres: **193,559** % **42**
 Name Of Land Evaluation System Used: **STATE OF HAWAII - LESA** Name Of Local Site Assessment System: **NONE** Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: **JULY 25, 1995**

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)

	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly	167	183	186	185
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly				
C. Total Acres In Site	167	183	186	185

PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	91	101	75	50
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	0	23	72	45
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Of Local Govt Unit To Be Converted	0.06	0.077	0.092	0.059
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	52	45	53	48

PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion

Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale Of 0 to 100 Points)	67	70	66	69
---	----	----	----	----

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 656.516)

	Maximum Points
1. Area In Nonurban Use	
2. Permitted In Nonurban Use	
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	
5. Distance From Urban Built-up Area	
6. Distance To Urban Subplot Services	
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services	
10. On Farm Investments	
11. Effect Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	160

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)

Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260

Site Selected: _____ Date Of Selection: _____
 Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes No

(See instructions on reverse side)

Form AD 1006-12-85

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Name Of Project: KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALT.
 Proposed Land Use: HIGHWAY
 County And State: MAUI, HAWAII
 Date Request Received By SCS: JUNE 9, 1995

Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Major Crops: SUGARCANE, PINEAPPLE
 Acres: 193,559
 Amount Of Farm and As Defined in FPPA: Acres: 159,000
 Name Of Land Evaluation System Used: STATE OF HAWAII - LEESA
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: JULY 25, 1995

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly: 172
 B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly: 172
 C. Total Acres In Site: 172

PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information
 A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland: 0
 B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland: 94
 C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted: 0.059
 D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value: 89

PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
 Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points): 51

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.511)
 1. Area In Nonurban Use: 172
 2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use: 172
 3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed: 172
 4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government: 172
 5. Distance From Urban Building Area: 172
 6. Distance To Urban Support Services: 172
 7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average: 172
 8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland: 172
 9. Availability Of Farm Support Services: 172
 10. On-Farm Investment: 172
 11. Effect Of Conversion On Farm Support Services: 172
 12. Compatibility With Existing Agriculture: 172
 TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS: 160

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 100
 Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 160
 TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines): 260
 Site Selected: Yes No

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Name Of Project: KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALT.
 Proposed Land Use: HIGHWAY
 County And State: MAUI, HAWAII
 Date Request Received By SCS: JUNE 9, 1995

Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Major Crops: SUGARCANE, PINEAPPLE
 Acres: 193,559
 Amount Of Farm and As Defined in FPPA: Acres: 159,000
 Name Of Land Evaluation System Used: STATE OF HAWAII - LEESA
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: JULY 25, 1995

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly: 187
 B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly: 187
 C. Total Acres In Site: 187

PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information
 A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland: 81
 B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland: 67
 C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted: 0.093
 D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value: 52

PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
 Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points): 67

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.511)
 1. Area In Nonurban Use: 187
 2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use: 187
 3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed: 187
 4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government: 187
 5. Distance From Urban Building Area: 187
 6. Distance To Urban Support Services: 187
 7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average: 187
 8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland: 187
 9. Availability Of Farm Support Services: 187
 10. On-Farm Investment: 187
 11. Effect Of Conversion On Farm Support Services: 187
 12. Compatibility With Existing Agriculture: 187
 TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS: 160

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 100
 Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 160
 TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines): 260
 Site Selected: Yes No



**Parsons
Brinckerhoff**
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-531-7084
Fax: 808-528-2388



Mr. Neal S. Fujiwara
Natural Resources Conservation Service
October 15, 1997
Page 2

October 15, 1997

Mr. Neal S. Fujiwara
District Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
210 Ima Kala Street
Suite 209
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793-2100

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Farmland Protection Policy Act, Form AD-1006

Dear Mr. Fujiwara:

In July 1995, you provided Forms AD-1006 for ten alternative alignments of the above federal-aid project to Ms. Jan Reichelderfer of Parsons Brinckerhoff (see enclosed transmittal letter and copies of Forms AD-1006). We are presently preparing a NEPA Draft environmental impact statement for this project which we hope to have completed by early next year. However, the alternative alignments now being considered are different from the alternatives in 1995. Therefore, in order to comply with the Farmland Protection Policy Act, we need Farmland Conversion Impact Ratings for our current alternatives (completed Parts II, IV and V of Form AD-1006).

The alternatives now being considered are eight possible combinations of four Upcountry termini, named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3, and two Kihai termini, named K1 and K2 (see enclosed project location map with the alternatives). The proposed right-of-way for Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway is still 160 feet. The current alternatives' lengths and my calculations of "Total Acres To Be Converted Directly" are as follows:

Alternative	Length (miles)	Acres
U1/K1	9.7	188
U1/K2	10.9	211
U2-A/K1	9.7	188
U2-A/K2	10.9	211
U2-B/K1	9.6	186
U2-B/K2	10.8	209
U3/K1	9.0	175
U3/K2	10.1	196

I am also enclosing soils maps with the current alignments.

We would appreciate if you can provide completed Parts II, IV and V as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (808)566-2235 or you can e-mail me at yazawa@pbworld.com.

Sincerely yours,

Jason Yazawa

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

- Enclosures: 1. Letter from Natural Resources Conservation Service to Jan Reichelderfer, Parsons Brinckerhoff, dated July 25, 1995
2. Forms AD-1006 completed in July 1995
3. Project location map with alternatives
4. Soils map with alternatives

Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence

Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence



Parsons
Brinckerhoff

Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-531-7094
Fax: 808-528-2168

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service
210 Ima Kala St.
Suite 209
Waipahu, HI
96782-2100

October 17, 1997

Mr. Neal S. Fujiwara
District Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
210 Ima Kala Street
Suite 209
Waipahu, Hawaii 96793-2100

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Farmland Protection Policy Act, Form AD-1006

Dear Mr. Fujiwara:

This letter is a follow-up to the letter I sent you on October 15, 1997. I have just received preliminary engineering data on the anticipated right-of-way requirements of each of the alternatives. Please replace the information I previously provided to you with this new information.

Alternative	Right-of Way Required (Acres)
U1/K1	241.2
U1/K2	277.3
U2-A/K1	243.3
U2-A/K2	279.4
U2-B/K1	245.6
U2-B/K2	281.7
U3/K1	219.3
U3/K2	252.5

Again, if you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (808)566-2235 or you can e-mail me at yazawa@pbworld.com. Thanks.

Sincerely yours,

Jason Yazawa
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

Over a Century of
Engineering Excellence



Our People... Our Islands... In Harmony

October 29, 1997

Mr. Jason Yazawa
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
1001 Bishop Street, Suite 3000
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Yazawa,

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project
Farmland Protection Policy Act, Form AD-1006

I am enclosing completed forms AD-1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, regarding the alternatives to the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project.

If you have any questions, call me at (808) 244-3729 or email me at nfujwara@hi.nrcs.usda.gov.

Sincerely,

Neal S. Fujiwara
District Conservationist

The Natural Resources Conservation Service works hand in hand with the American people to conserve natural resources on private lands. AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

U.S. Department of Agriculture

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Name Of Project: KUHUI - UICOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES
 Proposed Land Use: HIGHWAY
 Date Of Land Evaluation Report: OCTOBER 17, 1997
 Federal Agency Involved: FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION
 County And State: MAUI, HAWAII

PART II (To be completed by SCS)
 Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Major Crops: SUGARCANE, PINEAPPLE
 Acres: 193,559
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Report Received By SCS: OCTOBER 18, 1997
 Amount Of Farmland As Defined In FPPA: 67,200
 Acres: 159,000
 Data Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: 24
 Average Farm Size: 498
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: OCTOBER 30, 1997

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly: 245.6
 B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly: 245.6
 C. Total Acres In Site: 245.6

PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	83.3
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	91.0
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0.11
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	67

PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
 Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale Of 0 to 100 Points): 59

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.51b)

Criteria	Points	Maximum Points
1. Area In Nonurban Use	15	15
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use	10	10
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	20	20
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Areas	NA	NA
6. Distance To Urban Support Services	NA	NA
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	25
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5
10. On-Farm Investments	20	20
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	25
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	10
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	160

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 59
 Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 80
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines): 139

Site Selected: Yes No
 Date Of Selection: _____
 Reason For Selection: _____

U.S. Department of Agriculture

FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Name Of Project: KUHUI - UICOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES
 Proposed Land Use: HIGHWAY
 Date Of Land Evaluation Report: OCTOBER 17, 1997
 Federal Agency Involved: FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION
 County And State: MAUI, HAWAII

PART II (To be completed by SCS)
 Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? Yes No
 (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form.)
 Major Crops: SUGARCANE, PINEAPPLE
 Acres: 193,559
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Report Received By SCS: OCTOBER 18, 1997
 Amount Of Farmland As Defined In FPPA: 67,200
 Acres: 159,000
 Data Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: 24
 Average Farm Size: 498
 Name Of Local Site Assessment System: NONE
 Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS: OCTOBER 30, 1997

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly: 241.2
 B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly: 241.2
 C. Total Acres In Site: 241.2

PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	99.7
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	84.7
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	0.12
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	55

PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion
 Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale Of 0 to 100 Points): 66

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.51b)

Criteria	Points	Maximum Points
1. Area In Nonurban Use	15	15
2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use	10	10
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	5	20
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20	20
5. Distance From Urban Builtup Areas	NA	NA
6. Distance To Urban Support Services	NA	NA
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10	10
8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25	25
9. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5	5
10. On-Farm Investments	20	20
11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25	25
12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10	10
TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS	160	160

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)
 Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 66
 Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 84
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines): 151

Site Selected: Yes No
 Date Of Selection: _____
 Reason For Selection: _____



BENJAMIN J. CAVETINO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

JUN - 2 1998

KAZU NAKAMURA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
BIOMASS ENERGY
OLEFINAL COMMODITY

REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.9503

RECEIVED

JUN 03 1998

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

Mr. Saku Nakamura
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Services
Soil Conservation Services
P. O. Box 50004
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Nakamura:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

As per previous unofficial discussions, we are submitting the Farmland Conservation Impact Ratings [Form AD-1006(10-83)] for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project. The U. S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, has concurred with this submittal. We, therefore, request a determination as to whether the proposed conversion is consistent with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and all Department of Agriculture's internal policies.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Nakamura
KAZU NAKAMURA
Director of Transportation

Enclosures

/bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.



United States
Department of
Agriculture
Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service
P. O. Box 50004
Honolulu, HI
96850

RECEIVED
JUN 3 1998
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
Our People... Our Standards... In Harmony

June 5, 1998

RECEIVED
STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION
JUN 10 11 16 AM '98
HIGHWAY DIVISION
PLANNING BRANCH

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director of Transportation
State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)
HWY-PA 2.9503

I am returning the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (form AD-1600) for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project. The rating is intended to guide you (on federal agency projects) to limit the conversion of productive farmland to nonagricultural uses. It is up to the federal agency (Department of Transportation) to use the rating to select the appropriate alternative site.

Because the rating total score for all sites is less than 160, only a minimum level of consideration for protection is needed, and no additional sites need be evaluated. If a site scores 160 or more, an alternate site should be considered that converts fewer acres of farmland or converts other farmland that has lower relative value.

If you have any questions, or if I can provide you with any additional information, please call me at 541-2600 ext 133.

Sincerely,

Saku Nakamura

Saku Nakamura
Resource Soil Scientist

Enclosure

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION
JUN 9 10 37 AM '98

The Natural Resources Conservation Service works hand-in-hand with the American people to conserve natural resources on private lands. AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

RECEIVED

FEB 11 1999

WALTER S. WILSON ENGINEERING, INC.

HWY-PA
2.2615

FEB 10 1999

Various
Page 2
FEB 10 1999
HWY-PA 2.2615

SEE ATTACHED LIST

Subject: Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Archaeological Survey of Alternatives

The State of Hawaii Department of Transportation is evaluating alternatives for a new highway that would link Kihai-Makana to Upcountry Maui. You were referred to us by the State Historic Preservation Division because of your knowledge of historic and archaeological resources in the study area.

The alternatives under consideration in the upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are all eight combinations of two Kihai and four Upcountry terminus options. The Kihai termini and segments are called K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are called U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. The eight alternative alignments are:

1. U1,K1
2. U1,K2
3. U2-A,K1
4. U2-A,K2
5. U2-B,K1
6. U2-B,K2
7. U3,K1
8. U3,K2

Enclosed are archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for this project by Cultural Surveys Hawaii (CSH).

The following historic properties are within the path (within a 400-foot wide corridor) of the alternatives, and therefore, may be destroyed by the construction of the highway:

Alternative	Historic Properties Potentially Affected
U1,K1	CSH Sites 8, 16, 20, 21 and 22
U1,K2	CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21 and 22
U2-A,K1	CSH Sites 8, 16, 20 and 22
U2-A,K2	CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 22
U2-B,K1	CSH Sites 8, 16, 20 and 22
U2-B,K2	CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 22
U3,K1	CSH Sites 6, 16, 18, 19 and 20
U3,K2	CSH Sites 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 19

CSH recommended only data recovery of the above properties. An inventory-level survey will be conducted on the project's Preferred Alternative, which will be selected after receiving public comments on the project's forthcoming Draft EIS. For sites requiring additional data recovery, if any, a data recovery plan will be prepared and implemented after the Final EIS.

If you have knowledge of other traditional or historic properties at or near the proposed project, and/or have comments on the CSH reports, we would very much appreciate your input. Any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in its evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 20, 1999.

If you have any questions, please call Kenneth Au at 587-1843.

Very truly yours,

Kazu Hayashida

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Director of Transportation

Enclosures

SC:gm

bc: DLNR - SHPO, WSU Engineering, Inc., HWY-PA



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Hawaii Division
306 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3106
Honolulu, HI 96850
February 16, 1999

44-38862-2
HEC-HI

HWY-PA 2.2615

Similar letter sent to the following:

Mr. Leslie Kulobio
Maui/Lana'i Island Burial Council
c/o State Historic Preservation Division
Department of Land and Natural Resources
601 Kamohila Boulevard, Room 555
Kapolei, Hawaii 96707

Reverend David Ka'alahea
606 Pohala Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Charles Maxwell
157 Aiea Place
Pukalani, Hawaii 96768

Ms. Helen Felsing
South Maui Heritage Corridor
2846 Puu Ho'ola'i
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Mr. Brian Miskae, President
Kihei Community Association
P. O. Box 662
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Ms. Dana Hall
Waioli/Keokea Homestead Association
2087 Wells Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Mr. Raymond Soon, Chairperson
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
P. O. Box 1879
Honolulu, Hawaii 96805

Mr. Ed Lindsey
1087A Pookele Road
Makawao, Hawaii 96768

Mr. Mahealani Kaiaokamalie
Uluhalakua Ranch
P. O. Box 901
Kula, Hawaii 96790

Mr. Randall Ogata
Administrator
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapiolani Boulevard, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Timothy E. Johns
Historic Preservation Administrator
State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
33 South King Street, 6th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Mr. Don Hibbard

Dear Mr. Johns

Subject: Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
Request for Concurrence on Significance Evaluations and Treatment Measures of
Sites, and Effect Determination

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) submits the enclosed archaeological reconnaissance survey reports, prepared by Cultural Surveys Hawaii (CSH), for subject project. The project's alternatives that will be evaluated in the upcoming Draft environmental impact statement (EIS) are all eight combinations of two Kihei and four Upcountry terminus options (see enclosed figure). The Kihei termini and segments are called K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are called U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. The eight alternative alignments are:

1. U1,K1
2. U1,K2
3. U2-A,K1
4. U2-A,K2
5. U2-B,K1
6. U2-B,K2
7. U3,K1
8. U3,K2

Adjustments to Alternatives

The original U2 and U3 alignments were modified or shifted to avoid important archaeological sites found by CSH. These changes are described below:

- The mauka-most section of the U2 alignment was modified to Alignments U2-A and U2-B because of U2's potential impacts to CSH Sites 1 and 23 (see below). Later when important sites (CSH sites 101 and 102; see below and Alternative U2-A report) were discovered within the U2-A alignment, the alignment was shifted to Alignment U2-A

(New) to avoid both sites and CSH site 103. However, CSH determined that this new U2-A would indirectly affect a heiau (State Site 50-50-10-2701) because it would interfere with the heiau's makai (north to west) viewplane (see Alternative U2-A (New) report). Therefore, another U2-A alignment was developed as a combination of the original U2-A and U2-A (New). This U2-A (Hybrid) would avoid CSH sites 101, 102 and 103, and shifts the alignment to the south (mauka) of the heiau, as recommended by CSH. A reconnaissance survey of the U2-A (Hybrid) alignment is not necessary because the alignment embodies both the original U2-A and U2-A (New) alignments. CSH reviewed the U2-A (Hybrid) alignment, and determined that it would not affect the heiau.

- Part of the U3 alignment at Pulehu Gulch was shifted to avoid CSH site 7 (see below). A reconnaissance survey was not conducted on the re-aligned segment. Therefore, it is not known whether this shift would affect another site(s). However, as recommended by the State Historic Preservation Division during project scoping, an inventory survey will be conducted on the preferred alternative after the Draft EIS (see below).

Solicitation of Comments

Copies of the archaeological reports are being provided to the following individuals and organizations, as recommended by Mr. Boyd Dixon of your staff who provided this list in November 1997:

- Maui/Lanai Island Burial Council,
- Reverend David Kā'alakea,
- Charles Maxwell, Cultural Specialist,
- South Maui Heritage Corridor,
- Kihei Community Association,
- Waiohuli/Keokea Homestead Association,
- Ed Lindsey, Cultural Specialist, and
- Mahealani Kānakamalie, Native Forest Specialist

In addition, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands will receive copies of the reports. We will provide copies of the transmittal letters to the State Historic Preservation Division. These individuals and organizations will have 30 days to submit comments after receiving the reports. Any comments received will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division.

Site Evaluations

In the reports, CSH applied Significance Criteria from the National and State Registers of Historic Places and evaluated the sites. These evaluations are reported in the following sections:

- Original report (Note that the mauka-most section of the U2 alignment was modified to the U2-A and U2-B alignments).
- Section IV: Significance of the Historic Properties,

- Table 3: Significance of Sites Located During Reconnaissance Survey, and
- Section VII: Conclusions and Recommended Treatments;
- Alternative U2-A report (Note that this alignment was modified to the U2-A (new) alignment)
- Section III: Significance of the Historic Properties, and
- Section IV: Recommendations;
- Alternative U2-A (New) report (Note that this alignment was modified to the U2-A (Hybrid) alignment).
- Section V: Significance of the Historic Properties, and
- Section V: Recommendations; and
- Alternative U2-B report:
- Section III: Significance of the Historic Properties, and
- Section IV: Recommendations

In summary, CSH had following site evaluations and recommended treatment measures. The FHWA agrees with CSH's findings and recommendations:

- CSH sites 1, 7, 23, 101 and 102 were evaluated as significant under Criteria C, D and E, and these sites were recommended for preservation in a manner acceptable to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). The U2, U2-A and U3 alignments were modified or shifted to avoid all these sites
- CSH site 103 was evaluated as significant under Criteria C and D, and was recommended for only data recovery. The U2-A alignment was shifted to avoid this site
- State Site 50-50-10-2701 was evaluated as significant under Criteria D and E, and was recommended for preservation in a manner acceptable to the SHPO. The U2-A alignment was shifted to the south (mauka) of the heiau so that it would not affect the heiau's makai (north to west) viewplane.
- All the other sites (CSH sites 2 through 6 and 8 through 22) were evaluated as significant under Criterion D, and these sites were recommended for data recovery only. These sites are still within the path (within a 400-foot wide corridor) of the alternative alignments
- With regards to Pu'uoweli (see Alternative U2-B report), CSH requested that the SHPO determine its historic property status. CSH stated that Pu'uoweli may have a relationship with the surrounding petroglyphs (i.e. context to Hawaiian history), which would make the site significant under Criteria C, D and E. CSH also stated that the site's possible historic significance could be related to Kula's development, which would make the site significant under Criterion C. Pu'uoweli is in the path of the U2-B alignment.

- Data recovery of State Site 50-50-10-4181 was completed by others, and the site is no longer considered to be significant as an historic property

Assessment of Effect and Adverse Effect

Based on the CSH's recommended treatment measures, the FHWA completed the following assessments in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5:

Alternative	Effect Determination
U1.K1	"no adverse effect" on five (5) sites (CSH Sites 8, 16, 20, 21, 22)
U1.K2	"no adverse effect" on twelve (12) sites (CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22)
U2-A.K1	"no adverse effect" on four (4) sites (CSH Sites 8, 16, 20, 22); and "no effect" on four (4) sites (CSH Sites 101, 102, 103 and State Site 50-50-10-2701)
U2-A.K2	"no adverse effect" on eleven (11) sites (CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22); and "no effect" on four (4) sites (CSH Sites 101, 102, 103 and State Site 50-50-10-2701)
U2-B.K1	"no adverse effect" on four (4) sites (CSH Sites 8, 16, 20, 22); and "no effect" on one (1) site (State Site 50-50-10-4181), note that an effect determination of Pu'uoweli is not included, pending the SHPO's decision of its historic property status
U2-B.K2	"no adverse effect" on eleven (11) sites (CSH Sites 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22); and "no effect" on one (1) site (State Site 50-50-10-4181); note that an effect determination of Pu'uoweli is not included, pending the SHPO's decision of its historic property status
U3.K1	"no adverse effect" on five (5) sites (CSH Sites 6, 16, 18, 19, 20); and "no effect" on one (1) site (CSH Site 7)
U3.K2	"no adverse effect" on eleven (11) sites (CSH Sites 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19); and "no effect" on one (1) site (CSH Site 7)

Proposed Mitigation

Following identification of the project's preferred alternative, which will be made after receiving agency and public comments on the forthcoming Draft EIS, an inventory-level survey will be conducted on the preferred alternative to gather more information about affected sites and

determine whether further data recovery work is required for any site. The Final EIS will not be released until after the SHPO has approved the inventory survey. For sites requiring additional data recovery, if any, a data recovery plan will be prepared and implemented after the Final EIS in coordination with the SHPO and other agencies and organizations as required by the SHPO

During construction, fenced buffer zones will be placed around known archaeological preservation features at and near the construction site. If unknown historic or archaeological sites are uncovered during construction, work will stop immediately and the State Historic Preservation Division will be notified and consulted on the appropriate treatment measures. Construction would only resume after approval from the appropriate authorities.

Request to the SHPO

The FHWA requests that the SHPO concur with the significance evaluations, treatment measures and effect determinations provided in this letter. If you have any questions, please call me at (808) 541-2700 ext. 305

Sincerely yours,

Pat V. Phung
Pat V. Phung, P.E.
Transportation Engineer

- Enclosures:
1. Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TNK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, December 9, 1997
 2. Alternate U2-A, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TNK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, November 14, 1997
 3. Alternate U2-B, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TNK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, November 14, 1997
 4. Alternate U2-A (new), An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TNK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, July 1998
 5. Figure showing archaeological sites in relation to alternative alignments

- cc
- Mr. Stephen Chang, State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
 - Mr. Warren Unemori, Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.
 - Mr. David Aikin, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
 - Mr. Farley Watanabe, Corps of Engineers

BENJAMIN J. CALETANO
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII



RECEIVED
JUN 25 1999
BUREAU DIVISION

THOMAS E. JOHNS, CHAIRPERSON
BOARD OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
OFFICES
JANET E. LAWRENCE

AQUATIC RESOURCES
SOILS AND OCEAN RESOURCES
CONSERVATION AND RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT
COUNTY PLANS UNIT
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND
STATE PARKS
WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

BENJAMIN J. CALETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
655 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097
FEB 8 2001

BRIJAN K. MINAAL
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
JAMES M. CRUCIOTO
JANET E. URUSAKI

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1545

June 21, 1999

Mr. Abraham Wong
United States Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
300 Ala Moana Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Wong:

Subsequent to our discussions with the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Highways Division, our office has examined the four reconnaissance survey reports prepared by Cultural Surveys Hawaii, *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Waialuku Districts, Island of Maui (December 9, 1997), Alternate UZ-A, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Waialuku Districts, Island of Maui (November 14, 1997), Alternate UZ-B, An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Waialuku Districts, Island of Maui (November 14, 1997), and Alternate UZ-A (new), An Addendum to Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Waialuku Districts, Island of Maui (July, 1998). We concur with the Federal Highway Administration's determination that the twenty-five sites identified along the project's alternative alignments appear to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.*

Aloha!

Don Hibbard
Administrator and Deputy
State Historic Preservation Officer

TO: DON HIBBARD, PH.D., ADMINISTRATOR
STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

ATTN: MR. ROSS CORDY, PH.D., CHIEF, ARCHEOLOGICAL BRANCH

FROM: BRIJAN K. MINAAL *Brijan K. Minaal*
DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE OF TRANSPORTATION

SUBJECT: PROPOSED KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY, INITIATION OF SECTION 106 AND CHAPTER 6E PROCESS, INVENTORY SURVEY OF THE UI, K1 ALTERNATIVE, CULTURAL IMPACTS STUDY

The purpose of this letter is to initiate the historic review process under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Chapter 6E of the Hawaii Revised Statutes for the subject project. Enclosed is an inventory survey report of the UI, K1 alignment, which was selected as the preferred alternative and will be identified as such in the upcoming Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH), the author of the report, as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. Also enclosed is a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties (TCP) along the preferred alternative.

We respectfully ask that the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) review the inventory survey and TCP report. If these reports are acceptable, please provide us with a written notice of acceptance. We will also be submitting these reports to the State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) and the following individuals and organizations who were recommended by your staff for consultation for this project in 1997:

- Maui/Lani Island Burial Council;
- Charles Maxwell, Cultural Specialist;
- South Maui Heritage Corridor;
- Kihei Community Association;
- Waiohuli/Keokea Homestead Association;
- Ed Lindsey, Cultural Specialist; and
- Mahealani Kaiakamaile, Native Forest Specialist.

If there are others that you feel should be consulted, please let us know. We will forward to you any comments we may receive.

To assist you in reviewing the reports, we would like to provide a summary of the public involvement activities regarding the identification and assessment of potential impacts to historic properties.

Public Review of Archaeological Reconnaissance Surveys

CSH conducted archaeological reconnaissance surveys for all proposed alternative alignments considered in the project's Draft EIS. These alternatives included all eight combinations of two Kihai and four Upcountry terminus options. The Kihai termini and segments are called K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are called U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. The eight alternative alignments are:

1. U1, K1
2. U1, K2
3. U2-A, K1
4. U2-A, K2
5. U2-B, K1
6. U2-B, K2
7. U3, K1
8. U3, K2

The U2 and U3 alignments were modified or shifted prior to the Draft EIS to avoid important archaeological sites identified by CSH.

In February 1999, the reconnaissance reports were submitted for comments to OHA and the DPHL as well as those individuals and organizations listed above. Since none of these organizations and individuals provided comments within the time requested, each of them were contacted by phone in March 1999. The calls resulted in comment letters from OHA, DPHL and Mr. Ed Lindsey. These letters were forwarded to SHPD in April 1999 to assist in the SHPD review of the reconnaissance reports. Copies of these letters are enclosed in this letter.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The project's Draft EIS, which met the requirements of both the National Environmental Policy Act and HRS Chapter 343, was announced and released to the public in August 1999. Three formal public hearings were held on September 29 and 30, and October 13, 1999 at Kihai Aquatics and Community Center in Kihai, Mayor Hannibal Tavares Community Center in Pukalani, and Kahului School, respectively. The public hearings were "open house", a format in which no formal presentation is made, but information about the project is provided by "science fair" types of displays, and experts are available to answer questions. A portion of the display area was devoted

to the subject of historic resources, and was staffed by Mr. Hallett Hammett, principal of CSH, who was available at all three public hearings. This historic resources display area included maps showing the location of the historic sites found and photographs of some of the more notable sites (e.g., the petroglyphs that were avoided by the modifications to some of the alternatives).

Public review of the Draft EIS produced over 400 written and oral comments, of which, only one, a letter from Mr. Charles Maxwell, provided information about historic properties in the project area. OHA also provided a Draft EIS comment letter. Both letters are provided with this letter as enclosures.

Summary of Comments Received Regarding Historic and Cultural Properties

DPHL - DPHL stated that they have no knowledge of historic properties in the study area.

OHA - In the letter providing comments on the reconnaissance surveys, OHA requested additional information on Site 4776 (previously identified as CSH 20) and the sites along the K2 alignment, and requested that a cultural analysis be conducted. The second request was repeated in the letter providing comments on the project's Draft EIS.

Ed Lindsey - Requested a more detailed analysis of the preferred alternative.

Charles Kauluwehi Maxwell - Provided information about burial caves in Kaluapulani and Kaliainui Gulches in the vicinity of the U2-A and U2-B alignments, and about Site 2701, the Heiau adjacent to the U2-A alignment.

We complied with OHA's request to include a cultural assessment in the Draft EIS, the result being the cultural impacts study. The inventory survey complied with OHA and Mr. Lindsey's request for additional information. Mr. Maxwell's concern was alleviated by the selection of the U1, K1 alignment as the preferred alternative, instead of one of the U2-A or U2-B alignments.

Thank you for your time and effort. We would highly appreciate your immediate attention on this matter so that we may proceed with the Section 106 and Chapter 6E process. If you approve the reports, we will soon thereafter submit effect determinations.

BEJUAN J. CAYetano
GOVERNOR



BRIAN K. LUNA
DIRECTOR
SENIOR DIRECTORS
CLELIA M. OKADA
JACKIE Y. URUSHI

Memo to Don Hibbard, Ph.D.
Page 4

HWY-PA 2.1545

FEB 8 2001

If you have any questions, please call Wayne Kawahara, Advance Planning Section, Planning Branch, Highways Division, at 587-6357.

Enclosures

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
859 PUKIHOE WAY
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB 8 2001

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

Mr. Randall Ogata
Administrator
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapiolani Boulevard, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Ogata:

Subject: Proposed Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection to the Piliiani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

BENJAMIN J. CAYENANO
GOVERNOR



BRIAN K. MINAAMI
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
CLEMENS CHANICO
JACKIE Y. URASAKI

Mr. Randall Ogata
Page 2

FEB 8 2001

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,

BRIAN K. MINAAMI
Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

HWY-PA 2.1544

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB 8 2001

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

Mr. Raymond Soon, Chairperson
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands
P. o. Box 1879
Honolulu, Hawaii 96805

Dear Mr. Soon:

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimalie Road intersection to the Pihlani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

BEIJUAN J. CAVETARO
GOVERNOR



BRIAN K. MIDNAAI
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
GLENN Y. BARNES
JUDITH Y. BRADSHAW

Mr. Leslie Kulololo
Page 2
FEB 8 2001

HWY-PA 2.1544

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5087

PLEASE REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

FEB 8 2001

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,

BRIAN K. MIDNAAI

Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

Dear Mr. Maxwell:

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haiimaile Road intersection to the Pihihi Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GOVERNOR



BRJAN K. MINAAL
DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
669 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5087

Mr. Charles Maxwell
Page 2
FEB 8 2001

HWY-PA 2.1544

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
669 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5087

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

FEB 8 2001

Very truly yours,

BRJAN K. MINAAL
Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

Dear Ms. Felsing:
Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Ms. Helen Felsing
South Maui Heritage Corridor
2846 Puu Ho'ola'i
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

Ms. Helen Felsing
Page 2
FEB 8 2001

HWY-PA 2.1544

BENJAMIN J. CAYETANO
GOVERNOR



BRIAN K. MINA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
GLENN M. OKAMOTO
JADWIE Y. URASANO


STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
659 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

PLEASE REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,


BRIAN K. MINA
Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

FEB 8 2001

Kihei Community Association
P. O. Box 662
Kihei, Hawaii 96753

Dear Members:

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

Ms. Dana Hall
Page 2
FEB 8 2001

HWY-PA 2.1544

BENJAMIN J. CAYTAI/IC
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNICHOVA STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB 8 2001


BRADY K. UHAMA
DIRECTOR
DEPUTY DIRECTORS
GLENN H. OHMOTO
JACKIE Y. URASAU

IN REPLY REFER TO
HWY-PA
2.1544

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,


BRIAN K. MINNAI
Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

Mr. Ed Lindsey
1087A Pookele Road
Makawao, Hawaii 96768

Dear Mr. Lindsey:

Subject: Proposed Kihiri-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Two years ago we asked for your review and comments on archaeological reconnaissance survey reports prepared for the subject project. Since then, we have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project, held public hearings, solicited agency and public comments on the Draft EIS, and selected a preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is the U1, K1 Alternative, an alignment from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimalie Road intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

Following selection of the preferred alternative, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) conducted an archaeological inventory survey of this alignment. The inventory survey report identifies several sites that were evaluated by CSH as being significant per criteria of the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places. In addition, Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted a cultural impacts study for all the alternatives. The cultural impacts study did not identify any traditional cultural properties at or near the alternatives. Both reports are enclosed for your review and comments.

We would very much appreciate your input, and any comments you submit will be forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Division to assist in their evaluation of the reports. Please submit your comments by March 2, 2001 to:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
Highways Division
Planning Branch
Advance Planning Section
869 Kapiolani Boulevard, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Wayne Kawahara

JMK 03/14

Mr. Mahealani Kaiakamalile
Page 2

FEB 8 2001

HWY-PA 2.1544

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

MAR 22 7 55 AM '01
FAX (808) 587-1787

PHONE (808) 587-1787



STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
111 KAPOLANI BOULEVARD, SUITE 605
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,

Brian K. Minaai
BRIAN K. MINAAI

Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

February 28, 2001

Mr. Brian Minaai
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Subject: Proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Dear Mr. Minaai:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. We apologize for our late response.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs previously commented on the need for the preparation of a cultural impact statement. The cultural impacts study prepared by Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. concluded that there were no Traditional Cultural Properties within the project area. Consultation with 50 individuals knowledgeable about Hawaiian culture confirmed the existence of archeological sites but did not reveal any cultural practices.

The archeological inventory survey recommends data recovery of three identified sites and preservation of two sites. OHA requests the opportunity to review the data recovery plan and preservation plan prepared for these sites.

If you have any questions, please contact Sharla Manley, assistant policy analyst at 594-1944, or e-mail her at sharlam@goha.org.

Sincerely,

Colin C. Kippen, Jr.

Colin C. Kippen, Jr.
Deputy Administrator

cc: Board of Trustees
Randall K. Ogata
Maui CAC

RECEIVED
MAR 21 12 47 PM '01
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
111 KAPOLANI BOULEVARD
HONOLULU, HI 96813

10 01 07 7 07 AM
STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
111 KAPOLANI BOULEVARD
HONOLULU, HI 96813



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS
PO BOX 1879
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96818

RAYMOND C. SOON
CHAIRMAN
HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION
1000 S. KING ST.
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96818

The Honorable Brian K. Minaai:
March 2, 2001
Page 2

March 2, 2001

To: The Honorable Brian K. Minaai
Director, Designate of Transportation

From: Raymond C. Soon, Chairman
Hawaiian Homes Commission

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Archaeological Inventory Survey Report and
Cultural Impacts Assessment Report

RECEIVED
MARCH 6 11 27 AM '01
HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION
1000 S. KING ST.
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96818

Thank you for providing copies of the assessment reports on the archaeological and cultural significance of the lands and features within the proposed U1-K1 Alternative highway corridor proposed to connect Upcountry Maui and Kihei.

Your cover letter (HWY-PA 2.1544) advises us that this U1-K1 Alternative, connecting the Haleakala Highway/Haiimale Road intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection, is the preferred alternative.

In our January 15, 1998, and March 24, 1999, responses regarding the highway project, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) gave support to the proposed U2-K2 alignment and asked that we be consulted as part of the process to finalize the alignment selection and the locations of possible on/off ramps. We believe that the U2,K2 alignment will offer more opportunities for more drivers to avoid the high traffic concentrations that will occur at the busiest highway segments and intersections during peak hours.

It appears that the U1-K1 Alternative will not relieve the traffic along already heavily-used portions of the Haleakala and Piilani Highways. In the morning, residents of Makawao-Pukalani wishing to go to Kihei will still head

Makai (West) to use the new route, competing with those headed to Kahului-Wailuku. When they exit at Ki, they will be at the busiest section of the Piilani Highway in Kihei. During the afternoon peak hours, the same conflicts will occur, only in reverse.

DRHL would like to review Origin-Destination studies that support the U1-K1 Alternative as the most reasonable (preferred) alternative.

We have reviewed the archaeological and cultural reports provided and have no comments to offer.

If you have any questions, please call me at 586-3801, or have your staff call Joe Chu of our Planning Office at 587-6621.

1000 S. KING ST.
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96818

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

JWR0394

Mr. Mahealani Kaiokamalile
Page 2

HWY-PA.2.1544

FEB 8 2001

REGISTRATION SERVICE
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
TRANSPORTATION

MAR 22 7 55 AM '01
FAX FROM STATE

PHONE (808) 534-1144



STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
711 KAUFMAN BOULEVARD, SUITE 600
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

FAX Number: 587-1787

If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawahara at 587-6357.

Very truly yours,

Brian K. Minnai
BRIAN K. MINNAI
Director-Designate of Transportation

Enclosures

February 28, 2001

Mr. Brian Minaai
Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, HI 96813-5097

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway, Maui, Hawaii
Inventory Survey of the U1, K1 Alternative, Cultural Impacts Study

Dear Mr. Minaai:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. We apologize for our late response.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs previously commented on the need for the preparation of a cultural impact statement. The cultural impacts study prepared by Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. concluded that there were no Traditional Cultural Properties within the project area. Consultation with 50 individuals knowledgeable about Hawaiian culture confirmed the existence of archeological sites but did not reveal any cultural practices.

The archeological inventory survey recommends data recovery of three identified sites and preservation of two sites. OHA requests the opportunity to review the data recovery plan and preservation plan prepared for these sites.

If you have any questions, please contact Sharla Manley, assistant policy analyst at 594-1944, or e-mail her at sharlam@oha.org.

Sincerely,

Colin C. Kippen, Jr.

Colin C. Kippen, Jr.
Deputy Administrator

cc: Board of Trustees
Randall K. Ogata
Maui CAC

MAR 21 12 47 PM '01
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
TRANSPORTATION

MAR 21 10 57 07 AM '01
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
TRANSPORTATION



RAYNARD C. SOON
CHAIRMAN
HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION
JAMES M. DE VANELOON
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOMELANDS
PO BOX 1879
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

March 2, 2001

To: The Honorable Brian K. Minaai
Director, Regionate of Transportation

From: *[Signature]*
Raynard C. Soon, Chairman
Hawaiian Homes Commission

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
Archaeological Inventory Survey Report and
Cultural Impacts Assessment Report

RECEIVED
MAR 6 11 27 AM '01
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING DIVISION

Thank you for providing copies of the assessment reports on the archaeological and cultural significance of the lands and features within the proposed U1-K1 Alternative highway corridor proposed to connect Upcountry Maui and Kihei.

Your cover letter (HWY-PA 2.1544) advises us that this U1-K1 Alternative, connecting the Haleakala Highway/Haliimale Road intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection, is the preferred alternative.

In our January 15, 1998, and March 24, 1999, responses regarding the highway project, the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) gave support to the proposed U2-K2 alignment and asked that we be consulted as part of the process to finalize the alignment selection and the locations of possible on/off ramps. We believe that the U2.K2 alignment will offer more opportunities for more drivers to avoid the high traffic concentrations that will occur at the busiest highway segments and intersections during peak hours.

It appears that the U1-K1 Alternative will not relieve the traffic along already heavily-used portions of the Haleakala and Piilani Highways. In the morning, residents of Makawao-Pukalani wishing to go to Kihei will still head

The Honorable Brian K. Minaai
March 2, 2001
Page 2

Makai (West) to use the new route, competing with those headed to Kahului-Wailuku. When they exit at K2, they will be at the busiest section of the Piilani Highway in Kihei. During the afternoon peak hours, the same conflicts will occur, only in reverse.

DHHL would like to review Origin-Destination studies that support the U1-K1 Alternative as the most reasonable (preferred) alternative.

We have reviewed the archaeological and cultural reports provided and have no comments to offer.

If you have any questions, please call me at 586-3801, or have your staff call Joe Chu of our Planning Office at 587-6421.

COLLEEN J. CHRISTIAN
Supervisor of Mail



SHARPE E. CUMMINGS, CHAIRMAN
HAWAIIAN CULTURAL COMMISSION
Commission on the Arts, History & Monuments

DEPUTY
MARTI E. GARDNER
(Email: mgardner)

STATE OF HAWAII

DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
Kalaheo Building, Room 815
801 Kalaheo Boulevard
Kalaheo, Hawaii 96707

AGRICULTURE
ARCHAEOLOGY
COMMISSION ON WATER RESOURCES
MANAGEMENT
CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION
INFRASTRUCTURE
CONSTRUCTION
COURT REPORTS
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
LAND
STATE PLANNING

May 10, 2001

Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D.
Cultural Surveys Hawaii
733 North Kalia Avenue
Kaliua, Hawaii 96734

Dear Dr. Hammatt,

SUBJECT: Review of An Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed
Kihel to Kula Road Corridor,
Kaliua to Ka'ono'ono ahupua'a, Makawao and Waituku, Maui
TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009,
2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016
3-09-001: por. 016

LOG NO: 27374 ✓
DOC NO: 0104MK01

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report which our staff received on 12 February 2001 (Colin, Shideier, Creed, Bush, and Hammatt, 2000, *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihel to Kula Road Corridor, Kaliua to Ka'ono'ono ahupua'a, Makawao and Waituku, Maui*, TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009, 2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016, 3-09-001: por. 016... Cultural Surveys Hawaii ms.). We apologize for the delay in our response.

The background section acceptably establishes the ahupua'a settlement pattern and predicts the likely site pattern in the project area.

The survey has adequately covered the project area documenting 17 historic properties in the project area (six of which were previously identified). The site descriptions and interpretations are acceptable. The functional classifications for the historic properties include seven temporary habitation sites (3742, 3749, 3745, 5032, 5033, and 5035), three agricultural sites (3728 and 3729 precontact, 4765 historic), two petroglyph sites (5029 and 5031, each with only 3 petroglyphs), one cattle wall site (5030), one marker (3729), and three sites related to historic military training activities (4773, 4776, and 4778).

We agree that 15 of the sites are significant solely for their information content (Criterion "D" of the National Register of Historic Places). We believe, however, that the two petroglyph sites are significant for their information content (D) and also as representative examples of small petroglyph sites in the lower Kula gulches (criterion C). If you agree, please correct the significance evaluation for these two sites to include Criterion "C" and send us a replacement

Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D.
Page 2

page. If you disagree, please contact our Maui Archaeologist to discuss the situation. Regardless of the resolution of the specifics of significance, we can agree by consensus that all 17 historic properties are technically eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

We agree with the mitigation proposals. No mitigation (preservation or data recovery) is warranted for 12 of the sites (3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743, 3745, 4765, 4773, 4776, 4778, 5030, and 5034). These are small sites and a reasonable and adequate amount of their significant information was recovered during the survey, and in the cases of 3742, 3743, and 3745 (temporary habitations sites) during a prior survey which identified and documented them. The two small petroglyph sites are to be preserved. Three of the temporary habitation sites which have deposits (5032, 5033, and 5035) are to undergo archaeological data recovery.

We understand that this is a project with federal involvement (Federal Highways Administration). Thus, following the rules of the U.S. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, mitigation of the 5 sites is required to take place under a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). We see this as a very simple MOA with a stipulation for preservation (and an attached preservation plan) and another stipulation for archaeological data recovery (with an attached data recovery plan). Please be sure that your client and the federal agency that is involved consult with native Hawaiian groups and the interested public on the findings and the proposed mitigation. Parties that wish to be involved should have the opportunity to comment on the MOA. We will await receiving a copy of the draft MOA.

If you have questions, please contact Dr. Melissa Kirkendall (Maui/Lana'i SHPD 243-5169) as soon as possible to resolve these concerns.

Aloha

Bern Hibbard, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

MK:cjan

c: John Min, Director, Department of Planning, County of Maui, FAX 270-7634
Bert Raitte, County of Maui, Land Use and Codes, FAX 270-7972
Glen Ueno, County of Maui, Land Use and Codes, FAX 270-7972



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Hawaii Division
300 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3-306
Honolulu, HI 96850
June 18, 2001

50-50-10-4773
50-50-10-4776
50-50-10-4778
50-50-10-5030
50-50-10-5032
50-50-10-5033
50-50-10-5034
50-50-10-5035

Military
Military
Military
Animal Husbandry
Temporary Habitation
Temporary Habitation and Military
Temporary Habitation
Temporary Habitation

REPLY TO
HEC-HI

Mr. Gilbert Coloma-Agaran
Chairperson and State Historic Preservation Officer
State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources
601 Kamokila Boulevard, Room 555
Kapolei, Hawaii, 96707

Attention: Mr. Ross Cordy

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
County of Maui, Hawaii
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
Request for Concurrence on Effect Determinations

Dear Mr. Coloma-Agaran:

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, this letter requests that the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concur on effect determinations regarding historic properties in the subject project's Area of Potential Effect (APE).

The U1,K1 alignment has been identified as the preferred alternative. The U1,K1 alignment would run from the Haleakala Highway / Halimale Road intersection to the Piilani Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection.

An inventory survey of this area was conducted by Cultural Surveys Hawaii (CSH). The survey report (Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kaono'ulu, Ahupua'a, Makawao and Wailuku Districts, Island of Maui, December 2000) was reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), with review comments provided in the letter of May 10, 2001 (ref. LOG NO: 27374, DOC NO: 0104MK01). The report has been accepted by the SHPD.

The following historic properties were identified in the APE of the preferred alternative:

State Site Number	Function
50-50-10-3727	Agriculture
50-50-10-3728	Agriculture
50-50-10-3729	Marker
50-50-10-3742	Temporary Habitation
50-50-10-3743	Temporary Habitation
50-50-10-3745	Temporary Habitation
50-50-10-4765	Agriculture


With due consideration for both the results of the inventory survey report and input from public review, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) renders "no adverse effect" determinations on State sites 50-50-10-3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743, 3745, 4765, 4773, 4776, 4778, 5030, and 5034. None of these sites warrant preservation and sufficient documentation of these sites has been previously collected by CSH and others. The SHPD agreed in the May 10, 2001 letter that no further work is needed on these sites.

The FHWA renders "adverse effect" determinations on State sites 50-50-10-3032, 5033 and 5035, sites that functioned as temporary habitation. Two of the sites (5032 and 5033) are located 190 to 150 feet from the alignment centerline, just inside the APE. None of these temporary habitation sites warrant preservation. However, additional data recovery is needed if subsequent project planning confirms that these sites will be displaced by the project. A draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is enclosed.


Two petroglyph sites (State sites 5029 and 5031) are located approximately 200 feet from the alignment centerline in Kailiinui and Waiakoa Gulches. Because of this distance, and since Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross both gulches via two-lane bridge, both petroglyph sites are outside the APE. Nevertheless, the project's Record of Decision (ROD) will specify that buffer zones around the petroglyphs, demarcated with bright colored markers, be established during construction to prevent accidental damage to the sites. The ROD will instruct the State Department of Transportation to consult with the SHPD to determine adequate buffer zones.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at 541-2700 (ext. 302).

Sincerely yours,


Domingo Galciniao, P.E.
Structural Engineer

RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS



Enclosure: Draft Memorandum of Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, and the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding the Displacement of Three Temporary Habitation Sites for the Kihici-Upcountry Maui Highway, County of Maui, Hawaii, Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

cc: Dr. Melissa Kirkendall, State Historic Preservation Division
Mr. Wayne Kawahara, State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
Mr. Warren Unemori, Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.
✓ Mr. Jason Yazawa, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Ms. Laura Kong, FHWA



Parsons
Brinckerhoff
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
808-531-7094
Fax: 808-528-2368

September 26, 2001

Mr. Clyde Namu'o, Administrator
State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway
County of Maui, Hawaii
National Historic Preservation Act, Section 105 Consultation
Memorandum of Agreement

Dear Mr. Namu'o:

The State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) thank the Office of Hawaiian Affairs for its participation in the planning of this project. OHA has provided valuable comments on numerous occasions, most recently through the OHA review of the cultural impact study and archaeological inventory survey of the preferred alignment alternative (from the Haleakala Highway / Halimaile Road intersection in Upcountry to the Pular Highway / Kaonouli Street intersection in Kihei).

In accordance with Section 105 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the FHWA has reviewed proposed sites for determinations of three historic properties that functioned as temporary habitation: State Sites 50-50-10-5032, 5033 and 5035. Although these sites do not warrant preservation, additional data recovery is needed if subsequent project planning confirms that these sites will be displaced by the project. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is expected to concur with these effect determinations.

Enclosed please find a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the FHWA and the SHPO regarding the three sites. The State Historic Preservation Division has already reviewed the draft MOA. We respectfully ask the OHA to also review the MOA before it is signed. Please provide any comments you may have by October 26, 2001.

Please do not hesitate to call me at 566-2235 should you have any questions. I will be on vacation from October 10 to October 29. If you need to contact us during this period, please call Mr. David Aikin at 566-2205.

Sincerely yours,
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

Jason Yazawa, AICP

Cc Domingo Galicinao, FHWA (two enclosure)
Wayne Kawahara, SDOT (two enclosure)

Over 3 Century of
Engineering Excellence

PHONE (808) 544-1444



STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
711 KAPOLIANI BOULEVARD, SUITE 500
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

FAX (808) 544-1865

October 16, 2001

Mr. Jason Yazawa
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Yazawa:

Subject: Proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

This letter is provided as a response to the materials of September 26, 2001, produced by Parsons Brinckerhoff for FHWA, requesting review and comments relating to the above MOA. OHA finds the terms of the MOA to be standard and reasonable, and has no further concerns to add in its review.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment relating the proposed project. If you have any questions, please contact Wayne Kawamura, Policy Analyst at 594-1966, or email him at waynek@oha.org.

Sincerely,

Colin Kippen, Jr.
Deputy Administrator

cc: BOT
ADM

RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Among the

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION and the
HAWAII STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER**

Regarding the Displacement of Three Temporary Habitation Sites
for the Kiheti-Upcountry Maui Highway, County of Maui, Hawaii
Project No. HDPS-9203(1)

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has determined that State Sites 50-10-5032, 5033 and 5035, which functioned as temporary habitation, are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and that their displacement by the construction of Kiheti-Upcountry Maui Highway will have an adverse effect, and FHWA has consulted with the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470);

WHEREAS, the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT) participated in the consultation and has been invited to concur in this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA);

WHEREAS, the State of Hawaii Office of Hawaiian Affairs participated in the consultation; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the FHWA and the Hawaii SHPO agree that the displacement of State Sites 5032, 5033 and 5035 shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account such action's effect on historic properties.

STIPULATIONS

FHWA will ensure that the following measures are implemented.


1. Prior to the displacement of State Sites 5032, 5033 and 5035 (the undertaking), the HDOT shall arrange the preparation of a data recovery plan for these sites. HDOT will submit this plan to the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) for review. Once approved by the SHPD, HDOT shall arrange the data recovery of State Sites 5032, 5033 and 5035.
2. Upon SHPD's acceptance of the data recovery report, HDOT will be allowed to commence the undertaking.
3. The FHWA shall submit a copy of the executed MOA to the Council with the appropriate documentation pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.11 prior to the undertaking.
4. Should a party to this agreement object within 30 days to any items submitted pursuant to this agreement, the FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve the objection. If the FHWA determines that the objection cannot be resolved, the FHWA shall request comments of the Council pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.9. Any Council comment provided in response to such a request will be taken into account by the FHWA with reference only to the subject of the dispute; the FHWA's responsibility to carry out all actions under this agreement that are not the subjects of the dispute will remain unchanged.

5. Any party to this MOA may request that it be amended, whereupon the parties shall consult in accordance with 36 CFR Section 800 to consider such amendment.

6. Should the undertaking not take place within five (5) years of the executed MOA, the parties shall consult in accordance with 36 CFR Section 800 to determine whether amendments should be considered.

Execution of this MOA by the FHWA and the Hawaii SHPO, and implementation of its terms shall be evidence that FHWA has afforded the Council the opportunity to comment on the project entitled, "Kiheti-Upcountry Maui Highway, Island of Maui, Hawaii, Project No. HDPS-9203(1)" and its effects on historic properties, and that FHWA has taken into account the effects of the undertaking on State Sites 50-10-5032, 5033 and 5035.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

By: 
ABRAHAM WONG
Division Administrator

Date: 11/8/01


HAWAII STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

By: 
GILBERT COLOMA-AGARAN
State Historic Preservation Officer

Date: 11/20/01

CONCURRED BY:

STATE OF HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: 
BRIAN MINAAI
Director of Transportation

Date: DEC 04 2001



SENT TO
ATTENTION OF

Operations Branch

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
FT. SHAFTER, HAWAII 96854-5440
February 26, 1999

RECEIVED

FEB 27 - 1 1999

HAWAII DIVISION

Mr. Pat V. Phung, P.E.
Transportation Engineer
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3202
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Phung:

This letter is in regards to the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project located in Maui, Hawaii.

Based on information contained in the Environmental Assessment and a meeting held on February 9, 1999 with Mr. Farley Watanabe of my staff, Mr. Steven Chang, State DOT and yourself, it was determined that a Department of the Army permit would be required. The proposed project appears to have minor environmental impacts, therefore could possibly be authorized under Nationwide Permit #14, Road Crossing. In addition, a Coastal Zone Management Federal Consistency determination from the Office of Planning will be required. The State Department of Health has issued a blanket Section 401 Water Quality Certification for this NW permit and a Best Management Plan addressing any discharge of fill material into intermittent streams will need to be submitted.

File number 990000206 has been assigned to this project. Please refer to this number in any future correspondence with this office. Should you have additional questions or need further information, you may call Mr. Watanabe at 438-9258, extension 14.

Sincerely,

George P. Young, P.E.
Chief, Operations Branch

Copy furnished:

Clean Water Branch, Environmental Management Branch, Honolulu, Hawaii
DLNR, State Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, Hawaii
DBEDT, Office of Planning, Coastal Zone Management Office, Honolulu, Hawaii
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Honolulu, Hawaii
Environmental Protection Agency, Honolulu, Hawaii

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
Hawaii Division
300 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3-306
Honolulu, HI 96850
January 29, 2001

John J.

MEMO REFER TO
HEC-HI

Mr. David W. Blane, Director
Office of Planning, Department of Business, Economic
Development and Tourism
Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program
P.O. Box 2359
Honolulu, HI 96804

Subject: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, Federal Activity Consistency,
Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program


Dear Mr. Blane:

We have enclosed for your review a CZM Program Assessment Form for the above Federal-aid highway project. The proposed project is located within the State's CZM area. As required by 15 CFR 930.32, federal activities undertaken in or affecting Hawaii's coastal zone must be consistent with the State's CZM objectives and policies.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project was completed in July 1999. We provided your office with a copy of this Draft EIS for your review. The Final EIS is expected to be completed by this spring, so we are requesting a CZM Consistency Determination prior to issuance of the Final EIS.

If there are any questions or comments, please call me at 541-2700 ext. 302. We appreciate your assistance in making the determination.

Sincerely yours,


Domingo Galicinao, P.E.
Structural Engineer

Enclosures

cc: Jason Yazawa, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Wayne Kawahara, HWY-P

HAWAII COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

For

Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
Maui County, Hawaii

Submitted To:

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND TOURISM
Office of Planning
Coastal Zone Management Program

Submitted By:

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
And
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

November 2000

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
 Hawaii Division
 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3-306
 Honolulu, HI 96850
 January 29, 2001

1

PLEASE REFER TO
 HEC-11

Mr. David W. Blane, Director
 Office of Planning, Department of Business, Economic
 Development and Tourism
 Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program
 P.O. Box 2359
 Honolulu, HI 96804

**HAWAII COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
 ASSESSMENT FORM**

For
 Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway
 Maui County, Hawaii

Subject: Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, Federal Activity Consistency,
 Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program

Dear Mr. Blane:

We have enclosed for your review a CZM Program Assessment Form for the above Federal-aid highway project. The proposed project is located within the State's CZM area. As required by 15 CFR 930.32, federal activities undertaken in or affecting Hawaii's coastal zone must be consistent with the State's CZM objectives and policies.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project was completed in July 1999. We provided your office with a copy of this Draft EIS for your review. The Final EIS is expected to be completed by this spring, so we are requesting a CZM Consistency Determination prior to issuance of the Final EIS.

If there are any questions or comments, please call me at 541-2700 ext. 302. We appreciate your assistance in making the determination.

Sincerely yours,

Domingo Galiciano
 Domingo Galiciano, P.E.
 Structural Engineer

Enclosures

cc: Jason Yazawa, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
 Wayne Kawahara, HWY-P

Submitted To:
 STATE OF HAWAII
 Office of Planning
 Coastal Zone Management Program

Submitted By:
 STATE OF HAWAII
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 And
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

November 2000

INTRODUCTION

This assessment describes the impacts that the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project would have on recreational resources, historic resources, scenic and open space resources, coastal ecosystems, economic uses, coastal hazards, managing development, public participation, beach protection, and marine resources. These topics areas were reviewed to assess the project's conformance with Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management (CZM) program.

The State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) propose to construct a two-lane limited access highway connecting the Upcountry area of East Maui with the coastal Kihai area. The purposes of the project are the following:

- improve Maui's roadway system by providing a direct link between Upcountry Maui and the Kihai-Makena region;
- support further economic development of the established visitor industry, and the growing "high technology" industry centered at the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park in Kihai and Science City on the summit of Haleakala;
- address vehicular capacity deficiencies of existing highways;
- satisfy the increasing travel demand of Maui's growing population;
- promote the national interest as expressed through a legislative directive supporting research activities being conducted at the Maui R&T Park and Science City; and
- increase the coastal evacuation capacity of the Kihai-Makena region.

Construction of a two-lane highway is proposed initially because projections indicate that two lanes will be sufficient to accommodate travel demand in the design year, 2020. However, right-of-way will be acquired for a four-lane highway. The width of the right-of-way will be at least 160 feet in rural areas and at least 120 feet in urban areas. The precise width of the right-of-way at a given point will depend on local terrain features. Along most of the alignment, earthwork will only be done for a two-lane roadway. However, where the highway crosses certain gulches, and where an urban design (provision of gutters, sidewalks, etc.) is proposed, earthwork for the ultimate four-lane configuration will be conducted during the initial construction phase.


The alignments that were considered in this project's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are the eight possible combinations of four Upcountry and two Kihai termini options (see Figures 1 and 2). The Kihai termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. Both of the makai terminus options in Kihai fall on the mauka boundary of the Special Management Area (see Figure 3). A No-Build alternative was also considered. Brief descriptions of the build alternatives are provided below:

1. Alternative U1,K1. This alternative would start at the Haleakala Highway / Halimaile Road intersection in Upcountry and follow a south to southwest alignment to the Kaonoulu Street / Pilihi Highway intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 9.8 miles.


2. Alternative U1,K2. This alternative shares the same Upcountry terminus as Alternative U1,K1. However, this alternative would proceed southwest to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Pilihi Highway intersection. The length of Alternative U1,K2 is approximately 10.9 miles.
3. Alternative U2-A,K1. This alternative would extend from the Pukalani Bypass / Haleakala Highway / Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection in Upcountry, and follow a generally west to southwest alignment to the Pilihi Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihai. The length of this alternative is approximately 9.8 miles.
4. Alternative U2-A,K2. This alternative would extend from the "Five Trees" intersection to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Pilihi Highway intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 10.9 miles.
5. Alternative U2-B,K2. This alternative would extend west from a point on Kula Highway approximately 2,300 feet south of the "Five Trees" intersection. The alignment runs parallel to Segment U2-A for about 10,000 feet, and then joins the U2-A alignment. This alternative's Kihai terminus is at the Pilihi Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 9.6 miles.
6. Alternative U2-B,K1. This alternative shares the same Upcountry terminus as Alternative U2-B,K2. This alternative's Kihai terminus is at the Pilihi Highway / Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 10.8 miles.
7. Alternative U3,K1. This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Pilihi Highway / Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihai. The length of this alternative is approximately 9.0 miles.
8. Alternative U3,K2. This alternative shares the same Upcountry terminus as Alternative U3,K1. This alternative's Kihai terminus is at Pilihi Highway / Ke Alii Alanui Street. The length of this alternative is approximately 10.0 miles.

The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Office of Planning, Coastal Zone Management Program was mailed a copy of the Draft EIS for this project. Please refer to the Draft EIS for additional information.



After analyzing a wide range of factors including cost, transportation benefits, potential environmental impacts, comments received on the Draft EIS, conformance with government plans and policies, and community sentiment, SDOT selected the U1,K1 alignment as the preferred alternative. The FHWA approved this decision. The forthcoming Final EIS will identify the U1,K1 alignment as the preferred alternative. The selection of the preferred alternative was announced through the island of Maui news media.



Source: Warren S. Unemori, Engineering, Inc., October 1997



**Proposed Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**
Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
FIGURE 2



**Project Location
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**
Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
FIGURE 1

RECREATION RESOURCES


Objective: Provide coastal recreational opportunities accessible to the public.


Policies:

1. Improve coordination and funding of coastal recreation planning and management.
2. Provide adequate, accessible, and diverse recreational opportunities in the coastal zone management area by:
 - a) Protecting coastal resources uniquely suited for recreational activities that cannot be provided in other areas;
 - b) Requiring replacement of coastal resources having significant recreational value, including but not limited to surfing sites and sandy beaches, when such resources will be unavoidably damaged by development; or requiring reasonable monetary compensation to the State for recreation when replacement is not feasible or desirable;
 - c) Providing and managing adequate public access, consistent with conservation of natural resources, to and along shorelines with recreational value;
 - d) Providing an adequate supply of shoreline parks and other recreational facilities suitable for public recreation;
 - e) Encouraging expanded public recreational use of County, State and Federally owned or controlled shoreline lands and waters having recreational value;
 - f) Adopting water quality standards and regulating point and non-point sources of pollution to protect and where feasible, restore the recreational value of coastal waters;
 - g) Developing new shoreline recreational opportunities, where appropriate, such as artificial reefs for surfing and fishing; and
 - h) Encouraging reasonable dedication of shoreline areas with recreational value for public use as part of discretionary approvals or permits by the land use commission, board of land and natural resources, County planning commissions; and crediting such dedication against the requirements of Section 46-6.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Will the proposed action involve or be near a dedicated public right-of-way? | X | |
| 2. Does the project site abut the shoreline? | | X |





Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.



**Parks and Recreational Facilities
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY**
Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
FIGURE 4

3. Is the project site near a State or County Park? X
4. Is the project site near a perennial stream? X
5. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a surf site? X
6. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a popular fishing area? X
7. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a recreational or boating area? X
8. Is the project site near a sandy beach? X
9. Are there swimming or other recreational uses in the area? X

Discussion:

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will connect two State highways, Piilani Highway in Kihei and Haleakala or Kula Highways in Upcountry. The SDOOT owns the right-of-way of both highways.

The project will not use land from, nor adversely impair access or use of the parks and recreational resources shown on Figure 4. The nearest coastal recreational resources are parks and sandy beaches along the Kihei coastline, approximately one mile from Piilani Highway, the makai terminus of the proposed highway. Although coastal recreational activities (e.g., surfing, fishing, and boating) occur along the Kihei coastline, the roughly one-mile distance of the makai terminus of the proposed highway from coastal recreation areas indicates that the proposed highway would not adversely affect any coastal recreation activities. In contrast, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will improve access to these coastal recreational areas, especially for Upcountry residents.

For more information on parks and recreational resources, please refer to Sections 3.11, 4.11, and 4.12 of the Draft EIS.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Objective: Protect, preserve, and where desirable, restore those natural and man-made historic and pre-historic resources in the coastal zone management area that are significant in Hawaiian and American history and culture.

Policies:

1. Identify and analyze significant archaeological resources;
2. Maximize information retention through preservation of remains and artifacts or salvage operations; and
3. Support State goals for protection, restoration, interpretation, and display of historic resources

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

	Yes	No
1. Is the project site within a historic/cultural district?		X
2. Is the project site listed on or nominated to the Hawaii or National Register of Historic Places?	X	
3. Does the project site include undeveloped land, which has not been surveyed by an archaeologist?		X
4. Has a site survey revealed any information on historic or archaeological resources?	X	
5. Is the project site within or near a Hawaiian fishpond or historic settlement area?	X	

Discussion:

As suggested by the Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), reconnaissance-level surveys were conducted on the alignments considered in the Draft EIS. The SHPD suggested an archaeological inventory survey be conducted only on the preferred alternative, which was subsequently determined to be U1.K1. This approach was followed, with the results of the reconnaissance surveys disclosed in the Draft EIS. Subsequent to the identification of the preferred alternative, an inventory survey was performed on this alignment. Fieldwork was completed in October 2000, and the upcoming inventory survey report will be used to determine project compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It is expected that a Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) will be signed for this project.

In addition, a traditional cultural properties / practices (TCPs) study for the project was completed in September 2000. The study did not identify any TCPs that would be affected by the proposed project. The TCP study will be submitted to the SHPD for review.

The project area is either undeveloped or agricultural land. The archaeological reconnaissance surveys conducted in 1997 identified a total of 25 sites within 400 feet corridors centered on the eight proposed alignments. Twenty of these sites were newly discovered. All of the sites were evaluated as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. In a letter dated June 21, 1999, the Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred that the sites found are eligible for the National Register. The archaeological reconnaissance survey report was included in the Draft EIS as an appendix. The archaeological inventory survey of the U1.K1 alternative (the preferred alternative) identified ten distinct sites that may be eligible for the National Register, which is an increase from five sites identified during the reconnaissance survey of this alignment. The inventory survey will be included in the Final EIS as an appendix.

Impacts to all sites eligible for the National and Hawaii Registers of Historic Places, and recommended for preservation-in-place, were avoided by modifying the alignments of the alternatives. These sites include petroglyphs located in the gulches crossing the alignments and one *Heiau* in the vicinity of the U2-A alignment. The alignments were not adjusted to avoid those sites affected that were not recommended for preservation, such as temporary habitation sites, agricultural sites, and military sites. The upcoming MOA will specify data recovery requirements for these sites. Further details on how impacts to archaeological sites were avoided and minimized are provided in the Draft EIS.

Archaeological resources are addressed in Sections 3.10 and 4.10 of the Draft EIS. Correspondence with the SHPD and SHPO is included in Appendix C.

Hawaiian fishponds are located along the coastal area of Kihei, approximately one mile from the proposed makai terminus of the highway. Because of this geographic separation, the proposed highway will not affect the fishponds on Kihei's coast.

SCENIC AND OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

Objective: Protect, preserve, and where desirable, restore or improve the quality of coastal scenic and open space resources.

Policies:

1. Identify valued scenic resources in the coastal zone management area;
2. Insure that new developments are compatible with their visual environment by designing and locating such developments to minimize the alteration of natural landforms and existing public views to and along the shoreline;
3. Preserve, maintain and, where desirable, improve and restore shoreline open space and scenic resources; and
4. Encourage those developments, which are not coastal dependent to locate in inland areas.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

	Yes	No
1. Does the project site about a scenic landmark?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does the proposed action involve the construction of a multi-story structure or structures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Is the project site adjacent to undeveloped parcels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Does the proposed action involve the construction of structures visible between the nearest coastal roadway and the shoreline?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action involve construction in or on waters seaward of the shoreline? On or near a beach?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will convert about 10 miles of open space used for grazing and agriculture to a transportation use. Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company, the owner of the agricultural land, has indicated that they will continue to cultivate sugarcane on parcels adjacent to the highway. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway is not expected to cause substantial urban development in Upcountry because the urban growth potential of Upcountry is limited by scarce water availability, not limited transportation infrastructure. Despite the recent development of a well in Haiku, and diversion of a portion of the well production to the Kulamalu development, Upcountry will continue to rely on surface water resources which are highly vulnerable to drought conditions. Therefore, as stated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, the County does not intend to allow substantial urban development in Upcountry, despite the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

Views from Upcountry feature panoramic scenes of Central Maui and its open agricultural lands, the rugged and picturesque West Maui Mountains, and the open ocean and shoreline. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will not affect views from Upcountry because the terrain drops away towards Central Maui and the ocean. The views of the ocean, West Maui Mountains, and Central Maui from Upcountry will not be affected.

Views from Kihei offer near sea-level perspectives of the ocean and coastline, distant vistas of the West Maui Mountains and uphill views of Haleakala. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will affect the view of Haleakala from Kihei. A paved roadway and associated embankments climbing the slope will be visible, similar to the view of Haleakala Highway from Kahului.

Visual resources and impacts are discussed in Sections 3.12 and 4.13 of the Draft EIS.

COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS

Objective: Protect valuable coastal ecosystems from disruption and minimize adverse impacts on all coastal ecosystems.

Policies:

1. Improve the technical basis for natural resource management;
2. Preserve valuable coastal ecosystems of significant biological or economic importance;
3. Minimize disruption or degradation of coastal water ecosystems by effective regulation of stream diversions, channelization, and similar land user uses, recognizing competing water needs; and
4. Promote water quantity planning and management practices, which reflect the tolerance of fresh water and marine ecosystems and prohibit land and water uses, which violate State water quality standards.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

	Yes	No
1. Does the proposed action involve dredge or fill activities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Is the project site within the Shoreline Setback Area (20 to 40 feet inland of the shoreline)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Will the proposed action require some form of effluent discharge into a body of water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the proposed action require earthwork beyond clearing and grubbing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action include the construction of special waste treatment facilities, such as injection wells, discharge pipes, or cesspools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Is an intermittent or perennial stream located on or near the project site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Does the project site provide habitat for endangered species of plants, birds, or mammals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Is any such habitat located nearby?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Is there a wetland on the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

10. Is the project site situated in or abutting a Natural Area Reserve?

11. Is the project site situated in or abutting a Marine Life Conservation District?

12. Is the project site situated in or abutting an estuary?

Discussion

Surface water resources in the study area consist of intermittent streams that flow in gulches on the western flank of Haleakala, down slope of Kula and Haleakala Highways. The more prominent gulches are Kaliahuni, Kaluapuhani, Pulehu, Kolaba, Keahua Iwi, Waiakoa, Kulanihako, Waipuhani, Kaonohu, and Waiohuli. These gulches collect rainfall and direct flows toward the ocean. However, the gulches are usually dry, and in many places their streambeds have eroded to bedrock. There are no perennial streams in the project area.

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross several of these gulches. These crossings will either be by bridge or embankment. Embankments will include culverts to maintain the flow of water in the gulch. The decision to use a bridge or embankment partially depends on storm water flow in the affected gulches. Culverts would be used for those gulches with storm water flows below 3,500 cubic feet per second from a 100-year design storm. In gulches where there would be peak flows greater than 3,500 cubic feet per second from a 100-year design storm, bridges would be constructed. In either case, the crossing will not create upstream impoundments, and there will be no hydraulic impacts, except perhaps during conditions that exceed the 100-year design storm. As shown on Figure 5, the preferred alternative would require seven bridges, including two underpasses where the highway crosses cane haul roads.


Storm water runoff containing roadway pollutants (petroleum products, rubber), will drain into the gulches and in most cases percolate into the ground. However, during heavy rain, storm water runoff could enter coastal waters. Since roadway pollutant levels are related to vehicle-miles traveled (VMT), a reduction of total regional VMT would reduce the pollutant loading of coastal waters from roadways. Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will reduce total regional VMT because it will substantially shorten the travel distance between some of Maui's major travel markets. Therefore, the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would reduce roadway pollutant discharges to Maui's coastal waters in comparison to the future No-Build condition.

Although U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory Maps show wetlands within some of the gulches that would be crossed by the proposed highway, botanical surveys did not identify any evidence (vegetation, soils, or hydrology) of wetlands in any of the gulches where they would be crossed by any of the alternatives. Therefore, no wetlands would be affected by construction of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.


The USFWS stated that certain alternatives, namely the K2 alignments, would pass within one mile of Pu'u o Kali, one of the few remaining examples of dryland forest in the State, which may contain three federally endangered plants (*Abutilon menziesii*, *Hibiscus brakenridgei* spp., *Brackenridgei*, and *Bonania menziesii*) and some rare plant species (*Acacia koa*, *Achyranthes splendens* var. *splendens*, *Canavalia pubescens*, and *Nesotuma polynesicum*). None of the alternatives would affect Pu'u o Kali and this special forest. In fact, of all the

alternatives, the preferred alternative is furthest from this resource. Botanical surveys of the alternative alignments did not identify any listed, proposed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, or any plant species of concern.

The mammal and bird species found in the project area are common throughout the Hawaiian Islands, although the USFWS noted that the U2-A and U2-B alternatives would pass near a reservoir that was used by the endangered Hawaiian coot (*Fulica americana alai*), last seen in 1986. However, the U2-A or U2-B alignment would not affect this reservoir, and therefore, not affect endangered water birds that may be using this water body. USFWS agreed with this assessment.



Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., December 1997



Bridge Locations
 KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
 FIGURE 5

ECONOMIC USES

Objective: Provide public or private facilities and improvements important to the State's economy in suitable locations.

Policies:

1. Concentrate in appropriate areas the location of coastal dependent development necessary to the State's economy:
2. Insure that coastal dependent development such as harbors and ports, visitor industry facilities, and energy generating facilities are located, designed, and constructed to minimize adverse social, visual, and environmental impacts in the coastal zone management area; and
3. Direct the location and expansion of coastal dependent developments to areas presently designated and used for such development and permit reasonable long-term growth at such areas, and permit coastal dependent development outside of presently designated areas when:
 - a) Utilization of presently designed located is not feasible;
 - b) Adverse environmental effects are minimized; and
 - c) Important to the State's economy.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

	Yes	No
1. Does the project involve a harbor or port?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Is the project site within a designated tourist destination area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the project site include agricultural lands or lands designated for such use?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Does the proposed activity relate to commercial fishing or seafood production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Does the proposed activity relate to energy production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Does the proposed activity relate to seabed mining?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway links Kihei-Makena, Maui's second largest visitor accommodation region, with Upcountry Maui, an area containing visitor attractions in its own

right, lying on the way to Haleakala National Park. The new highway will enhance the visitor experience by providing a more direct vehicular access between Kihei, Upcountry, and Haleakala National Park. Socio-economic impacts of the project not related to agriculture are discussed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIS.

In terms of agricultural impacts, the mauka portion of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will cross agricultural lands, and the makai portion will cross grazing lands (see Figure 6). The preferred alternative would cause the greatest impact on active sugarcane land, and it will bisect one pineapple field. The U2-A and U2-B would also cross sugarcane land, as well as bisecting two pineapple fields. The U3 alternatives would not affect any sugarcane land, but will cross two pineapple fields and the Maui County agricultural park. No privately-owned Kula small-scale farm would be directly affected by any of the alternatives.

To maintain the productivity of agricultural lands adjacent to the highway, mitigation measures will be implemented. These mitigation measures will include modifying or reconstructing irrigation and drainage systems and haul routes affected by the highway. The preferred alternative will not create isolated, unworkable remnant parcels.

Some of the alternatives, including the preferred alternative, could modify travel patterns in a manner that may adversely affect certain Kula farms. Traffic on Omaopio and Pulehu Roads may increase, potentially interfering with farm vehicle movements.

To minimize impacts to ranching activities, stock-proof fencing will be erected along both sides of the highway in grazing areas. Provisions will also be made so cattle may be herded from one pasture to another without disrupting traffic.

A detailed discussion of farmlands in the project area is provided in Sections 3.2 and 4.2 of the DEIS.

COASTAL HAZARDS

Objective: Reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion, and subsidence.

Policies:

1. Develop and communicate adequate information on storm wave, tsunami, flood erosion, and subsidence hazard;
2. Control development in areas subject to storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, and subsidence hazard;
3. Ensure that developments comply with requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program; and
4. Prevent coastal flooding from inland projects.


Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

	Yes	No
1. Is the project site on or abutting a sandy beach?		X
2. Is the project site within a potential tsunami inundation area as depicted on the National Flood Insurance Program flood hazard map?		X
3. Is the project site within a potential flood inundation area according to a flood hazard map?		X
4. Is the project site within a potential subsidence hazard area according to a subsidence hazard map?		X
5. Has the project site or nearby shoreline areas experienced shoreline erosion?		X


Discussion:

The tsunami evacuation areas along the Kihei-Makena coastline are shown in Figure 7. As shown in the figure, the proposed highway is mauka of the tsunami inundation area. Moreover, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will increase the evacuation capacity of the Kihei-Makena region. This is one of the purposes of the project.

The Kihei coastline has experienced shoreline erosion. However, since Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will terminate approximately one mile away from the shoreline, it will not have an affect on shoreline erosion.



Source: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., May 1997



Impacts to Croplands
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
 FIGURE 6

MANAGING DEVELOPMENT

Objective: Improve the development review process, communication, and public participation in the management of coastal resources and hazards.

Policies:

1. Effectively utilize and implement existing law to the maximum extent possible in managing present and future coastal zone development;
2. Facilitate timely processing of application for development permits and resolve overlapping or conflicting permit requirements; and
3. Communicate the potential short- and long-term impacts of proposed significant coastal developments early in their life cycle and in terms understandable to the general public to facilitate public participation in the planning and review process.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.


	Yes	No
1. Will the proposed activity require more than two (2) permits or approvals?	X	
2. Does the proposed activity conform with the State and County land use designations for the site?	X	
3. Has or will the public be notified of the proposed activity?	X	
4. Has a draft or final environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment been prepared?	X	

Discussion:

Public participation has been an important element of this project. Many scoping and coordination meetings have been held with government agencies, elected officials, and the general public throughout the planning process, as described in detail in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS, which was published in July 1999.


Construction of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway will require the federal, State, and County permits listed in Section 4.18 of the Draft EIS. Aside from a Coastal Zone Management consistency determination concurrence, those permits pertaining to the protection of coastal resources include:

- Section 404 permit (Nationwide) from the U.S. Department of the Army;
- Stream Channel Alteration Permit from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources; and
- NPDES and Water Quality Certification permits from the State Department of Health.



Source: Joint Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research, University of Hawaii, in cooperation with the State of Hawaii Civil Defense System

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Tsunami Evacuation Areas
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program Assessment Form
 FIGURE 7

The highway will traverse land designated Agricultural and Urban by the State Land Use Commission. A State highway is an allowable use in these zones.

Piilani Highway, at the makai terminus of the project, forms the mauka boundary of the Special Management Area (SMA). Because project work would be limited to the mauka side of the highway, an SMA permit from the County is not needed.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Objective: Stimulate public awareness, education, and participation in coastal management.

Policies:

1. Maintain a public advisory body to identify coastal management problems and to provide policy advice and assistance to the coastal zone management program;
2. Disseminate information on coastal management issues by means of educational materials, published reports, staff contact, and public workshops for persons and organizations concerned with coastal-related issues, developments, and government activities; and
3. Organize workshops, policy dialogues, and site-specific mediations to respond to coastal issues and conflicts.

Discussion:

Public participation has been an important element of this project. Many scoping and coordination meetings have been held with government agencies, elected officials, and the general public throughout the planning process, as described in detail in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS, which was published in July 1999.

BEACH PROTECTION

Objective: Protect beaches for public use and recreation.

Policies:

1. Locate new structures inland from the shoreline setback to conserve open space and to minimize loss of improvements due to erosion;
2. Prohibit construction of private erosion-protection structures seaward of the shoreline, except when they result in improved aesthetic and engineering solutions to erosion at the sites and do not interfere with existing recreational and waterline activities; and
3. Minimize the construction of public erosion-protection structures seaward of the shoreline.

Discussion

Construction of Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway will not affect the shoreline setback area or have an impact on coastal erosion. The highway will not be adjacent to or abut the shoreline. At the point of closest approach to the shoreline, the proposed roadway would be approximately one mile from the coastline.

MARINE RESOURCES

Objective: Implement the State's ocean resources management plan.

Policies:

1. Exercise an overall conservation ethic, and practice stewardship in the protection, use, and development of marine and coastal resources;
2. Assure that the use and development of marine and coastal resources are ecologically and environmentally sound and economically beneficial;
3. Coordinate the management of marine and coastal resources and activities management to improve effectiveness and efficiency;
4. Assert and articulate the interests of the State as a partner with federal agencies in the sound management of ocean resources within the United States exclusive economic zone;
5. Promote research, study, and understanding of ocean processes, marine life, and other ocean resources in order to acquire and inventory information necessary to understand how ocean development activities relate to and impact upon ocean and coastal resources; and
6. Encourage research and development of new, innovative technologies for exploring, using, or protecting marine and coastal resources

Discussion:

Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway will not directly affect marine and coastal resources. Some indirect impacts are possible because of erosion during construction, and roadway runoff during extreme storm events. A NPDES permit will be obtained prior to construction. The permit application will specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be implemented to minimize erosion. Since Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway will reduce total regional VMT by shortening trip lengths, roadway pollutant loading of coastal waters will be less than under the future No-Build condition.

Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway will improve access to coastal areas, especially from the Upcountry region. Improving accessibility to coastal resources will help raise public awareness and support of ecologically-minded coastal resource management. The Draft EIS and the project's public outreach efforts have included discussions about the importance of minimizing the project's impact on the natural environment.



BENJAMIN J. CALETANO
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR
 SEM F. M. HARRIS
 DIRECTOR
 SHARON S. HARRIMAN
 DEPUTY DIRECTOR
 DAVID W. BLANE
 DIRECTOR

**DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS,
 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM**

OFFICE OF PLANNING
 235 South Beretania Street, 6th Floor, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

**FEDERAL CONSISTENCY
 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FORM**

Project Title: Kihikihi Upcountry Maui Highway
County of Maui, Hawaii
 Island: Maui Tax Map Key No.: Various
 Est. Start Date: Design: 2001
Construction: 2003

APPLICANT OR AGENT

Name & Title: Abraham Wong, Division Administrator
 Agency: Federal Highway Administration Telephone: 541-2700
 Address: P.O. Box 50206, Honolulu, Hawaii Zip: 96850

TYPE OF APPLICATION (check one only)

Federal Activity
 (statement "a")

The proposed activity is consistent with and will be conducted in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program.

Signature: *Abraham Wong* Date: 1/25/01
ABRAHAM WONG
 Structural Engineer

II. Permit or License
 (statement "b")

The proposed activity complies with Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program and will be conducted in a manner consistent with such a program.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

III. OCS Plan/Permit

IV. Grants & Assistance

Ref. No. P-9041

March 30, 2001

Mr. Domingo Galicinao, P.E.
 Structural Engineer
 U.S. Department of Transportation
 Federal Highway Administration
 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3202
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Galicinao:

Subject: Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program
 Federal Consistency Review for the Proposed Kihikihi
 Upcountry Maui Highway, Island of Maui, Hawaii

This is to update you on the status of our CZM federal consistency review. To date we have reviewed the CZM Assessment and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and have consulted with the public and various government agencies. After thorough review of the information provided, it is determined that we require additional information critical to our review. Information and discussion of impacts to scenic and open space resources, public participation and historical resources which will be included in the Final EIS is essential for review.


We understand that the Final EIS will not be complete until June 2001, however we have a federally mandated deadline of April 16, 2001. Therefore, we recommend the agreement of an alternative review schedule with a deadline of 30 days after receipt of the Final EIS.

Please submit a notification of your agreement to an alternative review schedule with a deadline of 30 days after receipt of the Final EIS. After concurrence of the alternative review

Mr. Domingo Galicinas, P.E.
Page 2
March 30, 2001

schedule, the CZM review will resume upon receipt of the additional information and/or the Final EIS. Should you have questions, please call Debra Tom of our CZM Program at 587-2840.

Sincerely,



David W. Blanc, AICP
Director
Office of Planning

c: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Pacific Area Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Ecoregion
Department of Health, Clean Water Branch
Department of Land & Natural Resources
Commission on Water Resources Management
Historical Preservation Division
Planning Department, County of Maui
Wayne Kawahara, State Department of Transportation, HWY-P
✓ Jason Yazawa, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



448714

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GOVERNOR
STATE OF HAWAII



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS
1001 KULUWAIA
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

RECEIVED
JAN 22 1 20 PM '98
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAYS DIVISION

KALI WATSON
HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS COMMISSION
POST OFFICE BOX 11111
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
DEPT. OF
TRANSPORTATION
JAN 20 1 36 PM '98

January 15, 1998

To: The Honorable Kazu Hayashida
Director of Transportation

From: Kali Watson, Chairman
Hawaiian Home Commission

Subject: Kihei-UpCountry Maui Highway: HWY-PA 2.7195

Thank you for sending a copy of the subject map (Revised: July 3, 1996) showing alternative termini and alignment segments for the proposed Kihei-UpCountry Maui Highway. The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) supports the proposed U2-K2 alignment.

DHHL has 6,111 acres at Kula comprised of TRK 2-2-02: 14, 55, & 56. The K2 alignment runs within 0.5 miles of the makai portion of DHHL's Kula property and a road connection may be possible in the future. This would provide access to the Kihei-Wailea area.

The U2 alignment provides a connection to the Kulamalu Project above Pukalani which includes sites for a Hawaiian agency complex, such as a DHHL office and new Kamehameha School.

DHHL is currently working on water system improvements to serve a residential subdivision at Maiohuli (318 lots) below Polipoli Road and an agricultural subdivision (72 lots) below the Kula Hospital. Construction of onsite improvements will proceed over the next 2-5 years.

We would like to undertake a review and update of our existing plans in conjunction with the results of DOT planning efforts for the Kihei-UpCountry Maui Highway. We request that DHHL be consulted as part of your process to finalize the alignment selection and the locations of possible on/off ramps.

If you have any questions, please call Joe Chu of our Planning Office at 586-3826.

c: Maui Commissioner
Maui District Office

BENJAMIN J. CAVETANO
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

FEB - 6 1998

KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

IN REPLY REFER TO:
HWY-PA
2.7941

RECEIVED

FEB 10 1998

TO: KALI WATSON, CHAIRMAN
HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION
DEPARTMENT OF HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS

FROM: KAZU HAYASHIDA
DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION

SUBJECT: KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
PROJECT NO. HDPS-9203(1)

Thank you for your comments and recommendations on the Kihei-Upcountry Maui project. Your preference on alignments has been noted. Your office is on the mailing list for this project and we will work closely with your Planning Office to keep them informed of our progress.

/bc: Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.

WARREN S. UNEMORI ENGINEERING, INC.

APPENDIX D

Environmental Assessment

**KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

Submitted Pursuant to
Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS)

Prepared for:
**State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Highways Division**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Roadway System Linkage Needs	4
1.3 Transportation Demand and Capacity Needs	4
1.4 Economic Development Needs	5
1.5 Legislative Mandate	6
2.0 PROPOSED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	6
2.1 No Build Alternative	6
2.2 Transportation System Management (TSM) and Public Transit Alternative	6
2.3 Build Alternatives	6
3.0 IMPACTS	11
3.1 Social and Economic Activity	11
3.2 Traffic	12
3.3 Environmental Resources	12
3.3.1 Air and Noise	12
3.3.2 Water Resources	13
3.3.3 Farmlands	14
3.3.4 Terrestrial Flora	14
3.3.5 Endangered and Threatened Species	15
3.3.6 Historic and Archaeological Resources	15
3.3.7 Parklands and Preserves	16
3.3.8 Visual and Aesthetic Setting	16
3.4 Permits	16
4.0 DETERMINATION	17
5.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY COORDINATION AND CONCERNS	17

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following person may be contacted for additional information
concerning this document:

Mr. Kazu Hayashida, Director
State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 587-2150

Prepared by:

Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc.
2145 Wells Street, Suite 403
Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii 96793

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade &
Douglas, Inc.
Pacific Tower, Suite 3000
1001 Bishop Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

May 1995

FIGURES

Project Location.....	Page
.....	2
Typical Section.....	3
Alternative Alignments.....	7

TABLE

Public and Agency Consultation.....	Page
.....	19

1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1.1 Introduction

The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) is filing this Environmental Assessment (EA) with the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) as the lead local agency for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project.

Figure 1-1 shows the general project location in Maui County, Hawaii. The proposed highway would connect Piilani Highway with either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway within an area bounded on the east by Haleakala and Kula Highways, starting at the Haleakala/Haliimaile Road intersection, continuing south past the Kula Sanitarium, toward Ulupatakua, and turning northwest to adjoin Piilani Highway, the western boundary of the area.

The proposed project would be a rural, limited access arterial roadway between the coastal area of Kihai and Upcountry Maui. Design speeds would vary along the roadway depending on the terrain, as indicated below:

- Level Terrain 100 km/h (62 mph)
- Rolling Terrain 80 km/h (50 mph)
- Mountainous Terrain 60 km/h (37 mph)

Depending on the alignment selected, the roadway length would range from 14.3 kilometers (8.9 miles) to 17.0 kilometers (10.6 miles) in an east-west (mauka-makai) direction. The minimum width of the roadway right-of-way would be 49 meters (160 feet) and would include two 3.6 meter (12.0-foot) lanes in each direction and a 6.8 meter (22.2-foot) median. The roadway shoulders would be paved, with a 1.8 meter (6.0-foot) shoulder between the median and the travel lane, and a 2.4 meter (8.0-foot) shoulder outside of the roadway (see Figure 1-2). Although the highway would ultimately have four lanes, an interim phase may be constructed initially which would consist of one through-lane in each direction and a truck climbing lane in the eastern (mauka) direction.

The planning phase of the project is projected for completion by September 1996, final design would occur from 1997 to 1999, and construction would begin in 1999 and be completed by 2003. The estimated cost of the project is \$50 million.

Upon completion, the highway would satisfy the following four needs: roadway system linkage, existing and projected transportation demand and capacity requirements; economic development requirements; and legislative mandates.

1.2 Roadway System Linkage Needs

There is a need to provide more efficient travel between the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park in Kihei and the related scientific facilities at the summit of Haleakala, called Science City. Currently, motorists must traverse Piilani Highway, Mokuiele Highway, Puunene Highway, Hansen or Dairy Road, Hana Highway, Haleakala Highway, and finally Haleakala Crater Road to travel from Kihei to Science City. A new highway would provide a more direct route and reduce the 72 kilometer (45-mile) journey by approximately 15.3 kilometers (9.5 miles). In addition to facilitating trips between Kihei and Science City, a more direct roadway would facilitate travel between Kihei and the Upcountry area.

1.3 Transportation Demand and Capacity Needs

The Kula-Kihei Road Study Travel Demand Forecast and Benefit Cost Analysis (1989) estimated existing and future levels of travel demand between Kihei and Upcountry. This study identified a roadway alignment with a benefit/cost ratio greater than one

Subsequently the Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study Island-Wide Plan (1991) (hereinafter referred to as the Maui Long-Range Plan) identified several areas where roadway and intersection capacity was deficient, including the Hana Highway/Haleakala Highway intersection. Based on 1987 traffic data collected by SDOT, this study concluded that Haleakala Highway southeast (mauka) of this intersection exceeds a volume/capacity (v/c) ratio of 90 percent during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour travel periods, producing a level of service (LOS) of E¹ during these periods. The segment of Hana Highway

¹ LOS E and F indicate near congested and congested levels of operation, respectively.

southwest of Haleakala Highway operates at LOS F in the outbound direction during the p.m. peak hour.

Since the completion of the 1991 Maui Long-Range Plan, SDOT has monitored traffic conditions at the Hana Highway/Haleakala Highway intersection on a biennial basis. The latest traffic data were collected in June 1993. These data indicate that daily traffic volume on Haleakala Highway southeast of the Hana Highway/Haleakala Highway intersection has grown approximately 24 percent since 1987, and daily traffic volume on Hana Highway southwest of this intersection has grown approximately 29 percent. Given the levels of congestion in 1987, the 1993 data indicate that congestion has worsened substantially. The proposed highway would help alleviate existing and projected future traffic congestion by providing more roadway capacity between Kihei and the Upcountry area

1.4 Economic Development Needs

Projected economic growth in West and South Maui is expected to result in the Kihei-Makena area becoming one of the island's major employment centers. The number of jobs in this area is expected to increase from 5,644 in 1987 to 19,353 in 2010 (Maui County Community Plan Update Program, Socio-Economic Forecast Report (Volume 1), 1994 -- hereinafter referred to as the Maui County Community Plan). Growth in the visitor industry is expected to stimulate most of this 83 percent growth

Population increases in Kihei-Makena are not expected to be sufficient to fully satisfy the local labor market, however. Most of the population increases are expected in the Wailuku-Kahului and Upcountry areas. According to the Maui County Community Plan, population in the Wailuku-Kahului area is expected to increase from 29,839 in 1987 to 48,132 in 2010 (61 percent). Likewise, population in the Upcountry area (Makawao-Pukalani-Kula) is expected to increase by 41 percent, from 17,339 in 1987 to 24,613 in 2010. Consequently, increased commuter travel is expected between the employment center (Kihei) and the growing residential communities of Upcountry and Wailuku-Kahului.

In addition, the average daily visitor count for Maui is expected to increase by 122 percent between 1987 and 2010, from 32,195 to 71,520 visitors (Maui County Community Plan).

- alignments that were proposed in prior studies and reports;
- a new examination of the study area, and
- other input provided to SDOT through scoping activities that have occurred to date.

Study of a Kihei-Upcountry Highway began more than 20 years ago when, in 1970, the County studied the feasibility of a road between Upcountry and Kihei. The next study, the County of Maui Toll Road Study (1988), developed Alternatives 5, 6B, and 7. The next study, the Maui Long-Range Plan (1991), developed Alternative 3. Alternatives 1, 2, 4, and 6A were derived from the eight alternatives contained in the State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry/Kihei Highway Final Report (1993). Alternatives 4B and 8 were developed subsequently to link more roadway termini.

The alternatives are described below

- **Alternative 1.** This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area to Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 610 meters (2,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 3.5 percent. This 14.3 kilometers (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse Agriculture zoned land, affecting five large agricultural parcels. Approximately 9.7 kilometers (6.0 miles) of the alignment would traverse cane fields.

Alternative 2. This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 915 meters (3,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 5.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse about 6.4 kilometers (4.0 miles) of cane field and would affect six large Agriculture zoned parcels

Alternative 3. This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway, between Haliimaile Road and Pukalani in the Upcountry area, to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 535 meters (1,750 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 4.2 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately five large parcels zoned for Agriculture. The alignment would also skirt the east (mauka) edge of approximately 6.4 kilometers

(4.0 miles) of cane field. The uppermost portion of the alignment is immediately west of Urban zoned lands.

- **Alternative 4A.** This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 715 meters (2,350 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.7 percent. This 16.6 kilometer (10.3-mile) alignment would affect approximately 12 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).
- **Alternative 4B.** This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 790 meters (2,600 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.6 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately 8 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).
- **Alternative 5.** This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 275 meters (900 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.8 percent. This 14.0 kilometer (8.7-mile) alignment would affect approximately eight parcels zoned as Agriculture land. One parcel near the Kula terminus is in pineapple cultivation, and another is being utilized for truck farming. The other parcels are used for grazing.
- **Alternative 6A.** This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, approximately 1.2 kilometers (0.5 mile) north of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula,

to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to keep maximum grade below 6.8 percent. This 17.0 kilometer (10.6-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

- **Alternative 6B** This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, west of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula, to Piilani Highway, next to the Kihei Regional Park. The location of the Kihei terminus would be across from the proposed east-west collector (Kihei Traffic Master Plan (1989)). The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to maintain a maximum grade of 7.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.
- **Alternative 7** This alignment would connect Kula Highway to Piilani Highway by extending Kula Highway south from the Kula Sanitarium to Ulupalakua, and turning northwest toward Piilani Highway. The minimum horizontal radius would be 150 meters (500 feet). The grade of this alignment between the Kihei terminus and Ulupalakua would be nearly the 7.0 percent maximum desired grade. The 14.4 kilometer (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse approximately 12 parcels. In order to meet current highway safety standards, about 6.0 kilometers (3.7 miles) of the existing substandard section of road between Ulupalakua and the Sanitarium would be reconstructed.
- **Alternative 8** This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway below Pukalani to Mokulele Highway, along the old Government right-of-way. The minimum horizontal radius would be 60 meters (200 feet). The maximum grade along the existing alignment would be about 10.0 percent. This 14.6 kilometer (9.1-mile) alignment would traverse 13.6 kilometers (8.5 miles) of cane land.

3.0 IMPACTS

Adverse and beneficial impacts would result from the construction of the Kihei-Upcountry Highway. The following sections summarize the current understanding of potential impacts.

3.1 Social and Economic Activity

Construction and operation of the Kihei-Upcountry Highway would potentially affect the following components of the existing social and economic conditions:

- residential communities;
- land use values;
- commercial activities, including agriculture and tourism, and
- transportation service.

Although no residential relocations would be required for any of the Build alternatives, the Kihei-Upcountry Highway would potentially affect the character of existing residential areas, particularly Upcountry. Facilitation of access to this area, and increased traffic volumes, could be perceived as incongruent with the current character of the Upcountry area. However, even without the proposed roadway, the population of Makawao-Pukalani-Kula is projected to increase by 41 percent between 1987 and 2010. Therefore, some change in the character of this area seems inevitable regardless of the roadway. In addition, the highway could enhance access to Hawaiian Home Lands located in the eastern portion of the project area, thus helping to satisfy residential demand.

The highway could also increase land values in the area by enhancing circulation and access, providing potential access to new areas, and increasing the highest and best use of lands adjacent to the roadway.

The roadway would encourage tourist activity by enhancing access to popular tourist destinations, such as Upcountry and Haleakala. The enhancement of access would facilitate other types of economic activities as well.

Although agricultural activities on or immediately adjacent to the roadway alignment could be adversely impacted, agricultural activity in the general area may be enhanced by providing a more direct route between agricultural areas and the Kihei urban center.

Another beneficial economic impact would be the expenditure of approximately \$50 million of construction funds.

Although the Kihei-Upcountry Highway would have beneficial impacts on residential, commercial, and tourist activities, and increase business opportunities by enhancing accessibility, regional circulation, and the level of transportation service, the full range of social and economic impacts of the project are presently unknown. Therefore, further study is appropriate to better determine the potential level of impact.

3.2 Traffic

The project would create new intersections and roadway crossings and produce a redistribution of traffic volumes on roadways in the region. More detailed traffic studies must be performed to better understand the potential level of impact.

3.3 Environmental Resources

3.3.1 Air and Noise

Construction of the highway would have localized, short-term air quality impacts, primarily caused by air-born particulate matter (dust). There would also be an air quality impact from vehicles on the new highway after the roadway opens.

Trucks, construction vehicles, and construction equipment would temporarily affect ambient noise levels, and after the roadway opens, traffic would affect ambient noise levels.

Additional analysis is necessary to determine the potential level of air quality and noise impacts.

3.3.2 Water Resources

Surface Water

Surface water resources in the area consist primarily of intermittent streams (gulches) within the project corridor. The more prominent gulches include:

- Kolatua Gulch;
- Waiakoa Gulch;
- Kulanihakoi Gulch;
- Waipuilani Gulch; and
- Kaonoulu Gulch.

Although the roadway would cause surface water runoff to increase because of an increase in impermeable surface, with appropriate mitigation, the roadway is not expected to have an adverse impact on surface water resources in the vicinity. Mitigation measures would include maintenance of flow in the gulches at points where the proposed roadway crosses the gulches.

Wetlands

Wetlands are not expected to be encountered along any of the alignments.

Floodplains

According to Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), the project area is contained within Zone C, indicating that the land is prone to minimal flooding.

Special Management Area (SMA)

The proposed Kihei-Maui Highway would not be located within the County's Special Management Area (SMA).

Ground Water

Mau's four principal groundwater sources are fresh basal water, brackish basal water, dike-confined water, and perched water. With appropriate mitigation, the roadway is not expected to have an adverse impact on groundwater resources.

3.3.3 Farmlands

Agriculture is the dominant economic activity in the Upcountry area, a major vegetable and flower producing region of the State. Major crops include pineapple, cabbage, lettuce, onions, and ornamental flowers. There is also ranching activity, with 80 to 85 percent of the length of Alternatives 4B, 5, 6A, 6B, and 7 traversing lands presently used for grazing.

Agricultural areas within the footprint of the project would be converted to a transportation use. Access to agricultural areas could also be affected. One of the alternative alignments would divide a County agricultural park.

The roadway would traverse soils which have been ranked as "prime"² and "important"³ by the federal and State Departments of Agriculture. "Prime" farmlands proposed for conversion to a transportation corridor, are subject to the Farmland Protection Policy Act

Further study is required to evaluate the level of potential impact on current agricultural activities and "prime" and "important" farmlands.

3.3.4 Terrestrial Flora

Vegetation communities would be cleared for the roadway. However, it is expected that the vegetational communities which would be affected are abundant in the region.

² "Prime" agricultural land is land readily suited for the production of food, feed, forage and fiber crops. This quality of land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops.
³ "Important" agricultural land is land of statewide or local value for the production of food, feed, fiber, and forage crops that do not qualify to be considered prime or unique due to various soil differences.

3.3.5 Endangered and Threatened Species

Information on the occurrence of endangered and threatened species was requested from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on September 1, 1994. In October, the U.S. FWS indicated that there are no endangered, threatened, or candidate species of birds recorded in the project area. However, an October 25, 1994 letter from the National Park Service identified "lowland dry forests... that contain a number of listed or proposed endangered plant species recognized by the U.S. FWS." Therefore, a botanical survey and a biological assessment may be necessary to determine the presence of any listed or proposed endangered species, and the potential impact of the project on such species.

3.3.6 Historic and Archaeological Resources

The State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) has stated that few archaeological surveys have been conducted in the undeveloped areas between Kula and Kihei. However, a number of historic sites are known to exist in the gulches of Kula. These include:

- Hawaiian petroglyphs;
- burial caves;
- habitational shelters (occurring in Kaluapalani, Kaliainui, Pulehu, Hapapa, Waiakoa, and Alae Gulches); and
- heiau sites (occurring on ridges to the west of Kula Highway in Omaopio, Waiakoa, Keokea, Waiohuli, Kaonouli, and Kamaoie).

In addition, the following traditional Hawaiian sites could occur in areas not previously disturbed by agricultural activities:

- east-west (mauka-makai) trails and associated temporary shelters;
- ahupua'a boundary walls;
- burial caves;
- special purpose resource gathering sites, and
- dry land agricultural features.

An archaeological inventory survey would be required to determine the potential level of project impact on archaeological resources. The discovery of such sites within the project area could lead to consultations with the SHPD, the Maui County Burial Council, the

- Office of State Planning - Coastal Zone Management Consistency Concurrence
- State Department of Land and Natural Resources - Historic Sites Review

County

- Department of Public Works - Grading, Grubbing, Stockpiling and Excavation Permit
- Department of Public Works - Permit for Excavation of Highway

4.0 DETERMINATION

In consideration of the information presented in Section 3.0, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is deemed appropriate because the potential level of project impact in several areas is presently unknown and could be significant. Additional investigations are warranted and their results would be reported in the draft EIS. The potential need for mitigation measures would also be disclosed in the draft EIS.

The draft EIS would address all of the topics included in this EA. Based on the information analyzed to date, it is expected that the following areas would be emphasized:

- Social and Economic Activity;
- Traffic;
- Air and Noise;
- Farmlands;
- Endangered and Threatened Species;
- Historic and Archaeological Resources; and
- Visual and Aesthetic Setting.

In addition, the draft EIS would assess the alternatives described in Section 2.0 in more detail, and select from those the three most meriting detailed investigation in the draft EIS.

5.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY COORDINATION AND CONCERNS

In May 1992, SDOT and the County of Maui appointed a joint task force to assist and advise in the planning of the Kihai-Upcountry Highway. In its final report, the Task Force provided conclusions and recommendations for the proposed roadway. Some of the concerns documented in that report included.

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei, and other concerned parties.

3.3.7 Parklands and Preserves

Kihai Regional Park and Harold M. Rice Memorial Park are in proximity to the project area. The proposed highway is not expected to affect either park although Alternative 6B would be located immediately east of Kihai Regional Park, and Alternatives 6A and 6B would be adjacent to Rice Memorial Park. In general, the proposed highway would enhance access to the parks, and adverse impacts are not anticipated.

3.3.8 Visual and Aesthetic Setting

The Kihai area is primarily commercial and will be undergoing further urbanization, while the Upcountry area is generally rural. The proposed highway would be visible from both project termini, and would create new vistas for highway users. Depending on the alternative selected, the earthmoving required and the width of the construction zone would vary. After the establishment of the landscaping to be provided as part of the project, the project is not expected to alter viewsheds or have significant adverse visual impacts, and would create new vistas for highway users.

Enhancement of access to Upcountry could have an adverse impact on Kula's aesthetic setting, however. Some adverse impacts are expected in any case because of the population increase projected for the area.

In summary, the project's adverse visual impact, with mitigation, is expected to be minor, and would be offset by the creation of new vistas.

3.4 Permits

The following permits or approvals may be required prior to the construction of the highway. Additional permits and approvals may also be necessary.

State

- State Department of Health - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (storm water from construction site)

Table 5-1

PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONSULTATION

Agency	Sept. 1, 1994 Consultation Correspondence	Responded to Initial Consultation Correspondence	Invited to Attend Scoping Meeting	Attended Scoping Meeting
FEDERAL				
Army Corps of Engineers	X	X		
Department of Agriculture				
Soil Conservation Service	X			
Ag. Stabilization & Conservation Service			X	
Department of Defense	X			
Department of the Interior				
Fish and Wildlife Service	X		X	
Geological Survey	X		X	
National Park Service	X	X	X	
Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration	X			
Environmental Protection Agency (Pacific Islands Contact Office)	X		X	
STATE				
Department of Accounting and General Services	X			
Department of Agriculture				
Director			X	
Soil Conservation Service	X		X	
Department of Education	X			
Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism	X			
Department of Hawaiian Home Lands				
Hawaiian Homes Commission	X			
Land Division	X		X	X
Maui District Office	X			
Department of Health (Environmental Management Division)	X		X	X

61

- directness to Haleakala;
- access to the Hawaiian Home Lands tract near Kekaulike;
- identification of existing areas of Hawaiian interest and reverence;
- safety of future intersections with secondary roads; and
- minimizing negative impacts on rural residential areas and farmlands.

SDOT initiated its consultation process on September 1, 1994, by issuing a letter to the agencies and individuals shown in Table 5-1. Responses to the September 1 correspondence identified the following key concerns:

- Alignment selection;
- Directness between the Maui R&T Park and Science City;
- Proposed highway termini;
- Land use and transportation impacts;
- Existing travel demand and traffic congestion;
- Improved commuter and tourist accessibility;
- Socio-economic impacts on existing communities;
- Disruption to agricultural lands and farming activities;
- Endangered species; and
- Archaeological features

In addition, an EIS scoping meeting for governmental agencies was held on October 26, 1994. Invitations were mailed, and those agencies in attendance are shown in Table 5-1.

Concerns raised at the scoping meeting included:

- Congestion at the Maui R&T Park/Piilani Highway intersection;
- Access to Hawaiian Home Lands;
- Farmland impacts; and
- Criteria to be used to select the three alternatives to receive detailed investigation in the draft EIS.

During preparation of the EIS, coordination with the agencies listed above would continue.

Table 5-1

**PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONSULTATION
(continued)**

Agency	Sept. 1, 1994 Consultation Correspondence	Responded to Initial Consultation Correspondence	Invited to Attend Scoping Meeting	Attended Scoping Meeting
Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company	X			
Kaonolu Ranch Company	X			
Kihei Community Association	X			
Kihei-Upcountry Highway Task Force Committee	X	X		
Kula Community Association	X	X		
Ms. Laura Tamanaha	X			
Maui Chamber of Commerce	X			
Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc.	X			
Makawao Main Street Association	X			
Pukalani Community Association	X			
Shinwa International, Inc.	X			
Sports Shinko Company, Ltd	X			

21

Table 5-1

**PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONSULTATION
(continued)**

Agency	Sept. 1, 1994 Consultation Correspondence	Responded to Initial Consultation Correspondence	Invited to Attend Scoping Meeting	Attended Scoping Meeting
Department of Land and Natural Resources			X	
Historic Preservation Division	X	X	X	
Director	X		X	
Maui Island Burial Council	X		X	
Division of Forestry & Wildlife			X	
Conservation and Environmental Affairs			X	
State Parks, Outdoor Rec & Historic Sites				
Office of Hawaiian Affairs	X		X	
Office of State Planning	X	X		
University of Hawaii Environmental Center	X			
COUNTY			X	
Department of Parks and Recreation	X		X	X
Department of Public Works & Waste Management	X		X	
Department of Water Supply	X			
Economic Development Agency	X		X	X
Department of Planning	X			
ELECTED OFFICIALS				
United States Senator Daniel K. Inouye	X			
State of Hawaii Senators	X			
State of Hawaii Representatives	X	X		
Mayor of Maui County	X			
Councilmembers of Maui County Council	X			
OTHER PARTIES				
Erehwon Ranch	X	X		
Haleakala Ranch Company	X			

20

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Community Resources, Inc., Maui County Community Plan Update Program, Socio-Economic Forecast Report (Volume 1), January 1994.
- County of Maui, County of Maui Toll Road Study, 1988.
- County of Maui, Department of Public Works, Kihei Traffic Master Plan, May 1991.
- County of Maui, Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan, 1981.
- State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry/Kihei Highway Final Report October 1993.
- State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation and County of Maui, Department of Public Works and Department of Planning, Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study, Final Report, May 1991.
- Warren S. Unemori Engineering, Inc., Kula-Kihei Road Study Travel Demand Forecast and Benefit Cost Analysis, October 1989.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX E

Alternatives Analysis Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS 1

1. INTRODUCTION 3

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT 3

3. ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES 3

4. SCOPING ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF THE EA 3

5. SCREENING ANALYSIS 8

 5.1 Sources Of Candidate Criteria 8

 5.2 Evaluation Process 10

 5.2.1 Tier One Screening 10

 5.2.1.1 Satisfaction of Project Goals 10

 5.2.1.2 Design Feasibility 10

 5.2.1.3 Benefit-Cost Ratio 10

 5.2.1.4 Bilurcate Maui R&T Park 10

 5.2.1.5 Evaluation of Alternatives Considered in Tier One 11

 5.2.2 Tier Two Screening 12

 5.2.2.1 Adverse Agricultural Impact 12

 5.2.2.2 Cost 14

 5.2.2.3 Conformance with Community Plans 14

 5.2.2.4 Highway Operations 15

 5.2.2.5 Impact on Endangered and Threatened Species 15

 5.2.2.6 Enhancement of Access to Hawaiian Home Lands Parcel 16

 5.2.2.7 Visual Impact 16

 5.2.2.8 Evaluation of Alternatives Considered in Tier Two 16

6. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 19

APPENDIX: INITIAL TEN ALTERNATIVES FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT 23

KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT
Maui, Hawaii

**ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS
FINAL REPORT**

Submitted to:

**State of Hawaii Department of Transportation
and
Federal Highway Administration**

LIST OF TABLES

1. Criteria Mentioned in EA Comment Letters and October 1995
Public Information Meeting Comments 9

2. Criteria Mentioned in Response to the May 1996 Public
Information Meetings (Oral and Written Comments) 9

3. Tier One Screening 12

4. Tier Two Screening 18

5. Suggested Alternative Naming System 22

Submitted by:

**Warren S. Unemorl Engineering, Inc.
and
Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.**

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Alternatives Selected for Further Study in Draft EIS 2

2. Project Location 4

3. Alternatives of the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway EA 5

4. Alternatives 2B, 2C and Widening of Adjacent Roadways
Typical Section 7

5. Upcountry and Kihai Termini and Alignment Segments of Selected Alternatives 17

6. 21

January 1997

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS


A two-tiered alternatives screening analysis was performed to evaluate alignment alternatives, a widening of adjacent roadways alternative and a transportation systems management (TSM) alternative for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project, Maui County, Hawaii. The purpose of the screening was to eliminate alternatives that would have no chance of being selected as the preferred alternative, and to reduce the number of alternatives to a more limited number to receive detailed analysis in the project's draft environmental impact statement (EIS). The No-Build alternative was not evaluated in this screening analysis because it is automatically included in the draft EIS as a reference against which the project impacts are assessed. The No-Build alternative entails the recommended roadway improvements contained in the Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan (Draft Final Report, February 1996), except for the proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway.

Alternatives were developed from planning studies, scoping and public participation activities, and FHWA requirements. The screening criteria, developed from technical and planning documents and the project's public participation activities, were separated into two groups. The first group (tier one) consisted of "fatal flaw" criteria. An alternative had to satisfy all of these criteria to be considered under tier two, a group of criteria relating to the nature or degree of adverse or beneficial impact. An alternative did not have to satisfy all the tier two criteria to pass the evaluation.

Four alternatives passed the screening evaluation:

- **Alternative 2B:** Halimaile Road/Haleakala Highway intersection to Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection;
- **Alternative 2C:** Halimaile Road/Haleakala Highway intersection to the proposed Road F/Piilani Highway intersection (south of the Kihei Regional Park);
- **Alternative 4B:** Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road to Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection, and
- **Alternative 5:** Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch to Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection.

The selection of these four alternatives, however, forced the consideration of two new alternatives produced by combining the mauka and makai portions of the alternatives passing the screening analysis (see Figure 1). Using the same alignment segments that passed the screening, the two new alternatives would link the proposed Road F/Piilani Highway intersection terminus with termini at Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road and Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch. Therefore, it is recommended that these two new alternatives join the four alternatives that passed the screening analysis and move forward for detailed analysis as the build alternatives in the forthcoming draft EIS. It is also recommended that the existing alternative naming system be changed to identify alternatives by their Upcountry and Kihei termini as shown on Figure 1.



Selected Alternatives Termini and Alignment Segments
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Alternatives Analysis Final Report
FIGURE 1

1. INTRODUCTION

The proposed Kihei-Upcountry Highway would be located in Maui County, Hawaii (see Figure 2). The proposed highway would connect Pihani Highway and either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway within a study area bounded on the east by Haleakala and Kula Highways, continuing south past the Kula Sanitarium, toward Ulupalakua, and turning northwest to join Pihani Highway, the western boundary of the study area.

The project would satisfy several goals:

- improvement of the connection between the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park and Science City, at the summit of Haleakala;
- establishment of a roadway linkage between Kihei and the Upcountry area;
- provision of additional roadway capacity to meet existing and future travel demand in the region; and
- provision of roadway infrastructure to accommodate projected growth and development.

2. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to:


- restate the project alternatives that were identified in the project's Environmental Assessment (EA) (Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Environmental Assessment, May, 1995);
- examine whether input received through project scoping activities conducted since publication of the EA warrants the development of additional alternatives;
- present the methodology used to reduce the number of alternatives to be carried forward in the planning phase; and
- present the alternatives that have been selected for detailed study in the forthcoming draft EIS.

An evaluation of the No-Build alternative is not included in this report because this alternative is required to be analyzed in the project's draft EIS as reference against which the selected alternatives' impacts are assessed. The No-Build alternative includes the recommended roadway improvements contained in the Maui Long Range Land Transportation (Draft Final Report, February 1996) except for the Kihei-Upcountry Highway, and consists of primarily widening existing roadways.

3. ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES

Ten alignment alternatives were developed during the public and agency scoping process that preceded the issuance of the project's EA (noted in the OEOC Bulletin on September 23, 1995 and the Federal Register on September 22, 1995). Descriptions of these ten alignment alternatives (see Figure 3) are provided in the Appendix.

The alignment alternatives were developed from



- Prior studies and reports: The County of Maui Toll Road Study (1988) produced Alternatives 5, 6A, 6B, and 7. The Maui Long-Range Highway Planning Study (1991) contained Alternative 3. The State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry/Kihel Highway Final Report (October 1, 1993) contained Alternatives 1, 2, 4A, 4B, 6A and 6B.
- Scoping input received before the publication of the EA (May, 1995): Alternative 8, utilization of an abandoned government right-of-way, was suggested at an agency scoping meeting held in October, 1994.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) participation in this project requires that Transportation Systems Management (TSM) be considered among the alternatives. TSM would consist of implementing a transit system and/or augmenting Maui's para-transit system in the region and selected transportation control measures (TCMs), such as high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and redesharing.

4. SCOPING ACTIVITIES FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF THE EA

Four major scoping activities have taken place since publication of the EA: written comments generated in response to the EA, oral testimony given at two public information meetings held in October, 1995; testimony provided during a second round of public information meetings held in May 1996, and written comments following the May 1996 information meetings. Information received was reviewed to determine whether additional alternatives were warranted. Most of the testimony focused on the need for the project, its cost, or characteristics of specific alignments. Some comments suggested potential new alignment alternatives.


Analysis of public comments resulted in the conceptual engineering of three new alternatives: Alternatives 2B and 2C (modifications of Alternative 2) and the "widening of adjacent roadways" alternative (see Figure 4)

Alternative 2B would extend from Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area, as Alternative 2, but would then share portions of Alternative 4B's mauka alignment near the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S) land to Kihel at Kaonoulu Street. The length of this alternative would be approximately 15.64 kilometers (9.72 miles).

Alternative 2C would maintain the Haliimaile Junction Upcountry terminus and share Alternative 4B's alignment near the HC&S land. However, its Kihel terminus would be located at the intersection of Pihani Highway and the proposed Road F. The length of alternative 2C would be approximately 17.5 kilometers (10.9 miles).

Alternatives 2B and 2C were developed in response to comments such as minimizing impacts to Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar (HC&S) Company land, not having the highway bisect the Maui R&T Park, and moving the Kihel terminus as far south as possible to create an alternative evacuation route for South Kihel and to support hotels and resorts in Wailea / Makena.

The "widening of adjacent roadways" alternative was also developed in response to public comments provided since issuance of the EA. This alternative provides an additional lane in each direction beyond the widening improvements proposed in the Maui Long Range Land



Transportation Plan (February 1996) The following roadways are included in the widening of adjacent roadways alternative:

- Haleakala Highway (12.4 kilometers (7.7 miles))
- Hana Highway (3.2 kilometers (2.0 miles))
- Dairy Road (1.3 kilometers (0.8 miles))
- Puunene Avenue/Mokuile Highway (10.5 kilometers (6.5 miles))
- Pihani Highway (4.8 kilometers (3.0 miles))

5. SCREENING ANALYSIS

The screening analysis is used to review candidate alternatives and eliminate those with the lowest benefits or overriding adverse characteristics so that only those alternatives that best maximize benefits while minimizing adverse impacts are examined in detail in the project's draft EIS. This section presents the methodology and results of the screening analysis conducted for this project.


5.1 Sources Of Candidate Criteria

The following sources were used to develop possible criteria for evaluating the project alternatives:

- Federal Highway (FHWA) Technical Advisory Guide (October 1987);
- State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry/Kihei Highway Final Report (October 1993);
- Federal, State, County, and local comments to a project initiation letter issued by SDOT on September 1, 1994;
- An agency scoping meeting held on October 26, 1994;
- Engineering standards (Hawaii Statewide Uniform Design Manual for Streets and Highways, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and American Standard for Testing and Materials (ASTM));
- Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Environmental Assessment (EA) (May 1995);
- Written comments received in response to publication of the EA, and
- Comments (oral and written) made at the public information meetings held on Maui on October 17 and 18, 1995, and on May 15 and 16, 1996.

Forty-two letters were received in response to the project's EA and the October 1995 informational meetings. Nine of the letters addressed alignment selection criteria, as summarized in Table 1.

The May public information meetings generated oral comments and 11 subsequent comment letters. Table 2 summarizes the written and oral comments relating to alignment selection criteria.



Alternatives 2B, 2C and Widening of Adjacent Roadways
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Alternatives Analysis Final Report
FIGURE 4

Table 1
Criteria Mentioned in EA Comment Letters and
October 1995 Public Information Meeting Comments

Economic Impact	Cost	Consistency with Comm. Plans	Impacts to Archaeology	Safety	Impacts to Endangered Species	Access to HHL
HC&S Riecke Maui L&P Sutrov	Stellway Raisbeck	Raisbeck OEOC	Stellway SHPO	Stellway Judge	NPS	Riecke

Abbreviations: Hawaiian Home Lands (HHL), Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S), Maui L&P (Land & Pineapple), National Park Service (NPS), Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEOC), and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Table 2
Criteria Mentioned in Response to the May 1996 Public Information Meetings
(Oral and Written Comments)

Noise Impacts	Impacts to Agriculture	Access to HHL	Evacuation from Kihel	Biturcate R&T Park
Amaral	HC&S Maui Planning	Thompson	Thompson Maui Planning Joner Hironaka	Maui R&T Park

Based on the sources discussed above, candidate evaluation criteria were generated, and are shown below. These criteria were sorted into two groups, Tier One (fatal flaws) and Tier Two. Nonconformance with any Tier One criterion was considered a "fatal flaw," a feature of the alternative rendering it impractical, unfeasible or unworkable given the constraints associated with the anticipated federal participation in project construction. The Tier Two criteria relate primarily to nature and degree of adverse impact or benefit. An alternative not satisfying these criteria could be feasible, but would not be advantageous with respect to the criterion in question.

Tier One (Fatal Flaw)

- Satisfaction of project goals
- Conformance with engineering design criteria
- Benefit/cost ratio
- Biturcate Maui R&T Park

Tier Two

- Adverse agricultural impact
- Cost
- Conformance with community plans
- Potential impact on historic and archaeological resources
- Highway operations
- Potential impact on endangered and threatened species
- Enhancement of access to Hawaiian Home Lands (HHL) parcel (TMK 2-02-002.014)
- Visual impacts
- Noise impacts
- Displacements/relocations
- Beneficial and adverse impacts on existing communities
- Enhancement of evacuation from Kihel
- Impact on prime, unique or important soils
- Extent of Right of Way Acquisition

5.2 Evaluation Process

A two-tiered evaluation process was used for this project. An alternative must satisfy all of the Tier One criteria to be considered in Tier Two.

5.2.1 Tier One Screening

5.2.1.1 Satisfaction of Project Goals

The alternatives were evaluated with respect to whether they satisfied the project goals stated in Section 1, such as establishing a roadway linkage between the Kihel and Upcountry areas. An alternative received a "Y" (yes) score if it would satisfy the project goals. A "N" (no) score would mean the alternative would not satisfy the project goals.

5.2.1.2 Design Feasibility

The alternatives were evaluated to determine whether they met engineering design criteria for a rural, limited access arterial roadway, such as minimum curve radius and design speed. A "Y" (yes) would signify that the alternative would have a conforming design, whereas a "N" (no) would mean that its design would not conform to the criteria.

5.2.1.3 Benefit-Cost Ratio

A preliminary benefit-cost analysis to the year 2023 (completion of construction plus 20 years) was performed to eliminate alternatives that would clearly not be cost-effective in achieving the goal of linking Kihel and Upcountry Maui. Calculation of the benefit-cost ratio (BCR) for each alternative was based on its differential comparison with the future No-Build Alternative of travel time between two centroids, one located at the Maui R&T Park in Kihel and the other in Pukalani, Upcountry Maui. Other factors used to calculate the BCRs included:

- cost of each alternative, consisting of initial cost (construction, right-of-way acquisition, design) and annual roadway maintenance;
- user costs for vehicle operation and maintenance; and
- economic factors, such as the expected long-term inflation rate and discount rate.

The methodology conformed to procedures described in the Manual On User Benefit Analysis of Highway and Bus Transit Improvements (AASHTO, 1977). Normally, an alternative's BCR would have to be greater than one (1) in order for the investment to be economically justified (the benefits of the project are greater than its cost). However, because of the preliminary nature of the analysis and the limited definition of what is considered a benefit, an alternative would have to have an extremely low BCR to be considered to have a BCR-related "fatal flaw" at this stage. A more precise benefit-cost analysis will be performed for the alternatives receiving detailed analysis in the draft EIS.

5.2.1.4 Bifurcate Maui R&T Park

The master plan for the Maui R&T Park has recently been revised to create a more campus-like atmosphere, in contrast to the light industrial park atmosphere that was originally envisioned. The revised draft master plan (February 1996) has, as its central roadway element, a large roundabout or "green" located at the core of the park. This master plan is being coordinated with the County Council as part of the Kihai-Makena Community Plan update. Any alignment that divides the Maui R&T Park would be inconsistent with the park's proposed campus-like roadway system. Because the Maui R&T Park is intended to be one of the major beneficiaries of the proposed highway, conformance with the draft master plan's proposed campus-like roadway system was elevated to a Tier One level of significance. Those alternatives that bifurcate the R&T Park were given a "Y" (yes), while those that did not were given a "N" (no). A "Y" score for this criterion indicates that the alternative has a "fatal flaw."

5.2.1.5 Evaluation of Alternatives Considered in Tier One

Table 3 summarizes the outcome of the Tier One evaluation. Scores not satisfying the criteria are shaded. In summary, Alternatives 4A, 6A through 8, the widening of adjacent roadways alternative, and the TSM alternative were eliminated from further study.

Non-satisfaction of the project goals eliminated the widening of adjacent roadways and TSM alternatives. The widening of adjacent roadways alternative would not establish a roadway linkage between Kihai and the Upcountry area. The TSM alternative would also not satisfy this goal, nor other goals, such as providing additional roadway capacity and infrastructure to meet existing and future travel demand in the region.

The design feasibility criterion eliminated Alternative 8 because it is constrained to an existing government right-of-way that does not conform modern highway design standards.

The preliminary benefit-cost analysis generated BCRs ranging from -0.04 to 1.53 (see Table 3). After noting the spread of the results and considering the preliminary nature of the analysis, the allowable threshold was set at 0.67 which eliminated Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7

Table 3
Tier One Screening

Criteria	Alternative												WR	TSM
	1	2	2B	2C	3	4A	4B	5	6A	6B	7	8		
Satisfies Project Goals	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Design Feasibility	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N.A.
Benefit-Cost Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.06	0.67	1.01	0.94	1.34	1.53	0.42	0.28	-0.04	1.10	Low ¹	N.A. ²
Bifurcate Maui R&T Park	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N.A.	N.A.

Notes: WR: Widening of Adjacent Roadways Alternative
TSM: Transportation Systems Management Alternative
Y: Yes
N: No
N.A.: Not Applicable.

¹ The BCR for the NBE Alternative was not calculated because it failed to satisfy the project goals criterion. If the BCR for the NBE Alternative was calculated, it would be expected to be quite low because the method of calculating BCRs is based on the differential comparison with the future No-Build Alternative of travel time between Kihai and Upcountry Maui. When compared to the No-Build Alternative, the NBE Alternative would offer a slight decrease in travel time because of marginally less congestion along the same circumferential route. This travel time savings, however, would not compare favorably to the decrease in travel time that would be achieved by shortening the distance between Kihai and Upcountry Maui through a new roadway. Therefore, along with its large capital cost (\$78 million), its BCR, as calculated here, would be small.

² The BCR for the TSM Alternative was not calculated because it failed to satisfy the project goals criterion.

The minimum passing BCR would have to be lowered to 0.42 to affect these results. However, lowering the BCR to this threshold would not have affected the overall screening because Alternative 6A, with its 0.42 BCR, would have been eliminated anyway because it bifurcates the Maui R&T Park, the last Tier One criterion. This last criterion also eliminated Alternatives 2 and 4A.

5.2.2 Tier Two Screening

The candidate Tier Two criteria (listed in Section 5.1) were evaluated to determine whether they would be useful in screening the remaining alternatives (1, 2B, 2C, 3, 4B and 5). Criteria rejected for the Tier Two screening and the rationale for rejection are described below

- Potential Impacts on Historic and Archaeological Resources: The overview analysis that would have been conducted for this screening would not satisfy Section 106 requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. Section 106 can only be fulfilled by conducting an inventory survey. Furthermore, the overview analysis would lengthen the project schedule and increase costs. Therefore, the appropriate level of archaeological detail will be conducted in the EIS phase of work. Should archaeological resources be encountered, the alternatives are still sufficiently conceptual to allow refinement of the alignment to avoid the resource, or the alternative should not be selected as the preferred alternative.
- Noise impacts. FHWA STAMINA 2.0 Highway Traffic Noise Modeling Program will be used to predict future noise levels for this project for the alternatives carried into the draft EIS. If appropriate, noise mitigation would be provided. Therefore, because noise impacts can be mitigated, potential noise impacts are not viewed as an alignment selection criterion.
- Displacements/Relocations. None of the alignment alternatives involve relocations or displacements of residential or commercial structures. Therefore, this criterion would not discriminate among the alternatives
- Beneficial and Adverse Impacts on Existing Communities: This criterion was not selected for Tier Two screening because of its importance. For example, the potentially adverse social impacts of the highway on the Upcountry Kula area would be a key concern in the draft EIS. Therefore, it was determined that a cursory examination of this criterion in the initial screening analysis would not be sufficient. A detailed analysis of community impacts of those alternatives that satisfy the other Tier Two criteria is deferred to the draft EIS.
- Enhancement of evacuation from Kihai: At present, evacuation of Kihai must be funneled through the critical junction of Mokuale Highway, Piilani Highway and Kihai Road. While a second access route may be highly desirable to relieve this choke point, enhancement of evacuation from Kihai is not a goal of this project. However, with the exception of Alternative 8 which was eliminated in Tier One, all the alternatives would provide additional evacuation capacity.

- Impacts on prime, unique or important soils: The alignment alternatives have all been rated by the US Natural Resources Conservation Service for their impacts on special soil types. Scores ranged from 51 to 77. In order to trigger the provisions of the Farmland Protection Policy Act, a score of 160 is necessary. Therefore, because all of the alternatives rated similarly, and far below the threshold of 160, this criterion does not indicate substantial differences among the alternatives with respect to this criterion.
- Extent of right-of-way acquisition: This criterion was not selected because it is a component of the project's cost, and cost was retained as a Tier Two criterion.

The remaining Tier Two criteria include adverse agricultural impacts, cost, conformance with community plans, highway operations, potential impacts on endangered and threatened species, enhancement of access to H-L parcel, and visual impacts. Six of the selected Tier Two criteria were mentioned in the public comment letters and oral comments received on the project's EA and public information meetings (see Tables 1 and 2). The selected Tier Two criteria are now described

5.2.2.1 Adverse Agricultural Impact

The number of hectares presently used for agriculture, such as pineapple or sugarcane cultivation and Upcountry truck farms, which each alternative would displace was calculated. Impacts on pasture lands were not considered as important because of the abundance of pasture land in the area and its substantially reduced investment in irrigation, drainage and other infrastructure. The following five-point scale was defined based on the acreage of encroachment for each alternative:

- (1): less than 10 hectares
- (2): 10 to 20 hectares
- (3): 20 to 30 hectares
- (4): 30 to 40 hectares
- (5): over 40 hectares

The draft EIS will contain a more complete analysis of impacts on agricultural activity for those alternatives selected for detailed study

5.2.2.2 Cost

This criterion compares the estimated cost of land acquisition, site work, roadway construction, and drainage system of each alternative. The following four-point scale was used to score these costs:

- (1): less than \$45 million
- (2): \$45 to \$55 million
- (3): \$55 to \$65 million
- (4): over \$65 million

5.2.2.3 Conformance with Community Plans

There are nine planning regions in Maui County for which community plans have been prepared. The plans report current and anticipated conditions, and stipulate advance planning goals, objectives, policies and implementation considerations to guide decision making for each region. The study area overlaps planning areas addressed by the Kihai-Makena Community Plan and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan. Although the community plans are not official until adopted by the County Council and the Mayor, it is customary on Maui to use the most recent proposed update to the community plans to assess conformance with county planning.

The most recent proposed update for the Kihai area is the Proposed Kihai-Makena Community Plan (October 1993). This proposed plan recommends a roadway that would link the primary residential area of Upcountry and job centers within the Kihai region. The Plan, therefore, favors those alternatives with mauka termini near Pukalani, and makai termini at or north of the Maui R & T Park. The 1993 plan is now in the early stages of being updated.

The proposed Community Plan Update of Makawao-Pukalani-Kula (July 1996) "ties" the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway, and states that the No-Build alternative is favored over any build alternative. However, the recommendations also include provisions that if the roadway is built, the preferred Upcountry terminus should be in the vicinity of Halimaile Road. This Plan has recently passed second reading by the County Council, and the Mayor is expected to officially approve the plan shortly.

The alternatives that best conform to the community plans were scored "Y" (yes). Alternatives that did not conform as well were scored "P" (poor). Alternatives that do not conform to the plans were scored "N" (No).

The draft EIS will contain an updated and more complete analysis of conformance with community plans for those alternatives selected for detailed study.

5.2.2.4 Highway Operations

While all of the alternatives entering the Tier Two screening can be designed to conform with applicable engineering standards (see Section 5.2.1.3), there may be operational problems with certain alternatives when connected to the existing roadway network. Those alternatives that would connect well with the existing roadway network were scored a "B" (better), those that did not, were scored a "W" (worse).

5.2.2.5 Impact on Endangered and Threatened Species

A botanical reconnaissance was conducted to rank the alternatives in terms of their relative adverse impact on those areas where endangered or threatened plant species might exist. The survey included:

- a helicopter reconnaissance of the project area;
- government agency interviews and literature search;

- a comparative ranking of the alternatives for potential botanical impacts, emphasizing impacts on rare species; and
- a general assessment of the level of potential impact of each alternative.

Based on the botanical reconnaissance, alternatives were scored numerically, from "1" (alternatives that were least likely to threaten endangered species) to "5" (alternatives with a higher possibility of displacing endangered species). Potential impacts on endangered species was not considered a "fatal flaw" because at this stage of project planning, the alignment alternatives are considered wide enough to allow some latitude to bypass particularly sensitive locations, if warranted. The draft EIS will contain a more complete analysis of potential impacts on sensitive habitat areas for those alternatives selected for detailed study.

5.2.2.6 Enhancement of Access to Hawaiian Home Lands Parcel

The Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway State/County Joint Task Force's Final Report (October 1, 1993) identified access to the Hawaiian Home Lands parcel (TI/MK 2-02-002.014) as a desirable benefit of this project. Alignment alternatives that would enhance future access to the HHL parcel received a "B" (better), while those alternatives that would not enhance access received a "W" (worse).

5.2.2.7 Visual Impact

Since all of the alternatives share a common typical design (see Figure 5: Typical Section) and a similar setting (agricultural lands on the western flank of Haleakala), the amount of earthmoving (cut plus fill) required for roadway construction was used as an approximate indicator of the project's long-term aesthetic impacts. It is assumed that the more material moved during construction, the greater the potential for visual disturbance of the existing landscape, even after the establishment of new plantings.

A four-point scale was developed to score the total amount of cut and fill material required for each alternative. Alternatives requiring less earthmoving received lower scores, while those requiring the most activity received a "4."

- (1): less than 1.5 million cubic meters
- (2): 1.5 to 2.0 million cubic meters
- (3): 2.0 to 2.5 million cubic meters
- (4): over 2.5 million cubic meters

The draft EIS will contain a more complete analysis of potential visual impacts for those alternatives selected for detailed study.

5.2.2.8 Evaluation of Alternatives Considered in Tier Two

Table 4 summarizes the Tier Two screening analysis. An alternative need not satisfy every criteria to pass the screening and move forward to the draft EIS. However, in certain

instances, a particular score or group of scores disqualified the alternative in question from moving forward. These disqualifying scores are shaded.


Table 4
Tier Two Screening

Criteria	Alternative					
	1	2B	2C	3	4B	5
Adverse Agricultural Impact Score	5	3	3	4	3	2
Encroachment (hectares)	56.2	27.1	27.1	32.6	21.6	13.3
Cost Score	3	2	3	2	2	1
Estimated Cost (\$ millions)	57	47	57	54	52	40
Conformance with Community Plans Kihai-Makaha Makawao-Pukalani-Kula	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	P
Highway Operations	N	N	N	N	N	N
Potential Impact to Endangered & Threatened Species	B	B	B	W	B	B
Enhancement of Access to HHL	1	1	2	2	3	5
Visual Impacts Score	3	1	2	2	2	1
Est. Earthmoving (millions of cubic meters)	2.1	1.4	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.4

Notes: B: Better
P: Poor
W: Worse
Y: Yes
N: No

Based on the Tier Two criteria, Alternatives 1 and 3 were dropped from future study in the draft EIS for the following reasons:

- Alternative 1. This alternative would produce a substantially greater displacement of cultivated fields than any other alternative. It would displace approximately 56.2 hectares (139 acres), while the alternative with the next largest impact, Alternative 3, would displace approximately 32.6 hectares (81 acres), 42 percent less.
- Alternative 3. This alternative was eliminated because of its poorer operational aspects, particularly at its mauka terminus at the intersection of Haleakala Highway and Pukalani Bypass Highway where there is a seven percent grade. Because of this steep grade, a very long left turn storage lane would be required for makai-bound traffic on



Not to Scale

Typical Section
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Alternatives Analysis Final Report
FIGURE 5

Haleakala Highway turning left onto Kihai-Upcountry Highway. The length of this left turn lane plus the proximity of the two intersections would cause a conflict in turning movements. Furthermore, this alternative scored a four (4) in terms of displacement of cultivated acreage.

Alternatives 2B, 2C, 4B and 5 passed the screening evaluation for the following reasons:

- Alternative 2B. The advantages of Alternative 2B are its cost (the second cheapest alternative), and its relatively minimal environmental impacts in those disciplines selected for this screening analysis. Although this alternative scored a three (3) in the agricultural impact criterion, the alignment was coordinated with HC&S officials to minimize adverse impacts to their sugarcane operations.
- Alternative 2C. Since this alternative is similar to Alternatives 2B and 4B, it too passed the Tier Two screening. The major disadvantage of this alternative, in comparison to these other two alternatives, is its cost (21 percent greater than Alternative 2B and 10 percent greater than Alternative 4B). Its advantages are that it is the only remaining alternative that may facilitate access to the HHL parcel and it provides another Kihai terminus option (Alternatives 2B, 4B and 5 all have the same Kihai terminus at Kaonoulu Street).
- Alternative 4B. This alternative compares favorably against other alternatives regarding level of impact, such as its moderate cost, impacts to cultivated fields and visual environment. It scores relatively high (3) under the "potential impact to endangered and threatened species" criterion. However, because the botanical reconnaissance was done from the air and because there is some latitude in modifying alternatives to avoid sensitive locations (see Section 5.2.2.5), this moderately high score did not warrant eliminating this alternative at this stage.
- Alternative 5. The primary benefits of this alternative are its cost (the least expensive alternative) and its least impact on cultivated fields. The negative aspects of this alternative are its higher probability of encountering endangered species habitats, and its "P" (poor) score in regards to conformance to the Kihai-Makana Community Plan (October 1993). However, these factors did not warrant eliminating this alternative.

In general, the alternatives passing Tier Two would generate comparatively fewer adverse environmental impacts in the topics selected for the screening analysis, and would not present operational difficulties interfacing with the existing roadway network. Only one of the selected alternatives would facilitate access to the HHL parcel. Potential community impacts, such as air quality and noise impacts, and other impact categories, such as potential impacts to archaeological resources, were not included in this analysis. However, these types of impacts will be addressed in detail in the draft EIS.

6. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Twelve alignment alternatives, a widening of adjacent roadways alternative, and a TSM alternative for a Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway were evaluated using two sets of screening criteria that were developed from previous planning efforts, engineering guides and public

input. Eight alternatives (2, 4A, 6A, 6B, 7 and 8, widening of adjacent roadways, and TSM) were dropped because they did not satisfy the first tier of screening criteria.

The Tier Two criteria were used to evaluate the remaining six alternatives. The Tier Two criteria eliminated Alternatives 1 and 3 because of their agricultural impacts and operational difficulties.

The remaining four alternatives (2B, 2C, 4B and 5) were then reconceptualized as combinations of mauka and makai segments. By combining two makai termini with three mauka termini, it became possible to generate six alternatives comprised of common roadway segments.


Figure 6 shows the Upcountry and Kihai termini choices and the alignment segments or "footprints" that would be used by the six alternatives. As shown on this figure, it is recommended that the Upcountry termini and segments be named U-1, U-2 and U-3 and the Kihai termini and segments be named K-1 and K-2. The descriptions of these segments are as follows:

- Segment U-1: Haliimaile Road/Haleakala Highway Intersection to Omaopio Road, and ending at the common point of all the segments located on Waiakoa Ridge approximately 5.75 km (3.5 miles) mauka (east) from Piilani Highway (see Figure 6)
- Segment U-2: Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road to Omaopio Road and ending at the common point
- Segment U-3: Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch, down Waiakoa Ridge and ending at the common point.
- Segment K-1: Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway Intersection up Waiakoa Ridge and ending at the common point
- Segment K-2: proposed Road F/Piilani Highway Intersection to the common point.

Table 5 provides the suggested naming system for the alternatives.

Table 5
Suggested Alternative Naming System

Old Name	Suggested New Name	Description
2B	U-1, K-1	Haliimaile Road/Haleakala Highway Intersection to Kaonoulu Street/Pihani Highway Intersection.
2C	U-1, K-2	Haliimaile Road/Haleakala Highway Intersection to proposed Road F/Pihani Highway Intersection.
4B	U-2, K-1	Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road to Kaonoulu Street/Pihani Highway Intersection.
5	U-3, K-1	Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch to Kaonoulu Street/Pihani Highway Intersection.
None	U-2, K-2	Kula Highway east of Pukalani Bypass Road to proposed Road F/Pihani Highway Intersection.
None	U-3, K-2	Kula Highway south of Pulehu Gulch to proposed Road F/Pihani Highway Intersection.



Upcountry and Kihel Termini and Alignment Segments of Selected Alternatives
KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Alternatives Analysis Final Report
FIGURE 6

APPENDIX KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY MAUI, HAWAII

INITIAL TEN ALTERNATIVES FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Alternative 1. This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area to Piliani Highway/Kaonolu Street in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 610 meters (2,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 3.5 percent. This 14.3 kilometer (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse Agriculture zoned land, affecting five large agricultural parcels. Approximately 9.7 kilometers (6.0 miles) of the alignment would traverse cane fields.

Alternative 2. This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in the Upcountry area to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 915 meters (3,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 5.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse about 6.4 kilometers (4.0 miles) of cane field and would affect six large Agriculture zoned parcels.

Alternative 3. This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway, between Haliimaile Road and Pukalani in the Upcountry area, to the Piliani Highway/Kaonolu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 535 meters (1,750 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 4.2 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately five large parcels zoned for Agriculture. The alignment would also skirt the east (mauka) edge of approximately 6.4 kilometers (4.0 miles) of cane field. The uppermost portion of the alignment is immediately west of Urban zoned lands.

Alternative 4A. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 715 meters (2,350 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.7 percent. This 16.6 kilometer (10.3-mile) alignment would affect approximately 12 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).

Alternative 4B. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Piliani Highway/Kaonolu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 790 meters (2,600 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.6 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately 8 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).

Alternative 5. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piliani Highway/Kaonolu Street intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 275 meters (900 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.8 percent. This 14.0 kilometer (8.7-mile) alignment would affect approximately eight parcels zoned as Agriculture land. One parcel near the Kula terminus is in pineapple cultivation, and another is being utilized for truck farming. The other parcels are used for grazing.

Alternative 6A. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, approximately 1.2 kilometers (0.5 mile) north of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula, to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to keep maximum grade below 6.8 percent. This 17.0 kilometer (10.6-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

Alternative 6B. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, west of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula, to Piliani Highway, next to the Kihei Regional Park. The location of the Kihei terminus would be across from the proposed Road F (Kihei Trailing Master Plan (1989)). The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to maintain a maximum grade of 7.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

Alternative 7. This alignment would connect Kula Highway to Piliani Highway by extending Kula Highway south from the Kula Sanitarium to Ulupalakua, and turning northwest toward Piliani Highway. The minimum horizontal radius would be 150 meters (500 feet). The grade of this alignment between the Kihei terminus and Ulupalakua would be nearly the 7.0 percent maximum desired grade. The 14.4 kilometer (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse approximately 12 parcels. In order to meet current highway safety standards, about 6.0 kilometers (3.7 miles) of the existing substandard section of road between Ulupalakua and the Sanitarium would be reconstructed.

Alternative 8. This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway below Pukalani to Mokuale Highway, along the old Government right-of-way. The minimum horizontal radius would be 60 meters (200 feet). The maximum grade along the existing alignment would be about 10.0 percent. This 14.6 kilometer (9.1-mile) alignment would traverse 13.6 kilometers (8.5 miles) of cane land.

APPENDIX A KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY HIGHWAY MAUI, HAWAII

INITIAL TEN ALTERNATIVES FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Alternative 1. This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Halimailie Road intersection in the Upcountry area to Piliāni Highway/Kaonolu Sireet in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 610 meters (2,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 3.5 percent. This 14.3 kilometer (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse Agriculture zoned land, affecting five large agricultural parcels. Approximately 9.7 kilometers (6.0 miles) of the alignment would traverse cane fields.

Alternative 2. This alignment would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Halimailie Road intersection in the Upcountry area to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 915 meters (3,000 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 5.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse about 6.4 kilometers (4.0 miles) of cane field and would affect six large Agriculture zoned parcels.

Alternative 3. This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway, between Halimailie Road and Pukalani in the Upcountry area, to the Piliāni Highway/Kaonolu Sireet intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 535 meters (1,750 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 4.2 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately five large parcels zoned for Agriculture. The alignment would also skirt the east (mauka) edge of approximately 6.4 kilometers (4.0 miles) of cane field. The uppermost portion of the alignment is immediately west of Urban zoned lands.

Alternative 4A. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 715 meters (2,350 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.7 percent. This 16.6 kilometer (10.3-mile) alignment would affect approximately 12 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).

Alternative 4B. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, east of the Pukalani Bypass Road in the Upcountry area, to the Piliāni Highway/Kaonolu Sireet intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 790 meters (2,600 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.6 percent. This 15.5 kilometer (9.6-mile) alignment would affect approximately 6 parcels, most of which are used for grazing. At least two parcels are being used for pineapple cultivation. All except the uppermost 1.5 kilometer (0.9 mile) of this alignment traverses agricultural lands. The uppermost portion traverses land designated for urban residential use in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (1981).

Alternative 5. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piliāni Highway/Kaonolu Sireet intersection in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 275 meters (900 feet). The alignment's maximum grade would be 6.8 percent. This 14.0 kilometer (8.7-mile) alignment would affect approximately eight parcels zoned as Agriculture land. One parcel near the Kula terminus is in pineapple cultivation, and another is being utilized for truck farming. The other parcels are used for grazing.

Alternative 6A. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, approximately 1.2 kilometers (0.5 mile) north of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula, to the Maui R&T Park in Kihei. The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to keep maximum grade below 6.8 percent. This 17.0 kilometer (10.6-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

Alternative 6B. This alignment would extend from Kula Highway, west of the Kekaulike Highway/Kula Highway intersection in Kula, to Piliāni Highway, next to the Kihei Regional Park. The location of the Kihei terminus would be across from the proposed Road F (Kihei Traffic Master Plan (1989)). The minimum horizontal radius would be 245 meters (800 feet). The topography is fairly steep and would require switch backs in order to maintain a maximum grade of 7.0 percent. This 16.3 kilometer (10.1-mile) alignment would traverse five parcels, two of which are owned by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.

Alternative 7. This alignment would connect Kula Highway to Piliāni Highway by extending Kula Highway south from the Kula Sanitarium to Ulupalakua, and turning northwest toward Piliāni Highway. The minimum horizontal radius would be 150 meters (500 feet). The grade of this alignment between the Kihei terminus and Ulupalakua would be nearly the 7.0 percent maximum desired grade. The 14.4 kilometer (8.9-mile) alignment would traverse approximately 12 parcels. In order to meet current highway safety standards, about 6.0 kilometers (3.7 miles) of the existing substandard section of road between Ulupalakua and the Sanitarium would be reconstructed.

Alternative 8. This alignment would extend from Haleakala Highway below Pukalani to Mokulele Highway, along the old Government right-of-way. The minimum horizontal radius would be 60 meters (200 feet). The maximum grade along the existing alignment would be about 10.0 percent. This 14.6 kilometer (9.1-mile) alignment would traverse 13.6 kilometers (8.5 miles) of cane land.

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 1

Year	Major Event	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Adjusted	Present Value	X	Amount	Adjusted
1997	Base Year	0	4,000	4,120	3,780			
1997	Start PS&E	1						
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1						
1998	End PS&E	2	6,600	7,214	6,072			
1998	Start Construction	3	10,780	11,780	9,096			
2000	Start Construction	4	10,780	12,133	8,595			
2001	Start Construction	5	10,780	12,497	8,122			
2002	Start Construction	6	10,780	12,872	7,675			
2003	Road Opens	7	10,780	13,258	7,253			
2004	First Benefit Year	8	290	367	184	1	2,350	2,977
2005		9	290	378	174	2	2,655	3,478
2006		10	290	390	165	3	2,981	4,006
2007		11	290	401	156	4	3,296	4,562
2008		12	290	413	147	5	3,611	5,148
2009		13	290	426	139	6	3,926	5,765
2010		14	290	439	131	7	4,242	6,416
2011		15	290	452	124	8	4,557	7,099
2012		16	290	465	117	9	4,872	7,818
2013		17	290	479	111	10	5,187	8,574
2014		18	290	494	105	11	5,503	9,368
2015		19	290	509	99	12	5,818	10,202
2016		20	290	524	93	13	6,133	11,077
2017		21	290	539	88	14	6,448	11,996
2018		22	290	555	83	15	6,764	12,960
2019		23	290	572	79	16	7,079	13,971
2020		24	290	590	75	17	7,394	15,031
2021		25	290	607	70	18	7,709	16,142
2022		26	290	625	67	19	8,025	17,305
2023		27	290	644	63	20	8,340	18,526
2024		28	290	663	59	21	8,655	19,803
2025		29	290	683	56	22	8,971	21,140
2026		30	290	704	53	23	9,286	22,539
2027		31	290	725	50	24	9,601	24,003
2028		32	290	747	47	25	9,916	25,535
2029		33	290	769	45	26	10,232	27,138
2030		34	290	792	42	27	10,547	28,813
2031		35	290	816	40	28	10,862	30,564
2032		36	290	841	38	29	11,177	32,395
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	290	866	36	30	11,493	34,308
Total							53,330	53,263
B/C Ratio: 1.00								
Inputs								
Annual Man. Cost 290								
Year 2004 Benefits (Base) 2,350								
Year 2023 Benefits (20-year) 8,340								
Y-Intercept 2,035								
Slope 315								
Inflation Rate 0.03								
Discount Rate 0.050								

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 2

Year	Major Event	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Adjusted	Present Value	X	Amount	Adjusted
1997	Base Year	0	3,900	4,017	3,685			
1997	Start PS&E	1						
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1						
1998	End PS&E	2	7,230	7,670	6,456			
1998	Start Construction	3	10,400	11,364	8,775			
2000	Start Construction	4	10,400	11,705	8,292			
2001	Start Construction	5	10,400	12,056	7,836			
2002	Start Construction	6	10,400	12,418	7,405			
2003	Road Opens	7	10,400	12,791	6,997			
2004	First Benefit Year	8	330	418	210	1	2,300	2,952
2005		9	330	431	199	2	2,641	3,445
2006		10	330	443	187	3	2,952	3,957
2007		11	330	457	177	4	3,263	4,517
2008		12	330	471	167	5	3,574	5,095
2009		13	330	485	158	6	3,885	5,706
2010		14	330	499	149	7	4,196	6,347
2011		15	330	514	141	8	4,507	7,022
2012		16	330	530	133	9	4,818	7,732
2013		17	330	545	126	10	5,129	8,478
2014		18	330	562	119	11	5,441	9,262
2015		19	330	579	113	12	5,752	10,085
2016		20	330	596	106	13	6,063	10,950
2017		21	330	614	100	14	6,374	11,857
2018		22	330	632	95	15	6,685	12,809
2019		23	330	651	90	16	6,996	13,807
2020		24	330	671	85	17	7,307	14,853
2021		25	330	691	80	18	7,618	15,950
2022		26	330	712	76	19	7,929	17,099
2023		27	330	733	72	20	8,240	18,303
2024		28	330	755	68	21	8,551	19,564
2025		29	330	778	64	22	8,862	20,884
2026		30	330	801	60	23	9,173	22,266
2027		31	330	825	57	24	9,484	23,711
2028		32	330	850	54	25	9,795	25,224
2029		33	330	875	51	26	10,106	26,805
2030		34	330	902	48	27	10,417	28,459
2031		35	330	929	45	28	10,728	30,188
2032		36	330	956	43	29	11,039	31,995
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	330	985	41	30	11,351	33,884
Total							52,960	52,659
B/C Ratio: 1.00								
Inputs								
Annual Man. Cost 330								
Year 2004 Benefits (Base) 2,330								
Year 2023 Benefits (20-year) 8,240								
Y-Intercept 2,019								
Slope 311								
Inflation Rate 0.03								
Discount Rate 0.050								

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 2C

Year	Major Event (Base Year)	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Present Value*	Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Present Value*
1997	Start PS&E	0	4,100	4,223	3,874			
1998	Start RW Acquisition	1						
1999	End PS&E	2	6,800	7,214	6,072			
2000	Start Construction	3	10,850	11,859	9,180			
2001		4	10,850	12,246	8,575			
2002		5	10,850	12,613	8,198			
2003	Road Opens	6	10,850	12,997	7,746			
2004	First Benefit Year	7	10,850	13,381	7,320			
2005		8	350	456	229	1,610	2,039	1,024
2006		9	350	470	216	1,826	2,382	1,097
2007		10	350	484	204	2,042	2,744	1,159
2008		11	350	498	193	2,257	3,125	1,211
2009		12	350	513	182	2,473	3,526	1,264
2010		13	350	529	172	2,689	3,949	1,288
2011		14	350	545	163	2,905	4,394	1,315
2012		15	350	561	154	3,121	4,862	1,346
2013		16	350	578	146	3,336	5,354	1,381
2014		17	350	595	137	3,552	5,871	1,421
2015		18	350	613	130	3,768	6,419	1,467
2016		19	350	631	123	3,984	6,985	1,519
2017		20	350	650	116	4,199	7,565	1,577
2018		21	350	670	110	4,415	8,164	1,641
2019		22	350	690	104	4,631	8,784	1,711
2020		23	350	710	98	4,847	9,436	1,787
2021		24	350	732	93	5,063	10,121	1,870
2022		25	350	754	87	5,278	10,841	1,959
2023		26	350	776	83	5,494	11,596	2,054
2024		27	350	800	78	5,710	12,388	2,156
2025		28	350	824	74	5,926	13,214	2,264
2026		29	350	848	70	6,142	14,073	2,378
2027		30	350	874	66	6,357	14,963	2,498
2028		31	350	900	62	6,573	15,884	2,624
2029		32	350	927	59	6,789	16,837	2,756
2030		33	350	955	56	7,005	17,822	2,894
2031		34	350	983	53	7,221	18,839	3,038
2032		35	350	1,013	50	7,436	19,888	3,188
2033	Last Benefit Year	36	350	1,043	47	7,652	20,968	3,344
Total		37	350	1,075	44	7,868	22,178	3,507
BC Ratio	1.06				54.463			36.471
Inputs								
1	Annual Main Cost		350					
20	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)			1,610				
	Y-intercept			5,710				
	Scope			1,394				
	Initiation Rate			216				
	Discount Rate			0.090				

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 2B

Year	Major Event (Base Year)	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Present Value*	Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Present Value*
1997	Start PS&E	0	3,300	3,399	3,118			
1998	Start RW Acquisition	1						
1999	End PS&E	2	5,800	6,153	5,179			
2000	Start Construction	3	8,800	9,616	7,425			
2001		4	8,800	9,904	7,017			
2002		5	8,800	10,202	6,630			
2003	Road Opens	6	8,800	10,508	6,265			
2004	First Benefit Year	7	8,800	10,823	5,920			
2005		8	320	405	203	2,080	2,635	1,322
2006		9	320	418	192	2,356	3,077	1,417
2007		10	320	430	182	2,636	3,542	1,496
2008		11	320	443	172	2,914	4,033	1,563
2009		12	320	458	162	3,192	4,550	1,618
2010		13	320	470	153	3,469	5,095	1,662
2011		14	320	484	145	3,747	5,668	1,696
2012		15	320	499	137	4,025	6,271	1,722
2013		16	320	514	129	4,303	6,905	1,739
2014		17	320	529	122	4,581	7,572	1,750
2015		18	320	545	115	4,859	8,272	1,754
2016		19	320	561	109	5,137	9,007	1,752
2017		20	320	578	103	5,415	9,780	1,745
2018		21	320	595	97	5,693	10,590	1,734
2019		22	320	613	92	5,971	11,440	1,718
2020		23	320	632	87	6,248	12,332	1,699
2021		24	320	650	82	6,526	13,267	1,677
2022		25	320	670	78	6,804	14,247	1,652
2023		26	320	690	73	7,082	15,273	1,625
2024		27	320	711	69	7,360	16,349	1,596
2025		28	320	732	66	7,638	17,475	1,565
2026		29	320	754	62	7,916	18,654	1,533
2027		30	320	777	59	8,194	19,888	1,499
2028		31	320	800	55	8,472	21,180	1,465
2029		32	320	824	52	8,749	22,531	1,429
2030		33	320	849	49	9,027	23,944	1,394
2031		34	320	874	47	9,305	25,421	1,357
2032		35	320	900	44	9,583	26,966	1,321
2033	Last Benefit Year	36	320	927	42	9,861	28,580	1,284
Total		37	320	955	39	10,139	30,267	1,248
BC Ratio	1.06				44.575			47.030
Inputs								
1	Annual Main Cost		320					
20	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)			2,080				
	Y-intercept			7,360				
	Scope			1,802				
	Initiation Rate			278				
	Discount Rate			0.090				

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 3

Year	Major Event (Base Year)	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)		X	Benefits (in \$1,000s)	
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted		Amount	Inflation Adjusted
1996	Start PS&E	0	3,850	3,856	3,038		
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1					
1998	End PS&E	2	6,550	6,949	5,849		
1999	Start Construction	3	10,260	11,211	8,657		
2000		4	10,260	11,548	8,181		
2001		5	10,260	11,884	7,730		
2002		6	10,260	12,251	7,305		
2003	Road Opens	7	10,260	12,519	6,803		
2004	First Benefit Year	8	320	405	203	2,280	1,450
2005		9	320	418	192	2,586	1,553
2006		10	320	430	182	2,892	1,642
2007		11	320	443	172	3,197	1,715
2008		12	320	456	162	3,503	1,775
2009		13	320	470	153	3,808	1,825
2010		14	320	484	145	4,115	1,862
2011		15	320	498	137	4,421	1,891
2012		16	320	514	129	4,726	1,910
2013		17	320	529	122	5,032	1,922
2014		18	320	545	115	5,338	1,928
2015		19	320	561	108	5,644	1,925
2016		20	320	578	103	5,949	1,917
2017		21	320	595	97	6,255	1,905
2018		22	320	613	92	6,561	1,889
2019		23	320	632	87	6,867	1,867
2020		24	320	650	82	7,173	1,843
2021		25	320	670	78	7,478	1,816
2022		26	320	690	73	7,784	1,786
2023		27	320	711	69	8,090	1,754
2024		28	320	732	66	8,396	1,720
2025		29	320	754	62	8,702	1,685
2026		30	320	777	59	9,007	1,650
2027		31	320	800	55	9,313	1,615
2028		32	320	824	52	9,619	1,571
2029		33	320	849	49	9,925	1,528
2030		34	320	874	47	10,231	1,482
2031		35	320	900	44	10,536	1,435
2032		36	320	927	41	10,842	1,412
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	320	955	39	11,148	1,372
Total					51,282		31,668
BC Ratio					1.01		
Inputs							
1	Annual Main Cost		320				
20	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)		2,280				
	Year 2023 Benefits (20-yr. cr.)		8,090				
	Y-intercept		1,974				
	Slope		306				
	Initiation Rate		0.03				
	Discount Rate		0.050				

Kihel-Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 4A

Year	Major Event (Base Year)	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)		X	Benefits (in \$1,000s)	
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted		Amount	Inflation Adjusted
1996	Start PS&E	0	5,450	5,614	5,150		
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1					
1998	End PS&E	2	12,350	13,102	11,028		
1999	Start Construction	3	14,540	15,885	12,669		
2000		4	14,540	16,365	11,993		
2001		5	14,540	16,856	10,955		
2002		6	14,540	17,362	10,352		
2003	Road Opens	7	14,540	17,892	9,783		
2004	First Benefit Year	8	340	431	216	3,090	1,964
2005		9	340	444	204	3,503	2,105
2006		10	340	457	193	3,916	2,221
2007		11	340	471	182	4,328	2,322
2008		12	340	485	172	4,743	2,404
2009		13	340	499	163	5,156	2,470
2010		14	340	514	154	5,569	2,521
2011		15	340	530	145	5,982	2,559
2012		16	340	546	137	6,395	2,585
2013		17	340	562	130	6,808	2,606
2014		18	340	579	123	7,222	2,621
2015		19	340	595	116	7,635	2,631
2016		20	340	614	110	8,048	2,636
2017		21	340	633	104	8,461	2,637
2018		22	340	651	98	8,874	2,634
2019		23	340	671	92	9,287	2,628
2020		24	340	691	87	9,701	2,619
2021		25	340	712	83	10,114	2,606
2022		26	340	733	78	10,527	2,589
2023		27	340	755	74	10,940	2,568
2024		28	340	778	70	11,353	2,543
2025		29	340	801	66	11,766	2,515
2026		30	340	825	62	12,179	2,483
2027		31	340	850	58	12,593	2,448
2028		32	340	876	55	13,006	2,410
2029		33	340	902	52	13,419	2,369
2030		34	340	929	50	13,832	2,325
2031		35	340	957	47	14,245	2,278
2032		36	340	985	44	14,658	2,228
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	340	1,015	42	15,072	2,175
Total					74,338		69,895
BC Ratio					1.04		
Inputs							
1	Annual Main Cost		340				
20	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)		3,090				
	Year 2023 Benefits (20-yr. cr.)		10,940				
	Y-intercept		2,677				
	Slope		413				
	Initiation Rate		0.03				
	Discount Rate		0.050				

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 4B

Year	Major Event Base Year	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)		Benefits (in \$1,000s)	
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Amount	Inflation Adjusted
1997	Start PS&E	0	3,500	3,605	3,307	
1998	Start R/W Acquisition	2	9,000	9,548	8,036	
1999	End PS&E	3	9,380	10,250	7,815	
2000	Start Construction	4	9,380	10,557	7,478	
2001		5	9,380	10,874	7,057	
2002		6	9,380	11,200	6,678	
2003	Road Opens	7	9,380	11,536	6,311	
2004	First Benefit Year	8	320	405	203	2,850
2005		9	320	418	203	3,747
2006		10	320	430	182	4,644
2007		11	320	443	161	5,531
2008		12	320	456	141	6,418
2009		13	320	470	121	7,305
2010		14	320	484	101	8,192
2011		15	320	499	81	9,079
2012		16	320	514	61	9,966
2013		17	320	529	41	10,853
2014		18	320	545	21	11,740
2015		19	320	561	1	12,627
2016		20	320	578	-19	13,514
2017		21	320	595	-39	14,401
2018		22	320	613	-59	15,288
2019		23	320	632	-79	16,175
2020		24	320	650	-99	17,062
2021		25	320	670	-119	17,949
2022		26	320	690	-139	18,836
2023		27	320	711	-159	19,723
2024		28	320	732	-179	20,610
2025		29	320	754	-199	21,497
2026		30	320	777	-219	22,384
2027		31	320	800	-239	23,271
2028		32	320	824	-259	24,158
2029		33	320	849	-279	25,045
2030		34	320	874	-299	25,932
2031		35	320	900	-319	26,819
2032		36	320	927	-339	27,706
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	320	955	-359	28,593
Total				49,814		66,969
B/C Ratio		1.34				
Inputs						
Annual Min. Cost		320				
1	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)	2,950				
20	Year 2023 Benefits (20-year)	10,480				
Y-intercept		2,553				
Slope		387				
Inflation Rate		0.03				
Discount Rate		0.050				

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 5

Year	Major Event Base Year	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)		Benefits (in \$1,000s)	
			Amount	Inflation Adjusted	Amount	Inflation Adjusted
1997	Start PS&E	0	2,750	2,833	2,599	
1998	Start R/W Acquisition	2	5,750	6,100	5,134	
1999	End PS&E	3	7,380	8,054	6,227	
2000	Start Construction	4	7,380	8,305	5,684	
2001		5	7,380	8,555	5,141	
2002		6	7,380	8,812	4,598	
2003	Road Opens	7	7,380	9,076	4,055	
2004	First Benefit Year	8	290	367	181	2,590
2005		9	290	378	174	3,485
2006		10	290	390	165	4,380
2007		11	290	401	156	5,275
2008		12	290	413	147	6,170
2009		13	290	425	138	7,065
2010		14	290	437	129	7,960
2011		15	290	450	120	8,855
2012		16	290	463	111	9,750
2013		17	290	476	102	10,645
2014		18	290	489	93	11,540
2015		19	290	502	84	12,435
2016		20	290	515	75	13,330
2017		21	290	528	66	14,225
2018		22	290	541	57	15,120
2019		23	290	554	48	16,015
2020		24	290	567	39	16,910
2021		25	290	580	30	17,805
2022		26	290	593	21	18,700
2023		27	290	606	12	19,595
2024		28	290	619	3	20,490
2025		29	290	632	-6	21,385
2026		30	290	645	-15	22,280
2027		31	290	658	-24	23,175
2028		32	290	671	-33	24,070
2029		33	290	684	-42	24,965
2030		34	290	697	-51	25,860
2031		35	290	710	-60	26,755
2032		36	290	723	-69	27,650
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	290	736	-78	28,545
Total				38,361		59,849
B/C Ratio		1.53				
Inputs						
Annual Min. Cost		290				
1	Year 2004 Benefits (Base)	2,590				
20	Year 2023 Benefits (20-year)	9,220				
Y-intercept		2,241				
Slope		349				
Inflation Rate		0.03				
Discount Rate		0.050				

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 6B

Year	Major Event	M	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Initiation	Present Value*	Amount	Initiation	Present Value*
1996	Base Year	0						
1997	Start PS&E	1	5,450	5,614	5,150			
	Start RW Acquisition							
1998	End PS&E	2	8,150	8,646	7,277			
1999	Start Construction	3	14,560	15,910	12,286			
2000		4	14,560	16,387	11,609			
2001		5	14,560	16,879	10,970			
2002		6	14,560	17,385	10,366			
2003	Road Opens	7	14,560	17,917	9,796			
2004	First Benefit Year	8	330	418	210	860	1,089	547
2005		9	330	431	196	975	1,272	586
2006		10	330	443	181	1,089	1,464	618
2007		11	330	457	171	1,204	1,667	646
2008		12	330	471	161	1,319	1,881	669
2009		13	330	485	151	1,434	2,105	687
2010		14	330	499	141	1,548	2,342	701
2011		15	330	514	131	1,663	2,591	711
2012		16	330	530	121	1,778	2,853	719
2013		17	330	545	110	1,893	3,128	723
2014		18	330	562	100	2,007	3,417	724
2015		19	330	579	90	2,122	3,721	724
2016		20	330	596	80	2,237	4,040	721
2017		21	330	614	70	2,352	4,375	716
2018		22	330	632	60	2,466	4,726	710
2019		23	330	651	50	2,581	5,094	702
2020		24	330	671	40	2,696	5,480	689
2021		25	330	691	30	2,811	5,885	682
2022		26	330	712	20	2,925	6,309	671
2023		27	330	733	10	3,040	6,753	659
2024		28	330	755	0	3,155	7,218	646
2025		29	330	778		3,269	7,705	633
2026		30	330	801		3,384	8,214	619
2027		31	330	825		3,499	8,748	605
2028		32	330	850		3,614	9,306	590
2029		33	330	875		3,728	9,889	576
2030		34	330	902		3,843	10,499	561
2031		35	330	929		3,958	11,137	546
2032		36	330	956		4,073	11,804	530
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	330	985		4,187	12,500	515
Total						70,589		19,429
B/C Ratio: 0.28								
Inputs								
Annual Main Cost 330								
Year 2004 Benefits (Base) 860								
Year 2023 Benefits (20-year)								
Y-Intercept 745								
Slope 115								
Inflation Rate 0.03								
Discount Rate 0.090								

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 6A

Year	Major Event	M	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Initiation	Present Value*	Amount	Initiation	Present Value*
1996	Base Year	0						
1997	Start PS&E	1	5,450	5,614	5,150			
	Start RW Acquisition							
1998	End PS&E	2	8,950	9,495	7,992			
1999	Start Construction	3	14,560	15,910	12,286			
2000		4	14,560	16,387	11,609			
2001		5	14,560	16,879	10,970			
2002		6	14,560	17,385	10,366			
2003	Road Opens	7	14,560	17,907	9,786			
2004	First Benefit Year	8	340	431	216	1,320	1,672	839
2005		9	340	441	204	1,497	1,954	900
2006		10	340	457	193	1,675	2,251	951
2007		11	340	471	182	1,852	2,564	994
2008		12	340	485	171	2,029	2,894	1,029
2009		13	340	499	161	2,207	3,241	1,061
2010		14	340	514	151	2,384	3,606	1,096
2011		15	340	530	141	2,562	3,991	1,096
2012		16	340	546	131	2,739	4,395	1,114
2013		17	340	562	121	2,916	4,820	1,117
2014		18	340	579	111	3,094	5,267	1,116
2015		19	340	596	101	3,271	5,736	1,111
2016		20	340	614	90	3,448	6,228	1,104
2017		21	340	633	80	3,626	6,745	1,094
2018		22	340	651	70	3,803	7,287	1,082
2019		23	340	671	60	3,981	7,856	1,068
2020		24	340	691	50	4,158	8,452	1,068
2021		25	340	712	40	4,335	9,077	1,053
2022		26	340	733	30	4,513	9,732	1,035
2023		27	340	755	20	4,690	10,418	1,017
2024		28	340	778	10	4,867	11,136	997
2025		29	340	801	0	5,045	11,888	977
2026		30	340	825		5,222	12,675	955
2027		31	340	850		5,399	13,499	933
2028		32	340	875		5,577	14,361	911
2029		33	340	902		5,754	15,262	888
2030		34	340	929		5,932	16,205	865
2031		35	340	956		6,109	17,190	842
2032		36	340	985		6,286	18,219	819
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	340	1,015		6,464	19,296	796
Total						116,755		29,946
B/C Ratio: 0.42								
Inputs								
Annual Main Cost 340								
Year 2004 Benefits (Base) 1,320								
Year 2023 Benefits (20-year)								
Y-Intercept 1,143								
Slope 177								
Inflation Rate 0.03								
Discount Rate 0.090								

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 7

Year	Major Event Base Year	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Initiation	Present Value*	X	Amount	Initiation
1996	Start PS&E	0	4,500	4,635	4,252			
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1						
1998	End PS&E	2	20,300	21,536	18,127			
1999	Start Construction	3	12,080	13,200	10,193			
2000		4	12,080	13,586	9,632			
2001		5	12,080	14,004	9,102			
2002	Road Opens	6	12,080	14,424	8,601			
2003	First Benefit Year	7	12,080	14,857	8,127			
2004		8	290	367	184	1	-110	-139
2005		9	290	378	174	2	-125	-163
2006		10	290	390	165	3	-141	-189
2007		11	290	401	156	4	-156	-216
2008		12	290	413	147	5	-171	-241
2009		13	290	426	139	6	-186	-274
2010		14	290	439	131	7	-202	-305
2011		15	290	452	124	8	-217	-338
2012		16	290	465	117	9	-232	-372
2013		17	290	479	111	10	-247	-409
2014		18	290	494	105	11	-263	-447
2015		19	290	509	99	12	-278	-487
2016		20	290	524	93	13	-293	-529
2017		21	290	539	88	14	-308	-574
2018		22	290	555	83	15	-324	-620
2019		23	290	572	78	16	-339	-669
2020		24	290	590	73	17	-354	-720
2021		25	290	607	69	18	-369	-774
2022		26	290	625	65	19	-385	-830
2023		27	290	644	61	20	-400	-889
2024		28	290	663	57	21	-415	-950
2025		29	290	683	53	22	-431	-1,015
2026		30	290	704	50	23	-446	-1,082
2027		31	290	725	47	24	-461	-1,153
2028		32	290	747	44	25	-476	-1,227
2029		33	290	769	41	26	-492	-1,304
2030		34	290	792	38	27	-507	-1,385
2031		35	290	816	35	28	-522	-1,469
2032		36	290	841	32	29	-537	-1,557
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	290	866	30	30	-553	-1,650
Total					70,770			-2,543
B/C Ratio	-0.04							
Inputs								
Annual Man. Cost		290						
Year 2004 Benefits (Base)		-110						
Year 2023 Benefits (20-yr fore)		-400						
Y-Intercept		-95						
Slope		-15						
Inflation Rate		0.03						
Discount Rate		0.090						

Kihel Upcountry Highway
Benefit-Cost Analysis
Alternative 8

Year	Major Event Base Year	N	Costs (in \$1,000s)			Benefits (in \$1,000s)		
			Amount	Initiation	Present Value*	X	Amount	Initiation
1996	Start PS&E	0	2,500	2,575	2,352			
1997	Start R/W Acquisition	1						
1998	End PS&E	2	5,300	5,623	4,733			
1999	Start Construction	3	6,740	7,355	5,687			
2000		4	6,740	7,586	5,374			
2001		5	6,740	7,814	5,078			
2002	Road Opens	6	6,740	8,048	4,799			
2003	First Benefit Year	7	6,740	8,289	4,535			
2004		8	290	367	184	1	1,720	2,179
2005		9	290	378	174	2	1,849	2,544
2006		10	290	390	165	3	1,979	2,928
2007		11	290	401	156	4	2,108	3,324
2008		12	290	413	147	5	2,238	3,731
2009		13	290	426	139	6	2,368	4,149
2010		14	290	439	131	7	2,497	4,578
2011		15	290	452	124	8	2,627	5,018
2012		16	290	465	117	9	2,756	5,469
2013		17	290	479	111	10	2,885	5,931
2014		18	290	494	105	11	3,014	6,404
2015		19	290	509	99	12	3,143	6,888
2016		20	290	524	93	13	3,272	7,383
2017		21	290	539	88	14	3,401	7,888
2018		22	290	555	83	15	3,530	8,404
2019		23	290	572	78	16	3,659	8,931
2020		24	290	590	73	17	3,788	9,469
2021		25	290	607	69	18	3,917	10,018
2022		26	290	625	65	19	4,046	10,578
2023		27	290	644	61	20	4,175	11,149
2024		28	290	663	57	21	4,304	11,731
2025		29	290	683	53	22	4,433	12,324
2026		30	290	704	50	23	4,562	12,928
2027		31	290	725	47	24	4,691	13,544
2028		32	290	747	44	25	4,820	14,171
2029		33	290	769	41	26	4,949	14,809
2030		34	290	792	38	27	5,078	15,458
2031		35	290	816	35	28	5,207	16,118
2032		36	290	841	32	29	5,336	16,789
2033	Last Benefit Year	37	290	866	30	30	5,465	17,471
Total					35,300			39,858
B/C Ratio	1.10							
Inputs								
Annual Man. Cost		290						
Year 2004 Benefits (Base)		1,720						
Year 2023 Benefits (20-yr fore)		6,090						
Y-Intercept		1,491						
Slope		29						
Inflation Rate		0.03						
Discount Rate		0.090						

APPENDIX F

Air Quality Analysis Technical Memorandum

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project

Project Number: HDPS-9203(1)

Air Quality Analysis Technical Memorandum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
2. RELEVANT POLLUTANTS	3
2.1 Carbon Monoxide	3
2.2 Hydrocarbons	3
2.3 Nitrogen Oxides	4
2.4 Ozone	4
2.5 Particulate Matter	4
2.6 Sulfur Oxides	4
2.7 Lead	4
3. NATIONAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS	5
4. AIR QUALITY REGULATIONS AND PLANNING	5
5. AMBIENT AIR QUALITY IN THE STUDY AREA	6
5.1 Local Meteorology	6
5.2 Attainment Status of Study Area	7
5.3 Monitored Air Quality	7
6. IMPACT ASSESSMENT	9
6.1 Pollutants for Analysis	9
6.2 Mesoscale Analysis	9
6.3 Microscale Analysis	9
6.4 Methodology	10
6.4.1 Vehicular Emissions	10
6.4.2 Dispersion Model	11
6.4.3 Receptor Locations	12
6.4.4 Meteorological Conditions	12
6.4.5 Persistence Factor	12
6.4.6 Analysis Years	13
6.4.7 Background Concentrations	13
6.4.8 Traffic Information	13
7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS	13
7.1 Mesoscale Impacts	13
7.2 Microscale Impacts	14
8. CONFORMANCE WITH THE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP) FOR AIR QUALITY	15
9. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	15
9.1 Fugitive Dust Emissions	15
9.2 Mobile Source Emissions	16
10. REFERENCES	17
APPENDIX A: AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA	
APPENDIX B: MOBILESA EMISSIONS (NOT INCLUDED. CAN BE REVIEWED AT THE HIGHWAYS PLANNING BRANCH OF THE STATE OF HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION)	
APPENDIX C: CAL3QHCY2 DATA AND OUTPUTS (NOT INCLUDED. CAN BE REVIEWED AT THE HIGHWAYS PLANNING BRANCH OF THE STATE OF HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION)	
APPENDIX D: TRAFFIC	

Prepared for:

State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Prepared by:

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

October 1998

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1 Project Location 2
 Table 1 National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards 6
 Table 2 Air Quality Summary for Study Area, HDOH and MECO Monitoring Stations 8
 Table 3 Predicted Worst-Case 1-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm) 14
 Table 4 Predicted Worst-Case 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm) 14

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to describe the air pollutants associated with motor vehicle exhaust, discuss applicable air quality standards and regulations, summarize the existing air quality conditions in the study area, and identify and quantify the potential air quality impacts of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway.

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project on the island of Maui, Hawaii. Figure 1 shows the general project location. The proposed federal-aid two-lane limited access highway would link the Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui regions.

The alternatives under consideration are all eight possible combinations of two Kihei terminus options and four Upcountry terminus options. The Kihei terminus and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry terminus and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3.

Descriptions of the alternatives are as follows:

1. Alternative U1.K1. This alternative would start at the Haleakala Highway / Hallimale Road intersection in Upcountry and follow a south to southwest alignment to the Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 15.8 km (9.8 miles).
2. Alternative U1.K2. This alternative is the same as Alternative U1.K1 from the Upcountry terminus to where the alternative alignments cross. However, this alternative would proceed southwest to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Piilani Highway intersection. The length of Alternative U1.K2 is approximately 17.5 km (10.9 miles).
3. Alternative U2-A.K1. This alternative would extend from the existing Pukalani Bypass/Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection in Upcountry, to an alignment common with U1. The Kihei terminus would be at the Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection.
4. Alternative U2-A.K2. This alternative would be from the "Five Trees" intersection to the Ke Alii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection.
5. Alternative U2-B.K1. This alternative would extend from Kula Highway at approximately 700 m (2300 ft) south of the "Five Trees" intersection to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.

6. **Alternative U2-B,K2.** This alternative is shares the same Upcountry terminus and alignment as the Alternative U2-B,K1. This alternative's Kihel terminus is at the Pihani Highway/Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection.
7. **Alternative U3,K1.** This alternative would be from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Pihani Highway/Kaanoulu Street intersection in Kihel.
8. **Alternative U3,K2.** This alternative would extend from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Ke Alii Alanui Street/Pihani Highway intersection.

The proposed highway would be a limited access arterial roadway with one 3.6 m (12 ft) lane in each direction. The minimum width of the roadway right-of-way would be 49 m (160 ft) in rural areas and at least 37 m (120 ft) in urban areas. Additional right-of-way is being reserved to allow for future widening to a four-lane divided highway if appropriate in the future. Posted speed limits would vary from 70 km/h (45 mph) in urban areas to 90 km/h (55 mph) in rural areas.

2. RELEVANT POLLUTANTS

Potential air quality impacts are estimated by quantifying the change in estimated air quality levels anticipated under each Build alternative with the levels estimated under the No Build alternative. "Air Pollution" is a general term that refers to one or more chemical substances that degrade the quality of the atmosphere. Individual air pollutants degrade the atmosphere by reducing visibility, damaging property, reducing the productivity or vigor of crops or natural vegetation, or by reducing human or animal health.


Seven air pollutants have been identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as being of concern nationwide. The pollutants are carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, ozone, particulate matter, sulfur oxides, and lead.

2.1 Carbon Monoxide

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless and odorless gas, which is generated in the urban environment primarily by the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels in motor vehicles. Relatively high concentrations of CO are typically found near crowded intersections and along heavily used roadways carrying slow-moving traffic. CO chemically combines with the hemoglobin in the red blood cells to decrease the oxygen-carrying capacity of blood. Prolonged exposure can cause headaches, drowsiness, or loss of equilibrium.

2.2 Hydrocarbons

Hydrocarbons (HC) include a wide variety of organic compounds emitted principally from the storage, handling, and use of fossil fuels. Though HC can cause eye irritation and breathing difficulty, their principal health effects are related to their role in the formation of ozone.



2.3 Nitrogen Oxides

Nitrogen oxides (NOx) constitute a class of compounds that includes nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and nitric oxide (NO); both of which are emitted by motor vehicles. Although NO₂ and NO can irritate the eyes and nose and impair the respiratory system, NOx is also of concern primarily because of its role in the formation of ozone.

2.4 Ozone

Ozone (O₃), or photochemical oxidants, is a major cause of lung and eye irritation in an urban environment. It is formed through a series of reactions involving HC and NOx, which take place in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. Relatively high concentrations of O₃ are normally found only in the summer.

2.5 Particulate Matter

Particulate matter includes both liquid and solid particles of a wide range of sizes and composition. Of particular health concern are those particles that are smaller than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) in size. The principal health effects of airborne particulate matter are on the respiratory system. Relatively little particulate matter is emitted by gasoline-fueled motor vehicles. On July 16, 1997, EPA established a new standard for particulates with a diameter smaller than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}). Medical evidence indicated that these much smaller particles are also of serious concern to human health, since they lodge deeply in the lungs and can cause premature deaths and respiratory problems.

2.6 Sulfur Oxides

Sulfur oxides (SOx) constitute a class of compounds of which sulfur dioxide (SO₂) and sulfur trioxide (SO₃) are of great importance. The health effects of SOx include respiratory illness, damage to the respiratory tract, and bronchoconstriction. Relatively little SOx is emitted from motor vehicles.

2.7 Lead

Lead is a stable element that persists and accumulates both in the environment and in animals. Its principal effects in humans are on the blood-forming, nervous, and renal systems. Historically, motor vehicles constituted the major source of lead emissions to the atmosphere. Lead levels in the urban environment from motor vehicles have significantly decreased due to the federally mandated switch to lead-free gasoline and are, in general, no longer of concern.

On the island of Maui ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons (and thus ozone) are predominantly influenced by motor vehicle activity. Emissions of nitrogen oxides come from both mobile and stationary sources, and emissions of particulate matter, sulfur oxides and lead are associated mainly with various stationary sources of emissions.

Pollutants that can be traced principally to motor vehicles are of primary importance in evaluating the potential air quality impacts of the proposed project. Of these pollutants, carbon monoxide is evaluated on a localized or "microscale" basis and hydrocarbons, and nitrogen oxides, as precursors to ozone, are evaluated on a regional or "mesoscale" basis.

3. NATIONAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

As required by the Clean Air Act, National Ambient Air Quality Standards ("NAAQS") have been established for seven major air pollutants: carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, ozone, particulate matter smaller than 10 microns (PM-10), particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns (PM-2.5), sulfur oxides, and lead. The State of Hawaii has also established its own standards for these pollutants.

Both the National and State ambient air quality standards are summarized in Table 1. The "primary" standards have been established to protect the public health. The "secondary" standards are intended to protect the nation's welfare and account for air pollutant effects on soil, water, visibility, materials, vegetation, and other aspects of the general welfare. The State of Hawaii issues its ambient air quality standards in terms of a single standard that is designed "to protect public health and welfare and to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality".

4. AIR QUALITY REGULATIONS AND PLANNING

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (Amendments) direct the EPA to implement strong environmental policies and regulations that will ensure cleaner air quality. These Amendments will affect proposed transportation projects such as the proposed Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway. According to Title 1, Section 101, Paragraph F of the Amendments, "No federal agency may approve, accept or fund any transportation plan, program or project unless such plan, program, or project has been found to conform to any applicable state implementation plan (SIP) in effect under this act." Title 1 of the Amendments defines conformity as follows:

- Conformity to an implementation plan's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards; and
- That such activities will not:
 - (i) Cause or contribute to any new violation of any National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) in any area;
 - (ii) Increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any NAAQS in any area; or
 - (iii) Delay timely attainment of any NAAQS or any required interim emissions reductions or other milestones in any area.

The determination of conformity is to be based on the most recent estimates of pollutant emissions, and such estimates are to be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel and congestion estimates as determined by the responsible metropolitan planning organizations or other agency authorized to make such estimates.

**Table 1
National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards**

Pollutant	Standard	
	Hawaii State	Federal Primary / Federal Secondary
Carbon Monoxide (CO)		
1 Hour	10 mg/m ³ (9 ppm)	40 mg/m ³ (35 ppm)
8 Hour	5 mg/m ³ (4.5 ppm)	10 mg/m ³ (9 ppm)
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)		
Annual Arithmetic Mean	70 ug/m ³	100 ug/m ³ (0.053 ppm)
Particulate Matter < 10 micrometers (PM₁₀)		
24 Hour	150 ug/m ³	150 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	50 ug/m ³	50 ug/m ³
Particulate Matter < 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5})		
24 Hour	--	65 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	15 ug/m ³
Ozone (O₃)		
1 Hour	100 ug/m ³	235 ug/m ³ (0.12 ppm)
8 Hour	--	157 ug/m ³ (0.08 ppm)
Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)		
3 Hour	1300 ug/m ³	1300 ug/m ³ (0.5 ppm)
24 Hour	365 ug/m ³	365 ug/m ³ (0.14 ppm)
Annual Arithmetic Mean	80 ug/m ³	80 ug/m ³ (0.03 ppm)
Lead (Pb)		
Quarterly Average	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Clean Air Branch, EPA NAAQS, Updated July 1997.

5. AMBIENT AIR QUALITY IN THE STUDY AREA

5.1 Local Meteorology

The large Pacific semipermanent high pressure cell, which is usually centered north of the Hawaiian Islands, is one of the important climatic controls affecting the circulation of air in the islands. Over the central North Pacific, this cell produces a rather

persistent flow of air from the northeast known as the Northeast Trades. The trade-wind flow are almost constant during the spring and summer months, from May to October. In the fall and winter months, wind is more variable although, on average, the trades persist more than 50 percent of the time during these seasons.

Maui's climate varies according to altitude and leeward/windward location. Lowland areas tend to have a semi-tropical climate, while higher elevations are characterized by temperate climates. Maui is cooled by northeast trade winds approximately 70 percent of the year. Trade winds are affected by local topographic conditions. The northeast trade winds become northerly as they are funneled between the West Maui Mountains and Haleakala, often attaining speed of 65 to 72 km/h (40 to 45 mph) at Kahului Airport. Areas in the "wind shadows" are shielded.

The climate of Upcountry Maui is conducive to farming, being mild with warm days and cool evenings. Pukalani and Kula are relatively dry with rainfall ranging between 50 to 100 cm (20 to 40 inches) annually. The amount of rainfall increases northeastward towards Makawao and Haiku to approximately 125 to 250 cm (50 to 100 inches) annually. Temperatures range from around 15 (C) (60s (F)) during the winter to the high 20s (C) (mid 80s (F)) in the summer.

Kihel-Makana is on the south side of the island, in the rain shadow of Haleakala. The region is generally sunny, warm and dry the entire year. Temperatures range from a minimum of 17 degrees (C) (62 degrees (F)) in February to a maximum of 32 degrees (C) (90 degrees (F)) in July. Average annual precipitation is less than 38 cm (15 inches) per year. Most of this precipitation occurs during the winter months when storms are usually accompanied by south winds.

5.2 Attainment Status of Study Area

Section 107 of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendment requires the EPA to publish a list of all geographic areas in compliance with the NAAQS, as well as those not attaining the NAAQS. Areas not in compliance with the NAAQS are termed nonattainment areas. Areas that have insufficient data to make a determination are unclassified, and are treated as being attainment areas until proven otherwise. The designation of an area is made on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis.

The State of Hawaii is designated as an attainment area for all of the applicable pollutants.

5.3 Monitored Air Quality

The State of Hawaii Department of Health (HDOH) monitors air pollutant levels in Hawaii are through a network of sampling stations. There are two stations on Maui at Kihel and Paia. The stations were established in mid 1996, and are strategically located downwind of several sugarcane fields as special PM-10 sampling stations for sugarcane burning activities. Currently there are no other pollutants monitored on Maui by HDOH other than PM-10.

6. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

6.1 Pollutants for Analysis

Pollutants that can be traced principally, or in large measure, to motor vehicles are those that are of relevance in evaluating the impacts of the project. These pollutants include CO, HC, NO_x and O₃. Transportation sources account for a very small percentage of regional emissions of SO_x and particulate matter (PM-10), and detailed analyses for these contaminants are not warranted.

Motor vehicles have historically constituted a major source of lead emissions to the atmosphere. As already noted, lead levels have decreased significantly and will continue to do so, due to the mandated decrease and elimination of lead in gasoline. Therefore, a detailed analysis of the impact of lead emissions is also not warranted.

CO impacts are localized. Even under the worst meteorological conditions and most congested traffic conditions, high concentrations are limited to within a relatively short distance (300 to 600 feet) of heavily traveled roadways. Consequently, it is appropriate to predict concentrations of CO on a localized or 'microscale' basis.

HC and NO_x emissions from automotive sources are of concern primarily because of their role as precursors in the formation of ozone. Ozone is formed through a series of reactions that take place in the atmosphere in the presence of sunlight. Since the reactions are slow and occur as the pollutants are diffusing downwind, elevated ozone levels are often found many miles from sources of the precursor pollutants. The effects of HC and NO_x emissions are therefore generally examined on a regional or 'mesoscale' basis.

6.2 Mesoscale Analysis

Changes in 'pollutant burdens' (i.e. the tons of pollutants emitted in the study area each day or year) provide an indication of the general change in air quality in the region. This analysis is useful in assessing relative changes in the concentrations of CO, HC and NO_x between the Build and No Build alternatives. These pollutant burdens are computed based on the estimated vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours traveled (VHT), average travel speed and vehicle types for all major roadways in the study area.

6.3 Microscale Analysis

The analysis of mobile sources, which must be undertaken for a localized (microscale) area, applies mathematical models that simulate physical conditions to predict carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations at specific receptor locations. Mobile source dispersion models are the basic analytical tools used to estimate carbon monoxide concentrations expected under given conditions of traffic, roadway geometry and meteorology. The mathematical expressions and formulations that comprise the various models attempt to describe an extremely complex physical phenomenon. However, because all models contain simplifications and approximations of actual conditions, most results obtained from these dispersion models tend to be conservative.

Ambient background air quality data for other criteria pollutants on the island of Maui was obtained from the air quality study for the Proposed Kahului Airport Improvements, Kahului, Maui (B.D. Neal & Associates, December 1995). Monitored data cited in the above report was from the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Application for Maalaea Combined Cycle Project, Maui Electric Company (MECO), August 1990.

The pollutant data monitored at the HDOH stations and by MECO are presented in Table 2, and are the best representation of the air quality conditions in the project area. All of the monitored levels are well below the applicable standards.

**Table 2
Air Quality Summary for Study Area
HDOH and MECO Monitoring Stations**

Pollutant	Location		
	Maalaea (MECO Site #233)	Kihai (HDOH Site)	Pala (HDOH Site)
Carbon Monoxide (CO)			
1 Hour	14 ug/m ³ (.012 ppm)	NM	NM
8 Hour	6 ug/m ³ (.005 ppm)	NM	NM
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)			
Annual Arithmetic Mean	6 ug/m ³ (.003 ppm)	NM	NM
Particulate Matter < 10 micrometers (PM₁₀)			
24 Hour	56 ug/m ³	18 ug/m ³	60 ug/m ³
Annual Arithmetic Mean	14 ug/m ³	6 ug/m ³	19 ug/m ³
Particulate Matter < 2.5 micrometers (PM_{2.5})			
24 Hour	--	NM	NM
Annual Arithmetic Mean	--	NM	NM
Ozone (O₃)			
1 Hour	86 ug/m ³ (.044 ppm)	NM	NM
8 Hour	--	NM	NM
Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)			
3 Hour	34 ug/m ³ (.013 ppm)	NM	NM
24 Hour	13 ug/m ³ (.005 ppm)	NM	NM
Annual Arithmetic Mean	3 ug/m ³ (.001 ppm)	NM	NM
Lead (Pb)			
Quarterly Average	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³	1.5 ug/m ³

Note: NM - not monitored

Sources: Hawaii Air Quality Data 1996, HDOH, Clean Air Branch
Air Quality Study for the Proposed Kahului Airport Improvements, B.D. Neal & Associates, December 1995

6.4 Methodology

The potential adverse impacts of the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway due to increased vehicular activity in the study area must be investigated. Localized areas of concern for CO, such as heavily utilized and/or congested intersections, referred to as potential "hot spots", were analyzed consistent with FHWA and EPA project impact review requirements.

As stated in the EPA Conformity Guidelines, the need for a hot spot analysis is determined as follows:

- A hot spot analysis may be necessary if the project worsens an intersection's traffic level of service (LOS) from C or D.
- A hot spot analysis may be necessary if the intersection LOS is D or worse and the project substantially increases vehicular delay.

After reviewing the traffic data developed for the Kihai-Upcountry Air Quality Analysis, and based on FHWA and EPA project impact review requirements, it was determined that a detailed microscale "hot spot" analysis would not be required to meet federal air quality requirements. However, Hawaii's 1- and 8-hour SAAQS for CO are 4.5 and 9 ppm, respectively, much more restrictive than the NAAQS of 9 and 35 ppm, respectively. Therefore, to insure conformity to both the SAAQS and NAAQS, study intersections were ranked according to build LOS and volumes, and only the following two sites received detailed CO analysis because they represent the termini with the worst predicted traffic conditions:

- Site #1: Halimalie Road / Haleakala Highway / Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway intersection - Alternatives U1,K1 and U1,K2; and
- Site #2: Kaonoulu Street / Piilani Highway / Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway intersection - Alternative U1,K1

The two sites are worst-case representatives of predictions for all study area intersections under Build conditions, and for that reason an intersection by intersection comparison with estimated No Build levels was not necessary to determine conformity to both the SAAQS and NAAQS.

Microscale air quality modeling was performed using the most recent version of the EPA mobile source emission factor model (MOBILE 5A) and the CAL3QHC version 2 air quality dispersion model to estimate Build CO levels.

6.4.1 Vehicular Emissions

Vehicular Emissions were estimated using the EPA Mobile 5A vehicular emission factor model (User's Guide to MOBILE 5A, Mobile Source Emission Factor Model, Publication No. EPA-AA-TEB-92, Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 1993).

The type of vehicles using the facility affects total emissions. The percentages of each type of vehicle used for this analysis were based on the EPA's recommended national average fleet mix.

Emissions estimates account for three possible vehicle operating conditions: cold-vehicle operation, hot-start operation and hot-stabilized operation. CO emissions are greatest when engines are cold (cold-vehicle operation) and when engines are restarted shortly after they were shut off (hot-start operation). EPA-recommended vehicular operating conditions were used in this analysis (20.6% cold, 27.3%, hot).

Emissions are also greatly affected by speed, ambient temperature, vehicle age and mileage distribution. Ambient temperature was recommended by EPA, as was the usage of national average vehicle age and mileage distribution. Emission estimates used for this analysis can be found in Appendix B.

6.4.2 Dispersion Model

Mobile source models are the basic analytical tools used to estimate CO concentrations expected under given traffic, roadway geometry, and meteorological conditions. The mathematical expressions and formulations that comprise the various models attempt to describe an extremely complex physical phenomenon as closely as possible. The dispersion modeling program used in this study for estimating pollutant concentrations near roadway intersections is the CAL3QHC dispersion model (Version 2.0) developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Version 2, released in 1992, allows a more specific determination of the traffic characteristics occurring at a roadway intersection.

CAL3QHC is a Gaussian model recommended in the EPA Guidelines for Modeling Carbon Monoxide from Roadway Intersections (EPA-454/R-92-005). Gaussian models assume that the dispersion of pollutants downwind of a pollution source follow a normal distribution around the center of the pollution source.

Different emission rates occur when vehicles are stopped (idling), accelerating, decelerating and moving at different average speeds. CAL3QHC simplifies these different emission rates into the following two components:

- Emissions when vehicles are stopped (idling) during the red phase of a signalized intersection.
- Emissions when vehicles are in motion during the green phase of a signalized intersection.

The CAL3QHC version 2 air quality dispersion model has undergone extensive testing by the EPA and has been found to provide reliable estimates of inert (non-reactive) pollutant concentrations resulting from emissions from motor vehicles. A complete description of the model can be found in the User's Guide to CAL3QHC version 2.0: A Modeling Methodology for Predicting Pollutant Concentrations near Roadway Intersections, EPA-454/R-92-006.

Appendix C contains all CAL3QHC version 2 data and output information.

6.4.3 Receptor Locations

CO levels resulting from motor vehicles using the proposed project and associated roadways were estimated near the two sites selected for detailed analysis based on the ranking of termini intersections as outlined above. The sites were modeled using the CAL3QHC version 2 model and receptors were placed in accordance with EPA's Guidelines for Modeling Carbon Monoxide from Roadway Intersections, EPA-454/R-92-005.

6.4.4 Meteorological Conditions

The transport and concentration of pollutants emitted from motor vehicles are influenced by three principal meteorological factors: wind direction, wind speed, and the temperature profile of the atmosphere. The values for these parameters were chosen to maximize pollutant concentrations at each prediction site (i.e., to establish a conservative worst case situation).

- **Wind Direction** Maximum CO concentrations are normally found when the wind is assumed to blow approximately parallel to a single roadway adjacent to the receptor location. At complex intersections, however, it is difficult to predict which wind angle will result in maximum concentrations. At each receptor location, therefore, the approximate wind angle that would result in maximum pollutant concentrations was used in the analysis. All wind angles from 0° to 360° (in 5° increments) were considered.
- **Wind Speed** CO concentrations are greatest at low wind speeds. A conservative wind speed of 4 meters per second (8.8 miles per hour) was used to predict CO concentrations during peak traffic periods. This wind speed is the lowest average monthly wind speed recorded at the Kahului Airport in Local Climatological Data Annual Summary for 1980.
- **Temperature and Profile of the Atmosphere** An ambient temperature of 76 °F, a 'mixing' height (the height in the atmosphere to which pollutants will rise) of 1000 meters, and 'D' or neutral atmospheric stability conditions were used in estimating mesoscale CO concentrations. The selection of these meteorological parameters was based on recommendations from the Hawaii Department of Transportation and the EPA. This data was found to be the most representative of the conditions existing along the project area.

The estimated CO levels will be the maximum concentrations which could be expected to occur at each air quality receptor site analyzed because they result from assuming the simultaneous occurrence of all worst case parameters (peak hour traffic conditions, conservative vehicular operating conditions, low wind speeds, low atmospheric temperature, neutral atmospheric conditions, and the maximizing wind direction).

6.4.5 Persistence Factor

Peak 8-hour concentrations of CO were obtained by multiplying the highest peak hour CO estimates by 0.7. This factor, recommended by USEPA, takes account of the fact

that over eight hours (as distinct from a single hour) vehicle volumes will fluctuate downwards from the peak, vehicle speeds may vary, and meteorological conditions including wind speeds and wind direction will change to some degree as compared to the very conservative assumptions used for the single hour.

6.4.6 Analysis Years

Microscale carbon monoxide analyses have been performed using traffic for the project's design year of 2022.

6.4.7 Background Concentrations

Microscale modeling is used to predict CO concentrations resulting from emissions from motor vehicles using roadways immediately adjacent to the location at which predictions are being made. A CO 'background' level must be added to this value to account for CO entering the area from other sources upwind of the location at which predictions are being made.

A background level of 0.012 ppm was used for both the one- and eight-hour study periods. This level was based on 1989 ambient CO background monitored data used in the PSD Permit Application for Maalaea Combined Cycle Project, Maui Electric Company (MECO), August 1990.

6.4.8 Traffic Information

Traffic data for the air quality analysis was derived from a traffic inventory provided by the State DOT and traffic developed for the air quality analysis. The microscale carbon monoxide analysis was performed based on data from this network for the AM and PM peak traffic periods. These are the periods when maximum traffic volumes are expected to occur, and when the greatest traffic and air quality impacts of the proposed project are expected.

Appendix D contains all traffic information used for the air quality analysis.

7. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

7.1 Mesoscale Impacts

Since the change in regional VMT levels is predicted to be smaller under the Build condition than under the No Build condition, no quantified regional air quality analysis was conducted. In addition, a mesoscale analysis is not required as the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway is included in the current State of Hawaii Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), 1997, for Fiscal Years 1998-2000, and the regional effects of this project are incorporated into and satisfied the requirements of the conforming SIP.

7.2 Microscale Impacts

Maximum 1-hour and 8-hour carbon monoxide levels were predicted at sensitive receptor sites within the proposed Kihai-Upcountry's study area. The results of this analysis are given in Tables 3 and 4.

The levels predicted in this analysis are expected to be the highest microscale impacts due to the project within the study area. The three study intersections are worst-case representations of predictions for all study intersections under Build conditions. No violations of the Federal or State one or eight hour CO standards are predicted.

As the project is not predicted to cause or exacerbate a violation of the applicable air quality standards, it conforms to the goals set forth in the Clean Air Act Amendments.

**Table 3
Predicted Worst-Case 1-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)***

Site	Description	Alter.	State Std.	Build (Year 2022)	
				AM	PM
1	Haleakala Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K1	9	0.81	0.71
1	Haleakala Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K2	9	0.91	0.61
2	Kaopulu Street / Pihani Highway intersection	U1,K1	9	0.81	0.81

Note * 1-hr CO Background = 0.12 ppm

**Table 4
Predicted Worst-Case 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm)***

Site	Description	Alternative	State Standard	Build (Year 2022)
1	Haleakala Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K1	4.5	0.07
1	Haleakala Road / Haleakala Highway intersection	U1,K2	4.5	0.08
2	Kaopulu Street / Pihani Highway intersection	U1,K1	4.5	0.07

Note * 8-hr CO Background = 0.12 ppm

8. CONFORMANCE WITH THE STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (SIP) FOR AIR QUALITY

The State of Hawaii has been classified as an attainment area for ozone, PM₁₀ and carbon monoxide. As an attainment area, the State must demonstrate that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards will continue to be observed. The microscale analysis for the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway demonstrates that no violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards are predicted. The goals set forth in the New Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 are to insure that no violations of these standards are created or worsened. The project meets these goals and as such will not affect the State of Hawaii's current attainment status.

The Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project has been included in the current STIP, 1997, for Fiscal Years 1996-2000. As described earlier, the STIP is a multi-year, multimodal transportation improvement program that has been developed using existing transportation plans and policies, and current highway, transit, and transportation programming processes as required under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA).

9. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

The air quality impacts of the proposed action would be limited to short-term increased fugitive dust and mobile source emissions during construction.

9.1 Fugitive Dust Emissions

Fugitive dust is airborne particulate matter, generally of a relatively large particulate size. Construction-related fugitive dust would be generated by haul trucks, concrete trucks, delivery trucks, and other earth moving vehicles operating around the construction sites. This would be due primarily to particulate matter resuspended ('kicked up') by vehicle movement over paved and unpaved roads and other surfaces, dirt tracked onto paved surfaces from unpaved areas at access points, and material blown from uncovered haul trucks.

Generally, the distance that particles drift from their source depends on their size, emission height, and wind speed. Small particles (30 to 100 micron range) can travel several hundred feet before settling to the ground, depending on wind speed. Most fugitive dust, however, is made up of relatively large particles (i.e., particles greater than 100 microns in diameter). These particles are responsible for the reduced visibility often associated with this type of construction. Given their relatively large size, these particles tend to settle within 20 to 30 feet of their source.

In order to minimize the amount of construction dust generated, the guidelines below should be followed. Since the project is in a PM₁₀ non-attainment area, all the proposed particulate control measures related to construction activities should be

followed. The following preventative and mitigative measures should be taken to minimize the possible particulate pollution problem:

- I. Site Preparation
 - A. Minimize land disturbance;
 - B. Use watering trucks to minimize dust;
 - C. Cover trucks when hauling dirt;
 - D. Stabilize the surface of dirt piles if not removed immediately;
 - E. Use windbreaks to prevent any accidental dust pollution;
 - F. Limit vehicular paths and stabilize these temporary roads; and
 - G. Pave all unpaved construction roads and parking areas to road grade for a length no less than 50 feet where such roads and parking areas exit the construction site to prevent dirt from washing onto paved roadways.
- II. Construction
 - A. Cover trucks when transferring materials;
 - B. Use dust suppressants on traveled paths which are not paved;
 - C. Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities; and
 - D. Minimize dirt track-out by washing or cleaning trucks before leaving the construction site (alternative to this strategy is to pave a few hundred feet of the exit road, just before entering the public road).
- III. Post Construction
 - A. Revegetate any disturbed land not used;
 - B. Remove unused material;
 - C. Remove dirt piles; and
 - D. Revegetate all vehicular paths created during construction to avoid future off-road vehicular activities

9.2 Mobile Source Emissions

As discussed previously, carbon monoxide (CO) is the principal pollutant of concern when considering localized air quality impacts of motor vehicles. Since emissions of CO from motor vehicles increase with decreasing vehicle speed, disruption of traffic during construction could result in short-term elevated concentrations of CO, the temporary reduction of roadway capacity, and the increased queue lengths. In order to minimize the amount of emissions generated, every effort should be made during the construction phase to limit disruption to traffic, especially during peak travel periods.

10. REFERENCES

- User's Guide to CAL3QHC, Version 2.0: A Modeling Methodology for Predicting Pollutant Concentrations near Roadway Intersections; EPA-454/R-92, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality, Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC; November 1992.
- User's Guide to MOBILE 5A; EPA-AA-TEB-92, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Mobile Sources, Emission Control Technology Division, Test and Evaluation Branch, Ann Arbor, MI; March 1993.
- Guideline for Modeling Carbon Monoxide from Roadway Intersections; EPA-454/R-92-005, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality, Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, NC; November 1992.
- U.S. Congress, Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (P.L. 101-549)
- State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Monitoring Data; State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Environmental Management Division, Clean Air Branch; January 1995.
- Local Climatological Data for Kahului, Hawaii - 1980; U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Table 4-14 Island of Kauai: Monthly Summary of 24-hour Average PM-10 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ave
Lihue	24	24	17	22	16	17	16	19	23	22	19	17	20

Table 4-15 Island of Maui: Monthly Summary of 24-hour Average PM-10 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Ave
Kihei ^a						3	3	3	3	9	8	10	6
Paia ^b								16	16	24	20	19	19

^a Kihei station started operation in June 1996

^b Paia station started operation in August 1996

AIR QUALITY STUDY
FOR THE PROPOSED
KAHULUI AIRPORT IMPROVEMENTS

KAHULUI, MAUI

Prepared for:

Edward K. Noda and Associates, Inc.

December 1995



B. D. NEAL & ASSOCIATES
Applied Meteorology • Air Quality • Computer Science
P.O. BOX 6319, OCEAN VIEW, HAWAII 96761-6319
TELEPHONE (808) 534-1117 • FAX (808) 534-7393

Table 7
AMBIENT BACKGROUND AIR QUALITY DATA FOR
MAALAEA, MAUI - JUNE 1989 THROUGH DECEMBER 1989

Pollutant	Averaging Period	Concentration		Percentage of Standard	
		(ppb)	(µg/m ³)	State	National
Sulfur Dioxide	3-hour	13	34	3	3
	24-hour Annual	5	13	4	4
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual	1	3	4	4
	Annual	3	6	9	6
Ozone	1-hour Annual	44	86	86	37
	Annual	16	31	-	-
Carbon Monoxide	1-hour	12	14	<1	<1
	8-hour	5	6	<1	<1
Particulate Matter	24-hour Annual	-	56	37	37
	Annual	-	14	28	28

Notes:

- The data given in the table were obtained by Maui Electric Company at Site No. 233 located approximately 1 mile north of Maalaea power plant. Concentrations shown in the table for averaging times shorter than annual are the highest concentrations recorded during the period June 10, 1989 through December 31, 1989. Annual average concentrations for all pollutants are based on the 7-month period.
- Concentrations shown in the table for averaging times shorter than annual do not include periods when the on-shore flow (southerly flow between 130 and 230 degrees) persists, as this would include the Maalaea Generating Station emissions.

Source: Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permit Application for Maalaea Combined Cycle Project, Maui Electric Co., Revised, August 1990.

Appendix B

Mobile5A Emissions

(Not included. Can be reviewed at the highways planning branch of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation.)

Appendix C

CAL3QHCV2 Data and Outputs

(Not included. Can be reviewed at the highways planning branch of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation.)

**Appendix D
 Traffic**

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R
No. Lanes	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	2
Volumes	1	49	176	101	281	1982	63	1752
PHF or PK15	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Heavy Veh	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Parking	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops								
Con. Peds								
Ped Button	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols		136						
Lost Time	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share								
Prop. Prot.								

Phase Combination 1 2 3 4
 Signal Operations

	1	2	3	4
EB Left	*			
Thru	*			
Right	*			
Peds				
WB Left				*
Thru				*
Right				*
Peds				*
NB Left				*
Thru				*
Right				*
Peds				*
SB Right				*
Green	18.0A			
Yellow/AR	5.0			
Cycle Length	90 secs			

Phase combination order: #1 #5 #6 #7

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Cap	Adj Sat	Flow	v/c	Ratio	g/c	Delay	LOS	Approach
EB L	94	376	0.012	0.222	17.6	C	18.1	C	
T	418	1881	0.124	0.222	16.1	C			
R	418	1881	0.000	0.222	0.0	A			
WB LT	342	1540	0.851	0.222	34.2	D	30.7	D	
R	355	1599	0.236	0.222	16.6	C			
L	413	1770	0.717	0.233	24.6	C	29.8	D	
T	2153	3725	1.017	0.578	31.3	D			
R	915	1593	0.072	0.578	5.4	B			
L	177	1770	0.006	0.100	23.6	C	11.8	B	
T	1656	3725	0.502	0.444	11.8	B			
R	704	1593	0.001	0.444	9.0	B			

Intersection Delay = 25.6 sec/veh Intersection LOS = D
 Lost Time/Cycle, L = 9.0 sec Critical v/c(x) = 0.664

HCM: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Version 2.4c 08-03-1998
 Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas
 Streets: (E-W) Haliimaile/Bypass (N-S) Haleakala Highway
 Analyst: Miyamoto File Name: UIK1PM.HC9
 Area Type: Other
 Comment: Year 2022, UIK1 8-3-98 Evening

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	T	L	T	L	T	L	T
No. Lanes	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	2
Volumes	124	357	170	75	130	659	152	1728
PHF or PK15	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Heavy Veh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parking	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Con. Peds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped Button	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols	130	300	130	300	152	300	152	300
Lost Time	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Prot.								

Phase Combination 1 2 3 4
 Signal Operations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
WB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
NB Right								
SB Right								
Green	22.0A							
Yellow/AR	5.0				8.0A	45.0A		
Cycle Length	90 secs							

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Cap	Adj Sat Flow	v/c Ratio	Delay	LOS	Approach
EB L	149	550	0.007	15.7	C	18.7
T	502	1881	0.267	16.9	C	
R	426	1599	0.561	19.6	C	
WB LT	293	1098	0.881	38.0	D	37.9
R	426	1599	0.002	15.6	C	
NB L	199	1787	0.690	31.4	D	11.9
T	1965	3762	0.371	8.3	B	
R	982	1881	0.000	0.0	A	
SB L	199	1787	0.005	23.0	C	24.2
T	1965	3762	0.972	24.2	C	
R	835	1599	0.001	6.6	B	

Intersection Delay = 21.5 sec/veh Intersection LOS = C
 Lost Time/Cycle, L = 9.0 sec Critical v/c(x) = 0.910

HCM: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Version 2.4e 08-03-1998
 Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas
 Streets: (E-W) Haliimaile/Bypass (N-S) Haleakala Highway
 Analyst: Miyamoto File Name: UIK2AM.HC9
 Area Type: Other
 Comment: Year 2022, UIK2 8-3-98 Morning

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	T	L	T	L	T	L	T
No. Lanes	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	2
Volumes	139	100	176	72	80	191	1984	63
PHF or PK15	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Heavy Veh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parking	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Con. Peds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped Button	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols	100	300	100	300	63	300	300	300
Lost Time	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Prot.								

Phase Combination 1 2 3 4
 Signal Operations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
WB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
NB Right								
SB Right								
Green	16.0A							
Yellow/AR	5.0				7.0A	40.0A		
Cycle Length	90 secs							

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Cap	Adj Sat Flow	v/c Ratio	Delay	LOS	Approach
EB L	64	418	0.012	16.6	C	19.0
T	376	1881	0.109	19.0	C	
R	376	1881	0.000	0.0	A	
WB LT	313	1564	0.834	34.3	D	30.7
R	320	1599	0.263	19.7	C	
NB L	413	1770	0.487	20.0	C	22.2
T	2235	3725	0.981	22.4	C	
R	1118	1863	0.000	0.0	A	
SB L	177	1770	0.006	23.6	C	11.1
T	1739	3725	0.509	11.1	B	
R	739	1583	0.001	8.3	B	

Intersection Delay = 20.3 sec/veh Intersection LOS = C
 Lost Time/Cycle, L = 9.0 sec Critical v/c(x) = 0.840

HCM: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Version 2.4e 08-03-1998

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas
 Streets: (E-W) Hallimaille/Bypass (N-S) Haleakala Highway
 Analyst: Miyamoto File Name: U1K2PM.HC9
 Area Type: Other 8-3-98 Evening
 Comment: Year 2022, U1K2

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	T	L	R	L	T	L	R
No. Lanes	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1
Volumes	1	66	263	170	60	1	97	704
PHF or PK15	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Heavy Veh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parking	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Con. Peds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped Button	(Y/N)	N	3	3	3	3	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols	97	97	152	152	152	152	152	152
Lost Time	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Prot.								

Phase Combination 1 2 3 4
 Signal Operations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
WB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
EB Right								
SB Right								
Green	16.0A							
Yellow/AR	5.0							
Cycle Length	90 secs							

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Cap	Adj Sat	v/c	Ratio	g/c	Delay	LOS	Approach
EB L	97	485	0.010	0.200	0.200	18.6	C	21.5
EB T	376	1881	0.183	0.200	0.200	19.3	C	
EB R	320	1599	0.547	0.200	0.200	22.4	C	
WB LT	283	1414	0.856	0.200	0.200	37.5	D	37.4
WB L	320	1599	0.003	0.200	0.200	18.6	C	
WB T	199	1787	0.514	0.111	0.111	26.2	D	8.6
WB R	2216	3762	0.351	0.589	0.589	6.2	B	
SB L	1108	1881	0.000	0.589	0.589	0.0	A	
SB T	199	1787	0.005	0.111	0.111	23.0	C	15.0
SB R	2216	3762	0.909	0.589	0.589	15.0	B	
Lost Time/Cycle	942	1599	0.001	0.589	0.589	4.9	A	

Intersection Delay = 15.4 sec/veh Intersection LOS = C
 Critical v/c(x) = 0.848

HCM: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Version 2.4e 08-03-1998

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas
 Streets: (E-W) Kaonoulu/Bypass (N-S) Pilihi Highway
 Analyst: Miyamoto File Name: K1U1AM.HC9
 Area Type: Other 7-30-98 Morning
 Comment: Year 2022, U1K1

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	T	L	R	L	T	L	R
No. Lanes	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2
Volumes	0	0	0	0	0	1766	187	58
PHF or PK15	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Heavy Veh	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Parking	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Con. Peds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped Button	(Y/N)	N	3	3	3	3	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols	58	58	187	187	187	187	187	187
Lost Time	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Prot.								

Phase Combination 1 2 3 4
 Signal Operations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
WB Left	*							
Thru	*							
Right	*							
Peds	*							
EB Right								
SB Right								
Green	21.0A							
Yellow/AR	5.0							
Cycle Length	90 secs							

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Cap	Adj Sat	v/c	Ratio	g/c	Delay	LOS	Approach
WB L	457	1787	0.815	0.256	0.256	27.9	D	25.9
WB R	409	1599	0.203	0.256	0.256	17.0	C	
NB T	2009	3689	0.972	0.544	0.544	23.3	C	23.3
SB L	175	1752	0.000	0.544	0.544	0.0	A	
SB T	2501	3689	0.504	0.100	0.100	24.9	C	5.7
Lost Time/Cycle	L = 9.0 sec					4.7	A	

Intersection Delay = 17.4 sec/veh Intersection LOS = C
 Critical v/c(x) = 0.858

HCM: SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION SUMMARY Version 2.4e 07-31-1998
 Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas
 Streets: (E-W) Kaonoulu/Quade & Douglas
 Analyst: Miyamoto
 Area Type: Other
 Comment: Year 2022, UIK1
 File Name: KIU1PM.HC9
 (N-S) Piilani Highway
 7-30-98 Evening

	Eastbound		Westbound		Northbound		Southbound	
	L	R	L	R	L	R	L	R
No. Lanes	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	2
Volumes			202	45	1476	449	176	1536
PHF or PK15			0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Lane W (ft)			12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
Grade			0	0	0	0	0	0
& Heavy Veh			1	1	2	2	2	2
Parking			N	N	N	N	N	N
Bus Stops			0	0	0	0	0	0
Con. Peds			0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped Button			(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N	(Y/N)	N
Arr Type			3	3	3	3	3	3
RTOR Vols			3	45	202	202	3	3
Lost Time			3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Prop. Share								
Prop. Prot.								

Signal Operations

Phase Combination	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
EB Left								
Thru								
Right								
Peds								
SB Left	*							
Thru								
Right								
Peds								
EB Right								
SB Right								
Green	14.0A							
Yellow/AR	5.0							
Cycle Length	90 secs							

Green 12.0A 4S 0A
 Yellow/AR 5.0 5.0
 Cycle Length: 90 secs Phase combination order: #1 #5 #6

Intersection Performance Summary

Lane Group	Adj Sat	V/C	Ratio	Delay	LOS	Approach
EB L	1787	0.670	0.178	26.0	D	D
EB R	1881	0.000	0.178	0.0	A	D
EB T	2111	0.773	0.567	11.0	B	B
SB L	1583	0.290	0.567	6.6	B	B
SB R	1770	0.672	0.156	27.4	D	B
SB T	2015	0.603	0.756	3.5	A	B

Intersection Delay = 9.1 sec/veh
 Intersection LOS = B
 Lost Time/Cycle, L = 9.0 sec Critical v/c(x) = 0.735

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX G

Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project

Project Number: HDPS-9203(1)

Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION..... 1
3. EXISTING CONDITIONS..... 4
 3.1 Background..... 4
 3.2 Noise Standards..... 4
 3.3 Noise Sensitive Sites and Existing Noise Levels..... 5
4. FUTURE TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS..... 8
 4.1 Prediction Methodology..... 8
 4.2 Noise Impact Analysis..... 9
 4.2.1 No-Build Alternative..... 9
 4.2.2 Build Alternatives..... 9
5. CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS..... 12
6. MITIGATION MEASURES..... 13
 6.1 Future Traffic Noise..... 13
 6.2 Construction Phase..... 14
7. REFERENCES..... 16

Prepared for:

**State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration**

Prepared by:

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

LIST OF FIGURES

1 Project Location..... 2
2 Alternatives..... 3
3 Noise Receptor Sites..... 7

LIST OF TABLES

1 Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC)..... 6
2 Existing Noise Levels..... 8
3 Predicted Year 2020 Noise Levels..... 10
4 Construction Equipment Noise Levels..... 13

October 1998

1. INTRODUCTION

This report documents an analysis of potential traffic noise impacts of the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project on the island of Maui, Hawaii. This study was prepared in accordance with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) rules and procedures and the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy (October 1996, approved by FHWA on June 26, 1997) (hereinafter referred to as Noise Policy). Its elements include:

1. Measurements of existing noise levels at representative noise sensitive receptors;
2. Prediction of future traffic noise levels;
3. Comparison of existing and predicted future traffic noise levels with the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC);
4. Recommendations to reduce noise impacts;
5. Evaluation of possible noise barriers; and
6. The effects of construction noise and proposed mitigation measures.


2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway project on the island of Maui, Hawaii. Figure 1 shows the general project location. The proposed highway would connect Piilani Highway with either Haleakala Highway or Kula Highway, directly linking the Kihai-Makena region with the Upcountry Maui region.

The alternatives under consideration are eight possible combinations of two Kihai terminus options and four Upcountry terminus options. Figure 2 shows the candidate Upcountry and Kihai termini and the alignment segments or "footprints" that would be used to link the termini. As shown on this figure, the Kihai termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3.

Descriptions of the alternatives are as follows:

1. **Alternative U1,K1.** This alternative would extend from the Haleakala Highway/Haliimaile Road intersection in Upcountry, following a south to southwest alignment for approximately 10 km (6.25 miles), and then a western alignment to the Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection.
2. **Alternative U1,K2.** This alternative is the same as Alternative U1,K1 from the Upcountry terminus. However, instead of terminating at the Kaonoulu



Project Location
KIHAI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum
FIGURE 1

Street/Piilani Highway intersection, this alternative would proceed in a southwest direction to the Ke Aii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection.


3. **Alternative U2-A,K1.** This alternative would extend west from the existing Pukalani Bypass/Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection in Upcountry, to an alignment common with U1. The Kihei terminus would be at the Kaonoulu Street/Piilani Highway intersection.
4. **Alternative U2-A,K2.** This alternative would be from the "Five Trees" intersection to the Ke Aii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection.
5. **Alternative U2-B,K1.** This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway at approximately 700 m (2300 ft) south of the "Five Trees" intersection. The alignment runs parallel with Segment U2-A for about 3000 m (10,000 ft), and then shares the same U2-A alignment and U1/U2 alignment. The U2-B,K1 alternative's Kihei terminus is at the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.
6. **Alternative U2-B,K2.** This alternative is shares the same Upcountry terminus and alignment as the Alternative U2-B,K-1. This alternative's Kihei terminus is at the Piilani Highway/Ke Aii Alanui Street intersection.
7. **Alternative U3,K1.** This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piilani Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection in Kihei.
8. **Alternative U3,K2.** This alternative would extend west from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Ke Aii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection.

The roadway right-of-way would be a minimum 49 m (160 ft) in rural areas and a minimum 37 m (120 ft) in urban areas. The roadway would include one 3.7 m (12 ft) lane in each direction, and paved shoulders. The minimum 49 m (160 ft) right-of-way is being reserved because the highway may be expanded to four lanes (two lanes in each direction) in the future.

3. EXISTING CONDITIONS


3.1 Background

Noise is defined as any sound that is undesirable or interferes with normal human activities. The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity and represents the ratio between a given sound and the faintest sound detectable by human hearing. Because sound pressure levels vary widely within the range of human hearing, the dB scale is logarithmic. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies within the entire sound spectrum. Accordingly, noise measurements are made using an A-weighting (dBA) scale to correspond to human perceptions of noise. A-scale sound levels are currently in use in many community and city noise ordinances and in state and city highway or traffic noise codes.



Source: Warren S. Uemori, Engineering, Inc.

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Alternatives
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum
FIGURE 2

Time variation in noise exposure is typically accounted for as a constant energy level equivalent (L_{eq}) for a given time period. The L_{eq} is the constant noise level over some specified period of time that is equivalent in energy to a fluctuating (or brief) noise "averaged" over that period of time. L_{eq} is also a function of time and is expressed as $L_{eq}(t)$ (time period). For example, $L_{eq}(h)$, expressed in A-weighted decibels (dBA), is the calculated constant noise over one hour which is equivalent in total energy to the varying noise levels actually measured during that one hour.

3.2 Noise Standards

The SDOT Noise Policy implements FHWA regulations on noise abatement (23 CFR 772) for the State of Hawaii. The regulations and policy require that a noise analysis be performed whenever potentially affected receptors exist, either as developed lands or lands that are planned, designed or programmed for future use.

The FHWA has established Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC), shown on Table 1, for different exterior and interior land use activities. The NAC do not constitute legally enforceable noise standards, but represent a yardstick for evaluating the effect of project noise on the surrounding community. The NAC have been adopted by the State of Hawaii as its standard.

Under SDOT policy, a noise impact occurs when the predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the NAC, or when the predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise levels. "Approach" means at least 1 dBA less than the NAC, and "substantially exceed the existing noise levels" means an increase of at least 15 dBA, if the NAC are approached or exceeded, or if there is a substantial increase above the existing noise level, noise abatement measures must be considered.

Changes in traffic noise are assessed using human perceptions of sound level changes. Generally, changes in noise levels of less than 3 dBA are barely perceptible to most listeners, but a 10 dBA change is perceived as a doubling (or halving) of noise levels. These guidelines permit estimation of an individual's probable perception of changes in noise levels.

3.3 Noise Sensitive Sites and Existing Noise Levels

Existing and future planned noise sensitive land uses, and activities adjacent to the project alternatives were identified from site inspections and existing mapping. These land use activities include residences, recreation and park areas, and institutions such as schools. A total of thirteen sites were selected as representative of existing and future noise sensitive land uses, and their locations area shown on Figure 3. Only Site 4 does not represent a noise sensitive land use. The area surrounding Site 4 is presently used for sugarcane cultivation, and there are no official plans to convert this area to an urban land use. Therefore, this site is considered Activity Category D (see Table 1) and has no NAC. This site was selected because this is the location of the U1 terminus. The other 12 sites are considered Activity Category B (see Table 1), and have a NAC of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA.

**Table 1
Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC)**

Activity Category	$L_{eq}(h)$ for Noisiest Traffic Hour - dBA	Description of Activity
A	57 (Exterior)	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
B	67 (Exterior)	Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals.
C	72 (Exterior)	Developed lands, properties, or activities not included in Categories A or B.
D	---	Undeveloped lands
E	52 (Interior)	Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and auditoriums.

Notes: $L_{eq}(h)$ is the one-hour energy equivalent sound level.

Interior noise level standards apply to:

1. Indoor activities for those parcels where no exterior noise sensitive land use or activities have been identified; and
2. Situations where the exterior activities are either remote from the highway or shielded, so that while the exterior activities remain undisturbed, noise nevertheless affects interior activities.

Source: Federal Highway Administration

Noise measurements at the noise receptor sites were taken in June, 1997, from between the hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Only Site 1, which is located in a residential community east (mauka) of Pihani Highway near the K1 alignment, was not measured between these hours. This site is approximately 600 m (2000 ft) from the K1 alignment, and under normal circumstances would probably not have been selected as noise receptor site because of this far distance. It was selected because of comments from people living in that community, that noise impacts would occur from early morning transports (buses, vans, cars) to the Haleakala Summit. Many tourists staying in West Maui and Kihai-Makena travel to the summit daily to watch its

spectacular sunrise. Noise measurements at this site were taken 5:00 a.m. All noise measurements were sampled for 20-minute periods, and the results are presented in Table 2.

Existing noise levels at the 13 noise receptor sites range from 39 dBA to 68 dBA. The only site that approaches the NAC of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA is Site 7. The high noise level at this site, and the noise levels at many of the other sites, are primarily caused by traffic movements on nearby roadways.

Table 2
Existing Noise Levels


Site No.	Location	Land Use Activity	Noise Level (L_{eq} (dBA))
1	Ohukai community (Ohukai St.)	Residential	39
2	Kamali Elementary School	School	58
3	Omaoipio Homesteads	Residential	53
4	Haleakala Hwy. / Halimale Rd. Intersection	Agriculture	68
5	Pukalani community (Alani St.)	Residential	57
6	Kula 200 community	Residential	51
7	Kula residence along Kula Hwy.	Residential	66
8	Pulehu community (Holopuni Rd.)	Residential	47
9	Future Kamehameha School	School	53
10	Pihani Hwy. / Kaonouli St. Intersection	Residential	60
11	Future Kihei Regional Park	Park	45
12	King Kekaulike High School	School	49
13	Unnamed Road off of Kula Hwy. near Five Trees Intersection	Residential	49

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, June 1997

4. FUTURE TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACTS

4.1 Prediction Methodology

The future year Build traffic noise levels were modeled at thirteen noise sensitive sites along the proposed project alternative alignments using the STAMINA 2.0 Highway Traffic Noise Modeling Program (FHWA, 1982). Impacts were calculated for the Year 2020.



Noise Monitoring Sites
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Noise Analysis Technical Memorandum
FIGURE 3

Input variables to noise modeling and analysis include traffic volumes, speeds and vehicle fleet mix (auto, medium truck, and heavy truck percentages). The noise analysis considers the following traffic scenarios:

- Two-lane facility - sunrise hours (5:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m.);
- Two-lane facility - peak hour;
- Two-lane facility - roadway operating at level of service (LOS) C; and
- Four-lane facility - roadway operating at LOS C.

LOS C is a qualitative traffic condition, on a scale from A to F, where traffic volume is at the capacity of the roadway and vehicles operate at the allowable speed limit. This is considered to be the noisiest of the six level of service conditions. The analysis assumes that existing and future traffic conditions have the same vehicle mix and vehicle speeds. The traffic modeling assumptions are presented in Appendix A.

4.2 Noise Impact Analysis

In terms of the one-hour $L_{eq}(h)$ noise descriptor, noise impact could potentially require mitigation if either of the following conditions is predicted to occur:

- future year traffic noise approaches or exceeds the FHWA NAC; or
- future year traffic noise substantially exceeds (15 dBA or more) the existing ambient noise level

Table 3 summarizes the results of the noise modeling at the thirteen receptor sites.

4.2.1 No-Build Alternative

Under the No-Build alternative, predicted future traffic noise levels are expected to be no more than a 1 dBA over the existing noise levels. The NAC of $L_{eq}(h)$ 67 dBA is predicted to be approached at Site 7 (see Table 3). All other sites are predicted to remain below the NAC.

4.2.2 Build Alternatives

This section describes the noise impacts of Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway under the four traffic scenarios described in Section 4.1. The predicted Build noise levels presented in Table 3 were modeled under certain alignments (e.g., U1, U2-A, K2, etc.). The "Segment" column in Table 3 specifies the alignment. The discussion in this section describes the noise impacts from a particular alignment, which in effect applies to two or four alternatives. For example, if a statement is made, "a U1 alternative is predicted to cause a X dBA increase at Site Y," then the impact would come from Alternatives U1, K1 and U1, K2.

Two-Lane Facility - Sunrise Hours
The predicted sunrise noise levels, presented in Table 3, represent the effects of traffic using the proposed highway and other roadways during the early morning hours. As described in Section 3.3, much of the early morning travel demand is caused by

**Table 3
Predicted Year 2020 Noise Levels**

Site	Location	Segment	Noise Levels ($L_{eq}(h)$) (dBA)					
			Existing	No-Build	Build Condition			
					Sunrise	Peak Hour	LOS C 2 Lanes	LOS C 4 Lanes
1	Ohukai community (Ohukai St.)	K1	39	40	42	46	48	55
2	Kamalu Elementary School	K2	58	59	46	60	61	63
3	Omaopio Homesteads	U2-A	53	54	52	59	63	66
		U2-B	53	54	52	59	63	66
4	Haleakala Hwy. / Halimalile Rd. Intersection	U1	68	69	49	69*	69*	69*
5	Pukalani community (Alani St.)	U2-A	57	58	48	56	59	62
		U2-B	57	58	45	58	60	62
6	Kula 200 community	U2-B	51	52	48	55	59	61
7	Kula residence along Kula Hwy.	U3	66	67	33	67*	67*	67*
8	Pulehu community (Holopuni Rd.)	U3	47	48	50	56	57	60
9	Future Kamhehameha School	U2-B	53	54	42	54	56	58
10	Pilani Hwy. / Kaonoulu St. Intersection	K1	60	61	52	62	63	70
11	Future Kihei Regional Park	K2	45	46	55	63	70	70
12	King Kekaulike High School	U2-A	49	50	40	51	53	55
		U2-B	49	50	38	50	52	53
13	Unnamed Road off of Haleakala Hwy. near Five Trees Intersection	U2-A	49	50	46	56	60	63
		U2-B	49	50	44	52	58	58

Notes: (XX) - Values that are underlined approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria.

* The predicted future traffic at Sites 4 and 7 results in noise levels that are lower than the predicted future No-Build noise levels. Therefore, future noise levels at these sites are assumed to be the same as the future No-Build levels.

Source: Parsons Brinckerhoff, 1997

tourists traveling to the Haleakala summit to watch its spectacular sunrise. However, these predicted noise levels do not include the cumulative effects of ambient early morning noise from other activities. Only Site 1 includes the effects of ambient early morning noise because measurements at this site were taken at 5:00 a.m. (see Section 3.3). The results in Table 3 indicate that the effects of early morning traffic would not cause future noise levels at the receptor sites to approach or exceed the NAC, including the effects of the K1 alternatives' traffic noise on Site 1. Site 1's sunrise noise levels are predicted to increase by 3 dBA over the existing ambient levels, which is considerably lower than the "substantial increase" definition of the SDOT Noise Policy. A 3 dBA increase is barely perceptible to the human ear.

Two-Lane Facility - Peak Hour

Under a two-lane Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, peak hour traffic noise levels at 12 of the 13 receptor sites are predicted to increase in the range of 1 dBA to 9 dBA over their existing ambient noise levels (see Table 3). If a K2 alternative is implemented, Site 11 peak hour noise levels are predicted to increase by 18 dBA over its existing ambient level. This is considered "substantial" according to the SDOT Noise Policy. If a U3 alternative is implemented, Site 7 is predicted to have peak hour noise levels ($L_{eq}(h)$) of 67 dBA that approach the NAC. However, this predicted $L_{eq}(h)$ is slightly lower, but assumed to be the same, as the predicted $L_{eq}(h)$ under the No-Build alternative. Therefore, there is no noise impact at this site. No other site is predicted to approach or exceed the NAC, including Site 4, which is predicted to have a peak hour $L_{eq}(h)$ of 69, because this site is considered an Activity Category D (see Section 3.3).

Two-Lane Facility - LOS C

Under a two-lane Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, LOS C noise levels at 12 of the 13 receptor sites are predicted to increase in the range of 1 dBA to 11 dBA over their existing ambient noise levels (see Table 3). Similar to the noise impacts under peak hour conditions (see above), Site 11 is predicted to have a "substantial increase" of 25 dBA, 7 dBA higher than under the peak hour condition, if a K2 alternative is implemented. The predicted $L_{eq}(h)$ of 70 dBA exceeds the NAC. Site 7 is also predicted to approach the NAC, with an $L_{eq}(h)$ of 67 dBA, if a U3 alternative is implemented. However, similar to the assessment above, there would be no noise impact because the No-Build $L_{eq}(h)$ is slightly higher than the LOS C $L_{eq}(h)$. No other site is predicted to approach or exceed the NAC.

Four-Lane Facility - LOS C

Under a four-lane Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway, LOS C noise levels at 11 of the 13 receptor sites are predicted to increase in the range of 1 dBA to 14 dBA over their existing ambient noise levels (see Table 3). Similar to the two-lane facility (peak hour and LOS C) conditions, Site 11 is predicted to have a "substantial increase" of 25 dBA and will exceed the NAC. Under this traffic scenario, Site 3 is predicted to have an $L_{eq}(h)$ of 66 dBA. Site 7 is predicted to have an $L_{eq}(h)$ of 67 dBA, and Site 10 is predicted to have an $L_{eq}(h)$ of 70 dBA, if a U2 (A or B), U3 or K1 alternative is implemented, respectively. These noise levels either approach or exceed the NAC. However, only Sites 3 and 10 are considered to have noise impacts under the four-lane facility - LOS C traffic scenario. Site 7 would not have a noise impact (see above).

5. CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS

Construction noise represents a short term impact on the noise environment. The duration and level of construction noise depend on the phase of activity, such as:

- ground clearing, demolition and removal of existing structures, trees, rocks and soil;
- excavation;
- placement of foundations and roadbeds;
- erection of structures including retaining walls; and
- finishing, including filling, grading, paving, landscaping and cleanup operations.

The first two phases, ground clearing and excavation, typically generate the highest noise levels. Noise generated by construction equipment, including trucks, graders, bulldozers, concrete mixers and portable generators can reach levels from 67 dBA to 98 dBA at 15 m (50 ft). Construction equipment noise emissions are regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency's Noise Control Program (Part 204 of Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations). Presently, air compressors are the only equipment under regulation, and no new regulations are currently under consideration. The State of Hawaii, Department of Health also regulates noise from construction activities (Hawaii Administrative Rule, Chapter 11-46, Community Noise Control).

Noise levels for equipment which might be used during the excavation and construction of the proposed project are presented in Table 6. The noise levels presented are at a reference distance of 15 m (50 ft). Since construction equipment noise levels decrease at a rate of approximately 6 dBA per doubling of distance, at 30 m (100 ft) the noise levels would be about 6 dBA less than the levels shown at 15 m (50 ft). Similarly, at 60 m (200 ft) the noise levels would be 12 dBA less than shown. Intervening structures or topography can act as a noise barrier to further reduce noise levels.

Noise abatement would only be considered at existing residential or planned development sites where building permit approvals have been obtained. The abatement would only apply to outdoor ground level areas.

According to Section 4.2.2, noise impacts are predicted to occur at Site 11 under three of the four traffic scenarios (two-lane facility - peak hour, two-lane facility - LOS C, and four-lane facility - LOS C), and at Sites 3 and 10 under the four-lane facility - LOS C traffic scenario.

At Site 11, a noise barrier does not appear to be a reasonable abatement measure because this site represents a future regional park and the barrier would have adverse visual affects and would not be appropriate in a park setting. An abatement measure that appears to be reasonable and feasible is buffer zones between the roadway right-of-way and areas of the park where human activities would occur.

Noise impacts at Sites 3 and 10 could be mitigated with a 3 to 3.8 meter (10 to 12 foot) noise barrier walls or earthen berms at the roadway right-of-way. For Site 3, the wall or berm would be located along Kihel-Upcountry Maui Highway (U2-A or U2-B alternatives). For Site 10, the wall or berm would be located along Pihani Highway. If a noise barrier wall or berm is considered, the height, length and location of the barrier would be determined during preliminary engineering design.

6.2 Construction Phase

Noise control measures during construction would be required to minimize impacts on existing noise sensitive land uses. The measures recommended in this section should be re-evaluated in greater detail during preliminary design because impacts to residences cannot be accurately determined without detailed construction plans and schedules. General mitigation measures presented below are recommended as guidelines in developing construction plans that consider the adverse impacts of construction noise.

1. **Design Considerations** - During the early stages of construction plan development, natural and artificial barriers, such as ground elevation changes and existing buildings, can be considered for use as shielding against construction noise. Strategic placement of stationary equipment, such as compressors and generators, could reduce impacts at the sensitive receptors.
2. **Construction of Noise Barriers During Initial Stages** - Noise barriers planned to ultimately be constructed along the right-of-way for traffic noise abatement could be constructed during the initial stages to reduce the impacts of construction. Initial construction of noise barriers would significantly reduce construction noise impacts at the sensitive receptors.
3. **Alternate Construction Methods** - Certain phases of highway construction work such as pile driving may produce noise levels in excess of acceptable limits, even when feasible noise reduction methods are used. These impacts may be reduced by using alternate methods of construction. In the case of pile driving, vibration or hydraulic insertion could be used. Drilled holes for cast-in-place

**Table 4
Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Source	L _{max} at 15 m (50 feet)	Model Tested
Backhoe	85 dBA	John Deere 605A
Front Loader	84 dBA	Caterpillar 980
Dozer	84 dBA	Caterpillar D7e
Grader	91 dBA	Caterpillar 16
Scraper	92 dBA	Caterpillar 660
Compressor	80-89 dBA	Various Tested
Pile Driver	95-100 dBA	Various Tested

Source: Federal Highway Administration, Highway Construction Noise Measurement, Prediction, and Mitigation, 1976

6. MITIGATION MEASURES

6.1 Future Traffic Noise

Noise abatement measures must be considered as part of the project if traffic noise impacts are identified. An impact occurs when traffic noise levels approach or exceed the NAC or if traffic noise levels substantially exceed (15 dBA or more) the existing ambient levels. The SDOT Noise Policy is used to determine whether noise abatement measures can be implemented, depending on whether these measures are reasonable and feasible based on the following criteria:

- Provides a minimum noise reduction of 5 dBA.
- Cost of noise abatement is not to exceed \$35,000 per residence benefited. The number of residences protected will include all dwelling units - owner occupied houses, rental units, mobile homes, etc. All units benefited by a 5 dBA or more noise reduction will be counted regardless of whether or not they were identified as impacted.
- Views from impacted residences are a major consideration in the reasonableness of noise abatement measures.
- Greater considerations to residential areas where absolute traffic noise levels are expected to occur, e.g., greater than 70 dBA, or where large increases over existing noise levels are anticipated.
- Greater consideration to residential areas along highways in a new location, residential areas constructed before an existing highway, residential areas in place along an existing highway for an extended period of time.
- Consideration of adverse environmental effects and beneficial reduction of construction noise.

piles are another alternative that would produce significantly lower levels of noise.

4. Source Control - The contractor shall comply with SDOT Standard Specifications and all local sound control and noise level rules, regulations and ordinances which apply to any work performed pursuant to the contract. Each internal combustion engine used for any purpose on the job or related to the job shall be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. No internal combustion engine shall be operated on the project without a muffler.
5. Time and Activity Constraints - The noisier activity involving large machinery could be limited to daytime hours when most people normally impacted are either not present or engaged in less noise sensitive activities. Nighttime construction would require a variance. Compliance with local Noise Ordinances will mitigate impacts associated with construction noise. To comply with the ordinance, all construction activities adjacent to residential uses will be limited to daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.) on Monday through Saturdays.
6. Community Relations - Community meetings can be held to explain the construction work, time involved, and the control measures to be taken to reduce the impact of the construction noise.

The measures above can be incorporated into site specific construction plans to minimize noise impacts to sensitive receptors along the project corridor. Noise emission limits could be developed. Construction hours could be set, and noise level criteria could be decided upon and adhered to during construction.

7. REFERENCES

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); Highway Construction Noise Measurement, Prediction, and Mitigation, 1976
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic and Construction Noise, Code of Federal Regulations 23 CFR 772
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA); Stamina 2.0/Optima Users Manual, Report No. FHWA DP-58-1, April 1982
- State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Highways Divisions; Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy, October, 1996

APPENDIX H

Community Impact Assessment

Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Project

Project Number: HDPS-9203(1)

Community Impact Assessment

SUMMARY

The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project, on the island of Maui, Hawaii. The proposed highway would link the Kihei-Makana and Upcountry Maui regions. Eight alternative alignments are under consideration, representing all possible combinations of two candidate Kihei terminals and four candidate Upcountry terminals (the two alternatives with the U2-B terminus has since been eliminated).

This community impact assessment was prepared in response to comments expressed during public meetings and correspondence received from government agencies and community organizations. The comments intended to be addressed by this report expressed concern about the impacts of the road on the existing character of the communities at the termini, especially the existing rural character of the Upcountry area. To address these concerns, the scope of study was designed to assess potential neighborhood, agricultural, land use, social and economic impacts of the proposed project. Mitigation measures are also suggested.

The project area includes the coastal communities of Kihei, Wailea and Makana, and communities on the Haleakala Crater slope known as Upcountry Maui. Kihei-Makana is a dichotomous community characterized by the urban mixed-use, working class environment of Kihei and the well-planned "upscale" hotel resort districts of Wailea and Makana. Mostly developed during the 1970s and 1980s, this community is the second largest visitor accommodation area on Maui. Upcountry Maui consists of the suburban/rural communities of Pukalani, Makawao and Halimaile, and the more rural communities of Kula. Kula is famous for its small farms which produce some of the best vegetables and flowers in the State, but it is also sought after for residences due to its cool climate, spectacular vistas and rural environment. The project area is also used for large-scale sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, and ranching.

In evaluating the alternatives' effect on land use patterns and consistency with existing community plans, it was found that there are other major factors controlling future land use patterns apart from restrictions imposed by roadway infrastructure. There is ample room for urban growth in the Kihei-Makana area between Pilihi Highway and South Kihei Road. However, development in this region would be more influenced by the health of Maui's visitor industry rather than the completion of the highway because of Kihei-Makana's heavy reliance on this industry. For Upcountry, the major constraint that has historically limited urban growth is water availability. Reliance on surface water resources would constrain development growth in the future. The Maui Board of Water Supply is planning water supply system improvements in response to County objectives to direct residential growth in the Pukalani-Makawao area. It was therefore determined that the alternatives aligned on the lower side of Pukalani may facilitate residential growth toward the new highway. The alternatives aligned on the upper side of Pukalani would not be as influential to development growth because this area is already being planned for residential, commercial and institutional development unrelated to the proposed project, and the market attractiveness of this development is based on Upcountry's desirability as a residential area. The Kula terminus alternatives

Prepared for:

**State of Hawaii
Department of Transportation
U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration**

Prepared by:

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

October 1998

are not likely to cause secondary land development in Kula, an area in which urban land uses are discouraged and constrained by a limited water supply system.

The highway would change existing travel patterns. The obvious intended change would be the diversion of some travel demand from Haleakala Highway, Hana Highway, Dairy Road, Mokulele Highway and perhaps even Kihelani Highway, onto Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway. However, the upper or lower Pukalani alternatives would encourage some motorists traveling between Kula and Kihai to use the narrow and winding Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as a "short-cut." Similarly, the Kula terminus alternatives would encourage some motorists traveling to the summit of Haleakala to use local residential roads running between Kula and Haleakala Highways. Increasing vehicular use of these roads would adversely affect farmers and residents along these roads by interfering with farm vehicle movements, jeopardizing roadway safety and increasing highway-related noise.

No alternative would cut through or isolate portions of existing neighborhoods. Some of the alternatives would, however, cut through sugarcane and/or pineapple fields adversely affecting the current operating practices of large-scale agricultural enterprises which have been experiencing suburban encroachment for several decades. The alternatives would increase accessibility to certain pasture land, however. No small privately-owned Kula farm would be directly affected. However, the U3 alternatives would cross a County agricultural park. Mitigation measures would have to be implemented to offset adverse impacts to agricultural production, and to prevent cattle from entering the highway right-of-way.

The economic impacts of the project are mostly beneficial. The project would infuse up to \$66 million of federal funds into the local economy, increasing short-term employment and the purchase of local goods and services. Longer-term employment opportunities would depend on how well the alternatives facilitate urban development and employment-producing land uses in areas approved by the County. Impacts to existing highway-dependent businesses and business districts are expected to be minimal or non-existent.

Table of Contents

SUMMARY..... S-1

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1-1

1.1 Description of the Proposed Action..... 1-1

1.2 Purpose of this Report..... 1-4

1.3 Scope of this Report..... 1-5

2. STUDY AREA AND COMMUNITY PROFILE..... 2-1

2.1 Definition of the Study Area..... 2-1

2.2 History and Physical Character of the Study Area..... 2-1

2.2.1 Kihai-Makena Region..... 2-1

2.2.2 Upcountry Maui Region..... 2-3

2.3 Demographic, Housing and Income Characteristics..... 2-4

2.3.1 Demographic Characteristics..... 2-4

2.3.2 Housing Characteristics..... 2-7

2.3.3 Income Characteristics..... 2-7

2.4 Economic Characteristics..... 2-10

2.5 Community Facilities, Parks and Services..... 2-10

2.6 Community Issues and Concerns..... 2-11

2.6.1 Community Plans..... 2-11

2.6.2 Joint Task Force on the Kihai-Upcountry Highway..... 2-13

2.7 Interviewee Information..... 2-15

2.7.1 Kihai-Makena Region..... 2-15

2.7.2 Upcountry Maui Region..... 2-16

3. DEVELOPMENT TRENDS..... 3-1

3.1 Community Plans..... 3-1

3.1.1 Kihai-Makena Community Plan..... 3-1

3.1.2 Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan..... 3-1

3.2 General Economic Trends..... 3-3

3.3 Interviewee Views..... 3-4

3.3.1 Kihai-Makena Region..... 3-4

3.3.2 Upcountry Maui Region..... 3-4

4. POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS..... 4-1

4.1 Neighborhood Impacts..... 4-1

4.2 Agricultural Impacts..... 4-2

4.3 Land Use Impacts..... 4-6

4.4 Displacements and Relocations..... 4-10

4.5 Travel Patterns and Highway Safety..... 4-10

4.6 Community Facilities, Services and Parks..... 4-14

4.7 Crime..... 4-14

5. POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS..... 5-1

5.1 Tax Revenues and Employment..... 5-1

5.2 Impacts on Highway-Related Businesses and Business Districts..... 5-2

5.3 Impacts on Regional and/or Local Economy..... 5-2

6. MITIGATION MEASURES..... 6-1

6.1 Agriculture and Ranching..... 6-1

6.2 Land Use Impacts..... 6-1

6.3 Traffic Patterns and Safety 6-1

BIBLIOGRAPHY 7-1

APPENDICES

Interview Questions A-1

List of Key Informants A-2

..... A-3

List of Figures

1-1 Project Location 1-2

1-2 Alternatives 1-3

2-1 Existing Neighborhoods and Communities 2-2

2-2 Census Tracts 2-5

3-1 Community Planning Areas 3-2

4-1 Cropland Impacts 4-4

4-2 Existing and Future Urban Areas in Pukalani-Makawao 4-9

4-3 Impacts to Omaoapio and Pulehu Roads 4-12

List of Tables

2-1 Demographic Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 2-6

2-2 Housing Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 2-6

2-3 Income Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990 2-9

3-4 Termini Preference Survey Results 2-14

4-1 Crime Rate of Selected Offenses Per 10,000 Residents 4-15

1. INTRODUCTION


The Highways Division of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (SDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project on the island of Maui, Hawaii. Figure 1-1 shows the general project location. The proposed federal-aid two-lane limited access highway would link the Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui regions.

1.1 Description of the Proposed Action


The alternatives under consideration are all eight possible combinations of two Kihei terminus options and four Upcountry terminus options. Figure 1-2 shows the candidate Upcountry and Kihei termini and the alignment segments or "footprints" that would be used to link the termini. As shown on this figure, the Kihei termini and segments are named K1 and K2, and the Upcountry termini and segments are named U1, U2-A, U2-B and U3. (The U2-B alternatives has since been eliminated from consideration.)

Descriptions of the alternatives are as follows:


1. Alternative U1.K1. This alternative would start at the Haleakala Highway / Halimalle Road intersection in Upcountry and follow a south to southwest alignment to the Kaonoulu Street / Piihoni Highway intersection. The length of this alternative is approximately 15.8 km (9.8 miles).
2. Alternative U1.K2. This alternative is the same as Alternative U1.K1 from the Upcountry terminus to where the alternative alignments cross. However, this alternative would proceed southwest to the Ke Alii Alanui Street / Piihoni Highway intersection. The length of Alternative U1.K2 is approximately 17.5 km (10.9 miles).
3. Alternative U2-A.K1. This alternative would extend from the existing Pukalani Bypass/Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection in Upcountry, to an alignment common with U1. The Kihei terminus would be at the Kaonoulu Street/Piihoni Highway intersection.
4. Alternative U2-A.K2. This alternative would be from the "Five Trees" intersection to the Ke Alii Alanui Street/Piihoni Highway intersection.
5. Alternative U2-B.K1. This alternative would extend from Kula Highway at approximately 700 m (2300 ft) south of the "Five Trees" intersection to the Piihoni Highway/Kaonoulu Street intersection.
6. Alternative U2-B.K2. This alternative shares the same Upcountry terminus and alignment as the Alternative U2-B.K1. This alternative's Kihei terminus is at the Piihoni Highway/Ke Alii Alanui Street intersection.



Source: Warren S. Unemon, Engineering, Inc.



Alternatives
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Community Impact Assessment
 FIGURE 1-2



Project Location
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Community Impact Assessment
 FIGURE 1-1

7. Alternative U3.K1. This alternative would be from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Piilani Highway/Kaonolu Street intersection in Kihei.
8. Alternative U3.K2. This alternative would extend from Kula Highway, south of Pulehu Gulch in Kula, to the Ke Alii Alanui Street/Piilani Highway intersection.

The proposed highway would be a limited access arterial roadway with one 36 m (120 ft) lane in each direction. The minimum width of the roadway right-of-way would be 49 m (160 ft) in rural areas and at least 37 m (120 ft) in urban areas. Additional right-of-way is being reserved to allow for future widening to a four-lane divided highway if appropriate in the future. Posted speed limits would vary from 70 km/h (45 mph) in urban areas to 90 km/h (55 mph) in rural areas.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

This community impact assessment report was prepared in response to comments expressed during public meetings and correspondence from government agencies and community organizations. During the public meetings, participants expressed concern that the proposed roadway would:

- increase crime in the Upcountry area;
- introduce an urban environment into the rural environment of Upcountry; and
- adversely affect agricultural activities in Upcountry by:
 - increasing the housing supply and water demand which would accelerate the loss of agricultural land;
 - bringing more tourists to the Upcountry area causing a nuisance to farmers;
 - adversely affecting access to Kahului Harbor for trucks carrying agricultural products from Upcountry via Omaopio and Pulehu Roads; and
 - creating hazardous conditions at the intersection of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads and the proposed highway.

Comments received from the County of Maui and community organizations regarding potential socio-economic impacts of the proposed project included

- concern about the loss of small farms and exposing rural communities, such as Omaopio, Keokea, and Waiaho, to development and transient traffic flows;
- a perceived adverse effect on efforts to preserve the unique Upcountry lifestyle and ambiance; and
- an opinion that the roadway should provide relatively inexpensive access to future Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) homesteads that would extend from Keokea to Kihei, and that the selected route should benefit both present and future residents

To address these and similar comments, detailed analyses of the alternatives' potential impacts on existing and future neighborhoods, land use development trends, and social, agricultural and economic activities were needed

1.3 Scope of this Report

This community impact assessment examines potential impacts to social and economic conditions of the affected neighborhoods and the region, existing and future land uses, mobility and access, safety, and the provision of public services. The FHWA's Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (1987), the draft report, Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation (March 1996) prepared by Apogee Research, Inc. for the FHWA, and the California Department of Transportation report, Conducting Socioeconomic Analysis: Guidance for Consultants (May 1988) were used as technical guides in preparing this report. Other sources of information included U.S. Census data, the Maui County Data Book (December 1994), the Kihai-Makena Community Plan (July 1985), the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996), and interviews of "key informants" from the community.

The report is organized in the following manner:

- Description of study area and affected communities
 - brief history of study area;
 - physical characteristics;
 - demographic, housing and income characteristics;
 - general economic characteristics;
 - issues, concerns and views of the community; and
 - development trends
- Analysis of impacts on:
 - neighborhood cohesion;
 - agriculture;
 - land use patterns and development trends;
 - displacement;
 - mobility and access;
 - provision of public services;
 - crime and safety; and
 - economic impacts on:
 - tax revenues;
 - public expenditures;
 - employment opportunities; and
 - businesses
- Suggested avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures

2. STUDY AREA AND COMMUNITY PROFILE

This chapter presents a summary of the history, present land use and socio-economic conditions of the study area. This chapter also presents a summary of major concerns and issues expressed by residents within the context of the County of Maui's community planning process, the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway Task Force process, and interviews conducted for this report.

2.1 Definition of the Study Area

The project is located in the area between the coastal community of Kihei and areas on the Haleakala Crater slope known as Upcountry Maui (see Figure 2-1). This study area is within the County of Maui's Kihei-Makana and Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Planning Areas. Defined neighborhoods or communities in the vicinity of the proposed project include Makana, Wailea, Kihei, Pukalani, Halimaile, Makawao, and the Kula communities of Omaoipo, Pulehu, Waiakoa, and Keokea. The locations of these neighborhoods or communities are shown on Figure 2-1. For some of the sections in this chapter, the study area is divided into two regions, for descriptive purposes, Kihei-Makana and Upcountry Maui.


2.2 History and Physical Character of the Study Area

This section briefly describes the Kihei-Makana and Upcountry regions' history and physical makeup. Histories of the regions are taken from the Kihei-Makana and Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plans.

2.2.1 Kihei-Makana Region

The Kihei-Makana region was well populated prior to western contact. Between 1840 and 1860, large expanses of land were acquired by foreigners and native Hawaiians were displaced. By 1841, sugar being produced in Ulupalakua for Kamehameha III was being shipped out from a government landing at Makana. A second private landing established at Makana Bay became one of the three busiest leeward ports on Maui in the nineteenth century. It was phased out after a government landing was built at Keawekapu in the early 20th century.

Development of the Kihei-Makana region has occurred primarily because of the phenomenal growth of Maui's visitor industry since the 1960s. Today, the Kihei-Makana region is comprised of the urban mixed-use environment of Kihei and the resort land uses of Wailea and Makana. This region is the second largest visitor accommodation area on Maui (behind the Kapalua-Kaanapali-Lahiana region on the western side of the island). Kihei, the largest and most populous of these coastal communities, consists of a wide mix of housing types from single-family to multi-family low to medium density units, small to medium-sized commercial malls, and small to medium sized hotels along South Kihei Road. The Wailea-Makana area is a resort community, similar in size and scale to other resort communities on Maui such as



Existing Neighborhoods and Communities
 KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Community Impact Assessment
 FIGURE 2-1

Kapalua and Kaanapali, and in terms of urban design and socio-economic conditions, it is vastly more "upscale" than Kihei which is basically a working class community. Wailea-Makena contains some of Maui's most luxurious condominiums and resort hotels, such as the Grand Wailea Resort & Spa, the Maui Inter-Continental Resort, the Four Seasons Resort, and the Maui Prince Hotel.

2.2.2 Upcountry Maui Region

Hawaiian settlement in Upcountry Maui prior to western contact is evident from the large numbers of archaeological sites within the region. There are numerous recorded and unrecorded heiau, stone walls, building platforms and petroglyphs which evidence intensive habitation and land use.

Large scale sugarcane production was established from the 1850s to the 1870s. A partnership between S.T. Alexander and H.P. Baldwin in 1870 began the large sugarcane plantation which is now Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, Inc. (HC&S). In 1876, the construction of Hamakua Ditch brought water to the dry central valley of Maui and northwestern slopes of Haleakala, making sugarcane production possible where only scrub land had existed.

In terms of total acreage, cattle ranching ranks second to sugarcane in the Upcountry area. Haleakala, Kaonouliu, Erewhon and Ulupalakua Ranches were the largest, and still raise cattle. Pineapple, first grown in Makawao in the 1920s, is now grown at generally higher elevations than sugarcane.

The availability of homesteads in Kula began the tradition of family farms in this area. The cool and relatively dry climate, good soil, and elevation makes the Kula area exceptional for a number of crops, such as the famous Maui onions, cabbages and cut flowers.

Culturally, Upcountry Maui became home to immigrants from Portugal, Japan, Russia, Germany, Philippines, Puerto Rico and China. Most were recruited as contract workers for the sugarcane plantations. When their contracts were fulfilled, many immigrants settled in the Upcountry area.

In general, the Portuguese gravitated towards ranching and related vocations such as blacksmithing and operating feed stores. The region's ranching "paniolo" heritage and activities were centered in Makawao. The Chinese settled largely in Keokea and Makawao, working as farmers and merchants. The Japanese arrived somewhat later, but contributed significantly to the formation of the area's character and development.

Since the early seventies, Upcountry Maui has experienced significant residential growth because the region's cool climate, rural setting and spectacular views make this area a desirable place to live. In particular, the Kula area has attracted luxury residences. This has sometimes conflicted with farming activities through the loss of agricultural lands and the inherent incompatibilities between the two uses.

Today, the Upcountry Maui communities of Makawao, Pukalani and Haliimaile are characterized as a mixture of suburban and rural, with Pukalani being the most

suburban of the three. Pukalani and Makawao contain most of Upcountry's commercial land uses. Pukalani's businesses are mostly located along Haleakala Highway and are typical of a suburban community (neighborhood shopping center, convenience stores, small offices, etc.). Businesses in Makawao, centered around the intersection of Makawao and Baldwin Avenues, are generally smaller and more pedestrian-oriented than the businesses in Pukalani. Makawao's businesses consist of restaurants, gift stores, and art galleries. Recently created urban design guidelines for Makawao maintains storefronts, prevent frontage parking, and preserve the town's historic architecture.

The Kula region contains a mixture of rural and agricultural uses with human settlement most concentrated at Waiahoa. Single-family residences, on lots up to 0.4 ha (1 acre), are generally found between Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and Kula Highway. This area and the area west (makai) of Kula Highway is also used for small truck farms and agricultural lots. The small two to four hectare (five to ten acre) farms produce vegetables, such as the famous Maui onions, and flowers. Large-scale sugarcane and pineapple activities extend from the west slopes of Haleakala, generally west (makai) of the small truck farms, to central Maui. Cattle ranching occurs in the area east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue, and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala. On the summit is Haleakala National Park. The few commercial activities in Kula are located primarily along the route to Haleakala National Park and in central Kula around Waiahoa.

2.3 Demographic, Housing and Income Characteristics

As shown on Figure 2-2, U.S. census tracts (CTs) 303 01, 303 02, 304 01, 304 02, and 307 generally encompass the study area. CT 303 01 covers the Kula neighborhoods of Pulehu, Waiahoa, Waiohuli and Keokea; CT 303 02 includes Wailea and Makena; CT 304 01 includes Makawao and Haliimaile; CT 304 02 includes Pukalani and parts of Kula; and CT 307 includes Kihei.

2.3.1 Demographic Characteristics

Table 2-1 exhibits selected demographic characteristics of the Kihei-Upcountry Maui study area. In 1990, the population of the study area as delineated by the above CTs was 34,171, or 34 percent of the County of Maui's total population. Population growth in the study area was rapid during the 1980s, growing by an annual average of 5.6 percent. In comparison, County of Maui and State of Hawaii annual average population growths in the same period were 3.5 percent and 1.4 percent, respectively. The Kihei area (CT 307) experienced the greatest population increase both in absolute terms (6,863) and by percentage--an average of 7.9 percent per year. The Pukalani-Kula area (CT 304 02 -- partial) had the smallest average annual growth rate within the study area of 3.5 percent per year. Kula (CT 303 01), Wailea-Makena (CT 303 02) and Makawao-Haliimaile (CT 304 01) had annual growth rates of 3.8 percent, 7.3 percent, and 5.1 percent, respectively.


Table 2-1 also displays the number of households, families, ethnicity and age distributions for the study area in 1990. Overall whites made up 60 percent of the total

Table 2-1
Demographic Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990

	Kula	Wailea-Makena	Haliimaile-Makawao	Pukalani-Kula (Partial)	Kihei	Total	Maui County
	CT 303.01	CT 303.02	CT 304.01	CT 304.02	CT 307		
Population	5,567	2,483	7,174	6,064	12,883	34,171	100,374
Sex							
Males	50%	51%	52%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Females	50%	49%	48%	49%	48%	48%	49%
Households	1,940	1,043	2,283	1,919	4,902	12,087	33,148
Families	1,439	661	1,793	1,576	3,112	8,581	23,672
Ethnicity							
White	64%	80%	54%	43%	65%	60%	40%
Chinese	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Filipino	3%	4%	11%	13%	14%	11%	21%
Japanese	18%	5%	11%	25%	5%	12%	17%
Other Asian	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Hawaiian	8%	3%	14%	14%	9%	10%	15%
Pacific Islander	0%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	1%
Black	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Other Race	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Age							
Less than 5 Years	10%	7%	11%	10%	9%	9%	9%
5 to 17 Years	17%	12%	20%	21%	14%	17%	17%
18 to 34 Years	20%	22%	28%	23%	31%	26%	26%
35 to 64 Years	41%	48%	34%	38%	39%	39%	36%
65 or More Years	12%	12%	7%	8%	8%	9%	11%

Note: CT = Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii



population of the study area. Japanese, Filipinos and Hawaiians were the second, third and fourth next most common racial groups, respectively. Within the study area, the proportion of whites as compared to the total ranged from a high of 80 percent in the Wailea-Makana area to a low of 43 percent in the Pukalani-Kula (partial) area. The age distribution of residents in the study area does not appear to be substantially different than the age distribution for the entire county.

2.3.2 Housing Characteristics

Table 2-2 exhibits certain housing characteristics of selected Kihei-Upcountry areas in 1990. Overall, 54 percent of the housing units were one-unit structures. However, this ratio varied by community within the study area. In the Upcountry areas, such as Kula (CT 303.01), Makawao-Pukalani (CT 304.01), and Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02), one-unit housing types made up more than 90 percent of all housing units, consistent with Upcountry's suburban and rural characteristics. The coastal areas of Wailea-Makana (CT 303.02) and Kihei (CT 307) have a mix of housing types consistent with these areas' more urban characteristics.

The age ratios of structures (see Table 2-2) is a good indicator of the ages of the neighborhoods within the CTs. From the information presented in Table 2-2, Wailea-Makana (CT 303.02) and Kihei (CT 307) are relatively young communities in comparison to all communities combined on the island. Very few of the houses in these areas are older than 20 years. In terms of age of their communities, Kula (CT 303.01) and Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02) are very similar to the island overall. The age ratios of Halimaile-Makawao indicate that they are older communities that have recently experienced surges in residential growth.

Overall the owner versus renter occupancy ratio for the study area was 58:42 in 1990, roughly the same as the owner-renter occupancy ratio for the county. Within communities of the study area, this ratio varied from 65:35 in Makawao-Pukalani to 51:49 in Kihei. According to the Maui County Data Book (December 1994), approximately 32 percent of the housing units in the Kihei to Makana area were used for seasonal or recreational purposes in 1990. In the Upcountry areas, only two to three percent of the housing units were used for such purposes.

2.3.3 Income Characteristics

Table 2-3 exhibits certain income characteristics for selected Kihei-Upcountry areas in 1990. Median household incomes in the study area were higher than the median for the County of Maui, which was \$38,771 in 1989. Incomes varied from a low of \$40,483 in Kula (CT 303.01) to a high of \$45,694 in Wailea-Makana (CT 303.02). The poverty rates of residents in Kihei-Upcountry areas were slightly higher than the rate for the County. The percentage of households with incomes below the poverty level ranged from a low of six percent in Pukalani-Kula (partial) (CT 304.02) to a high of 12 percent in Wailea-Makana (CT 303.02). From 1980 to 1993, the unemployment rate for Maui island ranged from 2.2 percent in 1989 to 7.6 percent in 1992. The average in this period was 4.9 percent. The Kihei to Makana region is one of the island's major employment centers.

**Table 2-2
Housing Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990**

	Kula	Wailea-Makana	Halimaile-Makawao	Pukalani-Kula (Partial)	Kihei	Maui County
	CT 303.01	CT 303.02	CT 304.01	CT 304.02	CT 307	
Housing Units	2,189	2,207	2,345	1,995	7,902	42,060
Units in Structure						
1 Unit	96%	50%	96%	98%	41%	68%
2 to 4 Units	2%	12%	2%	1%	3%	4%
5 or More Units	0%	38%	0%	0%	55%	27%
Mobile or Other	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Age of Structure						
1 Year	4%	11%	7%	5%	9%	5%
2 to 10 Years	32%	41%	37%	35%	32%	27%
11 to 20 Years	31%	43%	26%	34%	51%	37%
21 Years or More	33%	5%	30%	27%	8%	30%
Tenure						
Owner-Occupied	63%	53%	64%	66%	51%	58%
Renter-Occupied	37%	47%	36%	34%	49%	42%

Note. CT = Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii

2.4 Economic Characteristics

Maui's most important industry is tourism. From 1989 to 1993, an average of over 2.3 million visitors arrived on Maui per year. The peak for this period was 1989 when there was over 2.5 million visitors. Most of Maui's hotels, resorts, and visitor-related businesses are located in West Maui from Lahaina to Kapalua, and in South Maui from Kihei to Makena. In the latter area, there were 84 visitor-accommodation facilities in 1993 providing a total of 7,318 visitor rental units, approximately 40 percent of all visitor-related units on Maui. In contrast, the Upcountry areas had only 63 visitor-related units. The Kihei-Makena region held about 14.6 percent of the employment on Maui, ranking third behind West Maui and Wailuku-Kahului in the number of jobs on the island.

Unlike Kihei-Makena, agriculture is Upcountry Maui's prime economic activity. Major crops or agricultural activities in Upcountry Maui include large-scale sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, and ranching. Sugarcane and pineapple activities are located on the west slopes of Haleakala Crater to central Maui. Cattle ranching generally occurs in the area east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala Crater. In Kula, major agricultural crops include vegetables, such as head cabbage, lettuce, round onions, and flowers, such as carnations and protea. Unlike sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, agricultural activities in Kula are on much smaller farm lots of about two to four hectares (five to ten acres). Upcountry Maui also has some small to medium size commercial activities mostly within Pukalani and Makawao. The medium size commercial land uses are exclusively within Pukalani. Makawao's business district contains pedestrian-oriented small retail stores and restaurants. Kula has very few commercial activities.

Scientific research is becoming an increasingly important industry on Maui. This industry is located primarily at Science City on the summit of Haleakala and at the Maui Research and Technology (R&T) Park in Kihei. Science City, a federal facility, is used for space- and defense-related research and development. The Maui R&T Park currently houses the Maui High Performance Computing Center, Boeing-Rocketdyne, Sunsource, the U.S. Air Force, the Pacific Disaster Center, Lockheed Martin, the University of Hawaii, the University of New Mexico, and a number of small companies.

2.5 Community Facilities, Parks and Services

The Kihei-Makena region contains three major beach parks, Kalamo, Kamaole I, II and III and Mal Poina Oe Lau, as well as other smaller beach parks along the Kihei to Makena coastline. This community also supports a county recreation center, Silversword Golf Course, and two private golf courses in Wailea. A Kihei District Regional Park is being planned for the area east (mauka) of Pihani Highway near its intersection with Ke Alii Alanui Street. Parks and recreation facilities in Upcountry Maui include the Makawao Park/Mayor Eddie Tam Memorial Center, the Upcountry Youth Center, Pukalani Park and Community Center, Kula Botanical Garden, Harold F. Rice Park, Keokea Park, and the Pukalani Country Club Golf Course.

**Table 2-3
Income Characteristics in Selected Kihei-Upcountry Areas, 1990**

	Kula CT 303.01	Wailea- Makena CT 303.02	Haliimaile- Makawao CT 304.01	Pukalani- Kula (Partial) CT 304.02	Kihei CT 307	Maui County
Median Household Income	\$40,483	\$45,694	\$41,949	\$43,032	\$40,558	\$38,771
Selected Sources of Income						
Social Security Income	24%	24%	19%	21%	19%	26%
Retirement Income	14%	15%	16%	18%	12%	18%
Public Assistance Income	3%	3%	6%	2%	4%	6%
Households Below Poverty Level	11%	12%	10%	6%	8%	8%

Note: CT = Census Tract

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing, Hawaii

There are three schools in the Kihei-Makena region: Kihei Elementary School, Lokeiani Intermediate School, and the new Kamali Elementary School. Schools in Upcountry Maui include Makawao Elementary, Haiku Elementary, Pukalani Elementary, Kula Elementary, Paia Elementary, Kalama Intermediate, Seabury Hall (private), and the new King Kekaulike High School which opened in 1995.

Police patrols for Kihei-Makena and Upcountry Maui operate out of the main police headquarters in Wailuku. The Makawao Community Police Officer maintains an office in the town. There are plans to construct a police sub-station in Kihei. Fire stations are located on South Kihei Road near Kalama Park, in Makawao, and in Kula near Waiakoa.

Maui Memorial Hospital in Wailuku is the principal hospital on Maui. Smaller hospitals are in Hana and Kula. The general hospital in Kula provides care for tubercular, mental and long-term patients. An ambulance stationed in Makawao provides emergency service between the Upcountry area and Maui Memorial Hospital. There is no 24-hour ambulance service in Kula. Emergency medical service in Kihei is provided by Maui Memorial Hospital.

2.6 Community Issues and Concerns

This section describes community issues and concerns expressed through the update processes of the Kihei-Makena and Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plans and the State/County Joint Task Force on the Upcountry/Kihei Highway.

2.6.1 Community Plans

In the Proposed Kihei-Makena Community Plan (October 1993), the Kihei-Makena Community Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) expressed the following problems, issues and concerns regarding their community:

- Transportation. Inadequate traffic circulation and lack of public transportation.
- Community Facilities. Lack of youth programs, community facilities and playing fields in relation to its size as the third largest residential community on Maui. Recreation facilities such as a community swimming pool and sports fields, and a community center to house forums and events are particularly needed.
- School Environment. Problems expressed included an overall shortage of educational facilities, an overuse of portable structures, and the school's proximity to Pihihi Highway. These circumstances result in overcrowded, uncomfortable and generally poor classroom learning environments.
- Public Services. The lack of emergency medical facilities is a concern because of Maui Memorial Hospital's distance from Kihei. Greater police presence is needed to control crime. A ladder truck at Kihei Fire Station is needed to fight high-rise fires. A new Kihei community library would enhance learning for students. A general lack of social services, including child day care, was noted.

- Upcountry Transportation Connection. A transportation connection to the Upcountry area would save valuable commuter time between residential areas of Upcountry and job centers in the Kihei region. In choosing the alignment for this connection, the major concern should be improving transportation services for the maximum number of residents.

The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) CAC expressed the following problems, opportunities and interregional issues regarding their community:

Problems

- Water. Limited development of water resources and distribution systems to meet the needs of the region. Water resources should be allocated in the following order of priority: (1) preservation of agriculture and development of Department of Hawaiian Home Lands parcels; (2) ensure the long-term viability of the region's residences and economic base.
- Loss of Rural Character. The loss of Upcountry's rural ambiance is a significant concern. Preservation of the rural setting and open space of Upcountry is an important goal for the region.
- Transportation. Issues of concern include the inadequate transportation network, the need to address interregional access, and the need to provide alternative modes of transportation.
- Public/Quasi-Public Services and Facilities. Inadequate public and quasi-public facilities are cited as a major community issue. These facilities should be upgraded, expanded, or constructed to meet the growing needs of the region's residents.

Opportunities

- Rural Community Character. The region's rural qualities, characterized by its low crime rate, clean environment, abundant outdoor recreation opportunities, and vast open space and natural resources provide an opportunity to preserve Upcountry Maui's unique identity.
- Land Use. The land use patterns of the region should provide an opportunity to preserve the region's rural and agricultural setting. Planning of existing and future communities should retain their rural character, and agricultural lands and related activities must be recognized as key land use elements. To retain the integrity of the region's land use character, agricultural lands and related activities must be recognized as key land use elements which make Upcountry a special place.

Interregional Issues

- Kihei-Upcountry Highway. The selection of an alignment must consider the growth-inducing impacts on the region's agriculture, rural character and open

spaces. The need to maintain the unique Upcountry ambiance should be an essential criterion in analyzing alternatives.

- **Economic Well-Being.** The Upcountry region should continue to contribute to the overall economic health and stability of the county by maintaining sugarcane and pineapple cultivation, the region's rural character, and scenic and recreational resources.

- **Water.** A comprehensive water management strategy must be developed to balance various interests and accommodate environmental, agricultural and residential needs.

2.6.2 Joint Task Force on the Kihei-Upcountry Highway

A task force made up of citizens, businesses, and State and county officials was created in 1993 to explore and recommend alternatives for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway. The goal of the task force was to facilitate early community participation in the project's planning process to provide the SDOT with useful information and enhance the acceptance of the project.

As part of the Task Force effort, opinion surveys were conducted to obtain input on termini preferences. These surveys consisted of a questionnaire appearing in the July 19, 1993 edition of the Maui News, and surveys of hotel and HC&S employees. Table 2-4 displays the results.

Two Task Force meetings were held to discuss project alternatives. The first meeting on May 14, 1992 introduced the project and task force process to participants. The second meeting, held on April 8, 1993, surfaced more substantive comments, such as the highway's potential impacts on agricultural activities in Upcountry Maui. These concerns included taking agricultural land for the highway's right-of-way, dividing farms which would reduce their efficiency or make them non-viable, and adversely impacting agriculturally-related traffic movements on Omaopio Road and other roadways. A sampling of these concerns follows:

- "Major consideration should be given to the conservation of productive agricultural lands and the economic impact of withdrawal of such land for the highway. There is the potential that the most productive of these agricultural lands will be impacted by the highway."
- "I don't know how practical it is to have a road running right through some of the best farm land on Maui."
- "If we had any road coming down through here connected to Kihei, Pulehu and Omaopio Roads will become the main link connecting with the upper Kula Highway. Right now Omaopio and Pulehu are loaded with fast movers. Half of the guys are speeders."
- "If there is going to be any road coming down through here, it is going to be murder trying to cross that (Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway) road from (Omaopio Road). Try getting to Hansen Road from Puunene in rush hour. Can't do it. Only way you can do it is because there are nice guys on the road (that) give you a chance. But not on the highway, nobody is going to stop for you."

**Table 2-4
Termini Preference Survey Results**

Upcountry Termini	Survey		
	Maui News	Hotel/Employees	HC&S
Upcountry Termini			
Ujupalakua	13.5%	15.9%	2.0%
Upper Kula	11.6%	11.0%	95.1%
Lower Kula	22.0%	25.6%	0.4%
Above Pukalani	33.3%	23.6%	0.0%
Below Pukalani	16.5%	23.8%	0.4%
Other	3.1%	0.1%	2.0%
Kihei Termini			
Near Suda Stove	12.8%	15.9%	0.0%
Upoa / R&T Park	56.1%	16.5%	95.1%
Kanani / Keonekai	10.1%	17.6%	0.4%
Wailea / Makena	18.2%	49.1%	2.4%
Other	2.7%	0.9%	2.0%

Source: State/County Joint Task Force Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, October 1, 1993

- "Nothing would be worse to a small farmer than to have the highway cut his ten acre farm in half. (If you) subdivide even HC&S into a hundred little plots, (it is) no longer a farm."
- "About 150,000 acres of prime agricultural land from Kaupo to Waipaho is going to have nothing but guava trees and pakalolo. There is not going to be any legal farming there because there is no legal prosperous crop including cattle or anything else that we can make any money on. Consequently it's no longer prime ag(riculture)land; it's waste."
- "It we are going to really preserve agriculture, a lot of the issues brought up here are extremely important. If you subdivide and don't provide agriculture with easy access and easy transportation, you create a real problem."
- "I have a major problem on Mokulele. In fact, the first day we tried to cross, we had haulers piled up for four hours without being able to cross the highway. (On) the first day, we had six accidents."
- "I know the (Omaopio) land around there. There are a lot of gullies, a lot of hard rock. But there is not a lot of good soil where farmers can grow onions and grow cabbage. I don't think that should be disrupted with a bunch of tourists in automobiles and everything coming through there."
- "Any one of these alternatives will encourage more Upcountry development. If people working in Kihei, wouldn't it make sense to have more development in Kihei than encourage people to move to Upcountry and put more strain on existing resources?"

There were also disagreements on which type of agricultural land (small farmers or large-scale agriculture) should bear the brunt of impacts. Comments related to this issue are stated below:

- "When you mention the plantation and sugar, I think people, the agricultural lots are more important than the sugat because it's lifestyle of the people."
- "There's a lot of operating farms there. And if I had to trade off obviously small operating farms in the Omaoipo homesteads versus cane or pineapple land, I think the trade should be in favor of the (smaller) land owners versus the larger land owners."
- "I can understand wanting to preserve HC&S land, but the bread basket of our agricultural industry are independent farms in the Omaoipo, Pulehu, Naalea areas--this is the area that should be protected."
- "Good farm land is only good if you can make a profit on it. If you can't make a profit on it, it doesn't matter what else it has. It has to have economic viability. So if you take away economic viability from 1,500 farmers (working for HC&S), you destroy their 36,000 acres of what was prime agricultural land and turn it in to 36,000 acres of unusable farm land."

2.7 Interviewee Information

Often key individuals who are well informed about community issues, expectations and concerns can often provide good insight into the existing social condition of the affected neighborhoods. The three types of "key informants" were used for this study: community leaders, business owners and government agency personnel. Many of the key informants are present or past leaders of neighborhood or community organizations, and were interviewed for their knowledge of social groups, networks and activities. The business owners interviewed represented both large and small business enterprises. They provided insight into the project's potential impacts to their businesses. Government agency personnel were interviewed for their particular knowledge of certain key information or issues.

This section summarizes some of the information obtained from "key informants" in the community. Specifically:

- how "key informants" feel about their communities;
- how their communities have changed; and
- recent issues or problems their communities have faced.

2.7.1 Kihei-Makana Region

"Key informants" from Kihei generally thought of their communities as being working class and tourist-oriented. They noted that the de facto population (inclusive of visitors) is almost twice the residential population. However, they identified certain neighborhoods in Kihei as sharing some of the qualities characterizing Upcountry communities, such as rural setting. The Wailea-Makana communities are very different from Kihei in that the majority of their population, at any one time, is visitors or hotel employees. There are over two thousand condominium units in Wailea-Makana. However, most of these units are owned by absentee owners. Only a small fraction of the owners are full-time residents.

"Key informants" described Kihei's sandy beaches as being "great" with good public access. Although parking is a problem, they consider these beaches to be one of Kihei's most valuable assets.

The "key informants" stated that Kihei has not changed very much in the last few years, mainly because the visitor industry has flattened since the early 1990s which caused the construction industry to wane. During the 1980s, Kihei to Makana experienced phenomenal residential and hotel/resort growth in response to growing visitor counts. The resident population doubled and the de facto population quadrupled during this period. The peak of this development growth spurt occurred from 1988 to 1992.

When asked about present or recent community problems and issues, "key informants" identified traffic congestion, especially in the vicinity of North Kihei, and crime as being the major complaints of the community. They believed that little can be done about the crime problem because of Kihei's heavy reliance on the visitor industry. Efforts in recent years that have helped alleviate crime include rental car companies unlabeled their cars and a citizens' patrol along South Kihei Road. Unfortunately, these efforts forced criminals into other types of property crime and caused criminal activities to increase in inner neighborhoods.

2.7.2 Upcountry Maui Region

"Key informants" from Kula, regardless of where they live, almost unanimously identified their communities as being rural or country. They also identified the importance of agriculture, the quietness of the area, and similar lifestyles and values among neighbors. "Key informants" from Makawao and Pukalani gave slightly different responses, defining their neighborhoods as being more suburban. However, they also identified certain rural qualities, such as the pedestrian orientation of Makawao and open space.

All the "key informants" mentioned substantial increases in population and housing, especially from ten to 20 years ago. This has caused overcrowding of schools and increased traffic. Some of the "key informants" mentioned that 20 years ago, there were a lot more horseback riders.

"Key informants" noted that a substantial number of newcomers came from the mainland. Their impact on the social and cultural environment of Upcountry elicited mixed reactions. For example, some felt that most newcomers fit in well to the community, and were credited with reviving Makawao's business district. Negative comments about newcomers, regardless of whether they came from the mainland or within the State, included an assessment that they brought increased crime and drug use into the community, and that they do not share the same lifestyles and interests of long-time residents.

Recent or current community issues identified by interviewees included water availability; increasing traffic which raises safety concerns; the controversial location of the new King Kekaulike High School; a divisive issue that occurred a few years ago involving a proposal for hotel zoning near the Pukalani Golf Course which led to the disbanding of the Pukalani Community Association; teenagers loitering in Makawao

supposedly adversely affecting businesses; and the lack of 24-hour ambulance and other medical services in Kula.

Water availability for Kula farmers is a critical issue that can affect their business. For residents, it is more of an inconvenience. A Kula resident stated the problem succinctly: it has been "a blessing and a hardship." The blessing is that the lack of water has prevented development and maintained open space. The hardship is that residences frequently have to endure restrictions on water use.

3. DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

This chapter describes current land use and development trends from the perspective of the County of Maui's Community Plans for the affected regions, and the wishes and desires of the "key informants."

3.1 Community Plans

The County prepares nine Community Plans to help guide its decisions regarding development. Two of these plans are of relevance to the proposed project--the Kihei-Makana Community Plan (July 1985) and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996). Their planning areas are displayed on Figure 3-1.

3.1.1 Kihei-Makana Community Plan

The Kihei-Makana Community Plan (July 1985) is currently being updated, and a Proposed Plan (October 1993) is under review by the County Council. As shown on Figure 3-1, the planning region stretches from the southern shoreline to Waiuku and Lahaina. However, most of the population and development in this region is centered around the Kihei to Makana area.

The Proposed Plan raised issues regarding Kihei-Makana's physical and social infrastructure, emphasizing that community facilities are not keeping up with growth. Therefore, objectives were established to limit hotel and residential development until adequate public facilities and services, such as schools, are established to meet existing needs. The exception to this recommendation is that the Proposed Plan encouraged development of appropriate commercial and light industrial activities to diversify the region's economic base.

Based on the Proposed Plan, the following land use trends can be expected:

- Vacant land between Pilihi Highway and South Kihei Road to Kiohaha Road would be developed as an urban mix, such as single-family and multi-family residences and commercial land uses (shopping centers, hotels, etc.). The pace of this development would depend on market conditions and the availability of long-term employment.
- Limited commercial/light industrial expansion in areas mauka of Pilihi Highway would be developed, such as the Kaonouhi parcel and the build-out of the Maui R&T Park.
- Resorts and resort-related activities (some residences, retail commercial, etc.) would continue to be developed in the existing resort area of Wailea and Makana.

3.1.2 Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan


The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) seeks to protect and enhance the unique qualities of this region through policies and recommendations to expand the

region's agricultural base and enhance the rural and agricultural qualities associated with Upcountry Maui. The Plan seeks to accomplish this by directing growth into and adjacent to already established urbanization centers. For example, Pukalani would be the region's "hub" for business, commercial and housing land uses. Makawao's and Waiakoa's unique town ambience and Kula's rural and agricultural atmosphere are intended to be maintained. According to the Community Plan, the following land use trends can be expected:

- Agriculture and open space would be maintained.
- Residential growth would be directed into and adjacent to the established urbanized communities of Pukalani, Makawao and Halimaile. These areas would accommodate most of the residential growth (about 5,000 to the year 2010).
 - In Makawao:
 - businesses would develop around the established central core; and
 - the country town ambience would be maintained.
 - In Pukalani:
 - residential growth would be located within (in-fill) and to the north (makai) and south (mauka) of the community;
 - multi-family residences (for senior housing in the Kulamalu development) would be consistent with community's size and character; and
 - would be developed as Upcountry's geographic, public service and commercial hub.
 - In Halimaile:
 - some small-scale commercial uses would serve existing and proposed residences; and
 - limited single-family residential growth would be contiguous with existing residences.
- Small-scale agriculture in Kula, particularly on the west (makai) side of Kula Highway, would be preserved
- Waiakoa developed as Kula's town center:
 - some low density residential uses;
 - some small scale commercial; and
 - no urban sprawl.
- Some residences in Kula would generally be allowed in the area between Kula Highway and Haleakala Highway. The lot sizes would be no larger than 0.2 ha (1/2 acre).
- The Keokea area would be developed for homesteads by the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL).
- No large-scale retail or heavy industrial land uses.
- Existing communities would remain separated with no in-fill development between communities.

3.2 General Economic Trends

Maui's visitor industry is expected to continue to be its most important in the future. Economic forecasts (land use constrained) conducted for the County of Maui indicate that the number of visitor accommodation units and visitors for the county would



increase by 55 percent and 78 percent from 1990 to 2010, respectively. (Unconstrained forecasts would have had these indicators double from 1990 to 2010) Recently completed 2020 socio-economic projections prepared by the State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) indicates that these two indicators would increase by 44 percent and 52 percent, respectively. The two existing visitor-accommodation regions, Lahaina-Kaanapali-Kapalua and Kihai-Makena, would continue to be the primary resort areas.

HC&S, ML&P, the ranches, and the Kula small farms are expected to continue to be viable businesses into the 21st century, and constitute a fair portion of the county's economy. However, their growth would likely be moderate at best. These businesses may continue to face many of the same obstacles that have adversely affected them in the past, such as urban encroachment and world competition.

Maui's high technology industry is growing. Although the Maui R&T Park has currently a little more than 300 employees, it is only eight percent built-out. By the year 2020, Park officials estimate the entire 168 ha (415 acres) complex would be completed. Per County ordinance, fifty percent of the R&T Park must be dedicated to research and development, forty percent to support facilities and only ten percent to light manufacturing and general industrial. Park officials expect new major industries to locate in the park, such as bio- and medical-technology; arts and entertainment; environmental, earth and ocean sciences; information processing and exchange; defense missions; and education and international training and technology conferencing.

3.3 Interviewee Views

3.3.1 Kihai-Makena Region

"Key informants" from Kihai stated that they do not anticipate a lot of changes in Kihai because there is little incentive for developers to construct new hotels and housing. They noted that most of the prime resort locations are already developed, and the only areas to develop are in south Makena. With very little anticipated hotel development, the "key informants" believed that job growth would be modest. Therefore, they believe residential development would be slow, even though the area between Pihani Highway and South Kihai Road is only about one-third developed.

"Key informants" expressed the desire to prevent or limit shoreline development and maintain coastal access. They also stated that Kihai, as a tourist town, should have a network of greenways running along the coastline and parallel to and between Pihani Highway and South Kihai Road, with several east-west (mauka-makai) collectors (looking like a ladder). These greenways would be used for cycling and other recreational activities, and would support the tourist industry.

3.3.2 Upcountry Maui Region

Upcountry "key informants" almost unanimously stated that they want to maintain Upcountry's rural, country setting, its agricultural base, its open space, and its quiet

atmosphere. Some spoke about the need for residents to maintain their "local" values and culture. Those who spoke about this "local" culture defined it as having "Aloha," caring about the land and their communities, having similar goals for their communities, and having tolerance of other people's beliefs and lifestyles. "Key informants" generally wanted the Upcountry's "urban" area to remain in Pukalani and Makawao. They believed these towns to be appropriate areas for Upcountry's businesses and community and public services. "Key informants" from Pukalani and Makawao spoke about responsible zoning, and residential and commercial land uses that are consistent with the size and scale of the existing towns. For example, commercial uses in Makawao should be consistent with the county town atmosphere of its main street, and as a "bedroom community," Pukalani should not have inappropriate land uses such as bars and lounges.

According to the "key informants", threats to this desired future, include uncontrolled or inappropriate development; newcomers (from the mainland and in-State) not having "local" Upcountry values; increased tourism activities; and the water supply problem. One commenter specifically identified the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway as a threat to his desired future, stating that the highway would "single-handedly wipe out the community."

No "key informant" desired zero growth. Some said that without growth, the community would die. One person said that they need to provide land for their children so they too can live in the country. Another said that opportunities were needed for other Maui residents to move to Upcountry. The concern among all "key informants" was that too much or inappropriate development would destroy many of the things people value about Upcountry. For example, if the number of residences near the Kula farms increase, these farms may not survive. One person thought that if development cannot be controlled, Upcountry would not be a desirable place to live.

"Key informants" were willing to accepted the changes to Upcountry from the D-HL development

Those who spoke about tourism see it as a threat or obstacle to their ideal future if a "Disney-type" tourist attraction is allowed. "Key informants" do not object to tourists traveling to the Haleakala summit now or in the future. They did, however, object to tourists driving through Upcountry's rural neighborhoods.

The water availability problem was seen as a threat primarily to Kula farmers who depend on a steady supply of water.

4. POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS

This chapter analyzes potential social impacts of the six alternative alignments for the Kihel-Upcountry Highway.

The impact analyses of this chapter are based on the guidance documents identified in Section 1.3. Impacts identified if any of the following project-related effects occur:

- For neighborhood impacts:
 - Changes in neighborhoods or community cohesion. These changes may include splitting neighborhoods or isolating portions of neighborhoods or ethnic groups.
 - Impacts on specific social groups, such as the elderly, handicapped, non-drivers, transit-dependent and minority and ethnic groups.
- For impacts on agriculture:
 - Would there be a loss of farmland? If so, which farmland would be affected?
 - How would current agricultural practices be affected?
- Effect on current land use patterns and development trends. Questions to be answered for this type of impact include:
 - What is the growth inducement potential of each alternative and where would its generated growth be located?
 - Would the project be in compliance with local land use plans and zoning?
 - Are there other factors to be considered in determining land use patterns and development trends?
- If there are displacement or relocation impacts, the following questions would determine the level of impacts:
 - How many residences would be displaced?
 - How many businesses and farms would be displaced?
 - Are there available sites to accommodate those displaced?
- Changes in mobility and travel patterns and their effects on existing socio-economic activities.
- Impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc., including any changes in accessibility.
- Impacts of alternatives on highway and traffic safety as well as on overall public safety, including crime.

4.1 Neighborhood Impacts

Figure 2-1 identifies the neighborhoods or communities in the study area. Portions of the study area midway between Upcountry and Kihel are owned by a few large land

owners, such as Alexander & Baldwin and Haleakala Ranch, and are used for large scale sugarcane and pineapple cultivation and pasture. The following describes the alignments' physical relationships with existing neighborhoods:

- Segment U1 is located approximately 1200 to 1400 m (4000 - 4500 ft) west to northwest (makai) of Pukalani.
- At its closest point, Segment U2-A is located approximately 150 m (500 ft) south of Pukalani and approximately 300 m (1000 ft) north of a few Omaoipo homesteads.
- Segment U2-B is located approximately 275 m (900 ft) south of Pukalani and approximately 240 m (800 ft) of the Omaoipo homesteads. The lower part of a residential subdivision, Kula 200, is directly east (mauka) of the U2-B/Kula Highway intersection. However, this subdivision is upslope from the terminus.
- Segment U3 is located approximately 240 to 700 m (800 to 2300 ft) north of residences along Puiehu Road. U3's intersection with Kula Highway is approximately 500 m (1600 ft) southwest of the Kula Kai Subdivision which is located east (mauka) of Lower Kula Road.
- Segment K1 is located approximately 500 m (1600 ft) at its closest point from a residential subdivision located mauka of Pilihi Highway. West (makai) of K1's intersection with Pilihi Highway, Kaonoulu Estate, is the nearest residential subdivision.
- At the K2/Pilihi Highway intersection, the nearest residential area is approximately 500 m (1600 ft) north of this location, located west (makai) of Pilihi Highway.

Based on the information above, none of the alternatives would split any existing neighborhood, nor isolate parts of neighborhoods from the greater community. Therefore, the alternatives would not in themselves adversely affect community cohesion. However,

Although none of the alternatives would change land use patterns in Upcountry in a way different from the future development described in the Community Plan (see Section 4.3), implementation of the Community Plan may affect the rural county lifestyle of Upcountry by increasing the population and density, increasing traffic and associated roadway noise, and encroaching onto agricultural land.

Some of the alternatives have the potential to change existing travel patterns in a way that could adversely affect certain existing neighborhoods. These potential impacts are discussed in Section 4.5.

4.2 Agricultural Impacts

Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) cultivates approximately 14 000 ha (35,000 acres) of sugarcane on land on the west slopes of Haleakala and in Central

Maui (see Figure 4-1). HC&S operates two sugar mills, located in Pūnene and Paia, which also export electricity to the Maui electrical grid. Other highways, such as Haleakala and Hana Highways, already cross HC&S fields (see Figure 4-1), and these highways adversely affect productivity for several reasons. For example, only some public road-haul road crossings are signalized, and these crossings delay the transport of sugarcane to the mills. In addition, suburban encroachment interferes with operations, such as cane burning and aerial spraying.


Proximity to urban areas adversely affects the efficiency of HC&S sugarcane operations because cane burning has to be regulated (i.e., no cane burning during Kona (south wind) weather), dust control measures have to be used (the 136 000 kg (300,000 lb.) cane hauling vehicles traveling on unpaved cane roads produce tremendous amount of dust), and trespassers are more frequent, leaving derelict vehicles and other waste in the fields. As one of the few remaining sugar producing companies in Hawaii, HC&S believes that to remain competitive in the world market they must be as efficient as possible, and continue to produce high yields at least cost. HC&S feels that any project that brings more urbanization near their fields detracts from efficiency.

The other large-scale crop production business in the study area is Maui Land & Pineapple Company (ML&P), the last pineapple processor in the State. ML&P's pineapple fields are located around Halimaile, Makawao and Pukalani, and in lower Kula (see Figure 4-1). In addition to their own land holdings, ML&P leases land to cultivate pineapple because market demand exceeds supply. ML&P selected these areas to cultivate pineapple because they have good soil conditions and access to water. Similar to HC&S, urban encroachment has adversely affected ML&P productivity. The other major constraint for ML&P is obtaining land with access to water.

Cattle ranching generally occurs east (mauka) of Haleakala Highway/Kekaulike Avenue and on the lower west and south slopes of Haleakala. Ranching enterprises in the study area are the Haleakala and Kaonoulu Ranches. Similar to HC&S and ML&P, urban encroachment has adversely affected the ranches because of complaints about noise and cattle crossing public roadways.


Small farms are located in Kula around Omaopio, Pulehu Naalae, Waiahoa, and Keokea. As described in Sections 2.2 and 2.4, these two to four hectare (five to ten acre) farms cultivate vegetables and flowers. Kula farmers face problems similar to those expressed by HC&S and ML&P: urban encroachment and periodic water use restrictions during drought conditions. Urban encroachment affects Kula farmers through speculation (increasing land values), neighbor complaints of chemical use by farmers, and increased traffic (see Section 4.5).

The alternatives would cross agricultural land, and convert it to a transportation use (see Figure 4-1). Most of the agricultural impacts would occur on existing sugarcane and pineapple fields (see below). The degree of impact would depend on the alignment selected. No privately-owned Kula small-scale farm would be directly affected by any of the alternatives, although leased fields located in the Kula Agricultural Park owned by Maui County could be affected depending on the alignment



Source: Warren S. Unemon Engineering, Inc.

GRAPHIC SCALE:



Cropland Impacts
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
 Community Impact Assessment
 FIGURE 4-1

selected (see below). Also, some of the alternatives could modify travel patterns in a way that may adversely affect certain Kula farms. This is discussed in Section 4.5, "Traffic Patterns and Highway Safety."

When an alternative encroaches on land used for cultivation, it would adversely affect agricultural operations, such as planting, aerial spraying, irrigation, drainage and harvesting, for several reasons. For example, the roadway could interfere with agricultural infrastructure, such as existing service roads and irrigation and drainage systems. In addition, the roadway could isolate portions of fields, making them inaccessible and unworkable for cultivation. However, this project would not create unworkable remnant parcels in most cases because mitigation measures to maintain the productivity and workability of the affected fields would be implemented.

The impacts of alternative alignments are described below:

- Segment U1 would cross sugarcane fields owned by Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) west (makai) of Pukalani (see Figure 4-2). The alignment would separate approximately 400 ha (1000 acres) of sugarcane land from larger fields, and cross existing cane haul roads and irrigation and drainage systems. The isolated parcel would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1, would be implemented if a U1 alternative is constructed.
- Segment U1/U2-A/U2-B would cross a Maui Land and Pineapple Company (ML&P) pineapple field located along Pulehu Road, affecting internal roadways, water conveyance infrastructure and drainage patterns (see Figure 4-1). The two newly created parcels would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1, would be implemented if either a U1 or U2-A alternative is constructed.
- Segment U2-A or U2-B would separate approximately 25 ha (60 acres) of HC&S sugarcane land from a larger field (see Figure 4-1). It would also cross two major water ditches, the Hamakua Ditch and the Reservoir 40 ditch. The U2-A or U2-B alignment would also cross a ML&P pineapple field located south (mauka) of Pukalani, separating two parcels from a larger field. These affected fields would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1, would be implemented if a U2-A or U2-B alternative is constructed.
- Segment U3 would cross two ML&P fields located along Pulehu Road (see Figure 4-1). At the western (makai) field, two fields would be created. However, both fields would remain productive because mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1, would be implemented if a U3 alternative is constructed. At the eastern (mauka) field, unworkable remnant parcels may be created because of the small size of the isolated field. The U3 alignment would also cross the Kula Agricultural Park owned by Maui County (see Figure 4-1). The Ag Park leases low-rent parcels to small-scale farmers. Some of the parcels would be converted to the roadway. The remaining parcels and parcels modified because of the roadway alignment would remain productive because

mitigation measures, as described in Section 6.1, would be implemented if a U3 alternative is constructed.

Segments K1 and K2 do not affect existing cropland.

The alternatives would also cross land used for cattle ranching and grazing. Segments U1/U2-A/U2-B, U3, K1 and K2 would traverse cattle ranching/pasture land located toward the southern portion of the study area, south of the sugarcane fields and west (makai) of the small Kula farms. The proposed highway would increase accessibility to pasture land.

The U3 alignment would be located approximately 90 m (300 ft) from a working corral and water system (tank and troughs). The owner of the corral, Haleakala Ranch, has indicated a preference that the highway not be within visual distance of the corral to prevent highway users from interfering with cattle operations. The U3 alignment would therefore interfere with corral operations.

Haleakala Ranch also stated that they would have to herd cattle across the K1 alignment several times a year. Herds may reach 1,500 cows, and it would take about 10 to 15 minutes for the animals to cross the highway. However, impacts are not anticipated because mitigation measures would be provided as described in Section 6.1.

4.3 Land Use Impacts

To evaluate the potential urban development impacts of a highway project, one compares the proposed transportation project to the extent of planned growth within the project area. Highway projects often remove impediments to urban growth by enhancing access to vacant land or increasing transportation capacity. Therefore, assessment of the potential urban growth impacts of the proposed roadway is based on the question of whether the transportation infrastructure would facilitate planned growth, or induce unplanned growth. In this case, the planned growth would be according to the Proposed Kihai-Makana Community Plan (October 1993) and the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996) (see Section 3.1.4.2d).

The alternatives would support planned growth because all of them would improve transportation between Kihai and Upcountry by reducing travel time (see Section 1.2.1). The issue of whether Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway would induce unplanned growth is addressed below.

Kihai-Makana

Growth facilitation would be beneficial in Kihai-Makana where there is ample room between Pitani Highway and South Kihai Road. Additional development would conform to Kihai's visitor-based urban environment. However, other factors, such as future hotel and resort development and the pace of development of Maui's "high-technology" industry, are expected to determine the speed and extent of growth in Kihai more than the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway. As indicated in the Kihai-Makana

Community Plan, only limited commercial and business development would be allowed mauka of Pihani Highway, primarily the build out of the Maui R&T Park. State and county zoning east (mauka) of Pihani Highway would remain in agriculture. Therefore, neither K1 or K2 segments would facilitate development in areas east (mauka) of Pihani Highway. If the alternatives facilitate in-fill development between Pihani Highway and South Kiheti Road, this would be considered a positive impact because it would be consistent with the Kiheti-Makana Community Plan.

Upcountry

The Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan indicated maintenance of low densities, open space and agricultural activities in Upcountry's rural communities. In addition, in interviews with "key informants," many stated a broad concern about the proposed highway facilitating urban development and increasing traffic volumes in Upcountry. Elements that are inconsistent with the articulated vision for the area. However, it is appropriate to look beyond these concerns to other factors that could affect land use trends in Upcountry, and to the relative differences among the alignment alternatives.

The project could facilitate planned residential and commercial developments in Upcountry because it would provide a transportation link between the Kiheti-Makana employment center and the popular Upcountry Maui residential area. However, regardless of whether areas are available to be developed (i.e., have appropriate zoning or are identified for growth in official County land use plans), the greatest obstacle to further development in parts of Upcountry is water availability, which has historically constrained urban growth. According to the Maui Board of Water Supply (BWS), there is currently barely enough capacity to serve current customers in Upcountry. Under drought conditions, customers are required to cut back water use, and the reservoirs quickly run dry.

Maui is served by five major water supply systems: Central Maui, Makawao, Kula, Hana, and Lahaina, and 15 individual sub-systems. The Iao Aquifer in the West Maui Mountains is the water source for Kiheti-Makana and other areas. Unlike Kiheti-Makana, Upcountry's water supply is from surface sources along the north and east side of the island that feed into the Makawao and Kula systems. Makawao and Pukalani receive their water from the Makawao system. Surface water is treated at the Kamole Weir Water Treatment Plant located near Halimale, and pumped up to the two communities. This system has no reservoir. The Kula system operates as two separate systems (Upper and Lower), with each having its own separate surface water intakes, treatment facility, and distribution system (lines running along the upper portion of Haleakala Highway for the Upper system and lines running along Kula Highway for the Lower system). However, water can be pumped up (lower to upper) or gravity fed (upper to lower) between the two systems if required. Also, during droughts, water is sometimes pumped to the Kula systems from the Makawao system, and customers are required to reduce water use. The Maui BWS has recently constructed two 190,000 m³ (50 million gallon) reservoirs in the Upper Kula System, but there are no other immediate plans for a new reservoir in this system.

The Maui BWS uses the Community Plans in planning new water systems and/or increasing the capacity of existing systems. The Maui BWS is planning improvements

to the Makawao system in response to the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996), and has approved private development plans to drill a well in Haiku to free water in the Makawao system for the Kulamalu development located south of Pukalani. Recent and planned projects for the Upper and Lower Kula systems are intended to improve service to current customers so that during drought conditions the Maui BWS does not have to implement water use restrictions as they have done many times in the past (telephone conversation with Maui BWS, May 5, 1998).

Providing more water to the Kula systems to support unplanned development in Upcountry, particularly Kula, is unlikely mainly because the system relies on surface water. Surface water resources are vulnerable to drought conditions, whereas groundwater resources provide a sustainable yield even during a year or two of limited rainfall. According to the Maui BWS, the high cost and substantial risk of developing alternative sources of water (i.e., wells) has stopped many development proposals in Upcountry. The Kulamalu developer is able to assume the high cost and risk of drilling a well in Haiku because of the size and scale of the development (telephone conversation with Maui BWS, May 5, 1998). Therefore, water supply limitation is likely to remain the constraint to development in Upcountry in the future, despite the efforts of the Maui BWS to improve its Upcountry systems and despite the construction of the Kiheti-Upcountry Maui Highway.

Since the Maui BWS is planning to accommodate development in Pukalani (Makawao system), the U1 alternatives could facilitate Pukalani's growth westward (makai) toward the highway. This growth inducement would be partially consistent with the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan because there are parcels on the west (makai) side of Pukalani designated for residential growth (see Figure 4-2). The U1 alternatives could facilitate development beyond Pukalani's urban growth boundary if the landowner, Alexander and Baldwin (A&B), chooses to develop its land west (makai) of Pukalani. Similarly, the U1 alternatives may induce development in Halimale beyond what is designated in the Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (see Figure 4-2).

The U2-A and U2-B alignments may have very little influence in the area south (mauka) of Pukalani. The area south (mauka) of Pukalani is planned to be used for Kulamalu, and its developer will be making substantial improvements to the water supply infrastructure. Since parcels for this project already have State urban classification, the County has approved zoning and Community Plan amendments supporting the project (Maui News, December 2, 1997). With water availability not being a constraint, Kulamalu would be developed with or without Kiheti-Upcountry Maui Highway. However, the U2-A and U2-B alternatives, unlike the U1 or U3 alternatives, would support this development by providing additional transportation infrastructure to the site (i.e., Kulamalu residents would not have to use Haleakala or Kula Highways to travel to Kiheti). In particular, the U2-B alignment was suggested by the Kulamalu developer, and therefore would be more supportive of the development than the U2-A alignment. The U2-A and U2-B alignment may facilitate in-fill growth along Pukalani's southern (makai) side. According to the Community Plan, some of Pukalani's growth is directed toward this area (see Figure 4-2).

Segment U3 is located approximately 5 km (3 miles) south (mauka) of Upcountry's "urban" areas of Pukalani and Makawao, in an area where the Community Plan

designates very little additional growth. The developments that are planned include small scale commercial land uses in Waikoa and rural residences. These uses, particularly the residences, are not dependent on the highway because of Kula's attractiveness as a residential area. However, these developments will have to receive other governmental approvals (e.g., zoning, subdivision, etc.) and obtain water meters. The latter could be difficult (see above). In summary, U3 would facilitate planned growth but not induce unplanned growth.

4.4 Displacements and Relocations

Depending on the alternative, Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would require right-of-way from the land owners identified below (the properties' existing uses are provided in parentheses):

- Alexander & Baldwin (Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S)): sugarcane cultivation (U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives);
- County of Maui (Kula Agricultural Park): leased diversified agriculture (U3 alternatives);
- Dowling Company: vacant, but future Kulamalu development (U2-A and U2-B alternatives);
- Haleakala Ranch: pasture land and pineapple cultivation (all alternatives);
- Kaonoulu Ranch: pasture land (K1 and K2 alternatives)
- Malama Mohala Corp.: vacant, but future urban uses (U2-A and U2-B alternatives)
- Maui Land & Pineapple Company: pineapple cultivation (U2-A, U2-B and U3 alternatives)
- Von Tempisky Trust: pasture land (U3 alternative);
- Others (see Table 2-1 for a list of land owners): vacant, future urban uses (U2-A alternatives).


While mitigation measures to lessen the adverse impact on agricultural and ranching activities would be provided (see Section 6.1), none of these land owners or operators would be relocated due to right-of-way requirements. All of the enterprises listed above could continue operations at their present locations after acquisition of roadway right-of-way.

No alternative would require the displacement of any residence

4.5 Travel Patterns and Highway Safety

Traffic Diversion

All alternatives would cause major changes to existing traffic patterns in the project area. All would divert most, if not all, trips between Kihei-Makena and Upcountry onto the new highway and off of Haleakala Highway, Hana Highway, Dairy Road, and Mokuete Highway, the existing Kihei to Upcountry route. If a K1 alternative is selected, some of the travel demand between Upcountry and West Maui would also be diverted.



onto the new highway. Kihei-Upcountry trip lengths could be cut by half, depending on the alternative, and the origin and destination. However, the K1 alternatives would increase traffic volumes on Pihani Highway, north of the K1 terminus, and North Kihei Road, as traffic is diverted off the above roadways and Kulele Highway (part of the existing Upcountry-West Maui route). The traffic diversion impacts on Pihani Highway and North Kihei Road would not be substantial under the K2 alternatives.


Agricultural Movements

Omaopio and Pulehu Roads (see Figure 4-3) are County facilities used by Kula farmers to cultivate their fields (e.g., moving equipment from field to field) and transport agricultural products to Kahului Harbor. Although these roads are narrow and winding, they are used by some motorists as an alternative to Haleakala Highway to travel to Kahului or other parts of Maui. It has been reported that motorists often speed on these roadways. One "key informant" stated that some motorists use the even more narrow Pihai Road, a local access road approximately 1.4 km (0.85 miles) long that is parallel to and off of Omaopio Road, because it is straighter, allowing motorists to speed even faster. The use of these roads as a through route has adversely affected nearby and adjacent farmers and residents by interfering with farm equipment movements, increasing traffic noise and compromising traffic safety through excessive speeds on inappropriate roadways. Motor vehicle accident data from the Maui Police Department shows a high number of vehicle accidents on these roads. For example, in 1996, there were 34 vehicle accidents on Omaopio Road. As a comparison, Haleakala Highway from the "Five Trees" intersection to Hana Highway, a roadway that has many times the traffic volumes as Omaopio Road, had only nine vehicle accidents in the same year.

The U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives would intersect both Omaopio and Pulehu Roads (see Figure 4-3), and would cause an increase in the use of these agricultural roads as "short-cuts." The traffic on these roads would be higher under the U1 alternatives because the U1 terminus is farther from Kula than the U2-A or U2-B terminus. By increasing the use of Omaopio and Pulehu Roads as through routes, greater impacts than at present from the inappropriate use of these roads would be expected. These impacts include interference with farm equipment movements, increased traffic noise and lower traffic safety through excessive speeds on inappropriate roadways. However, the County is planning to improve Omaopio and Pulehu Roads.

In addition, the U1 or U2-A/U2-B crossings would have a slight adverse effect on farm product transportation from Kula to Kahului because delivery trucks would cross the new highway. However, the highway would enhance product transportation to Kihei-Makena.

The U3 alternatives would only intersect Pulehu Road (see Figure 4-3). Since the U3 terminus is a short distance away from the Pulehu Road/Kula Highway intersection, the traffic diversion onto Pulehu Road would be minimal.



Impacts to Omaopio and Pulehu Roads
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Community Impact Assessment
FIGURE 4-3

Residential Areas

U3 alternatives may encourage travelers to and from the Haleakala summit to use local residential roads between Kula Highway and Haleakala Highway. The preferred route for this trip is for motorists to stay on Kula and Haleakala Highways. Some visitors who are unfamiliar with the Upcountry roads may choose to use the local east-west (mauka-makai) roads between Kula and Haleakala Highways because they may appear to be "short-cuts" to the summit. Increasing traffic volumes on local residential roads would adversely affect the adjacent neighborhoods through increased traffic noise (including travel to the summit early in the morning to watch the sunrise), and the increased potential for accidents on roadways not designed for heavy volumes.

King Kekaulike High School

"Key informants" have reported that students of the new King Kekaulike High School located on the southeastern corner of the Pukalani Bypass/Haleakala Highway/Kula Highway "Five Trees" intersection walk along Kula Highway, which has no sidewalks. They also report that students walk on Haleakala Highway in Pukalani, again because there are no sidewalks. The "key informants" were also worried that student "inexperienced" drivers would have difficulty driving to and from the school if an alternative is selected that is near the school because of the high traffic volumes associated with the highway, such as travel demand to and from the summit and the more populous communities of Pukalani and Makawao.

The location of the U2-A terminus at the "Five Trees" intersection would facilitate access to King Kekaulike High School. This alternative would have minimal effects to the school's main entrance, which is located approximately 300 m (1000 ft) south of the intersection on Kula Highway, because much of the high traffic volumes associated with the highway would use Haleakala Highway. Some of this traffic would, however, pass in front of the school's second back entrance/exit on Haleakala Highway. Under any of the U2-B alternatives, the majority of traffic would pass in front of the main entrance/exit, and therefore may make it more difficult for "inexperienced" drivers to enter or exit the school.

Bicycling Impacts

Bicycle tours are a popular tourist activity on Maui. Tours normally start from the summit of Haleakala, run through Crater Road, Haleakala Highway and Baldwin Avenue, and end in Paia. Although Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway was not identified in Bike Plan Hawaii (April 1994) as a potential bikeway, the Kihei-Makena region would be a natural area to end some of the Haleakala bike tours. The proposed roadway would have sufficient room for bicyclists riding single file because bike lanes would be provided at urban roadway sections and adequate shoulders would be provided at rural roadway sections. Bike tour operators would be less likely to modify their routes if U1 or U3 is selected because of their distance from the "Five Trees" intersection.

Highway Safety

Engineering design standards for a rural, limited access arterial roadway, as specified by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), were used as a final flaw criterion in selecting alternatives for the project. Therefore, all the alternatives would provide a safe transportation facility. Regardless of the alternative selected, the Kihei and Upcountry termini would be signalized. However, since the U1, U2-A and U2-B alternatives could divert traffic onto Omaoio and Pulehu Roads, and because these roadways are not designed to accommodate high volumes of traffic, accidents could increase on these two roadways.

4.6 Community Facilities, Services and Parks

None of the alternatives would directly affect (through right-of-way impacts) existing public facilities and services, parks or recreational facilities. However, access to these facilities and services would be enhanced by any of the alignment alternatives because of the decreased travel time between Kihei and Upcountry.

4.7 Crime

Table 4-1 exhibits the crime rates of the communities in the study area for selected offenses for the years 1993 to 1996. The table indicates that for property crimes, such as burglary and theft, the Kihei to Makena communities have crime rates two to four times the rate of Upcountry communities. The crime rate differences for other offenses, such as criminal property damage, are not as great or the Upcountry communities have higher rates than the Kihei-Makena communities. The information presented in this table supports views expressed by "key informants" from Kihei who identified crime as a social problem affecting their community, and views expressed by Upcountry "key informants" that that crime is not a problem.

Scoping activities and interviews conducted for this study indicated a strong belief among some Upcountry residents that Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway would increase the crime rate in Upcountry because criminals based in Kihei would have more convenient access to Upcountry. Makawao and Kula police officers interviewed for this study could not speculate on whether the highway would increase the crime rate in Upcountry, although both officers agreed that the proposed highway would facilitate better police response through additional highway infrastructure.

**Table 4-1
Crime Rate of Selected Offenses Per 10,000 Residents**

Offense/Location	Year			
	1993	1994	1995	1996
Burglary				
Haliimaile	97.61	126.45	40.98	59.88
Makawao	53.90	162.05	149.25	97.29
Pukalani	88.47	67.85	93.84	65.64
Kula	100.40	54.37	43.54	49.94
Kihei	211.12	304.89	241.38	249.24
Wailea-Makena	141.69	144.69	206.49	132.51
Theft				
Haliimaile	86.77	231.82	174.18	189.62
Makawao	297.10	342.79	264.75	282.48
Pukalani	237.47	256.33	199.41	175.51
Kula	111.92	166.29	163.27	166.46
Kihei	730.30	905.90	909.66	843.66
Wailea-Makena	631.60	618.44	814.61	766.34
Criminal Property Damage				
Haliimaile	108.46	126.45	163.93	129.74
Makawao	158.68	180.42	177.03	161.42
Pukalani	85.36	123.64	77.71	57.09
Kula	64.19	57.56	65.31	90.80
Kihei	138.01	238.65	176.96	197.89
Wailea-Makena	100.86	105.02	117.99	154.59
All Offenses*				
Haliimaile	835.14	1022.13	891.39	928.14
Makawao	1483.79	1676.23	1783.09	1587.77
Pukalani	963.84	1020.81	1036.66	927.51
Kula	515.14	580.43	738.61	776.33
Kihei	2134.23	2863.76	2784.85	2753.02
Wailea-Makena	1203.17	1155.19	1590.65	1462.01

Note: * Includes violent, drug, forgery, gambling, runaway, sex, terroristic threatening, truancy, and court order violation offenses.

Source: Police Department, County of Maui, July 14, 1997

5. POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

This chapter analyzes potential economic impacts of the alternatives for the Kihei-Upcountry Highway project. The following economic impacts of the proposed project are discussed:

- effects of the project on local tax revenues, public expenditures, and employment opportunities;
- impacts on the existing highway-related businesses and the economic vitality of established business districts; and
- impacts on the local or regional economy.

5.1 Tax Revenues and Employment

Property values could increase over the long term for lands adjacent to the highway, particularly at the termini, if they could be developed (i.e., proper zoning and water availability), resulting in increased property tax revenues for Maui County. None of the alignment alternatives would decrease property values in adjacent parcels. These parcels would more likely be affected by current land use and economic development trends.

Because of right-of-way requirements, property taxes that would be collected by Maui County would decrease by \$13,000 to \$17,000 per year (1997 dollars) for the four alternatives that have Upcountry termini at U1 and U3. The four alternatives with the U2-A and U2-B termini would produce property tax decreases of approximately \$44,000 to \$46,000 per year (1997 dollars). This higher impact is attributable to the conversion of vacant land designated urban to roadway right-of-way. The U1 and U3 alternatives would convert almost exclusively lands designated agricultural, which have much lower property values.

The proposed project would infuse up to \$66 million (depending on the alternative) in federal funds for construction into the local economy, which would increase short-term employment and the purchase of local goods and services. The potential for additional long-term employment opportunities depends on how well the proposed project facilitates employee-producing land uses in areas approved by the County. For example, the U2-A and U2-B alternatives would support current land use plans for parcels near the mauka terminus of these alignments (Kulamalu), including business development. Although the Kulamalu development would occur with or without the either U2-A or U2-B alternative being selected, both alternatives would directly and indirectly support this area as a business district, leading to increased long-term employment opportunities. The Kulamalu developer formally suggested the U2-B alignment, and has developed a master plan with the U2-B alignment. A U2-A alignment may cause the developer to modify the Kulamalu master plan.

5.2 Impacts on Highway-Related Businesses and Business Districts

Existing commercial districts in Upcountry are located in Pukalani and Makawao (see Section 2.2). Kihai's commercial districts are along South Kihai Road and at a parcel in North Kihai, west (mauka) of Pihani Highway. Regardless of the alternative chosen, the proposed highway is not expected to adversely affect these districts because the roadway would not function as a commercial district bypass, except for Kahului. In contrast, Pukalani Bypass adversely affected certain Pukalani businesses. The proposed highway would not function in such a manner. Pukalani Bypass' impacts to Makawao was less profound. A Makawao business owner stated that Makawao caters to very few drive-by visitors because of its location away from the main traffic route. Most business patrons intend to visit Makawao for its shops and restaurants.

Although the proposed project would enable many motorists to bypass Kahului, economic impacts to Kahului businesses would be minimal. Residents would continue to travel to Kahului regardless of the proposed project because of Kahului's attractiveness as the island's principal commercial center (Kaahumanu Shopping Center, K-Mart, Costco, Eagle Hardware, etc.).

5.3 Impacts on Regional and/or Local Economy

The proposed project would infuse up to \$82 million (up to \$66 million in federal funds) into the local economy, providing job opportunities and the purchase of goods and other services needed to complete the project. In that respect, the proposed project, regardless of the alternative, would have a positive impact on the local economy. Further, if Segments U1, U2-A, or U2-B is selected, this would probably facilitate expansion of Pukalani in the direction of the roadway, providing further benefits to the local economy through construction job creation, purchases of goods and services, and possible long-term employment opportunities.

All the build alternatives would enhance access to tourist destinations in Upcountry and Haleakala National Park, and therefore would have a positive effect on this industry. The proposed project may facilitate economic activities catering to visitors.

Impacts on agricultural activities are discussed in Section 4.2.

The proposed project would support Maui's efforts to develop high technology industry. The roadway would provide increased synergism between Science City on the summit of Haleakala Crater and the R&T Park in Kihai. Currently, Science City receives technical support from defense contractors occupying space in the R&T Park.

6. MITIGATION MEASURES

The following are suggested measures to mitigate or minimize adverse impacts described in previous sections.

6.1 Agriculture and Ranching

Isolated or divided fields require mitigation measures to maintain their productivity. These measures should include haul road crossings (the U1 alternative should include two undercrossings), and the modification and reconstruction of existing irrigation and drainage systems. Access provisions for farm equipment to reach the isolated fields should be made. If U2-A or U2-B alternative is selected, Hamakua and Reservoir 4D Ditches should be protected and remain operative during and following construction.

If a U3 alternative is selected, SDOT should purchase any unworkable remnant ML&P land based on guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. Also, if a U3 alternative is selected, SDOT should work with Maui County to modify the Kula Agricultural Park.

Stock-proof fencing should be erected along both sides of the highway where there is cattle grazing. These fences may be constructed of hog wire with barb wire along the top and bottom of the fence. Provisions should be made at various bridge crossings so that cattle could be herded from one pasture to another without disrupting traffic. If a U3 alternative is selected, the nearby cattle corral should be relocated based on guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.

6.2 Land Use Impacts

Mitigation should not be required because the proposed project is not anticipated to cause unplanned development. However, it is nevertheless recommended that the SDOT deny access to the new highway from parcels other than those with proposed development that is approved by Maui County and is consistent with appropriate State and County land use objectives and guidelines. If DHHL requests access to the proposed highway for their Ulupalakua area homesteads, the SDOT should consider granting such a request in order to relieve increasing traffic volumes on Kula Highway from this development.

6.3 Traffic Patterns and Safety

Under a U1, U2-A or U2-B alternative, at least one of the intersections of the proposed highway with Omaoipio and Pulehu Roads should be signalized to facilitate crossing by heavy trucks. If possible, the timing algorithm of this signal(s) can be set to discourage motorists from using Omaoipio and Pulehu Roads as a "short-cut." This, of course,

would be an inconvenience for Kula farmers who previously had an uninterrupted route to Hana Highway.

If a U3 alternative is selected, signage should be provided to direct motorists to the proper route to the Haleakala summit.

Regardless of the alternative selected, the SDOT should consider constructing sidewalks along both sides of Kula Highway from the "Five Trees" intersection to at least the school. Since it is expected that development would occur on the south (mauka) side of Pukalani, sidewalks should also be appropriate on the east (makai) side of Kula Highway.

7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apogee Research, Inc. for the Federal Highway Administration, Community Impact Assessment: A Quick Reference for Transportation, March 1996

California Department of Transportation, Conducting Socioeconomic Analysis: Guidance for Consultants, May 1988

Community Resources, Inc. for Maui County Planning Department, Maui County Community Plan Update Program Socio-Economic Forecast Report, Final Report, January 1994

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Kihei-Makena Community Plan, July 1985

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Makawao-Pukalani-Kula Community Plan (July 1996)

County of Maui, Maui Planning Commission, Proposed Kihei-Makena Community Plan, October 1993

County of Maui, Office of Economic Development, Maui County Data Book, December 1994

Eagar, Harry, "Long Planned Development Scaled Back, Ready to Start," The Maui News, September 5, 1997

Kaku Associates and Munekiyo & Associates, Inc. for State of Hawaii Department of Transportation, Draft Final Report, Maui Long Range Land Transportation Plan, February 1996

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume I, October 1, 1993

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume II, October 1, 1993

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume I, October 1, 1993

State/County Joint Task Force, Upcountry/Kihei Highway, Final Report, Volume II, October 1, 1993

U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents, 1987

APPENDICES

Appendix A Interview Questions

1. How long have you lived in [location]?
2. How would you define your neighborhood? What makes it a "neighborhood"?
3. How old is your neighborhood?
4. How well do your neighbors know one another?
5. Would you say there is a sense of neighborhood? If so, in what way?
6. What kind of issues or problems has your neighborhood experienced in the last few years?
7. How were these issues or problems resolved?
8. [If interviewee is part of community association] What kinds of issues does your community association get involved with?
9. Is there something about [location] that you wish to stay the same?
10. What would you like to change?
11. What are the threats to the things you value about this place, if anything?
12. How have things changed in [location] in the last five years?
ten years?
twenty years?
13. What do you think [location] will be like in 20 years?
14. What kind of future would you like for [location]?
15. What are some of the obstacles to this future?
16. What are some of the opportunities or what can be done for this future to come true?
17. How do you feel about this project?
18. What kinds of impacts do you expect to your neighborhood from this project?
to [location]?
to the island?
19. Would a certain alternative make a difference?
20. How can the negative impacts be prevented or minimized?
21. How will [location] benefit from this project? How about the island? Neighborhood?

**Appendix B
List of "Key Informants"**

Name	Position	Organization
Peter Baldwin	President	Haleakala Ranch
Virginia Bateman	Kula 200 resident	
Wayne Botein	Legislative Analyst	County Council
Michele Chouteau	Legislative Analyst	County Council
David Cradick	Director	Board of Water Supply, County of Maui
Medelin D'Enbeau	small business owner	Makawao Main Street Association
Kris Dixon	Makawao Community Police Officer	Mau: Police Department
Dan Evert	Past President	Pukalani Community Association
Paul Ekins	long-time Pukalani business owner	
Will Freeman	Planner	Board of Water Supply, County of Maui
Gary Gilford	President	Mau Land & Pineapple Company
G. Stephen Gladay	General Manager	Hawai Commercial and Sugar Company
John Hoxie	Vice President	Hawai Commercial and Sugar Company
Buck Jones	Member	Kihai Community Association
Dave Jones	Member	Kihai Community Association
Russ Kanady	Member	Kihai Community Association
Alan Kaulima	President	Kula Community Association
Brett Klyver	Director of Development	Mau R&T Park
Mabel Lopez	President	Makawao Community Association
L. Douglas MacCluer	Plantation Manager	Mau Pineapple Company
Dick Mayer	Vice Chair	Upcountry Citizens Advisory Committee
Peter Meagher	Past President	Makawao Community Association
Brian Miskae	President	Kihai Community Association

**List of "Key Informants"
(continued)**

Name	Position	Organization
Randall Moore	Land Manager	Hawai Commercial and Sugar Company
Wesley Nonara	Plantation Superintendent	Mau Pineapple Company
Bill Overton	Manager	Wailea Community Association
Henry Rice	President	Kaonou Ranch
Susan Scofield	Principal and Pukalani resident	King Kekaulike High School
Ernest Soares	Kula Community Police Officer	Mau Police Department
Warren Suzuki	Vice President	Mau Land & Pineapple Company
Steve Sutrov	Past President	Kula Community Association
Masa Uradomo	Kula farmer	

APPENDIX I

Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey Report

**Archaeological Inventory Survey Report
of the Preferred Alternative**

Cultural Impacts Assessments Report

ABSTRACT

An archaeological reconnaissance survey of six proposed alternate routes for the Kihei to Kula road corridor was conducted by Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. from 18 February through 6 March 1987. Subsequent to the original reconnaissance survey additional alternatives, U2A and U2B were also subjected to reconnaissance survey. The alternate corridors are four hundred feet wide and over 121,176 linear feet (1112.7 acres). The alternate routes under study are located in the Makawao and Wailuku Districts of Maui island on the western slopes of Haleakala. They extend from Kailua at about 2300 ft. (700 m.) above mean sea level (amsl) at the north, through thirteen ahupua'a, to Kama'ole at about 100 ft. (30 m.) amsl in the south.

The reconnaissance survey included field work to assess archaeological sites, archival research of historical documents and maps, and research of previous archaeological studies. The fieldwork was conducted by three archaeologists walking each 400 foot wide corridor along a staked center line.

A total of 25 historic properties, or sites, were recorded. Twenty of these are new sites, designated State Sites #50-50-10-4760 through #50-50-10-4779. Previously recorded sites are the Kaliainui petroglyph site #50-50-10-1061; Kaluapulani Gulch petroglyphs, site #50-50-10-1062; Kaluapulani Gulch Petroglyphs (Cannets etc.) #50-50-10-4178; an historic cattle wall #50-50-10-4180; and two pineapple plantation clearing mounds, #50-50-10-4181. The new site types included enclosures, walls, mound and cairns, midden and lithic scatter, modified outcrop, road, ditch, overhang shelters and petroglyph sites. The primary functions of a majority of the sites found were agricultural and ranching (animal closures), although there were 4 recurrent habitation sites, 1 permanent habitation site, symbolic function for petroglyphs, and military function for a complex of enclosures.

In the U2A corridor historic properties, or sites, were found in two localities along Alternate U2A. The first, in Kaluapulani gulch, are two friezes of petroglyphs on the east side of the corridor. A search of the land to the west of the corridor revealed no historic properties there, thus, an option is to adjust the corridor to the west to avoid the archaeological sites.

Another site was found in Kaliainui gulch on the west side of the corridor. This site is a small shelter-cave. If the corridor will impact the site mitigation measures could be to realign the corridor to the east where no sites were found, or to retrieve the potential data from the site by archaeological excavation. No other sites were found in Alternate U2A.

If segment U2A is selected for the final road corridor an archaeological inventory survey is recommended to mitigate impacts to the historic properties in the vicinity of the corridor.

The western portion of Alternate U2B corridor, from the north edge of Kaliainui gulch westward to its terminus, was reconnoitered during the present survey work.

No historic properties, or sites, were found in the surveyed section of the corridor. However, U2B passes directly through site 50-50-10-4181 on the east side of Pu'u o Wehi. It

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE SURVEY
OF THE PROPOSED KIHEI TO KULA ROAD CORRIDORS,
KAILUA TO KAMA'OLE AHUPUA'A,
MAKAWAO AND WAILUKU DISTRICTS, ISLAND OF MAUI
(TMK 2-2 AND 2-3)

by

William H. Folk, B.A.
Melody Heidel, B.A.
Victoria Creed, Ph.D.
Thomas K. Devereux, B.A.
Jan A. Masterson
Kenneth Hillyard, B.A.
and
Hallett H. Hammatt, Ph.D.

prepared for
Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade, and Douglas, Inc.

Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc.
June 1989

consisted of four features including two agricultural clearing mounds and two stone alignments. Testing conducted at the stone alignments yielded historic artifacts associated with pineapple agriculture and the site is considered "no longer significant" (Wulzen 1996: ii). This previous work did not consider Pu'u o Welii, in the U2B corridor, as an historic property.

The eastern section of U2B, from Kaliainuui gulch to the Kula Highway was previously subjected to an archaeological survey in 1996. (This portion of the route was not re-surveyed in the current work). The 1996 survey recorded one historic property, or site, in the area that is the U2B corridor. The site - 50-50-10-4181 - was tested by archaeological excavation during that survey and found to be a modern site associated with pineapple cultivation. Based on the testing the site is considered to be no longer significant and no further archaeological work is recommended for the site.

Near it's *mauka* terminus Alternate U2B cuts into the west and north sides of the cinder cone Pu'u o Welii, which historically has been quarried for its cinder. This *pu'u* was not treated as an historic property in the previous archaeological study, but is potentially significant from an historic perspective in the context of the petroglyphs surrounding it, and as an early quarry associated with development in Kula.

Construction of Alternate U2B also has potential to indirectly impact the friezes of petroglyphs in Kaluapulani gulch - site 50-50-10-1062. They will require protective measures against short and long term negative impact. If segment U2B is selected for the final road corridor an archaeological inventory survey is recommended to mitigate impacts to the historic properties in the vicinity of the corridor.

On the west and southwest slope of Haleakala, previous archaeological researchers report a pattern of at least four zones: 1) coastal; 2) intermediate or barren; 3) upland habitation and agriculture; and 4) forest zone, inland and coastal settlement and agriculture with little evidence of occupation between these extremes. The corridors under study extend from the upland *mauka* zone to the coastal (*makai*) zone. The present findings within the road corridors support this predicted settlement pattern.

Land Commission claims and awards (LCAs) of the Mahele and Kuleana Acts reflect some aspects of traditional life and new agricultural trends associated with the growth of an international trade. The locations of LCAs on the western flank of Haleakala also support the predicted pattern of habitation and agriculture in the upland and coastal regions and an absence of these activities in the intermediate zone.

National Register of Historic Places significance criterion D is assigned to sites State sites #50-50-10-4750; -4760; -4761; -4763; -4780; -4783 through -4778 because the sites may be likely to yield information important to history and prehistory of Hawaii. An inventory level archaeological survey is recommended for mitigation of adverse impact to these sites, followed by data recovery of specific sites.

Sites Sites #50-50-10-1061, #50-50-10-4178, #50-50-10-4762, and #50-50-10-4764 are

significant under National Register criterion D and C because they are, respectively, likely to yield information important to history and prehistory, are considered excellent site types. Site #50-50-10-4762 is also significant under Hawaii Historic Preservation draft rules criterion E because it is "culturally significant". Recommendations for these sites call for an inventory level archaeological survey and preservation of these site areas. Mitigation of impact for these sites may necessitate realignment of portions of some of the Alternates to avoid the sites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i	Recommended Treatment	61
LIST OF FIGURES	vi	B. Summary of Results	63
LIST OF TABLES	viii	VIII. REFERENCES	65
I. INTRODUCTION	1	APPENDIX A. PHOTOGRAPHIC APPENDIX	72
Project Area Description	1	APPENDIX B. LAND COMMISSION AWARDS TABLE	
Scope of Work	1		
Survey Methodology	7		
II. NATURAL HISTORY	9		
Geology	9		
Geography	9		
Kula District	9		
Upland Zone	9		
Coastal Kihai Region	10		
Intermediate Zone	10		
III. HISTORIC BACKGROUND	12		
Historic Setting	12		
Mythological and Traditional Accounts	12		
Early Historic Period	12		
Mid-1800s (Land Commission Awards)	16		
Settlement Pattern in Kula as shown by LCAs	17		
Late 1800s	17		
Early 1900s To The Present	24		
One Informant Interview	25		
Summary	26		
Summary	27		
IV. PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH	29		
Kula Region	29		
Coastal Kihai Region	31		
Predictive Model	32		
V. SURVEY RESULTS	38		
A. Site Descriptions	38		
State Site #	38		
B. Summary of Results	42		
Summary of Results	54		
VI. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HISTORIC PROPERTIES	56		
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	61		
Conclusions	61		

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	State of Hawai'i	2
Figure 2	General Location Map, Maui Island	2
Figure 3	Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographical maps of the Haiku, Kihoana, and Pu'u O Kali quadrangles, showing the corridor Alternates (the study area), and approximate site locations	3
Figure 4	Previous archaeology conducted in upper portions of project area	34
Figure 5	Previous archaeology conducted <i>makai</i> of the project area during the 1970s	35
Figure 6	Previous archaeology conducted <i>makai</i> of the project area during the 1980s	36
Figure 7	Previous archaeology conducted <i>makai</i> of the project area during the 1990s	37
Figure 8	Map showing general location of awarded land claims in Upcountry Kula, Maui	71
Photographic Appendix		
Figure 9	Overview of cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs, view to north, State site 50-50-10-1061	73
Figure 10	Closeup of petroglyph: single human figure with spear, pecked on north face of overhang State site 50-50-10-1061	73
Figure 11	Modified outcrop, view to northeast, State site 50-50-10-4760	74
Figure 12	Enclosure, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4761	74
Figure 13	Enclosure, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4762	75
Figure 14	Terrace, view to east, State site 50-50-10-4180	75
Figure 15	Wall, view to east, State site 50-10-10-4763	76
Figure 16	Cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs located on Palehu Gulch wall (in upper left corner of photo), view to north, State site 50-50-10-4764	76
Figure 17	Overhang wall showing numerous pecked human petroglyph figures, view to north, State site 50-50-10-4764	77
Figure 18	Man with dog petroglyph, pecked, view to northeast, State site 50-50-10-4764	77
Figure 19	Historic agricultural complex, showing berm segment with <i>panini</i> -covered clearing mound at left, view to southeast, State site 50-50-10-4765	78
Figure 20	Historic agricultural complex, showing clearing mound, view to northwest, State site 50-50-10-4765	78
Figure 21	Wall and <i>ahu</i> , view to west, State site 50-50-10-4769	79
Figure 22	<i>Ahu</i> and enclosure, view to west, State site 50-50-10-4770	79
Figure 23	Enclosure (square), view to east, State site 50-50-10-4773	80
Figure 24	Wall, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4774	80
Figure 25	Wall, on southern edge of Kolaloa Gulch, State site 50-50-10-4775	81
Figure 26	Midden and lithic scatter, view to southwest, State site 50-50-10-4776	81
Figure 27	Midden and lithic scatter, view to northeast, State site 50-50-10-4776	82
Figure 28	Wall, along eastern ridge of Kaliaimui Gulch, view to north, State site 50-50-10-4777	82
Figure 29	L-shaped enclosure, view to east, State site 50-50-10-4778	83
Figure 30	Petroglyph site, north wall of south fork of Kaluapulani Gulch, view northwest, State site 50-50-10-4178	83
Figure 31	Canoe (with sail) petroglyphs on wall panel, view north, State site 50-50-10-4178	84
Figure 32	View of the north wall of Kaluapulani gulch from the south side. The center of the photo is aligned with the centerline of Alternate U2A. State site State site 50-50-10-1062, first panel is on the north wall right of center line; State site State site 50-50-10-1062, second panel is out of the photo to the right.	85
Figure 33	Lava Bedrock exposure bearing the State site State site 50-50-10-1062, petroglyph frieze; the view is to <i>mauka</i> , or east.	85
Figure 34	Examples of the petroglyphs at State site State site 50-50-10-1062. The 35 mm camera lens cap is included to show scale.	86
Figure 35	Example of petroglyph groupings at State site State site 50-50-10-1062. Ruler used for scale is six inches long. Petroglyphs exhibit an unusual triangular pattern.	86
Figure 36	Example of another petroglyph grouping at State site State site 50-50-10-1062, note the canoe-like petroglyph at top center of photo.	87
Figure 37	Close-up of canoe-like figure in petroglyph grouping shown in Figure 31.	87
Figure 38	The overhang shelter at State site 50-50-10-1062, beneath the petroglyph frieze.	88
Figure 39	Remains of a small fire in the overhang shelter beneath the State site 50-50-10-1062 frieze.	88
Figure 40	The niche, or alcove, at State site 50-50-10-1062, second panel. The petroglyph frieze is to the upper left, the plunge pool at the upper center obscured by the understorey. Possible <i>manake</i> plants are at the lower left backed by the large boulder.	89
Figure 41	Shelter-cave site State site 50-50-10-4779 in the south wall of Kaliaimui gulch. The front edge of the cave floor has five small boulders that level the floor of the shelter. View is to the west from near the streambed.	89
Figure 42	General view of the project area near 5 + 00, view to north, with pineapple plants visible in foreground	90
Figure 43	General view of the project area in the vicinity of 30 + 00, view to north	90
Figure 44	General view of State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view to east, showing surface structure	91
Figure 45	General view of State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view to the northeast, showing SW <i>heiau</i> facing	91
Figure 46	General view of State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view to northeast	92
Figure 47	View of State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view to the southwest, showing the surface of the north end of the structure	92
Figure 48	State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view of a typical constructed pit in the structure surface at the northeast end	93
Figure 49	Downslope view from State site #50-50-10-2701, <i>heiau</i> , view to the southwest, showing the view plane from the structure	93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Land Commission Claims for Kula 21
Table 2: Sites Located During Reconnaissance Survey 39
Table 3: Significance of Sites Located During Reconnaissance Survey 58

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

An archaeological reconnaissance survey of eight alternate routes for a proposed Kihei to Kula road corridor was conducted by Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. from 18 February through 6 March 1997 for Parsons Brinkerhoff. The routes under study are located in the Makawao and Wailuku Districts of Maui island on the western slopes of Haleakala.

Subsequent surveys were conducted for the new U2A and Alternate U2B alignments as a result of the finding of historic properties in the previously surveyed U2 corridor (Folk and Hammatt, eds. 1997).

Historic properties were found in Kaluapulani gulch (also shown on some maps as Haakakai gulch), and in Kaliainui gulch in the new U2A corridor. However, minor realignment of the corridor a few hundred feet to the west (downslope) will avoid these cultural resources in Kaluapulani and minor realignment to the east (up slope) will avoid the cultural resources in Kaliainui. No historic properties were found in the other segments of the U2A corridor.

Project Area Description

The proposed Kihei to Kula road corridors selected for study extend from Pi'ilani Highway in the south at about 100 ft. (30 m.) amsl north to Kula Highway at about 2300 ft. (700 m.) amsl. The corridors cross thirteen *ahupua'a* (Figures 1-3) from north to south, Kailua, Keahua, 'A'apeo, Kaliainui, Oma'opio, Pūlehunui, Kealahou 3 & 4, Waiakoa, Ka'ono'ulu, Kōheo 1 & 2, Waiohuli, Kōkōen, and Kama'ole.

The eight alternate route segments are based on four upcountry termini designated U1, U2A, U2B, and U3 and two Kihei termini designated K1 and K2; these designations are used to identify the route segments in this report. U1 intersects Haleakala Highway, U2A & U2B and U3 intersect the Kula highway. K1 and K2 intersect Pi'ilani Highway.

A segment common to alternatives U1 and U2 and is designated U1/U2 (Figure 3). Each alternate corridor is four hundred feet wide and combined, total approximately 121,176 linear feet (112.7 acres). The eight alternates are summarized as follows:

1. Alternate U1 is about 18000 ft. long. Beginning at Haleakala Highway at the intersection Hā'i'imaile Road, the route proceeds south through cultivated fields of sugarcane, crosses Kaliainui gulch, Oma'opio Road and Pūlehu gulch to intersect alternatives U1/U2 and U2 in old cane fields converted to pasture north of Pūlehu Road at about 1000 feet above sea level.
2. Alternate U2, also about 18000 ft. long, extends from the Kula Highway at Kaluapulani Gulch west (*mafai*) through former pineapple fields - now used for pasture - passing south of Pu'u O Wehi - an historically quarried cinder cone - to Kaliainui Gulch. It continues west on the south side of Kaliainui Gulch through




Figure 1 State of Hawaii




Figure 2 General Location Map, Hawaii Island

3. fields cultivated in pineapple, and then fields of sugarcane. In the sugarcane Alternate U2 turns south to parallel Alternate U1 crossing Oma'opio Road and Pūlehu Gulch, joining Alternate U1 and U1/U2 in the old sugarcane fields north of Pūlehu Road.
4. Alternate U1/U2 - a segment shared by Alternates U1 and U2 - is approximately 13000 feet long and extends from the intersection of U1 and U2 north of Pūlehu Road to the intersection of U3, K1 and K2 at about 750 feet above sea level. It begins in old cane field converted to pasture, proceeding south-southwest across Pūlehu Road, through cultivated pineapple fields, across Kololua Gulch at about 1000 ft. elevation, to and across Waiakoa Gulch at about 800 ft. to meet with the other alternates.
5. U3 begins at the Kula Highway at Pūlehu Gulch and proceeds west for over 25000 feet through cultivated pineapple fields, pasture, and truck farm lands. At 1600 ft. elevation the route crosses Pūlehu Road into more pineapple fields, then crosses Kololua Gulch, and Waiakoa Gulch at 1100 ft. elevation as it proceeds to the intersection of K1, K2, and U1/U2.
6. K1 is about 18000 ft. long and proceeds from Pi'ilani Highway at Ka'ono'ulu St. east through ranch pasture land between Waiakoa and Kūlanihāko'i gulches, intersecting Alternates K2, U1/U2 and U3 at 750 ft. above sea level.
7. K2 extends northeastward for approximately 23000 feet, from Pi'ilani Highway at its intersection with the newly built collector road (Road F per the Kihei Traffic Master Plan), through ranch pasture land. K2 crosses Waipūlani Gulch at about 500 feet above sea level and two branches of Kūlanihāko'i Gulch at about 650 ft. elevation, and joins with the other alternates near the 750 ft. contour.
7. The proposed U2A Alternative is approximately 9,000 ft. long and extends west, southwest from the intersection of Kula and Haleakala Highway to a point O1 on the U2 Alignment.
8. The U2B Alignment, approximately 8,000 ft. long and extends west, southwest from Kula Highway opposite - from the cane fields at Oma'opio Road east (*mauka*) through the pineapple fields south of Pūkalani town to the Kula Highway at the new King Kekaulike High School - impacted historic properties in a secondary, tributary branch of Kalupūlani gulch, in Kaliainui gulch, and on the ridge land south of Kaliainui gulch.

As a result of the findings of historic properties in Alternate U2 two new *mauka* alignments - Alternate U2A and Alternate U2B - were proposed and surveyed during September 1997.




Figure 3
 Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographic maps of the Hanalei, Kūlanihāko'i, and Pū'ū O Kūali quadrangles, showing the proposed Alternates (the study area), and approximate site locations.

Scope of Work

This scope of work is in response to the information delivered to Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. (CSH) on Jan. 12, 1996, including agreements concluded during the Jan. 31, 1996 meeting at Parsons Brinkerhoff. The scope incorporates an Oct. 30, 1995 memorandum from Don Hibbard DLNR/SHPD on a review of an Environmental Impact Statement Notice for the Kihei to Kula Highway.

Based on these documents two phases of work will be undertaken:

Phase I: Conduct background research on 6 corridor alternatives (2 added later) providing an overview in addition to walking of each of the staked corridors to locate sites and define site limits. During this phase, fieldwork would be carried out and fatal flaws, if they occur in any of the three corridors, would be identified.

Phase II: archaeological inventory survey of the single chosen alternative involving complete documentation of all archaeological resources within the chosen corridor. DLNR has requested to review both Phase I and II reports as well as the scope.

A scope of work for each phase is presented below.

Phase I: Assessment and Field Survey of 8 Alternatives

1. Historical background including archaeological and archival information dealing with past land use and history. This will also involve a search of land commission award records and historic maps. Aerial photographs will be studied to find any archaeological sites that may be visible. Ms. Sara Collins and other knowledgeable individuals will be consulted about items of archaeological and historical interest. The purpose of this background research will be to document settlement patterns for the areas covered by the alternatives. Not only will high density, medium density, and low density areas be defined by number of archaeological sites, but also DLNR has requested that the specific kinds of sites be included in this settlement study such as: habitation, agriculture, burials, and religious sites.
2. Interviews with knowledgeable *kama'aina* are planned especially Hawaiians, who could shed light on the settlement pattern as well as help identify traditional cultural places and archaeological sites. This task has been deferred until the Phase II, final road corridor is selected and will be conducted as part of the inventory survey.
3. Fieldwork will be conducted to confirm the predictions for site location as determined by historic documentation, examination of aerial photographs and. Fieldwork will involve helicopter reconnaissance followed by survey of the staked corridors. CSH would request stakes be placed at not more than 200' intervals and preferably at 100' intervals. The survey area for each

corridor will be 400' wide. The length of the survey area is estimated to be from 22 to 25 miles long. Although each site located will not be recorded in detail at this time, the types of features will be noted and the general boundaries of the site complexes will be recorded and initial assessments of the significance of these sites will be made.

4. Preparation of Phase I report. This report will summarize all the background information collected and the results of the fieldwork to evaluate the relative archaeological constraints involved in each of the alternatives. This evaluation will be in the context of the settlement pattern predictions for the area covered by the three corridors and will include maps showing site density and types of sites for each area. Each alternative will be ranked according to the relative impact on archaeological resources. The archaeological site areas will be located on an overall map of each corridor in relation to centerline stakes, and each area will be assessed on a preliminary basis for value and possible mitigative measures. This report will clearly identify if archaeological constraints will be difficult or impossible to overcome.

Phase II: Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Single Selected Corridor

The single corridor selected from the 8 alternatives of Phase I will be subject to a complete inventory survey with 100% ground coverage of the corridor and detailed description and mapping of each site.

The following Scope of Work is standard for satisfying the State and County requirements for an inventory survey level of investigation:

1. A complete ground survey of the entire project area for the purpose of site inventory. All sites will be located, described, and mapped with evaluation of function, interrelationships, and significance. Documentation will include photographs and scale drawings of selected sites and complexes. All sites will be assigned State site numbers.
2. Limited subsurface testing to determine location, boundaries, depth and quantity of cultural materials within archaeological sites and to obtain datable samples for chronological information for sites in the immediate area, if such data is not available from previous studies.
3. Research on historic and archaeological background, including a search of historic maps, written records, Land Commission awards, and Native Testimony. Research will focus on the specific area with general background on the *ahupua'a* and district and will emphasize settlement patterns.
4. Preparation of a survey report which will include the following:

- a. A topographic map of the survey area showing all archaeological sites and site areas;
- b. Description of all archaeological sites with selected photographs, scale drawings, and discussions of function;
- c. Historical and archaeological background sections summarizing prehistoric and historic land use as they relate to the archaeological features;
- d. A summary of site categories and their significance in an archaeological and historic context;
- e. Recommendations based on all information generated which will specify what steps should be taken to mitigate impact of development on archaeological resources, such as data recovery (excavation) and preservation of specific areas. Recommendations will be developed in consultation with the landowner and State and County agencies.

Survey Methodology

The center lines of the eight corridor segments comprising the alternate routes were located by licensed land surveyor. These center lines were marked in the field - normally at two hundred foot intervals - by wooden hubs and numbered wooden stakes with pink flagging tape at each point. The center line stake markers were used as guides for the survey and to locate sites by bearings and distances.

The archaeological reconnaissance survey was conducted on foot by three archaeologists. Each of the six segments of the proposed alignments were completely covered in the survey. The corridors surveyed were four hundred feet wide; two hundred feet on either side of the center line. The two hundred foot corridor half-width was used as the width for each sweep of the archaeological survey. Thus the archaeologists were spaced at intervals of approximately sixth-seven feet (20.4 meters) apart, with each archaeologist covering a distance of no more than thirty five feet (10.7 meters) to either side of his survey line. Where tall grasses grew the interval between archaeologists was reduced to provide complete coverage.

At the U2A crossing of Kaliainui gulch the survey area was expanded four hundred outside the corridor to the west, or *makai*, side of the centerline. This was done to evaluate the potential impact to historic properties if the corridor were realigned to the west, because of the proximity of historic properties to the east.

The survey of Alternate U2A in Kaliainui was coordinated with another survey - of Alternate U2B - because of the steep valley walls in these sections of the gulch. The result was that the land from the west edge of the U2A corridor to the east side of the U2B

corridor was entirely surveyed within the gulch.

Vegetation was a factor in the survey; where it hampered visibility, the speed of the survey was reduced to provide more adequate coverage. The vegetation in the project area consisted of open savannah of *kiawe* trees and Pangola-like pasture grasses. At higher elevations the savannah closed in to open *kiawe* forest and the understory included dense growths of *panini* cactus. The *kiawe* did not present difficulties for the survey activity in the savannah or open forest, but recent rains produced a substantial growth of the grass understory. The grasses were consistently one to two feet high in the savannah and three, or rarely, four feet high in the open forest. Although difficult to see with sixty percent to one hundred percent high grass coverage, it was possible to view the archaeological features when they were present. The *panini* was difficult to navigate around and through, but the ground beneath it was clear of other vegetation.

All sites were located on the 1 in. = 3000 ft., 5-foot contour map by means of hand held tape and compass relative to the centerline stakes. They were briefly described and preliminary assessments of type, function, significance and future treatment were made. Selective photography was also used to complement survey documentation. The sites were flagged with yellow barricade tape and given temporary CSH site numbers were inscribed on the flagging. In the Kihai section of the K2-U1 corridor some sites comprised a grouping, or complex, and the barricade tape flags were placed to mark the bounds of the site grouping within the road corridor. In other instances where a site had fewer features, each feature of the site was also flagged and assigned a letter suffix to the temporary site number. methods

II. NATURAL HISTORY

Geology

The *ahupua'a* of Kaihū, Keāhuna, 'A'apueo, Kaiālininui, Ōma'opio, Pūlehu Nui, Kealahou 3 & 4, Waiahoā, Ka'ono'ūlu, Kōheo 1 & 2, Waiohuli, Kōkeā, and Kama'ole are all located on the western slope of Haleakalā. Haleakalā is composed of lava flows known as the Honomanū Volcanic Series of the Tertiary system. These ancient lavas have been mostly covered by later flows and are exposed in only a few localities, along the north and northeast shore sea cliffs and in Ke'anae Valley (Macdonald, *et al.* 1983:388).

In the project area, the Honomanū Series lavas are covered by the Kula Volcanic Series of the Pleistocene epoch. Lavas of the Kula Series consist mostly of *aa*; eruptions were explosive to the extent that many large cinder cones were formed and beds of ash are common. These cones are present mostly on the summit and northern slopes of the mountain but also occur on the western slope in vicinity of the project area. The Kula flows are relatively thick, averaging from twenty feet thick near the summit of Haleakalā to fifty feet thick at the coast. More recent rocks of the Hāna Volcanic Series mantle the Kula Series at the east and southwest ends of Haleakalā, but do not extend into the study area (*op. cit.*:383,390). The western edge of the study parcel (in the vicinity of Pīlani Highway) is characterized by a thin band of sedimentary rock consisting of a recent, younger alluvium. The Kīhei coastline is comprised of an older sediment consisting of the lithified dunes of the Pleistocene epoch (*op. cit.*:383).

Geography

Kula District:

The western slopes of Haleakalā receive a relatively small amount of rain annually; the recorded mean annual rainfall at the mountain's summit is 1000 mm, which decreases to 400 mm at 1000 ft. above mean sea level (msl). The majority of the project area receives between 400 mm. (sea level to 1000 ft. msl) and 500 mm. (1000 to 2000 ft. msl) of rainfall annually. The mauka portion of the parcel (2000 to 2300 ft. msl) receives between 500 mm. and 750 mm. per year (Giambelluca *et al.* 1986:112). Mean monthly rainfall records show the heaviest rainfall to occur between November and March, ranging from 50-100 mm. (from approximately 300 ft. to 2000 ft. msl), with the months of April to October averaging between 5-25 mm. During the driest month, June, the area receives 5-10 mm. (*op. cit.*:113-124).

Air temperatures in the upper elevations are cool; Kula San station, located at 3004 ft. msl, records a maximum annual mean ranging from 69° to 75°F and a minimum annual mean from 50° to 58°F. The station has recorded a record low of 40°F in December and a record high of 90°F in June (Armstrong 1973:56).

Upland Zone

Soils in the mauka portions of the project area (the low uplands) consist primarily of the Keāhuna-Keāhuna-Molokai association, consisting of "moderately deep and deep, nearly level to moderately steep, well-drained soils that have a moderately fine textured subsoil" (Foote *et al.* 1972: General Soil Map, Maui Island). These soils range from sea level to 1500 ft. msl and have a temperature between 73° and 75°F (*op. cit.*:8). A small area, where Pūlehu Gulch meets Kula Highway, has soils of the Puu Pa-Kula-Pane association. This soil association consists of "deep, gently sloping to steep, well-drained soils that have a medium-textured or moderately fine textured subsoil or underlying material, on intermediate and high uplands." (Foote *et al.* 1972: General Soil Map, Maui Island. These soils range from 1000 to 6000 ft. msl and have a temperature between 55° and 69° F (*op. cit.*:9).

Vegetation consists of *kiawe* and lowland shrubs below 1000 ft. msl, including *koa haole*, finger grass, and *pili* grass; and *lantana-koa haole* shrubs between 1000 and 3000 ft. msl, including *ku*, *panini*, *itiima*, and *Natal* redtop grass (Armstrong 1973:64). Wildlife consists mostly of upland game birds (Foote *et al.*:8).

Handy and Handy (1972:55) describe the Kula region as sloping land covered with old, red soil in which sweet potato (*'uala*), sugar cane, and pineapple grow well. The word *kula* is traditionally used to refer to dry land versus wet, taro land. Handy and Handy refer to fields of *pili* grass in Kula, traditionally used for roof thatching. The authors state that "before cultivation took over the area, the carpeting grass was interspersed with vines (such as the *kwali*, morning-glory) and many shrubs, all of which found practical uses by the immigrant folk. There were also a few stunted trees." (*Ibid.*) Handy and Handy also indicate that in the uplands of Kula grew flowering plants (including native ginger), medicinal herbs, thick shrubs, and many different trees whose wood was used for many purposes.

Coastal Kīhei Region:

The Kīhei area receives less than 400 mm. of rainfall annually, ranging from 5 mm. to 50 mm. monthly), making it the minimum rainfall area on Maui (Giambelluca *et al.* 1986:14). Most of the rain in this area comes during winter storms. Giambelluca *et al.* indicate that "the Kīhei minimum is part of a broad area of low rainfall covering the saddle of the island and extending along the leeward coast from Makana to Ka'anapali. The aridity of this region results from the rain-shadow effects of the island's two large volcanoes" (*op. cit.*:16). Typically, Kīhei is sunny and dry with an average temperature of 77°F with occasional variations ranging from the low 60s to the high 80s (CSH 1991:24).

Intermediate Zone

Soils in the area immediately mauka of the Kīhei coastal bench zone are of the Pūlehu-Ewa-Jaucus association. These are "deep, nearly level to moderately sloping, well-drained and excessively drained soils that have a moderately fine textured to coarse-textured

subsoil or underlying material; on alluvial fans and in basins." (Foote *et al.* 1972: General Soil Map, Maui Island). These soils develop between sea level and 600 ft. amsl and have a temperature of 75°F (*op. cit.*:8).

Vegetation consists of *kiawe* and lowland shrubs below 1000 ft. amsl, including *koa haole*, finger grass, and *pili* grass (Armstrong 1973:64). Wildlife consists of native water birds and upland game birds (Foote *et al.* 1972:8). During the field survey, a population of wild deer was observed in the *makai* portion of the study parcel.

III. HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Historic Setting

The project area lies primarily in what is referred to as the "barren zone" of the Makawao and Wailuku Districts, the area located between the narrow coastal zone and the upland habitation and agricultural zone which begins at 2000 ft. amsl (Cordy 1977:4). The eastern portion of the present study area extends into the inland zone. According to Cordy the barren zone was probably most utilized in the late pre-contact era as a route between the inhabited coastal and inland areas with corresponding intermittent habitation (*op. cit.*:12). Fredericksen and Fredericksen (1995:2) state that the upper area was probably used intermittently for its resources (e.g. *koa* and possibly sandalwood trees) and possibly for dryland agriculture towards the end of the pre-contact period. Sources indicate that upper Kula (old district), even with its arid climate, has continuously been a place of agricultural production, particularly of dryland *'uala* or sweet potato. In their studies of Ōma' Ōpio, (Donham 1992:4) and Waiohuli and Kōōkea (Kolb *et al.* 1997) the authors discuss the presence of *heiau* and the subsequent inference that a large permanent population must have been present, as well as noting the presence of habitation and agriculture in the uplands (2000 to 2800 ft. amsl) of Kōōkea and Waiohuli (south Kula) (Kolb *et al.* 1997). Wong-Smith (Brown and Haun 1989:C-2&3) also notes several *heiau* located in the uplands of Kōōkea, Waiohuli, and Kaitua and overlooking Māi'alaia Bay. Dryland agriculture in Kula would extend from pre-contact times to the 19th century and on into the present, amidst the influx of other land uses such as ranching, pineapple and sugar cane cultivation, and residential development.

Mythological and Traditional Accounts

Mythology regarding this region of the Makawao (Kula) and Wailuku Districts is relatively scarce. Legends of Maui the demi-god often encompass the entire island (or large portions) and include Haleakala, but rarely do they focus on the area inclusive of the study parcel. However sayings regarding the Makawao and Wailuku Districts do exist, as well as accounts of the pre- and post-contact activities of the chiefs. The literal translations of relevant land division names are presented below, along with selected historical and legendary sayings regarding Kula, Makawao and Wailuku, and traditional accounts regarding Wailuku, Kula, Pu'ūnene, Kama'ole, and Kīhei.

Literal translations of several of the land areas and divisions relevant to the project area are listed below. Unless otherwise noted, the translations are taken from Pukui, *et al.* (1974).

Makawao (district): "forest beginning" (or "Watchful eyes of Wa-o" (timeless or eternity)--Wong-Smith in Donham 1990b:B-1)
Kula (district): "plain"
Kīhei: "cape, cloak"
Kama'ole: "childless" (or "barren"--Fredericksen, *et al.* 1994:3)
Kōōkea: "the white sand"

Waiohuli:
 Kōheo:
 Ka'ono'ulu:
 'Alae:
 Waiakoa:
 Kealahou:
 Pūlehu Nui:
 Oma'opio:
 Kaliainui:
 Maka'eha:
 'A'apueo:
 Pukalani:
 Keahua:
 Kailua:
 Wailuku:
 Pu unene:

"water of change"
 "to show off or to twirl"
 "the desire [for] breadfruit"
 "mudhen"
 "water [used] by warrior"
 "the new pathway"
 "large Pūlehu [broiled]"
 possibly "whistling thrush"
 meaning uncertain
 "sore eye"
 "owl call" (Wulzen, et al. 1996:B-6)
 "heavenly gate" or may take its origin from Pu'u-ka-lani "hill of the heavens"
 "the mound"
 "two seas (probably currents)"
 "water of destruction"
 "goose hill"

Pukui (1983) notes several sayings regarding Kula. These sayings range from the historical, legendary, and environmental to those of both ridicule and admiration. The following two sayings refer to historical and legendary events in Kula.

"*Ai pua'a a Kukeawe. The pork-eating of Kukeawe*" refers to "a person who is not satisfied with the number of his own pigs and so robs his neighbors of theirs." (op. cit.:#88) This saying stems from the early historical account (c.1785) of a petty chief under Kāhekili named Kukeawe, whose story (as told by Kamakau).

"*O ka uai kau no ia o Ke'anae: o ka 'ūki ho ouali 'ūwala ia o Kula. It is the pool on the height of Ke'anae; it is the 'ūki digging stick for the potato [patch] of Kula.*" (op. cit.:#2447) This saying relates the story of a man from Kula and a woman from Ke'anae, both of great beauty, who in their mutual attraction boasted of their own physical perfection. The woman referred "to her body as the pool on the heights of Ke'anae...he looked down at himself and boasted of his manhood as the digging stick of Kula." The man's chosen metaphor implies not only the greatness of his ego and/or "manhood," but the importance of agriculture/sweet potato production in Kula.

Some sayings note environmental characteristics of Kula, using their imagery to describe other aspects of life.

"*Moe kokolo ka uahi o Kula, he Hau. The smoke of Kula traveled low and swift, borne by the Hau wind.* Said of one who is swift in movement. Also, in love and war much depends on swiftness and subtlety." (op. cit.:#2170)

"*Kokolo ka uahi o Kula, he Kāhau. The smoke of Kula creeps along when the Kāhau breeze blows.* Where there is smoke there is fire." (op. cit.:#1824)

Pukui records three derisive sayings regarding Kula and one saying of praise which hinge upon the inland location of the Kula community:

"*Kula unahi pikapika he'e. Kula people, scalars of the suckers on the tentacles of the octopus.* Said in fun of the people of Kula, Maui. A Kula chiefess who lived inland did not know what the suckers on an octopus were and tried to scale them as one scales fish." (op. cit.:#1911)

"*No Kula ia po'e ke hōe heua noi. To Kula belong the people who are such poor paddlers.* Kula, Maui, people are ignorant. Also, never mind the talk of fools." (op. cit.:#2339)

"*O Kula i ka hōe heua. Kula of the ignorant canoe-paddlers.* Said of Kula, Maui, whose people did not know how to paddle canoes because they were uplanders." (op. cit.:#2473)

"*No keiki uneune mānane o Kula. The lads of Kula, who tug and pull the mānane up by the roots.* An expression of admiration for the people of Kula, Maui, who accomplish whatever they set out to do." (op. cit.:#2238)

Pukui (1983) records several sayings about Makawao including these three, which describe the characteristics of the inhabitants and the environment:

"*E hu'e mai 'oe i ke ka'ai o Makawao! Try uprooting the koa'i tree of Makawao!* I defy you to tackle a lad of Makawao! A boast from a native of Makawao, Maui." (op. cit.:#298)

"*Keiki hōhōhō kuaua o Makawao. The lad of Makawao who goes about in the rain.* Said of a native of that place who is not afraid of being wet." (op. cit.:#1705)

"*Ka ua 'ūkiu o Makawao. The 'ūkiu rain of Makawao.* Refers to Makawao, Maui." (op. cit.:#1602)

"*Hō'ālaie a ka ua 'ūkiu. A suggestion of the 'ūkiu rain.* Go ahead and do what was suggested. The 'ūkiu rain is cold enough to make one hurry and scurry." (op. cit.:#1092)

Pukui (1983) notes a few sayings regarding Wailuku, including the following which refers to one of many battles which occurred in the area:

"*Kc inu aku la paha o'u 'Alapa i ka wai o Wailuku. My 'Alapa warriors must now be drinking the water of Wailuku.* Said when an expected success has turned into a failure. This was a remark made by Kalaniopu'u to his wife Kalola and son Kiwala'o, in the belief that his selected warriors, the 'Alapa, were winning in their battle against Kāhekili. Instead they were utterly destroyed." (op. cit.:#1711)

Traditional accounts concerning Makawao and Wailuku seem to be limited to the pre- and post-contact activities of the chiefs. Compiled below are traditional accounts regarding Wailuku, Kula, Pu unene, Kama'ole, and Kihei.

Kamakau (1961) provides references to the areas of Wailuku, Kula, and Kihei involving the ruling chiefs of Maui and Hawaii and their warfare during the 1730s:

When Ke-kau-like heard that the ruling chief of Hawaii [Alapa'i] was at Kohala on his way to war against Maui, he was afraid and fled to Wailuku in his double war canoe named Ke-aka-nilo...and the fleet landed at Kapa'ahu at the pit of 'Ai-hako'ko' in Kula. Here on the shore the chiefs prepared a litter for Ke-kau-like and bore him upland to Haleki'i in Kukahua. There Ke-kau-like died...in the month of March, 1736. (op. cit.:69-70)

Alapa'i sailed from Kohala on Hawaii... But when he landed at Mokulau in Kaupo (Maui) and heard that Ke-kau-like was dying, he gave up all thought of war and wished only to meet Ke-kau-like and his (half) sister Ke-ku'i-ipo-iwa-nui... He landed at Kiheipukoa with all his chiefs and fighting men... While he was at Kihei, Alapa'i heard that the ruling chief of Oahu was making war upon Molokai. Most of the chiefs of Molokai... were of Hawaii... Alapa'i's sympathy was aroused, for these were his own brothers and children (relatives), and he made ready to go to their help on Molokai. (op. cit.:70)

Speakman (1984:14), in his narration of the power struggle between the sons of Ke-kau-like for succession to the Maui throne, describes battles which occurred in West Maui, and specifically Pu unene:

For several years after Ke-kau-like's death, the war continued. A major battle took place at Honokawai in West Maui. The forces of Alapa'i and the young Maui heir [Kamehameha-nui] were badly mauled and withdrew. Another battle occurred in which the ruling chief of Oahu fought in alliance with Ka-uhi, the challenger. The hardest fighting happened at Pu unene in the dry central plain of Maui. The slaughter was great on both sides, and a stalemate resulted in a peaceful settlement between the ruling chiefs.

Kamakau (1961:142) relates an account of a lesser chief on Maui during the 1780s, with references to Kula, Wailuku, and Kama'ole:

During this period there were disturbances among the country people, not only on Oahu but also on Maui. The trouble arose through one of the lesser chiefs (*kaukauarii*) named Ku-keawe, a favorite (*aiikane*) of Ka-hekili to whom Ka-hekili had given the privilege of letting his pigs run over the land of Kula and roasting them as he needed them. But he seized also the pigs belonging to the country people of Kula, Honun'ula, and Kahikinui, as far as Kaupo, and went with a large party to rob them of their wealth even with

violence. This was the cause of the uprising of the country people called the "Battle of the pig-eating of Ku-keawe" (*Aipua 'a-a-Ku-keawe*). When the plundering party reached Kaupo they were surprised by some fighting men of Kahikinui, Honun'ula, Wailuku, and Waihe'e... they climbed the mountain of Haleakala in order to descend to Kamaole in Kula... Here they were surrounded by Ka-wehena's men, Ku-keawe was killed, and his body stuck up like an image toward the sea of Palanua.

A second reference to Kama'ole, regarding the coastal place name Kaluanihakoko, is recorded by Kamakau in an account of the ruling chief 'Umi (1961:230):

... 'Umi came from a humble family, yet when he became ruling chief the people bowed to him... But Kiha-Pi'ilani despised 'Aihako'ko' and Ku-malae, the children of his sister Pi'i-kea-a-Pi'ilani, because they were born to 'Umi. 'Aihako'ko' was brought to Maui, but Kiha treated him with contempt and killed his favorite *kahu*; and 'Aihako'ko' died of grief for him and was buried at Kapa'ahu where is the burial cave of 'Ai-hako'ko'. The young people are mistaken in giving the name Ka-lun-'Ai-hako'ko' to the coconut grove at Koa-kanu on the seacoast of Kama'ole in Kula...

Speakman (1984:70-74) provides an account of the experiences of the British Captain George Vancouver, who first visited Hawaii under Captain Cook and later captained his own voyages. Kihei was one of the locations visited by Vancouver during his explorations of Hawaii between 1793-1794. During these visits, the captain became closely connected with several high chiefs and kings, including Kamehameha (of Hawaii) and Ka-hekili (of Maui). Speakman (op. cit.:74) and Clark (1980:50) note the presence of a monument at Mai Poia 'Oe Ia'u Beach Park in Kihei commemorating Vancouver's on-shore expedition in 1792, when he first met Kahekili.

Prehistoric Period

An abundance of *heiau* - 33 total recorded in the archaeological survey of Maui by Winslow Walker (1931) - are in the district of Makawao between roughly the 2000 ft. to 3000 ft. elevation contours. This provides an image of extensive agricultural fields across open land in prehistoric times, much as Kula appears today. Only two *heiau* are located on the coast at Kalepolepo, the others are all in the upland (Kolb *et al.*, 1997:28). In their recent study in Waiohuli, selected portions of Ke'okene and Kama'ole, Kolb *et al.* documented 1093 features making up 213 sites of mostly pre-historic agricultural and habitation sites with some ritual sites and historic agricultural sites.

Early Historic Period

For elaboration on the following subjects of whaling, the Irish potato industry, the Chinese presence in Kula, ranching, and sugar cultivation the reader is referred to Helen Wong Smith's research as presented in Brown and Haun (1989: Appendix C) and Kolb *et al.* (1997). However, a general overview of these subjects is provided in the following sections (Early Historic Period through Summary) along with supplemental information not covered by Wong Smith.

During the early 1800s, the whaling industry was introduced in Hawaii. Although the whaling centered around Lahaina and mainly effected the Kula/Kihei area with its agricultural demands, Clark (1980:47) notes that "From the 1840s to the 1860s a small whaling station was maintained at Kalepolepo [Kihei]."

The introduction of whaling to the Maui community brought with it an increased demand (from the sailors) for the potato. As a result, after 1830 dryland agriculture in the old Kula District expanded to include the Irish potato. The California Gold Rush of 1849 intensified this demand as a California-Hawaii potato trade began to flourish. Kula became the area of highest potato production and came to be known as "the potato district" (the area between 2000 and 5000 ft. amsl). Potato production thrived in Kula from 1830-1850 until successful potato cultivation and production in California and Oregon resulted in a decline in the Hawaii trade. (Burgett and Spear 1995:6-7) Donham (1992:5) notes that the inundation of land clearing and cultivation associated with the Gold Rush resulted in "deforestation [which] adversely affect[ed] the amount of rainfall in the district, and periods of drought became more common."

Around 1849 John Halstead built The Koa House at Kalepopo in Kihei. The building, part store and part residence, thrived on the whaling industry and the resultant potato industry. The store also served as a gathering place for the whaling sailors. David Malo created a balance for this boisterous crowd by constructing a church at Kalepolepo sometime after 1843. During the Gold Rush years, the store became "an emporium for Irish potatoes." Halstead ran his store until 1876, closing shop when the potato industry diminished and moving to Ulupalakua. (Janion 1977:25-31)

The increase in agricultural production associated with the potato industry encouraged many Hawaiians to venture into cash-cropping (Speakman 1984:116) and attracted Chinese immigrants to Kula in the 1840s. During the subsequent 30 to 40 years the Chinese created a thriving community (Burgett and Spear 1995:7). According to Speakman (1984:140), even though the Kula land was hard, with scattered rains and common droughts, "the Chinese who lived and worked around Kōkeka enjoyed the healthiest climate to be found almost anywhere; they also enjoyed themselves and became good friends and neighbors of the Hawaiians living there."

During this time period sugar cultivation and ranching were established in the Kula region. Sugar was present prior to 1846, with six sugar producers operating on the slopes of Haleakalā (Wong-Smith in Brown and Haun 1989:C-7). As Wong Smith points out (*op. cit.*:C-6), ranching was present in the area prior to the 1840s. Cordy (in Fredericksen, *et al.* 1994:3) specifically mentions that the majority of Kama'ole *ahupua'a* at that time, as noted in Mahele awards, was government cattle range (with Irish potato on inland parcels).

Mid-1800s (Land Commission Awards)

Settlement Pattern in Kula as shown by LCAs

As background, it is important to know that Kula was famous for its *'uala* (sweet potato) "plantations" (Handy and Handy 1972:511). The combination of good soil developed in

volcanic ash, cool temperatures and frequent clouds to lower evapo-transpiration and bring moisture as fog drip, and rainfall distributed fairly evenly throughout the year would also have allowed for taro cultivation for subsistence by Hawaiians living in Kula on a permanent basis.

Informants for Handy and Handy (*ibid.*) in the 1930s place a "considerable population" on the "lower westward slopes of Haleakala." This information is supported by the findings in Kōkeka and Waiohuli of numerous archaeological sites of prehistoric age (Brown and Haun 1989; Kolb *et al.* 1997). However, Jarves (in Kuykendall 1980:313) describes the Kula area in July 1846 in the midst of the cash cropping boom of Irish potatoes there.

"It ranges along the mountain (Haleakala) between 2000 and 5000 feet elevation, for the distance of 12 miles. The forest is but partially cleared, and the seed put into the rich virgin soil."

This would seem to suggest that prehistoric occupation in Kula was dispersed and with possibly *swidden* type agriculture practiced. Substantial forest clearing does not appear to have occurred until the mid-1800s for commercial agriculture, especially potatoes and sugar cultivation throughout most of Kula during the Mahele period. In Waiohuli and Kōkeka Kolb *et al.* noted that in this period the forest fringe began just above the Kula Highway at about 1,036 meter amsl (3,400 foot) elevation (Kolb *et al.* 1997:99).

Kolb *et al.* also noted that Mahele records showed "awards extending down to ca. the 700 meter (2,300 foot) elevation" in Waiohuli & Kōkeka but survey and testing showed the agricultural fields actually extended down to the 460 meter (1,500 foot) elevation (*ibid.*). These areas were not planted in sugar cane or pineapple as have the areas farther north, and this study might indicate that the areas farther north also had more agricultural plots farther *makai* than those noted in the Mahele records. Long-term commercial cultivation of sugar cane and pineapples in the more northerly *ahupua'a* would have destroyed surface evidence of such plots.

The following *ahupua'a* were examined for Land Commission claims: 'A'apueo, the four *ahupua'a* of 'Alae, Kalinui (most commonly written as Kaliaianui in the documents), Kama'ole, Kamehame Nui and Kamehame Iki), Ka'ono'ulu, the 4 *ahupua'a* of Kealahou, Kōkeka, Kōheo, Kukuiaeo (Kukuiaea), Makaehu, the ten *ahupua'a* of Ōma'opio, Pūlehu with Pūlehu Iki and Pūlehu Nui, Waiakoa, and Waiohuli. While in some cases the boundaries of the *ahupua'a* appear as straight lines across the map's surface, gullies (whenever present) appear to act as natural demarcation lines between *ahupua'a*.

It seems likely that 'Alae, Ōma'opio and Kealahou, which had multiple sections at the time of the *Māhele* and *hulucano* awards (*i.e.* 'Alae 1, 2, 3, 4) may have been single *ahupua'a* at some previous time, and subsequent division of these lands resulted from population expansion and/or expanded land use.

While traditionally we speak of the number of claims or awards in an *ahupua'a*, it seems to make less sense to do so in the Kula area than elsewhere since the claimants here did not

confine their claims to one *ahupua'a*. A large number of claimants request *apana* in two, three, or more *ahupua'a* as a general practice. Therefore, we have tried to look at the Land Commission claim data in a slightly different way. Within each *ahupua'a*, the *'i'i* and number of *apana* or specific land pieces seem to better reflect the mosaic of resident population, "migrant farmers" who come from elsewhere on Maui to work in their fields, and the absentee landlords who had various crops (especially potatoes) raised for them. While the Native Register documents for Kula tend to omit the name of the *'i'i* (smaller strips of land within the *ahupua'a* where the *apana* were claimed), the Foreign and Native Testimony documents generally name these. Claimants in the Register, and *konoiki* (land managers), *luna auhau* (tax assessors), and neighbors in the Testimony documents (except for the royal claims for entire *ahupua'a*), discuss either vaguely or specially the land use of each *apana* claimed. In a few instances there is a claim for land that is temporarily fallow, but rarely, if ever, in Kula does anyone ever mention waste land. There are several mentions of fields which are temporarily lying fallow.

We have devised a table (Appendix B) which gives by *ahupua'a* (column 1), the *'i'i* within that *ahupua'a* (whether awarded) (column 2), the land use (column 3), the claimant's name (column 4), the claim number (column 5), the acreage and the *apana* awarded, or entire claim # not awarded (column 6), and the location of the Tax Map Key (TMK) number where found on the TMKs. This table is accompanied by a map (Figure 8, in the back pocket), compiled using the TMKs, showing the *ahupua'a* for Kula with the located *apana*. Boundaries between some *ahupua'a* are not absolutely clear on the TMK maps, particularly between Kamehameiki and Pālehuiki. Here there are several claimants who tell of their land in one *ahupua'a*, while the award appears in the other.

Land use has been restricted to house lots, potato fields (both Irish and sweet having the same habitat) and *kafo* (refer to Figure 8 in the report back cover) for the reconnaissance survey since the located claims are not within the road corridor alternatives, but rather are focused in the upland zone between the 2000 ft. (610 m.) and 4000 ft. (1219 m.) elevation, mainly along the old Kula Road. Claims extended down to the 2,300 ft. elevation in the south in Kamā'ole and Keōkea and to the 1,100 ft. elevation in the north in 'A'apueo and Makaehe.

In Keōkea claim 6654, which is a wrong number and therefore not awarded, is among a number of house lots claimed but not awarded at the shore. Modern TMK maps do not show any of the awarded Land Commission claims along the shore. Kolb *et al.* have a map of the Kihei coastline which shows these awards (Kolb *et al.* 1997:65).

Some *kulcana* were awarded although they were not claimed, some were exchanged for land in another *ahupua'a*, and traces of two *kulcana* were noted on the TMKs that were illegible Oma opio TMK 2-3-05, parcel 132 and Waiohuli TMK 2-2-05, parcel 34) and some numbers were transposed or misread so that 3759B appears as 8759B.

Including two claims (2383 for 'Alae and 3829 for Pālehuiki) not claimed but awarded, there were at least 254 *apana* granted by the Land Commission in Kula to 187 claimants; this is approximately 40% of the 619 *apana* claimed for that district. This number includes

the royal awards of entire *ahupua'a* where no land use is given. Each claimant puts in a claim for an average of 3+ *apana* an average slightly higher than in most other places.

One map of a coastal area was located which shows coastal awards (in Kolb *et al.* 1997: 65) in Kalepolepo. Other coastal awards are not located. In Kula 69 house lots were claimed; many of these were in the coastal villages of Keawakapu, Late, Kapukahawai, Waitaku and Kalepolepo. Only 15 of the 67 are awarded and 12 of the 15 can be seen on the Kolb *et al.* Map. Claims also list some potatoes plots and bananas claimed in conjunction with the house lots.

The rest of the Land Commission Awards (LCAs) in Kula occur in a narrow horizontal band along the old Kula road where there is sufficient natural rain for growing crops and where it is cool enough for tuber crops. There are number of house lots claimed in this area. Of the 24 "hooilo" (winter or permanent gardens) claimed in the Kaonoulu, Koheo, and Kamehame *ahupua'a*, 3 are awarded, of those 2 are shown on maps; these are in this Kula road upland zone.

The unawarded claims give a different picture of the land use than do the awarded claims, indicating many house lots at the shore, typical of other areas. It would also seem from the non-awarded claims that many residents had their coastal house lot and an upland house lot.

The Kula map drawn by Monsarrat and Dodge (1872-1879; Registered Map No. 913) shows only a few awarded claims, but some of these are different from those shown on the TMKs. What is evident on R.M. 913 is that some of the names of claimants appear with grant numbers, rather than Land Commission Awards. Helen Wong-Smith (in Donham 1990b:4) notes that prior to the Mahele land in Makawao was offered for sale, fee-simple, to native Hawaiians. These parcels (numbering close to 100) ranged from 5 to 10 acres and were purchased for \$1.00 an acre, which may explain why many of the LCAs are not on the TMKs because the claimants had already opted for grant status.

A number of claimants use more than one number for the same claim. Kekahuna uses 4 different numbers, Hewahewa uses 3, Kaai uses 3, Kekua uses 3, and 16 others use 2 different numbers for their claims. This explains some instances where some claims are not awarded, as the same piece is awarded under another number. Some claimants are of high chiefly status, e.g. Keaweamahi, Keshokalohi, and Namauu who claims a house lot in Waiohuli; and Naithe with a house at Kamā'ole; some are important personages such as Kaanwai, the land commissioner of Maui, and Hewahewa, who is awarded land on all islands and has a home in Kalepolepo; these persons appear to have claims in many places. There are, however, also claimants who appear to be commoners from elsewhere, Waikuku, Waikapu, Lahaina, who, along with the chiefs, are raising sweet potatoes and Irish potatoes for trade with the seagoing vessels or for the California Gold miners who had no time to raise food, or both.

The following table lists by *ahupua'a* the number of *apana* claimed and granted and the number of claimants.

Table 1: Land Commission Claims for Kula

Ahupua'a	# of claims	# of apana requested	granted	# of claimants	comments
Ahupua'a	8	14	2	8	
A'apueo	14	18	3	14	
Kaliianui	15	31	13	15	
Kama'ole	49	90	25	14	some consolidated awards
Kahamehame	8	7	1	8	5 claims on TMK map, some confusion with Pulehu Iki claims
Ka'ono'ulu	35	57	21	33	
Kealahou (various)	22	43	19	19	
Ka'ikea	46	111	32	44	
Ko'heo	11	13	5	11	
Kukuinana/Kukuiaco	1	1	1	1	
Maka'eha	1	1	0	1	
Oma'opio 1-10	25	56	21	18	
Pulehu/Pulehu Iki/Pulehu Nui	17	33	32	16	some consolidated awards; awarded not claimed
Waiakea	17	44	33	16	
Waiohuli	41	100	30	40	

The majority of claims consist of *apana* for kula, often specified as sweet potatoes or Irish (foreign, or small) potatoes, some dry lo'i, winter kula *maka'i*, as well as occasional bananas, and house lots. There are many claims for *moku mau'u* which the translator of the Native Register believes might be small arable pockets in stony soil. Mostly they are unspecific as to land use, although occasionally they say *moku mau'u* of sweet potatoes. Whether this means all *moku mau'u* were sweet potatoes is unknown.

The following land use profiles list, by *ahupua'a*, 1) the number of houses, 2) number of Irish potato patches (*mala*, *kihapai*, or *kula*), 3) number of sweet potato patches (*mala*, *mahina*, *moku mau'u*, *kula*), 4) the number of *kula* or *iti*, pastures, when no specified cultivar is named, 5) generic potato ground or patches or plots which probably can be considered as sweet potatoes, 6) generic plots such as *kihapai*, *moku mau'u*, or "claims," 7) number of *lo'i*, taro (*kalo*), and 8) other.

At A'apueo, Keohokalole claims and receives the *ahupua'a*. Awarded claims range from the minimum 6+ acres to Kekahuna's (9022) 22 acres of *kula*. The two claims not awarded are for *kula* or an unspecified "claim." Claimed are *apana* for 1 house lot, 6 Irish potato

patches, 6 sweet potato patches, 11 *kula/iti* or pastures, 1 "claim," and no taro or other items mentioned.

At A'Alae 1, 2, 3, & 4, Keohokalole is awarded A'Alae 3. There is 1 house lot, 2 plots of Irish potatoes, 2 of sweet potatoes, 6 *kula*, 1 generic potato ground, 19 generic "claims" or *moku mau'u*, and no taro or other items mentioned.

At Kaliianui, Kamaikaaloo claims and receives the *ahupua'a* (claims #4460 and 7124) of 19,838 acres in claim 7124. There are claims for 4 house lots, 7 Irish potato patches or lands, 3 sweet potato patches, 20 *kula* (1 a winter *kula*), 3 unspecified "claims," etc., as well as 12 taro patches, and mention of wauke, a boggy place, and bananas.

At Kama'ole, the entire *ahupua'a* is not claimed. There are 3 claimants who receive close to or more than 50 acre *apana*, while most are from 1/2 acre to several acres. There are 17 house lots, 55 Irish potato patches or lands, 15 sweet potato lands, 23 *kula*, 25 generic potato lands, 27 generic *moku mau'u* or "claims," 5 *moo* of dry *kalo*, 1 *moo* of sugar cane, 1 pig enclosure, and 2 *mala* of bananas.

At Kahamehame there is no house claim, there are 2 Irish potato patches, 0 sweet potato land, 3 *kula*, 0 generic potato lands, 9 generic lands or "claims," and no taro, but there is mention of 2 *pa'a*, 2 bogs, and a bracken place.

At Ka'ono'ulu, Hewahewa is awarded the *ahupua'a* of 5715 acres. Other *apana* awarded range in size from .22 Acre to 28 acres. Claims are for 2 house lots, 22 Irish potato patches or land, 0 sweet potato claims, 46 *kula* which include winter *kula*, 1 generic potato land, 67 *moku mau'u* or "claims," 18 taro patches, a stream bank, and a *kuapa* (or pond) is mentioned in claim No. 5407.

At Kealahou (1, 2, 3 & 4), Keohokalole is awarded Kealahou 3-4 (no acreage given). In Kealahou the next largest award is for Kekapai who receives 6 *apana* of 10.25 acres, plus other smaller parcels. Claims for *apana* include no house lots, 3 Irish potato lands, 4 sweet potato lands, 31 *kula* etc., no generic potato lands, 26 *moku mau'u* or other generic land, and no taro or other items mentioned.

At Ke'okea (5332 acres) awards granted range from .25 acres to 16+ acres. *Apana* are claimed for 22 house sites, 42 Irish potato patches, 33 sweet potato patches, 26 *kula* or pastures, 6 generic potato lands, 19+ generic lands, and 73 taro lands, with 5 banana patches, sugar cane and fishing rights mentioned (claim 6453).

At Ko'heo, Keohokalole claims and gets the *ahupua'a*. The only other award is 14+ acres awarded to Kahinu for 4 *apana* of taro and Irish potatoes. Claims not awarded include no claims for house lots, 7 Irish potatoes lands, 0 sweet potato lands, 11 *kula* including 1 winter *kula*, 0 generic potato lands, and 3 *kalo* patches.

At Kukuinea, Keohokalole receives the *ahupua'a* of 150+ acres. There are no other claimants and Keohokalole does not mention land use.

At Makā'eha, Kekahuna claims but does not get the *ahupua'a*. Donham (1990c:6) notes that Keohokalele had been offered Makā'eha but she transferred this to the government. This is also true for the *ahupua'a* of Kailua. There are no other claims in Makā'eha.

At Ōmā'opio 1-10, there is 1 claim for a house site, 8 claims for Irish potatoes, 1 for sweet potatoes, 28 for *kula*, none for generic potato lands, 5 for generic land, 21 *lo'i*, sugarcane and 2 *wauke* patches. LCA 281B is awarded to Ali, a non-resident claiming Lāhaina as his place of residence. He has 1052 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres. Nine awards are centrally located between the north Ōmā'opio *ahupua'a* boundary (the high ground between Kaliahūi Gulch and Pūlehu Gulch) and the south Ōmā'opio *ahupua'a* boundary which is the stream bed in Pūlehu Gulch.

We do not believe this narrow band of plots is typical of the prehistoric settlement pattern in Ōmā'opio. The land form in the *ahupua'a* provides widespread areas of arable land. Prehistoric settlement including cultivated fields would have been dispersed across the whole landscape in the *ahupua'a* between 488 and 1219 m. amsl. The pattern we see reflected in the distribution of Land Commission Awards probably results from population decline and subsequent resettlement of the remaining farmers to land close to or adjacent to the major trails or roads such as Ōmā'opio Road, Kimo Road and Lower Kula Road leading to the new population centers at Makawao-Pū'uokalani and Kahului.

At Pūlehu, Pūlehuiki and Pūlehuunui, Keaweamahi receives 1 *apana* of 16,678.78 acres. There are no claims for house lots, 11 patches of Irish potatoes, 25+ patches of sweet potatoes, 35 *kula*, no generic potatoes, 13 generic lands, no taro lands, and mention of pigs, a bog and 3 springs.

At Pūlehu, Kaili claims 7 *kula* but relinquishes them for 20 acres in Ōmā'opio.

At Waiakoa, there is 1 claim for a house lot, 7 for Irish potatoes, and 7 for sweet potatoes, 52 for *kula* or pastures, none for generic potatoes, 3 for generic lands, and 1 taro field.

At Waohuli, there are claims for 25 house lots, 35 Irish potato lands, 113 sweet potato lands, 74 *kula*, 30 generic potato lands, 4 generic lands, 24 taro fields, 16 banana patches, 2 sugar cane lands. There is mention of the government road.

It is interesting that very many if not all the land sections have place names of their own in addition to the *iti* and *ahupua'a* names. We also note that many of the awards, in describing the bounds of their lands, use for reference the land of many other people who never received awards. *Pā'atima* (land worked for a chief) and *aiupuni* (government land) are also mentioned in describing claims to the Land Commission.

The majority of house lots claimed are in Kōōkea (22) and Waiohuli (25) although *kula* often had houses on them that were not claimed separately.

Winter *kula* is a term used only on Maui and in Kula; they are often indicated as being *makai*. One gets the impression that there was great movement between lowland and

upland and between other *ahupua'a* elsewhere and Kula, particularly during this potato growing time. Another interesting fact coming from the Mahele accounts is the canoe landing at Lāhaina for the Waikapu people who come to sell their potatoes (Creed 1993). A sizeable number of Waikapu claimants had potato patches in Kula.

Another great potato growing area, Paohu, is mentioned by surveyors and Mr. E. Baldwin in their notes (F.T. 91-95v16 and N.T. 91-95v16). They discuss the loss of potato lands there where people thought to consolidate their lands but could not afford them and so lost them altogether. This kind of documentation does not appear for our Kula district lands, although there is mention of consolidation of claims to get grants of larger lands. In Waiohuli many claimants do not receive their claims, a few because they have not been there long enough. This comment adds support to the argument that 1848 was near the height of the Irish potato growing phenomenon, especially for the market in California. In the Kula District it appears that higher status claimants, living elsewhere on other parts of Maui and even on other islands, came into Kula at this time to grow potatoes.

By 1880 the government survey of the Kula area (RM 913) shows very few Land Commission Awards and even shows those who received awards as having replaced the award with grants. Many homestead sections were opened up before 1880 and many new names appear on this map. By 1853-90 land grants were awarded in the Kula area.

Typical subsistence agriculture continued to be prominent in the southernmost *ahupua'a*, but there, as elsewhere in Kula, people from outside Kula are coming to Kula to raise potatoes for the foreign market.

Late 1800s

A note of interest regarding the Chinese presence in Kula is that Sun Yat-sen, father of the Chinese Revolution and founder of the Chinese Republic, frequented the area in the 1880s. His brother was a Kula rancher. Sun Yat-sen, an Iolani graduate who also attended medical school, was often asked medical advice while visiting Kula. "When word reached Kula that the 1912 revolution was a success, the town [celebrated]...Sun Yat-sen [was] a familiar and respected personality in Kula." (Speakman 1984:141-143)

By the 1880s lower Kula consisted primarily of pasture land for ranching (Wong Smith in Donham 1990b:6). Kennedy (1992:7) notes that at this point *kiaue* was imported to feed cattle and provide wood. Maps from late 1800s/early 1900s indicate that several ranching companies owned and operated land in Kula. The land of Kōōkea, particularly the lowland/constant portion, was historically used for ranching activities by Haleakala Ranch Company (Donham 1990b:6).

Sugar companies began operating in the Makawao area in the late 1800s. In 1899 the Kihai Plantation Company (KPC) was founded and began sugar operations in Kihai and the plain above. This plantation was then absorbed by the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company in 1908. The best KPC fields continued to be cultivated (some are still productive), while the remaining plantation lands became cattle pasture. (Cox 1976:14-15)

The Hawaiian Commercial Company was founded in 1878 by Claus Spreckels and in 1882 became the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&SC), located in Pu'uhene. In 1899 the company was acquired by investors headed by J.B. Castle, with Alexander & Baldwin replacing the plantations agents. In 1948, HC&SC absorbed the nearby Maui Agricultural Company, a Paia plantation. (Conde and Best 1973:208-210,213)

Early 1900s To The Present

Twentieth century activities in Makawao and Wailuku include sugar and pineapple cultivation, military operations, agriculture, ranching, and residential and commercial land development. According to Frederickson and Frederickson (1993:6), Kula experienced a shift toward diversified agriculture and cattle raising during this time frame, with the area of Oma'opio undergoing "intensive residential land development." Kihei also became an area of extensive development.

In 1905 the Kula Pipeline was built during a harsh drought, expanding the water resources of the Kula area (Mark in Kennedy 1992:7).

Sugar production continued into the twentieth century, with Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company cultivating sugar in the Kihei and Wailuku area, particularly during the 1940s-1960s (Sinoto and Pantaleo 1992:5). HC&SC currently operates the cane fields which constitute the bulk of the study parcel.

Pineapple cultivation was introduced to Makawao in the early 1900s. The Maui Agricultural Company (M.A.Co.), primarily a sugar producer, began planting pineapple in its upland parcels. "Some of the M.A.Co. fields in the higher elevations were too far from the main line railroad and lacked a water supply for fluming and irrigation. In 1923 the plantation started planting pineapple on these lands....the C.P.C. (California Packing cannery) concern then built a large cannery....The M.A.Co. moved the cannery workers from Paia to Kahului." (Conde and Best 1973:233)

Maui Land and Pineapple Company also had its beginnings during this time period. According to Speakman (1984:130-131) the company started as Baldwin Packers which then became Maui Pineapple Company, owned by Alexander & Baldwin. The company developed over the 1950s and 1960s, becoming "the largest producer of pineapple on Maui." The Cameron family then took control and the company became Maui Land and Pineapple Company. McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996:3) note that Maui Land and Pineapple Company planted pineapple in 'A'apua in 1979, in an area currently used for cattle pasture. During the 1970s, under the new ownership, the company began endeavors into residential land development, such as the condominiums at Kapalua. Maui Land and Pineapple Company continues to cultivate pineapple within the western reaches of the study parcel.

While World War I had little impact on Maui, World War II brought with it a significant military presence. Speakman (1984:166-176) provides a detailed review of the Marines on Maui, particularly Camp Maui in Kokomo and training maneuvers held on Kaho'olawe and

at Ma'alaea Bay, along its beach and in the *kiawe* groves to the east of the Bay. Allen (1971:230) notes that the Marines conducted amphibious landing training at Ma'alaea Bay. Allen (*Ibid.*) also gives an extensive account of the Navy presence on Maui, which included the Combat Demolition Training Station at Kama'ole and two naval air stations, one at Pu'uhene and the other at Kahului. The training station at Kama'ole was responsible for research work at Kihei as early as 1940. The Pu'uhene air station was established in 1939, making it the second oldest in Hawaii. During 1941 (especially after Pearl Harbor) the station expanded to cover much of the Pu'uhene plain and served as an important naval hub for training, plane maintenance, and medical care for the enlisted.

A recent article in *The Honolulu Advertiser* (Tanji 1997:A23&26) notes an on-going research project conducted by the Maui Military Museum which studies the Naval Air Station at Pu'uhene, with its corresponding air strip, and the plentiful historic military artifacts which they are unearthing in the area. Bartholomew and Bailey (1994:147) refer to the Army camps throughout Maui (including Kula) and two hospitals, one in Waikapu and one in the old Makawao School.

Burgett and Spear (1995:8) discuss the introduction of ranching ventures into the uplands of Kula in the early 1900s. TMK maps (sections 2-2 and 2-3) list the following landholders: Haleakala Ranch Co., Ulupalakua Ranch, Inc., Kaonoulu Ranch Co., Ltd., Maui (Land and) Pineapple Co., Ltd., the James Campbell Estate, the State of Hawaii, and Hawaiian Homes Lands. As discussed by Wong Smith (Brown and Haun 1989:C-7), agriculture and cattle raising would continue to be important activities in the Kula area. During the 1970s, Kula produced the majority of Hawaii's locally grown produce and livestock ranches comprised most of the remaining land use. At present, non-residential areas are still in use as centers of agricultural production, particularly in the "potato district" of Kula (Donham 1992:5). Haleakala, Ulupalakua and Kaonoulu Ranches are also still in operation.

Kihei underwent a rapid residential and commercial development beginning in the 1970s. Clark (1980:49) notes that the groundwork for this development was established in the late 1950s when investors began purchasing coastal property. However, the construction boom of high rise apartments, hotels, and condominiums and corresponding shopping centers, restaurants, and real estate offices didn't occur until the 1970s. Speakman (1984:188) notes that along with the condominiums and "classy" hotels (Maui's "hallmark") came the construction of millionaire homes in the dry hills overlooking Kihei and the view beyond of Kaho'olawe and Moloka'i. He comments on the congestion and overcrowding which resulted from this development (*op. cit.*:188-189): "It was partially blamed on the fact that Kihei was owned by many proprietors or speculators, each with individual plans uncoordinated with general planning, and partly on the failure of the County planners to hold the line against the runaway development. Kihei became the model for the wrong way to go about expansion." Pihani Highway was constructed to ease the congested Kihei traffic which resulted from this development and expansion of the tourist industry.

One Informant Interview

On April 16, 1997 Mr. Thomas Devereux of Cultural Surveys Hawaii Inc. (CSH) met with

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING

At Maka'eha, Kekahuna claims but does not get the *ahupua'a*. Donham (1990c:6) notes that Keohokalole had been offered Maka'eha but she transferred this to the government. This is also true for the *ahupua'a* of Kailua. There are no other claims in Maka'eha.

At Oma'opio 1-10, there is 1 claim for a house site, 8 claims for Irish potatoes, 1 for sweet potatoes, 28 for *kula*, none for generic potato lands, 5 for generic land, 21 *lo'i*, sugarcane and 2 wauke patches. LCA 281B is awarded to Ali, a non-resident claiming Lohaina as his place of residence. He has 1052+ acres. Nine awards are centrally located between the north Oma'opio *ahupua'a* boundary (the high ground between Kaliainui Gulch and Pūlehu Gulch) and the south Oma'opio *ahupua'a* boundary which is the stream bed in Pūlehu Gulch.

We do not believe this narrow band of plots is typical of the prehistoric settlement pattern in Oma'opio. The land form in the *ahupua'a* provides widespread areas of arable land. Prehistoric settlement including cultivated fields would have been dispersed across the whole landscape in the *ahupua'a* between 488 and 1219 m. amsl. The pattern we see reflected in the distribution of Land Commission Awards probably results from population decline and subsequent resettlement of the remaining farmers to land close to or adjacent to the major trails or roads such as Oma'opio Road, Kimo Road and Lower Kula Road leading to the new population centers at Makawao-Pū'uokalani and Kahuhui.

At Pūlehu, Pūlehuiki and Pūlehunui, Keaweamahi receives 1 *apaua* of 16,678.78 acres. There are no claims for house lots, 11 patches of Irish potatoes, 25+ patches of sweet potatoes, 35 *kula*, no generic potatoes, 13 generic lands, no taro lands, and mention of pigs, a bog and 3 springs.

At Pūlehu, Kaili claims 7 *kula* but relinquishes them for 20 acres in Oma'opio.

At Waiakoa, there is 1 claim for a house lot, 7 for Irish potatoes, and 7 for sweet potatoes, 52 for *kula* or pastures, none for generic potatoes, 3 for generic lands, and 1 taro field.

At Waohuli, there are claims for 25 house lots, 35 Irish potato lands, 113 sweet potato lands, 74 *kula*, 30 generic potato lands, 4 generic lands, 24 taro fields, 16 banana patches, 2 sugar cane lands. There is mention of the government road.

It is interesting that very many if not all the land sections have place names of their own in addition to the *lo'i* and *ahupua'a* names. We also note that many of the awards, in describing the bounds of their lands, use for reference the land of many other people who never received awards. *Pōaitia* (land worked for a chief) and *aiupuni* (government land) are also mentioned in describing claims to the Land Commission.

The majority of house lots claimed are in Kōokea (22) and Waiohuli (25) although *kula* often had houses on them that were not claimed separately.

Winter *kula* is a term used only on Maui and in Kula: they are often indicated as being *makai*. One gets the impression that there was great movement between lowland and

upland and between other *ahupua'a* elsewhere and Kula, particularly during this potato growing time. Another interesting fact coming from the Mahele accounts is the canoe landing at Lahaina for the Waikapu people who come to sell their potatoes (Creed 1993). A sizeable number of Waikapu claimants had potato patches in Kula.

Another great potato growing area, Paehu, is mentioned by surveyors and Mr. E. Baldwin in their notes (F.T. 91-95v16 and N.T. 91-95v16). They discuss the loss of potato lands there where people thought to consolidate their lands but could not afford them and so lost them altogether. This kind of documentation does not appear for our Kula district lands, although there is mention of consolidation of claims to get grants of larger lands. In Waiohuli many claimants do not receive their claims, a few because they have not been there long enough. This comment adds support to the argument that 1848 was near the height of the Irish potato growing phenomenon, especially for the market in California. In the Kula District it appears that higher status claimants, living elsewhere on other parts of Maui and even on other islands, came into Kula at this time to grow potatoes.

By 1880 the government survey of the Kula area (RM 913) shows very few Land Commission Awards and even shows those who received awards as having replaced the award with grants. Many homestead sections were opened up before 1880 and many new names appear on this map. By 1853 90 land grants were awarded in the Kula area.

Typical subsistence agriculture continued to be prominent in the southernmost *ahupua'a*, but there, as elsewhere in Kula, people from outside Kula are coming to Kula to raise potatoes for the foreign market.

Late 1800s

A note of interest regarding the Chinese presence in Kula is that Sun Yat-sen, father of the Chinese Revolution and founder of the Chinese Republic, frequented the area in the 1880s. His brother was a Kula rancher. Sun Yat-sen, an Iolani graduate who also attended medical school, was often asked medical advice while visiting Kula. "When word reached Kula that the 1912 revolution was a success, the town [celebrated]...Sun Yat-sen [was] a familiar and respected personality in Kula." (Speakman 1984:141-143)

By the 1880s lower Kula consisted primarily of pasture land for ranching (Wong Smith in Donham 1990b:B-6). Kennedy (1992:7) notes that at this point *kiawe* was imported to feed cattle and provide wood. Maps from late 1800s/early 1900s indicate that several ranching companies owned and operated land in Kula. The land of Kōokea, particularly the lowland/coastal portion, was historically used for ranching activities by Haleakala Ranch Company (Donham 1990b:6).

Sugar companies began operating in the Makawao area in the late 1800s. In 1899 the Kīhei Plantation Company (KPC) was founded and began sugar operations in Kīhei and the plain above. This plantation was then absorbed by the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company in 1908. The best KPC fields continued to be cultivated (some are still productive), while the remaining plantation lands became cattle pasture. (Cox 1976:14-15)

The Hawaiian Commercial Company was founded in 1878 by Claus Spreckels and in 1882 became the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&SC), located in Pu'uhene. In 1899 the company was acquired by investors headed by J.B. Castle, with Alexander & Baldwin replacing the plantations agents. In 1946, HC&SC absorbed the nearby Maui Agricultural Company, a Paia plantation. (Conde and Best 1973:208-210,213)

Early 1900s To The Present

Twentieth century activities in Makawao and Wailuku include sugar and pineapple cultivation, military operations, agriculture, ranching, and residential and commercial land development. According to Frederickson and Frederickson (1993:6), Kula experienced a shift toward diversified agriculture and cattle raising during this time frame, with the area of Oma'opio undergoing "intensive residential land development." Kihai also became an area of extensive development.

In 1905 the Kula Pipeline was built during a harsh drought, expanding the water resources of the Kula area (Mark in Kennedy 1992:7).

Sugar production continued into the twentieth century, with Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company cultivating sugar in the Kihai and Wailuku area, particularly during the 1940s-1960s (Sinoto and Pantaleo 1992:5). HC&SC currently operates the cane fields which constitute the bulk of the study parcel.

Pineapple cultivation was introduced to Makawao in the early 1900s. The Maui Agricultural Company (M.A.Co.), primarily a sugar producer, began planting pineapple in its upland parcels. "Some of the M.A.Co. fields in the higher elevations were too far from the main line railroad and lacked a water supply for fluming and irrigation. In 1923 the plantation started planting pineapple on these lands...the C.F.C. (California Packing cannery) concern then built a large cannery...The M.A.Co. moved the cannery workers from Paia to Kahului." (Conde and Best 1973:233)

Maui Land and Pineapple Company also had its beginnings during this time period. According to Speakman (1984:130-131) the company started as Baldwin Packers which then became Maui Pineapple Company, owned by Alexander & Baldwin. The company developed over the 1950s and 1960s, becoming "the largest producer of pineapple on Maui." The Cameron family then took control and the company became Maui Land and Pineapple Company. McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996:3) note that Maui Land and Pineapple Company planted pineapple in 'A'apueo in 1979, in an area currently used for cattle pasture. During the 1970s, under the new ownership, the company began endeavors into residential land development, such as the condominiums at Kapahua. Maui Land and Pineapple Company continues to cultivate pineapple within the western reaches of the study parcel.

While World War I had little impact on Maui, World War II brought with it a significant military presence. Speakman (1984:166-176) provides a detailed review of the Marines on Maui, particularly Camp Maui in Kokomo and training maneuvers held on Kaho'olawe and

at Ma'alea Bay, along its beach and in the *Hi'auae* Groves to the east of the Bay. Allen (1971:230) notes that the Marines conducted amphibious landing training at Ma'alea Bay. Allen (*Ibid.*) also gives an extensive account of the Navy presence on Maui, which included the Combat Demolition Training Station at Kama'ole and two naval air stations, one at Pu'uhene and the other at Kahului. The training station at Kama'ole was responsible for research work at Kihai as early as 1940. The Pu'uhene air station was established in 1939, making it the second oldest in Hawaii. During 1941 (especially after Pearl Harbor) the station expanded to cover much of the Pu'uhene plain and served as an important naval hub for training, plane maintenance, and medical care for the enlisted.

A recent article in *The Honolulu Advertiser* (Tanji 1997:A23&26) notes an on-going research project (conducted by the Maui Military Museum) which studies the Naval Air Station at Pu'uhene, with its corresponding air strip, and the plentiful historic military artifacts which they are unearthing in the area. Bartholomew and Bailey (1994:147) refer to the Army camps throughout Maui (including Kula) and two hospitals, one in Waikapu and one in the old Makawao School.

Burgett and Spear (1995:8) discuss the introduction of ranching ventures into the uplands of Kula in the early 1900s. TMK maps (sections 2-2 and 2-3) list the following landholders: Haleakala Ranch Co., Ulupalakua Ranch, Inc., Kaonoulu Ranch Co., Ltd., Maui Land and Pineapple Co., Ltd., the James Campbell Estate, the State of Hawaii, and Hawaiian Homes Lands. As discussed by Wong Smith (Brown and Haun 1989:C-7), agriculture and cattle raising would continue to be important activities in the Kula area. During the 1970s, Kula produced the majority of Hawaii's locally grown produce and livestock ranches comprised most of the remaining land use. At present, non-residential areas are still in use as centers of agricultural production, particularly in the "potato district" of Kula (Donham 1992:5). Haleakala, Ulupalakua and Kaonoulu Ranches are also still in operation.

Kihai underwent a rapid residential and commercial development beginning in the 1970s. Clark (1980:49) notes that the groundwork for this development was established in the late 1950s when investors began purchasing coastal property. However, the construction boom of high rise apartments, hotels, and condominiums and corresponding shopping centers, restaurants, and real estate offices didn't occur until the 1970s. Speakman (1984:188) notes that along with the condominiums and "classy" hotels (Maui's "hallmark") came the construction of millionaire homes in the dry hills overlooking Kihai and the view beyond of Kaho'olawe and Molokai. He comments on the congestion and overcrowding which resulted from this development (*op. cit.*:188-189): "It was partially blamed on the fact that Kihai was owned by many proprietors or speculators, each with individual plans uncoordinated with general planning, and partly on the failure of the County planners to hold the line against the runaway development. Kihai became the model for the wrong way to go about expansion." Pihani Highway was constructed to ease the congested Kihai traffic which resulted from this development and expansion of the tourist industry.

One Informant Interview

On April 16, 1997 Mr. Thomas Devereux of Cultural Surveys Hawaii Inc. (CSH) met with

Mr. Douglas MacCluer, manager of Maui Land and Pineapple Co. MacCluer is an avid hunter and hiker who has been employed in the pineapple industry on Maui for over thirty years and is well acquainted with the project area. The objectives accomplished at this meeting with MacCluer were: (1) a review of the archaeological sites located during the survey by CSH crew members; (2) conducting a field inspection of the surveyed sites; (3) conducting a field inspection of other site locations known by Mr. MacCluer to contain archaeological sites in the vicinity of the road corridors.

All archaeological sites identified by Cultural Surveys Hawaii in the mauka portion of the project area were confirmed by Mr. MacCluer during the field inspection. The field inspection was conducted by vehicle and on foot in the mauka portions of the project area in the cultivated pineapple fields. Several other archaeological sites known to Mr. MacCluer were pointed out at this time along segments B and C but were determined by Cultural Surveys Hawaii staff to be located well outside the alignment boundaries. It was Mr. MacCluer's opinion that CSH had located, within the alignment corridors, all archaeological sites with which he was familiar.

Summary

The project area is located primarily in the barren zone of the Makawao and Wailuku Districts, with the western boundary at the coast and the eastern boundary extending into the upland zone. The upland zone has served as an agricultural center since the pre-contact era; uala, or sweet potato, has traditionally been cultivated in Kula in elevations above 2000 ft. amsl. Corresponding with this agricultural activity was habitation in the uplands and in the coastal zone with transportation routes and intermittent habitation in the zone between the coast and the upland referred to as the intermediate or barren zone.

Mythology regarding this portion of Maui is relatively scarce and traditional accounts focus on political activities. Existing accounts describe the people of Kula, Makawao, and Wailuku (referring to the importance of agriculture in Kula) and record the struggles and activities of Maui and Hawaii chiefs in the 1700s, including Ke-kau-like, Alapa'i, Ka-hekili, Ku-keawe, 'Umi, and also British Captain Vancouver.

During the early historical period Kula's agricultural role was expanded as the introduction of whaling and the California Gold Rush of 1849 initiated a demand for the Irish potato, which was cultivated in the uplands. The traditional uala planting grounds were now also used for the Irish potato, and the area became known as the "potato district." Immigrants from China came to Makawao during this time and created a thriving community in Kula. Cash croppers in the Kula Region had a readily accessible port at Kalepolepo where J.J. Halstead had his store and residences, referred to as the "Koa House." Sugar cultivation and ranching were also introduced in the region in the early 1800s.

Many of the Land Commission claims in the Kula area were not granted. It is believed that many people living and farming in this area tried to consolidate their land holdings into a single large piece; a study of the grants in this area may show this in detail.

The Mahele-era data indicates both coastal zone and upland zone had permanent habitation, though the awarded claims suggest fewer coastal house lots than in the upland zone. The exception is a cluster or village-type setting at the Kalepolepo fishpond(s). Agriculture is almost exclusively in the upland zone, though a few claims note "winter kula makai." Whether makai means at the shore has not been deduced from available sources (e.g. TMK maps, or historic 19th and 20th century maps). The few "hooilo" or winter kula that were awarded are in the upland zone along the Old Kula Road, approximately at the center of the district and were not noted as being "makai."

The Mahele and Grant data also indicates variations across the region in terms of number of claims and awards and the elevational ranges of the upland zone. At the southern end of the region, upland kuleana claims are at roughly the 2800 to 3000 ft. amsl range. Moving north the elevational range drops. In Omaoio the range of the upland belt appears to be from ca 1200 to 2700 ft. amsl; in 'A'apueo from ca. 1100 to 4000 ft. amsl; at Pukalani, 1100 to 1700 ft. amsl. The ranges are based on available map locations for Land Commission awards and similar mid-1800's grant data.

There is virtually no specific land use data for the intermediate zone between the coastal and upland zones from the Mahele data, however there are references to trails with one of the most important accessing Kalepolepo, which was an early vitalizing trade post for pigs, cattle, sheep, perhaps taro from Waikapu, sugar, potatoes and undoubtedly water.

The late 1800s were marked by the continuation of ranching and sugar in Makawao. Lower Kula consisted primarily of pasture land by the end of the century. By the late 1800s, Hawaii Commercial and Sugar Company became a major presence in Makawao with its absorption of other neighboring operations. Also, Sun Yat-sen frequently visited Kula and its Chinese community during the 1880s.

During the twentieth century sugar, pineapple, diversified agriculture, and ranching activities would continue while military operations associated with World War II and residential and commercial development would be introduced. Hawaii Commercial and Sugar Company and Maui Land and Pineapple Company continued their operations in the area. The military established itself on Maui during WWII with a Marine camp in Kokomo, Naval Air Station at Pu'unene, a Navy Combat Demolition Training Station at Kama'ole, Army camps and hospitals in Kula and Makawao area. Agriculture and ranching continued in the area, with Kula providing a major source of produce for Hawaii in the 1970s and ranches constituting much of the remaining land use. Kula continues to provide local produce, including vegetables and flowers. Haleakala, Ulupalakua, and Kaonoulu Ranches continue to operate at this time. Residential and commercial development was initiated in the 1950s, with a construction boom beginning in the 1970s. The focus of this development was Kihei, an area now known for its resorts and retail ventures. Pi'ihani Highway was constructed to ease the Kihei traffic which became congested as a result of this development and the expansion of the tourist industry on Maui.

IV. PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Previous archaeological research in the Makawao District has been concentrated in the higher elevations (1000 ft. amsl and above) of upcountry Kula and the coastal Kihei region. Research relevant to the study parcel is discussed below in terms of these two regions. Table 3 lists State sites in the corridor areas and the sites in or near the road corridors are shown on Figure 3.

Kula Region

The earliest archaeological studies on Maui begin with descriptive lists of religious sites by Thomas Thrum (1906-1918) and John Stokes (n.d.) in the early 1900s and culminate with the first island wide site survey by Winslow Walker (1931). Throughout the Kula region of Maui from Olinda and Makawao to Kanaio beyond Ulupalakua, the sites recorded by Walker (all *Aetau* - 33 total) are located in a continuous band between roughly 2000 ft. and 3000 ft. amsl.

From around 1930 to the 1970s only sporadic visits were made to Kula by archaeologists, primarily for the purpose of recording individual archaeological sites reported by local residents. In 1970 J. Halley Cox and Edward Stasack (1970) compiled a listing of identified petroglyph sites throughout Hawaii, including the Kula area. Two of these sites, MA-B22-2 (State site 50-50-10-1061, Kahalinui Gulch petroglyphs) and MA-B22-1 (identified as MA-B23-1 in Cox and Stasack; State site 50-50-10-1062, Kaluapalani Gulch petroglyphs), were relocated during the present project (designated CSH 1 and CSH 23, respectively).

Inez Ashdown (1899-1992) spent her lifetime collecting information about Maui. This information she collected was put together in the book *Ke Aialoa o Maui* (1971). Regarding Kula (including the current project area and areas nearby), she notes that the largest fields of *ki'i* were at Nu'u, and the next largest could be found throughout Honua'ula, particularly around the ancient temple of Lono in Oama'opio Isiel. In Kamehameiki area and on across into Ka-ono-ulu many petroglyphs are known and new ones can be found" (*top. cit.*:48). She also remarks that in the Kéokea and Waiakoa areas:

are many structures, fields of petroglyphs and temples around the two temples called Pa'uhu and Ka-imu-pe'e-lua. Also in this area the temples of Maheka and Ka-umu-o-pahu (or Ka-umu-o-pahu) may still remain, along with Po'o-na-hoe-hoe and Mana' the latter now part of a modern cemetery. At Pūlehu stood the temple of Ni-ni-ni-wai, and at Kama'ole the two on the Mao land, one named Wailuku because of the battle there and the destruction during the time when Ka-lani-ku-pule ousted a brother of Pūlehu Kamehameha (*top. cit.* 57-58).

Three archaeological surveys conducted during the 1980s in the *ahupua'a* of Waiohuli and Kéokea by Mary Riford (1987), Roderick Brown and Alan Haun (1989) and Kolk *et al.* (1997) have contributed the bulk of data on site patterning and land use prior to the 20th century in "up-country" Kula Maui. These studies, and a selection of others relevant to the




Figure 4 Previous archaeological conducted in upper portions of project area.

upcountry Kula area, are summarized below (Figure 4).

Riford's (1987) monitoring and reconnaissance survey for the Waiohuli and Kōkeke Subdivisions identified 113 sites with 252 features consisting of "agricultural terraces and mound features as well as a number of possible habitation- and religious-related stone-walled enclosures..." (op. cit.:55). Riford suggests that human occupation in the area extended from prehistoric times to the 1950s based on artifacts observed at the sites (op. cit.:56). This time frame is further documented by Brown and Haun (1989:18-21).

Brown and Haun (1989) conducted an inventory survey for the same study parcels in Waiohuli and Kōkeke, covering 1,025 acres of uncultivated pasture land located between 1,800 ft. and 3,000 ft. amsl. Within the survey area 159 sites with 274 features were identified, including agricultural, residential, and ceremonial complexes. Fifty-three of the sites had been identified during the Bishop Museum (Riford 1987) survey.

Hammatt and Shideler (1990) conducted an inventory survey of a plot of land on the Kīhei coast at Wailuku. Kama'ole, just *makai* of the proposed K2 shoreline terminus. There were 8 sites; ranch walls, 3 fishing shrines and midden scatter, a C-shape and an undetermined remnant.

In general Brown and Haun (1989:27) found that the Kōkeke division was intensively exploited in a variety of ways for at least two-thirds of the entirety of Hawaiian prehistory. They suggest similar land use and chronology but lesser density in the Waiohuli area, probably due to a greater amount of recent land clearing activities. Sixteen radiocarbon dates provided overlapping ranges from A.D. 1270 through A.D. 1955. One sample, with the earliest date, yielded three possible ranges between A.D. 680 and A.D. 1157. (op. cit.:19-20)

In January 1993 (Folk and Hammatt 1993), Cultural Surveys Hawaii conducted an inventory level survey of approximately 25 acres on the southern edge of Ōma'opio *ahupua'a*. This survey resulted in the relocation of several previously recorded sites, which in relation to the current study parcel are located east of terminus U3, between Kula Highway and Halekaia Highway. These sites, already documented by Griffin and Donham, included a large enclosure (site 50-50-11-1349) and the Upper Fulehu Gulch Petroglyphs (site 50-50-11-1268). Additional archaeological features consisting of a stacked boulder alignment and few low mounds were also located and collectively assigned site number 50-50-11-3121. Charcoal analysis of site 50-50-11-1349 suggests the site dates to be possibly as early as the 15th century A.D.

In 1995, Burgett and Spear (1995) of Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted an inventory survey of a 22.5 acre parcel located in Ka'ono'ono *ahupua'a*, Makawao District (to the south of the southeastern portion of the current study parcel). A total of six sites comprised of 29 features were identified during the survey. The identified features included the following formal types: terrace, wall, enclosure, cistern, mound, building and platform. It was determined that all sites are post-contact in age and associated with agriculture and habitation activities.

In February 1996 McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996) conducted an archaeological

reconnaissance survey of a 250-acre parcel located in the land of 'A'apueo, Makawao District (TMK: 2-3-08: Por.5). Most of the project area consists primarily of former pineapple lands between Kaluapalani and Kalia Gulches. This survey resulted in the identification of two sites: (1) a site assigned the temporary number 1707-1 and described as a sailing canoe petroglyph, and (2) temporary site number 1717-2 described as a wall. In addition to these sites several land clearing piles associated with historic pineapple cultivation were also reported but were not assigned site numbers. It was determined that further data collection activities should take place at the wall site 1707-2, and that the petroglyph site 1707-1 be preserved with interpretive development.

Then in March 1996 Wulzen, et al. (1996) conducted an inventory survey of a 44-acre parcel that is the *mauka* portion of McPhatter and Rosendahl's February 1996 project area. The 44-acre parcel is also described by Wulzen as part of the 305-acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision Unit III located in the land of 'A'apueo, Makawao District (TMK: 2-3-08: Por.5). Wulzen's project area contained three previously recorded sites: (1) the Kalia petroglyph site 50-50-10-1081, (2) 50-50-10-4179, the "sailing canoe petroglyph site" recorded as temporary site number 1707-1 by McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996); the description of this site was upgraded to multiple petroglyphs, and (3) 50-50-10-4178, the new site (Site 50-50-10-4181) was identified during Wulzen's survey; it consisted of four features including two agricultural clearing mounds and two stone alignments. Testing conducted at the stone alignments yielded historic artifacts associated with pineapple agriculture. The Kaluapalani petroglyph site 50-50-10-1062, originally described as being only on the north side of Kaluapalani gulch, was relocated by Wulzen although his project area boundary is on the south side of that gulch. They reported their concurrence with the original recorded data on the site, except they found the petroglyphs to extend farther *makai* than originally described.

Other research in the upcountry Kula area includes Donham (1990c), 1992), Fredericksen and Fredericksen (1993, 1995) and Kolb et al. (1997).

In the study of Hawaiian Homestead parcels in Waiohuli and Kōkeke, excavation data indicates that initial permanent habitation and land clearing for agricultural pursuits began ca. A.D. 1200 to 1400 (Kolb et al. 1997:300-304). The sequence of agricultural and habitation intensification was suggested by radiocarbon and pollen analysis and includes the A.D. 1200 to 1400 initial land clearing of forest, becoming mixed shrubs and grass lands by A.D. 1400-1500, with a corresponding "boom of habitations" and by the 1600s to 1700s the forests disappear and are replaced by expansive agricultural fields and continued increase in habitations. The increase of the 1600s to 1700s includes expansion into less favorable terrain both *makai* and *mauka* of the prime upland zone lands (Ibid.). The research also indicated, as it has elsewhere in Hawaii, that there was a "rapid depopulation and change" by the mid-1800s (Ibid.)

Coastal Kihel Region

Numerous archaeological surveys were conducted along the south coast of the Makawao District, particularly in the Kihel, Waila, and Mākena area and the from Kama'ole to Waiakoa as a result of the 1970s resort development.

From 1969 to 1971, Kirch (1971) conducted a survey and subsequent excavations at Palaea, south of K1 and K2 termini at Pi'ilani Highway. Through his analysis of coastal sites 50-50-10-1028 and 50-50-10-1029, Kirch concluded that settlement patterns in this area were characterized by transient coastal habitation involving the use of ocean resources with permanent settlements and agricultural activities in the upland region. (Donham 1990b: 4)

Donham (1990), in a report on Phase II of the Pi'ilani Residential Community in Keōkea lists numerous reconnaissance and testing projects conducted in the Waila and Mākena area from the early 1970s to the late 1980s. These studies, as stated by Donham, include: Barre 1974, Clark 1974, Cleghorn 1974 and 1975, Barre 1975, Hommon 1975, Cordy 1978, Haun 1978, Sinoto 1978, Jourdane and Sinoto 1979, Bordner 1980, Schilt and Dobyms 1980, Bordner and Cox 1982, Walker, Rosendahl and Haun 1985, Dicks and Haun 1987, Dobyms 1988, Haun 1988, and Shapiro and Haun 1988. According to Donham, the findings from the Jourdane and Sinoto 1979 and Schilt and Dobyms 1980 studies also support Kirch's hypotheses regarding settlement and subsistence patterns involving the inland and coastal regions of Makawao.

Several projects were also conducted *makai* of the current project area in the coastal region of Kihel extending from Kama'ole *ahupua'a* in the south to Waiakoa *ahupua'a* in the north (Figures 5, 6, and 7). These projects provide useful information about the coastal area of Kihel and settlement patterns relating to the inland zone, as discussed by Kirch (1971). However, since these studies reiterate already mentioned information and are located outside of our current study parcel, they will not be discussed here. For the reader's reference, these projects include (but are not limited to) a flora and fauna survey by Austin, Smith & Assoc. Inc. in 1974 and the following archaeological studies: Cox 1976, Hirota 1979, Hommon 1981, Keau 1981, Miura 1982, Neller 1982, Mayberry and Haun 1988, Hammatt and Shideler 1989, Hammatt and Shideler 1990, Donham 1990(a&b), Hursi 1991, Kennedy 1991, Hammatt and Shideler 1992, Kennedy 1992, Sinoto and Pantaleo 1992, Fredericksen *et al.* 1993, and Fredericksen *et al.* 1994.

Predictive Model

Based on background studies the project area, consisting of the corridors from *Makai* termini K1 and K2 to *mauka* termini, U1, U2A, U2B and U3 - is situated within the traditional Hawaiian District of Kula, which has been characterized as having a zonal settlement pattern based on elevation and terrain type. The zones include coastal, intermediate, upland, and forest. The bulk of the project area is within the intermediate zone. The *makai* termini are just inland of the coastal zone and the *mauka* termini U2A, U2B and U3 are in the upland zone. The *mauka* terminus of U1 is at approximately 900 ft. amsl within the upper limits of the intermediate zone.

The settlement pattern model suggests a low site density for the intermediate zone with like site types to include: trails, markers, agricultural features, temporary habitation, and petroglyphs in gulches. The pattern suggests a higher site density in the vicinity of the *mauka* termini as they are within the upland zone. Based on historic background data site types could include: permanent habitations, large ceremonial structures, evidence of extensive dryland agriculture, burials and petroglyphs. Research, however, indicates that historic commercial agriculture of pineapple and sugar cane, has extensively altered the landscape.

Modern mechanized commercial agriculture has altered the landscape to such a degree that few, if any, sites are anticipated in existing or fallow fields. Based on the above data, it is presumed that sites will exist within non-commercial agricultural terrain such as gullies and gulches or where no commercial agriculture occurred. Based on existing maps, commercial agricultural fields are located above the 750-1000 ft. amsl range.




Figure 5 Previous archaeology conducted makai of the project area during the 1970s




Figure 6 Previous archaeology conducted makai of the project area during the 1980s

V. SURVEY RESULTS

Twenty-five localities where historic properties, or sites, are present were identified during the archaeological reconnaissance survey (Table 2). In accord with the scope of work (see page 4) the survey was conducted at a reconnaissance level of site recording not that of an inventory survey. The types of features were noted, the general boundaries of the sites were recorded, and initial assessments of site significance were made based only on the reconnaissance data. Site function and significance will be refined or re-defined during the inventory survey level of work to follow in Phase II. State Inventory of Historic Places (SIHP) numbers are usually assigned during inventory survey. However, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) has requested that SIHP numbers be assigned here. SIHP numbers are, therefore, assigned to the features identified in the reconnaissance survey. This is potentially problematic because the age and function of some sites are difficult to determine without inventory survey level field testing. Some of the SIHP numbers may need to be retracted based on subsequent inventory survey findings.

A. Site Descriptions

State Site #:	50-50-10-1061, Kaliaimui petroglyphs	CSH #1
Site Type:	Petroglyphs/overhang shelter	
Function:	Symbolic/habitat, recurrent	
Corridor:	Alternate U2	
Features (#):	2	

Description: The Kaliaimui petroglyphs were first recorded by the Bishop Museum as site MA-B22-2, and later, assigned State Inventory of Historic Places number 50-50-10-1061. The site is comprised of extensive arrays of petroglyphs on both the north and south walls of Kaliaimui gulch, and a cliff-overhang shelter located on the north wall beneath the petroglyphs. The land survey centerline stake number 1581 is in the gulch bottom in the vicinity of the petroglyphs. Vegetation at the site consists of various exotic grasses, lantana, a few relict *ulivili* trees.

Feature A is a cluster of 7-10 pecked petroglyph figures located on a single 3.5 m. (11.5 ft.) wide by 3 m. (9.8 ft.) tall rock panel located at the bottom of the south side of the gulch, 23 m. (75.4 ft.) southwest of stake -1581. Petroglyph figures at Feature A range in size and consist of several anthropomorphic figures, circles, and an image which could be interpreted as avian. No midden or artifacts were observed. There are no sediment deposits associated with this petroglyph cluster.

Feature B consists of a cliff overhang shelter and several rock faces containing 50+ pecked and incised petroglyph figures. Feature B is located 52 m. (171 ft.) west of stake -1581 and 30 m. (100 ft.) makai of Feature A along the bottom of the north side of the gulch.




Figure 7 Previous archaeology conducted makai of the project area during the 1990s

Table 2: Sites Located During Reconnaissance Survey

*SIHP #	Alignment Section	Location	Description	Comments
#50-50-10-1061	U2	North and south sides of Kalialinui Gulch, stake # 1581	overhang shelter and petroglyph friezes	2 features; 60+ petroglyph figures, previously recorded as State site 50-50-10-1061
#50-50-10-1062	U2B	Kaluapulani Gulch	petroglyph (50+) freize, fire pit & wall	+/- 15 figures, including canoes; previously recorded State site 50-50-10-1062
#50-50-10-4178	U2	South fork of Kaluapulani Gulch, stake #-1592	Petroglyphs	
#50-50-10-4180	U2A	near Puu O Weli	Wall	identified by Wuizen (1996), related to pineapple cultivation cattle control
#50-50-10-4181	U2B	North face of Kalialinui Gulch, mauka of 50-50-10-1061	Complex of two agricultural clearing mounds; two stone alignments	Agriculture
#50-50-10-4760	U2	30 m. southeast of stake #-1578	Modified outcrop	Cattle trail bisects site
#50-50-10-4761	U2	At stake #-1582	Oval enclosure	Recurrent habitation
#50-50-10-4762	U2	Mauka of stake #-1582	Square enclosure	Permanent habitation

39

#50-50-10-4763	U3	Southern side of stake #-723 along ridge	Wall	Cattle wall
#50-50-10-4764	U3	North side of Pūlehu Gulch at stake #-578	Cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs	15 pecked and incised figures
#50-50-10-4765	U1/U2	65 m. northwest of stake #-1189	Mounds, road berm, and irrigation ditch	3 features; ditch, clearing mounds, and berm segment
#50-50-10-4766	K2	Between stake #-907 and 911 both mauka and makai of centerline	Area of sites	+/- 30 associated features (enclosures, alignments, and mounds)
#50-50-10-4767	K2	On centerline between stake #-913 and -915	Circular enclosure	Agriculture
#50-50-10-4768	K2	On centerline between stake #-916 & -920	Wall	- Cattle wall?
#50-50-10-4769	K2	45 m. east of stake #-920	Wall and cairn	2 features; wall and ahu
#50-50-10-4770	K2	At stake #-923	Enclosure and cairn	2 features; enclosure and ahu
#50-50-10-4771	K2	300 m. mauka of Ke All'i Alanui Road & Pi'ilani Highway	Mound	clearing mound?
#50-50-10-4772	K2	Between stake #-928 & -929 along centerline	Boundary Wall	Site extends across entire corridor width

40

The overhang shelter measures 13.7 m. (45 ft.) wide, 3.1 m. (10.2 ft.) deep, with a maximum entrance height of 3.2 m. (10.5 ft.) tall. The petroglyph figures associated with the overhang shelter are found scattered above and inside the entrance area of the shelter. Petroglyph figures at the feature consist of partial and complete, incised and pecked stick and triangular human figures, 4 incised and pecked canoes, dog, bird, and several other incomplete shapes. Cultural material observed at the feature consisted of an egg-shaped coral manuport (worked). The floor of the shelter exhibits a sediment layer. Cultural material may be present in the sediments.

State Site #: 50-50-10-1062 CSH #101 & #102
 Site Type: Petroglyph friezes, fire pit and stone wall
 Function: Symbolic/habitation, recurrent
 Corridor: Alternate U2A
 Features (#): 50+

Description: Two petroglyph friezes. The first one is over one hundred feet long. It may be considered a discontinuous extension of SIHP 50-50-10-1062 - the Kaluapulani petroglyphs. This 100 foot long frieze is located on the north side of Kaluapulani gulch (Figure 3 and 4) west of the previously recorded friezes. There are a minimum of 23 petroglyphs in this section. (The boundaries of the site as recorded in the SIHP will need to be amended.) The petroglyphs are on the vertical face of an aa flow exposed by the stream cut. The lava flow is nearly horizontal and is near the top of the gulch wall. The road corridor centerline stake #314 is situated at the edge of the gulch on the north side, directly above the *makai* end of the bedrock exposure.

The columnar or block-jointed lava of the aa flow exposure creates an overhang shelter area near the center of the frieze. Beneath the overhang is the remains of a small fire of grass and twigs about 20 centimeters in diameter. The remains of the fire was photographed, but was not otherwise disturbed (see Photographic Appendix).

Below the petroglyph frieze, the ground consists of a talus deposit sloping steeply down to the riverbed and is covered by tall grass, but otherwise open to full sun. At the bottom of the talus slope a discontinuous stacked stone wall is present along the edge of the riverbed. The wall is probably an old cattle fence, and thus, unrelated to the petroglyphs. The bedrock exposure on the north side of the gulch is bounded on each end by a single *Witiwiti* tree and there are others on the opposite side of the gulch. A major electrical power line runs in the gulch bottom and power pole (PP) #186 is located in the riverbed directly below the site.

Another frieze of petroglyphs was discovered in the road corridor on the south wall of Kaluapulani gulch, about 100 feet *mauka* of an unnumbered, corridor centerline stake. The stake is at the south edge of the gulch, and is about 85 feet north of centerline stake #317, thus, its number should be #316.15 (stake #316 + 15 feet) (see Figure 3). (Stake numbers on the Alternate U2A corridor increase from north to south.) This frieze of petroglyphs, like the other on the north side of the gulch, is located on a vertical exposure of blocky, jointed

#50-50-10-4773	K1 & K2	5 m. east of stake #390; Both sides of centerline between stake #1118 & 1120	Complex of 2 Enclosures and 7 Enclosures	contain live small arms ammunition
#50-50-10-4174	U3	Bisects numbered stake #545 along northern side of Waiaikoa Gulch	Wall	Cattle
#50-50-10-4775	U3	On southern edge of Koloa Gulch between stake #567 & 568	Wall	Cattle
#50-50-10-4776	K1	East side of Kulanihakoi Gulch between stake #3000 & -3001	Midden and lithic scatter, and mound	Previous test units observed in surrounding area (association undetermined)
#50-50-10-4777	U1	East edge of Kaliulinui Gulch	Wall	Cattle; above power line at bottom of gulch
#50-50-10-4778	U1/U2	south edge of Waiaikoa gulch at stake #1135	Enclosure	Undetermined
#50-50-10-4779	U2A	in Kaliulinui gulch	Shelter Cave	recurrent habitation

* State Inventory of Historic Places

lava of an aa flow. There are a minimum of twenty-six pecked and incised anthropomorphic figures of stick and triangular types in this frieze. The exposed bedrock is approximately 150 to 200 ft. in length and ranges in height from 10 to 30 ft., forming a semi-circular niche in the south ridge of the gulch. At the back of the niche is a dry waterfall course roughly 8 ft. wide and 30 ft. high. All the petroglyphs in this frieze are situated on the rock faces which are *mauka* of the waterfall at the back of the niche. None were observed *makai* of the waterfall although the lava exposure continues there. A re-alignment of a short section of this corridor 400 feet to *makai* in Kaluapulani gulch would not impact other historical properties and would avoid the two new friezes of 50-50-10-1062.

At the base of the waterfall are plunge pools indicating a significant volume of water when there is a flow. The waterfall forms the confluence of the primary stream in Kaluapulani and this secondary unnamed tributary stream draining Pu'uovehi and the ridge to the south.

Large trees (of unknown classification) of perhaps 60 feet in height provide the niche with cool shade. Christmasberry trees and exotic grasses were also present. One plant observed in the sparse understory may be *Mamake*.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4178
 Site Type: Petroglyphs
 Function: Symbolic
 Corridor: Alternate U2
 Features (#): 1
 CSH #23

Description: #50-50-10-4178 comprises 15 +/- petroglyphs located on the north side of the south fork of Kaluapulani Gulch. Previously recorded as Bishop Museum site MA-B23-1 (Cox and Stasack 1988:92) the SIHP site number is 50-50-10-1062. The petroglyphs consist of anthropomorphic figures and images that could be interpreted as canoe. They are located on the vertical basalt faces of an aa lava flow exposed in the north wall of the gulch covering an area 5 m. (16.4 ft.) long and 3 m. (9.8 ft.) high. Vegetation at the site consists of exotic shrubs and grasses. No associated features or cultural material was observed in the area.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4180
 Site Type: Enclosure
 Function: Animal control
 Corridor: Alternate U2
 Features (#): 1
 CSH #5

Description: Site 50-50-10-4180 (also known as site 1707-2 (McPhatter and Rosendahl 1996) is a wall of small basalt boulders located on the steep, rocky, northern face of Kaluapulani Gulch, *mauka* of the Kaluapulani Petroglyphs (#50-50-10-1062) (CSH 1). A segment of the wall about 12 m. (39.4 ft.) long, with a maximum height of 1 m. (3.3 ft.) and

maximum width of 2.5 m. (8.2 ft.), was observed in the U2 corridor. The wall extends between two vertical rock faces of the gulch. The site is in poor condition with substantial collapsing toward the gulch bottom. No cultural material was observed and it is unlikely that sediments in the vicinity of the wall would yield important information relative to its age or function. It is probable that the wall was used recently for control of grazing animals - to keep them in the gulch and out of the pineapple fields. Some rocks on this north edge of Kaluapulani gulch may also have been raked from the pineapple fields and dumped over the edge of the gulch. Vegetation at the site on the gulch slope consists of exotic shrubs and grasses.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4181
 Site Type: Rock walls and rock piles
 Function: Historic agriculture
 Corridor: U2B
 Features (#): 4
 Wulzen site

Description: The site is described in Wulzen *et al.* 1996:6-9 as consisting of: (1) two "alignments forming terraces in a small swale between former pineapple fields" (features A and B) and, (2) two "hand-clearing piles of rock, associated with pineapple cultivation" (features C and D). Features A and B were tested by archaeological excavation, the results of which indicated a recent age (mid-twentieth century) for the site.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4760
 Site Type: Modified Outcrop
 Function: Undetermined
 Corridor: Alternate U2
 Features (#): 1
 CSH #2

Description: State site #50-50-10-4760 is a modified outcrop located on the west side of gently sloping bedrock approximately 30 m. (98 ft.) southeast of stake number -1578. The modified area is constructed of small to medium boulders and measures 4 m. (13.1 ft.) in length with a maximum height of 1.4 m. (4.6 ft.). The modified section has an uneven bedrock and cobble surface and is not well faced. A 1 1/2 inch water pipe and a cattle trail run along the top of the modified outcrop, and blocks of cement are east of the outcrop along the waterline. Immediately around the site is close cropped pasture with water trough and jeep road. *Witiwiti* trees are present at the site, and *panini* cactus is also present east of site #50-50-10-4760 in the adjacent property - separated by a fence line - where sites 50-50-10-4761 and 50-50-10-4762 are located. No cultural middens were observed at the site. Based on the observations a cultural deposit exists within the overhang shelter.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4761
 Site Type: Enclosure
 CSH #3

Function: Habitation, recurrent
Corridor: Alternate U2
Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4761 is an enclosure located near centerline stake 1582 on a gentle aa slope, surrounded by *panini* cactus, tall pasture grass and *ekoa* trees that are probably a decade or more old. The enclosure, roughly oval in shape and approximately 20 m. (14.8 ft.) E-W by 4.5 m. (14.8 ft.) N-S, is constructed of small basalt boulders stacked 0.3 to 0.6 m. high. The structure is in fair condition with some collapsing of the walls in the site interior. No cultural material was observed at the site, but the grass cover suggests sediments suitable for cultural material. Downslope to the east is State site #50-50-10-4762 and to the west is State site #50-50-10-4760 over the fence line in the adjacent pasture.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4762
Site Type: Enclosure
Function: Habitation, permanent
Corridor: Alternate U2
Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4762 is an enclosure located near centerline stake 1582 on a gentle aa slope surrounded by *panini* cactus, tall pasture grass and *ekoa* trees that are probably a decade or more old. The enclosure is roughly square in shape, approximately 20 m. (15 m. x 4 m. or 16.4 ft. by 13.1 ft.) E-W, and constructed of small angular basalt boulders stacked 0.5 to 0.8 m. high. An apparent entrance is located in the center of the west side of the enclosure. Site -4762 is in good condition. No cultural material was observed at the site, but a cultural deposit is anticipated. The tall grass suggests that deep sediments may be present which may contain cultural material. Site -4761 is located up-slope to the west and beyond -4761 is site -4760, across the fence line in the adjoining pasture.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4763
Site Type: Enclosure
Function: Animal control
Corridor: Alternate U3
Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4763 is a cattle paddock with 3 sides being barbed wire fencing and the northern side is dry masonry, stacked, basalt boulder wall. The wall is oriented *mauka*/*makai* along the ridge line on the south edge of Pūlehu gulch near center line stake number 723 approximately one thousand feet *makai* of the Kula Highway. The wall is 0.7 m. (2.3 ft.) wide and ranges in height from 0.7 to 1.6 m. (2.3 to 5.3 ft.) with a total length of 55 m. (180.4 ft.). The other three sides of the paddock are constructed of barbed fence wire strung between wooden posts with the south fence separating the pine

fields and paddock. If the wall has always functioned as part of the enclosure it may be related to cattle ranching. The wall then could date to the nineteenth century when ranching was even more widespread than today. Vegetation at the site consists of *panini*, *lantana*, and exotic shrubs and grasses. The wall is in good condition. No cultural material was observed. Sediments are gravelly, the terrace may be an old gravel bar of the stream.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4764
Site Type: Petroglyphs and overhang shelter
Function: Symbolic/habitation, recurrent
Corridor: Alternate U3
Features (#): 2

Description: 50-50-10-4764 consists of several rock faces containing a minimum of fifteen pecked and incised petroglyph figures and a cliff-overhang shelter. Located on the north wall of Pūlehu Gulch just *makai* of center line stake number 578 and about halfway between the top and bottom of the gulch, the bedrock exposure comprising the site is the dense center of a nearly horizontal aa lava flow. The overhang shelter is beneath the flow's dense layer and measures 6.5 m. (21.3 ft.) wide and 3.5 m. (11.5 ft.) deep, with a maximum height at the entrance of 1.7 m. (5.6 ft.). The petroglyph figures associated with the overhang shelter are found scattered above and inside the entrance area of the shelter. Petroglyph figures at the site consist of partial and complete, incised and pecked, stick and triangular anthropomorphic figures, animal forms that appear dog, bird, or fish-like, and several other nondescript shapes. Vegetation at the site consists of *koa* *haole* and various exotic grasses of up to eight feet in height. The site is in excellent condition. Cultural material observed at the feature consists of a large, cobble-sized, basalt core and several large wood pieces. Sediments are present in the shelter and may contain cultural deposits.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4765
Site Type: Mounds, road berm and irrigation ditch
Function: Agriculture (Sugarcane cultivation)
Corridor: Alternate U1/U2
Features (#): 3

Description: State site 50-50-10-4765 consists of features derived from sugarcane cultivation on this parcel of land between Pūlehu Road and Oma Opio Road, which has since been converted to pasture. Feature A is a historic irrigation ditch, Feature B consists of several agricultural clearing mounds, and Feature C is a small road segment. These features are located in gently sloping pasture land approximately 65 m. (213 ft.) northwest of center line stake number 1189. Vegetation in this section of the corridor consists of *panini* cactus, few monkeypod trees, *koa* *haole*, and exotic grasses grazed short which allowed for an un-obscured view of the ground.

Feature A is an agricultural irrigation ditch. It passes through the Alternate U1/U2 corridor from *mauka* to *makai* where it is primarily earthen in construction. Beyond the corridor boundaries there are remnants of mortar and small basalt boulders used in the ditch's construction. Although it is in disuse the ditch was traced to a small reservoir that is now part of a newer, active ditch system *makai* of the U1/U2 road corridor, at the edge of

fields cultivated in sugarcane. Feature A has a maximum width of 2.3 m. (7.5 ft.) and maximum depth of 1.3 m. (4.3 ft.). The ditch is certainly part of an older irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature B includes nine agricultural clearing mounds distributed along a shallow gully crossing the U1/U2 corridor just north of the 50-50-10-4765 feature A ditch. The mounds vary in size from a few meters in diameter, to 10 to 15 m. (32 to 49 ft.) long by 10 m. (32 ft.) wide and 2 to 5 m. (6.5 to 16.4 ft.) high. They consist of small to large boulders pushed up into piles on the high points of the ground along the gully and elsewhere leaving the low ground relatively free of stones. No cultural material was observed. There were no sediments observed in these boulder piles.

Feature C is a short (7.5 m. or 24.6 ft.) segment of road, or bridge-like berm, that extends across the shallow gully north of feature A and surrounded by five of the mounds of feature B. The berm is constructed of small basalt boulders which are exposed as a facing on the west, or *maikai*, side of the berm. The berm is approximately 3 m. (9.8 ft.) wide 1.3 m. (4.3 ft.) high at the midpoint, or highest point. The feature is in good condition. No cultural material was observed. There is some sedimentary material trapped among the boulders. However, any material in these sediments will likely be historic in age or out of context if of prehistoric age. Construction detail of the road berm is intact.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4766 CSH #9
 Site Type: Complex of C-shapes, enclosures, mounds, alignments
 Function: Agriculture/habitation, temporary
 Corridor: Alternate K2
 Features (#): +/-30

Description: State site #50-50-10-4766 is a complex of +/-30 archaeological features that probably functioned as agricultural and habitation sites. The features include multiple C-shaped (2-3 m. diameter) and rectangular enclosures (approximately 3 features with 2-4 m. interior width), alignments, and mounds constructed of small basalt boulders. They are distributed along the top of a low, *mauka/maikai*, or east-west oriented ridge line between centerline stakes 907 to 911. Multiple features are located on both sides of the staked center line. At the time of the survey the grass ground cover was dense and about two feet high precluding an accurate count of the features. The sites are in fair condition in land used as pasture for cattle for many years. No cultural material was observed in the sites probably because of the dense grass. The ground within the site cluster is very old aa lava. This normally produces a substantial surface sediment layer. The thick growth of grass also indicates a good soil layer where archaeological deposits may be present. The predominant tree is *koa*, however, *koa hauhau*, and occasionally *uiliuili* are also present.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4767 CSH #10
 Site Type: Enclosure
 Function: Agriculture
 Corridor: Alternate K2
 Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4767, a small, roughly circular enclosure approximately 3 m. (9.8 ft.) in diameter located on the north bank of a ravine between centerline stakes 912 and 913, is constructed of small boulders stacked 1 to 3 courses high for a maximum height of 0.5 m. (1.6 ft.). *Kiaue* and uncropped pasture grass predominate with sparse *koa haole*, and occasional *uiliuili*. The site is in fair condition; no cultural material was observed. The site is believed to be part of a large agricultural complex, extending east and north of this single enclosure. Other features may be beyond the project area boundaries to the west also, probably joining with the features of site 50-50-10-4766. These other sites were not investigated because they are outside the project area. Sediments are almost surely present on this old aa lava surface, but are obscured by the grass cover. Archaeological materials may be buried in the sediments.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4768 CSH #11
 Site Type: Wall
 Function: Animal control
 Corridor: Alternate K2
 Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4768 is a meandering wall segment. The wall is located on the road centerline between centerline stakes 916 and 919. It is built along the perimeter of a natural depression in the terrain; the area may have served as a corral or pen to include or exclude animals. The wall is constructed of small to medium boulders in combination with sections of natural bedrock and is approximately 150 m. (500 ft.) long and 0.3 to 0.6 m. (1 to 2 ft.) wide, with a maximum height of approximately 1.3 m. (4.3 ft.). The depression is predominantly grass filled; surrounding areas are savannah of *kiaue* and unidentified pasture grasses. The wall is in fair condition. No cultural material was observed. There may be sufficient sediment associated with the foundation of the wall in some places to establish a date of construction.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4769 CSH #12
 Site Type: Wall and cairn
 Function: Animal control/Boundary marker
 Corridor: Alternate K2
 Features (#): 2

Description: State site #50-50-10-4769 consists of a wall segment (feature A) and an *ahu* (feature B). These features are located approximately 45 m. (150 ft.) east of centerline stake 920 on the bank of a steep aa flow. Vegetation at the site consists of *uiliuili*, *kiaue*, and various grasses.

Feature A is a wall segment constructed of small boulders stacked 1-4 courses high. The wall segment is approximately 0.5 m. (1.6 ft.) wide, with a maximum height of 1.2 m. (3.9 ft.). The total length of the wall feature is not known because it extends beyond the four hundred foot wide survey corridor. The feature is in fair condition. No cultural

material was observed, however, there may archaeological material associated with the wall foundation to establish a date of construction.

Feature B is an *ahu* feature constructed of small boulders stacked 3-4 courses high. The *ahu* is approximately 0.9 m. (3 ft.) wide and 0.7 m. (2.3 ft.) tall. The feature is in fair condition. No cultural material was observed, however, there may archaeological material associated with the *ahu* foundation to establish a date of construction.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4770 CSH #13
Site Type: Enclosure and cairn
Function: Habitation, temporary/trail or boundary marker
Corridor: Alternate K2
Features (#): 2

Description: State site #50-50-10-4770 consists of an enclosure (feature A) and an *ahu* (feature B) located at centerline stake 923 on an aa lava flow at the edge of a *kipuka*. The savannah persists on the aa and in the *kipuka*.

Feature A is a roughly circular enclosure located in gently sloping aa. It is constructed of small boulders stacked 1 to 3 courses high for a wall construction height of 0.5 m. (1.6 ft.) and an average diameter 4.5 m. (about 15 ft.). The feature is in poor condition. No cultural material was observed, however, there may archaeological material associated with the wall foundation to establish a date of construction. The absence of other features in the vicinity of this structure detracts from the possibility the feature is related to agriculture. The presence of the nearby *ahu*, which may be a trail marker, could be used to argue for the site being a temporary habitation site. Test excavations during the inventory survey could aid in the interpretation of the site by determining if archaeological deposits are present. If present the deposits could provide material to further assess site function, and for age determination.

Feature B is an *ahu* feature constructed of small boulders stacked 3 to 4 courses high with a maximum height of 0.6 m. (2 ft.) and width of 2 m. (6.6 ft.). The feature is in fair condition. No cultural material was observed and it is unlikely that there is archaeological material associated with the wall foundation that would be useful in establishing a date of construction.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4771 CSH #14
Site Type: Mound
Function: Undetermined
Corridor: Alternate K2
Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4771 is a mound located about 300 m. (980 ft.) mauka of Piliuni Highway at Ke Ali'i Alanui Road, in the midst of an area of recent, heavy

bulldozing. It appears the bulldozer operator recognized and purposefully avoided the site while clearing the surrounding area. The bulldozing has obliterated the former landscape and other features, if present, around the mound. Thus, the context and estimated age of the mound is indeterminate. The bulldozed ground surface was inspected for archaeological remains of disturbed deposits, but no cultural material was seen. The mound is constructed of small boulders stacked 3 to 5 courses high measuring 0.9 m. (3 ft.) wide with a maximum height of 0.7 m. (2.3 ft.). The site is in fair condition. No cultural material was observed. If this corridor is selected the mound should be excavated to test for archaeological material.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4772 CSH #15
Site Type: Wall
Function: Ahupua'a boundary
Corridor: Alternate K2
Features (#): 1

Description: State site #50-50-10-4772 is a dry masonry stone wall, running generally mauka/mahele, located between centerline stakes 928 and 929, along the boundary of two lava flows of different ages. The wall is constructed of small and few medium boulders and cobbles stacked 5 to 7 courses high. Areas of barbed wire fencing were also observed along some sections of the wall which is 0.5 to 0.7 m. (1.6 to 2.3 ft.) wide and 1.4 to 1.7 m. (4.6 to 5.6 ft.) high. The total length of the wall was undetermined in the survey. It extends across the 400 ft. wide project area corridor and beyond its limits both to the east and the west. The wall is shown on the USGS topographic map as the boundary between Kama'ole and Kōke'a *ahupua'a*. This could be used to argue the wall probably dates to the late nineteenth century. The savannah persists on either side of the wall in spite of the difference in age of the lava flows on either side, and *parini* cactus makes an appearance at this elevation. The site is in excellent condition and appears to still be in use as a fence. No cultural material was observed. The sediments associated with the wall foundation could provide archaeological material for dating the structure especially if earlier wall structures are buried beneath the present one.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4773 CSH #16 & #17
Site Type: Enclosures, square (2), Enclosures, U-shaped (7)
Function: Temporary military command post and rifle positions
Corridor: Alternate K1
Features (#): 9

Description: State site #50-50-10-4773 consists of two complexes of enclosures. The first two enclosures are roughly square, located adjacent to a jeep road, and 5 m. (16.4 ft.) east of centerline stake 390. The enclosures are similar in size, being approximately 2.5 m. (8.2 ft.) square, and are constructed of small boulders stacked 1 to 4 courses high with a maximum height of 0.5 m. (1.6 ft.). *Kiawe* trees are growing in the sites, and the surrounding area is open savannah with *kiawe* trees and *ahu* being common. The

enclosures of the site are in fair condition. Historic cultural material observed at the site consisted of live, small arms ammunition and other assorted metal fragments including shrapnel and communications wire. These features are in an area with widespread bulldozing and abundant remains of military activities related to personnel training. These activities probably took place during WWII based on the abundance of .30 cal. ammunition and Springfield ammo clips, but no written evidence of this was found. No pre-contact or other early historic cultural material was observed. No other cultural material was observed. There are sediments within the enclosures, however, they appear to be predominantly decomposed bedrock, or C-horizon sediments. Test excavations during inventory survey of the route will show if these features were present prior to the twentieth century.

The second set of 7 U-shaped enclosures consists of a minimum of seven U-shape enclosures located between centerline stakes 1118 and 1120 in level, soil-covered terrain in open savannah. Signs of bulldozing are present in the area. The enclosures are uniform in construction style and size, measuring approximately 2 m. (6.6 ft.) in length and 1.5 m. wide, and constructed of small boulders stacked 1 to 3 courses high. A few are nearly circular, but also have the opening on one side. Small depressions are found in the interior of each of the U-shaped features. Historic cultural material observed within the interior of the enclosures and in the general site area include live, small arms ammunition, spent shell casings, tin food containers, shrapnel and other assorted metal fragments. These features are in an area with widespread bulldozing and abundant remains of military activities related to personnel training. These activities probably took place during WWII based on the abundance of .30 cal. ammunition, but no written evidence of this was found. No pre-contact or other early historic cultural material was observed. There are sediments within these features, however, the evidence of bulldozing suggests cultural deposits are unlikely.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4774
 Site Type: Wall
 Function: Animal control
 Corridor: Alternate U3
 Features (#): 1

CSH #18

Description: State site 50-50-10-4774 is a dry masonry wall crossing the road corridor diagonally at centerline stake 545. The wall extends along the slope contour (generally north-south) on the north side of Waiakoa gulch. This section of wall appears to be still in use as new barbed wire fencing is used as patch material where short sections of the wall have collapsed. The wall is constructed of small boulders stacked 3 to 6 courses high to a maximum of 1.3 (4.3 ft.) to 1.6 m. (5.3 ft.), with a maximum width of 0.8 m. (2.6 ft.). The cooler temperatures at the higher elevation of this site has created a nearly closed canopy forest of *kiawe* with large stands of *panini* and at the time of the survey the uncropped grass was about three feet high. The site is in good condition. No archaeological middens were observed. However, there may be archaeological material associated with the wall foundation that would be useful to establish a date of construction.

51

State Site #: 50-50-10-4775
 Site Type: Wall
 Function: Animal control
 Corridor: Alternate U3
 Features (#): 1

CSH #19

Description: State site #50-50-10-4775 is a dry masonry wall within Koloaia gulch on the southern edge of the streambed between the corridor centerline stakes 567 and 568. The wall is constructed of small to medium boulders and incorporates sections of natural bedrock where the bedrock presents a wall-like drop that restricts cattle from passing. Constructed portions of the wall are generally 1 m. (3.3 ft.) high and 0.8 m. (2.6 ft.) wide. The barrier to animal crossing can be considerably higher where the bedrock is exposed and where gulch walls are vertical. The wall is still in use as a fence, evidenced by patches of new barbed wire in the wall where collapsing has occurred recently. The *kiawe* forest is semi-closed on the land south of Koloaia gulch with an understory of pasture grasses. On the north side of the gulch the ridge is cultivated in pineapple. The wall is in good condition. No archaeological middens were observed. However, there may be archaeological material associated with the wall foundation that would be useful to establish a date of construction.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4776
 Site Type: Midden and lithic scatter/ mound
 Function: Habitation, recurrent/agriculture
 Corridor: Alternate Ki
 Features (#): 1

CSH #20

Description: State site #50-50-10-4776 is a surface scatter of marine shell midden, coral, and lithic tools and detritus including a hammer-stone. A low mound of cobbles and small boulders is also included within the bounds of the site. The site is located between centerline stakes 3000 and 3001 along the east side of Kūlanihāko'i Gulch at Pi'ilani Highway. The area in which the mound, scattered cultural middens, and artifacts were observed measures approximately 37 m. (about 120 ft.) in diameter. A previously dug pit within the mound at the site appears to be one meter square, as would be expected for archaeological test excavation units. This probability is augmented by the presence, nearby the mound, of two back-dirt piles from the mound excavation - one of sifted dirt and the other of neatly stacked rocks. Nevertheless, a search of previous archaeological studies conducted in the area and consultation with the Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division staff did not determine the origin of the excavations. Intact archaeological deposits at the site appear unlikely. Deflation of a former soil deposit may have created the site as we see it today, or the site may have originally been only a surface scatter. Flora at the site is consistent with most of the low land survey area - open savannah, the predominant tree is *kiawe*.

52

State Site #: 50-50-10-4777
 Site Type: Wall
 Function: Animal control/Field boundary
 Corridor: Alternate U1
 Features (#): 1

CSH #21

Description: State site #50-50-10-4777 is a wall located along the top edge of the north side of Kaliainui Gulch where it intersects the U1 corridor *makai* of Pukalani town. The constructed portions of the wall are discontinuous sections connecting exposures of blocky vertical bedrock. A typical wall section has a height of over 1 m. (between 3 and 4 ft.) and is constructed of small to medium, slab-shaped boulders and cobbles. Wood fence posts and wire fencing are currently being used to repair collapsed sections of the wall indicating its former use as a fence. The gulch is surrounded by cultivated sugarcane, but within the gulch there are various exotic grasses used for pasture and relict *kukui* and *wiliwili* persist. No other cultural material was observed. However, there may be archaeological material associated with the wall foundation that could be useful to establish a date of construction.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4778
 Site Type: Enclosure, L-shaped
 Function: Habitation, temporary
 Corridor: Alternate U1/U2
 Features (#): 1

CSH #22

Description: State site #50-50-10-4778 is a L-shaped enclosure located upon a flat soil surface on the southern edge of Waiahoon Gulch at centerline stake 1135. The L-shaped enclosure measures 1.5 m. (4.9 ft.) east-west by 1.5 m. (4.9 ft.) north-south, and is constructed of small boulders stacked 1 to 3 courses high to a maximum height of 0.5 m. (1.6 ft.). The open savannah of *kiawe* trees and pasture grass at the site is consistent with the central project area as a whole. No cultural material was observed at the site. Grasses in the enclosure indicate some sediments there, but the site is in rocky terrain near the edge of the gulch which suggests these sediments are shallow.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4779
 Site Type: Shelter-cave
 Function: Habitation, temporary
 Corridor: Alternate U2A
 Features (#): 1

CSH #103

Description: State site #50-50-10-4779 consists of a shelter-cave located in Kaliainui gulch (see Figure 2 and the Photographic Appendix). The shelter-cave is excavated into an aa clinker layer in the south wall of the gulch about 1.2 m. (4 ft.) above the gulch floor. The cave measures 2.1 m. (7 ft.) deep by 4 m. (13 ft.) long, with a ceiling height of 1.7 m. (5.5 ft.). Five boulders placed along the front edge of the cave floor are the only signs on the surface

53

of human use of the site. No midden or artifacts were observed, but the shelter floor appears to be a of loose sediment that may contain intact archaeological deposits.

B. Summary of Results

Archaeological sites were recorded at twenty-five locations within the eight proposed alternate road segments during the reconnaissance survey. The sites fall into two general categories: 1) prehistoric sites including traditional sites in use in the early post-contact period, and 2) post-contact sites including historic and recent archaeological remains.

The prehistoric archaeological remains include simple shelter structures - which could have been used for temporary or recurrent shelter or sheltered planting areas - and three areas of extensive petroglyphs. The prehistoric habitation and agricultural sites occur in the *makai* and *mauka* extremes of the project area which were permanently occupied in prehistoric times. The petroglyphs occur only in the *mauka* sections of the corridors, in Kula.

The post-contact sites include: (1) stone walls for ranch fencing and corrals throughout the alternate corridors from Kihai to Kula, (2) irrigation ditches, rock-clearing mounds and a road berm for sugarcane cultivation occur at the edge of still active sugarcane fields at the edge of Kula, (3) and enclosures for military bivouac and troop maneuvers which occur in the middle section of the area of study.

The cave-shelter at the base of the south wall of Kaliainui gulch - State Site 50-50-10-4779 - was probably used for temporary habitation, and it has potential to provide additional information on area history and prehistory. The site lies on, or very near, the west edge of corridor U2A where the corridor crosses Kaliainui gulch. Its location could only be approximated because of the steep walls of the gulch. The site could be subjected to archaeological mitigation such as data recovery if necessary.

The sites will potentially be impacted because of their proximity to Alternate U2A, but they are present only in the two prominent gulches - Kaluapulani and Kaliainui - and complete avoidance of the sites is possible by adjustment of the gulch crossing locations. There also are no historic properties in Alternate U2A westward from Kaliainui to its intersection with Alternate U2B, nor to their combined *makai* termination point. Re-alignment of the U2A corridor to the east (*mauka*) within the limits of the reconnaissance as described here would not impact any historic properties.

The present reconnaissance of the Alternate U2B corridor from the north edge of Kaliainui gulch westward to its terminus in the cane fields of Oma'opio, did not locate any historic properties. The corridor passes through primarily cultivated fields of pineapple on the ridges. It crosses Kaliainui gulch about six hundred feet east, or *mauka*, of a shelter-cave (field # CSH 103) identified in another surveyed corridor Alternate U2A, and over one thousand feet west, or *makai*, of the well known Kaliainui Petroglyphs - 50-50-10-1061. We found the Kaliainui gulch walls to be nearly vertical from top to bottom in the vicinity

54

of the Alternate U2B and U2A crossings. Because of these conditions we inspected the entire section of the gulch from two hundred feet west, or *maka*, of corridor U2A (where State site 50-50-10-4779 is found) to two hundred feet east, or *mauka*, of corridor U2B. We climbed the talus on both sides of the gulch to inspect all of the accessible bedrock exposures. No historic properties were observed (other than 50-50-10-4779 on the west edge of U2A) in either corridor, or between them, within Kaliainui gulch.

At its *mauka* end the proposed Alternate U2B road would entail cutting into the west and north sides of Pu'u O Weli, a cinder cone of Pleistocene age derived from the Kula volcanic series of Haleakala. Our present research has not revealed a legendary history for Pu'u O Weli, nevertheless, it must certainly have been a prominent feature on the Kula landscape in prehistoric times. Its literal meaning, "hill of fear" (Pukui *et al.* 1974: 205), in the context of the petroglyphs to the north, west and south allows us to infer cultural significance. Furthermore, during the modern development of Kula the Pu'u O Weli cinder cone was used as a borrow pit, or quarry. Depending on the age of the quarry and its role in the development of Kula, Maui's road systems, or other formative events, the use of Pu'u O Weli as a quarry should also establish the pu'u as an historic property.

Finally, the construction of Alternate U2B has the potential to indirectly impact the friezes of petroglyphs in Kaluapulani gulch. The frieze identified as field #50-50-10-1062 will require protective measures where the Alternate U2B road must cross the secondary stream west of Pu'u O Weli, along the south edge of Kaluapulani gulch. Further *mauka* on the north side of Pu'u O Weli the Kaluapulani petroglyphs, which are also known by the SIHP # 50-50-10-1062, will potentially be impacted by construction of the U2B road. The petroglyphs are reportedly all on the north wall of Kaluapulani gulch, but cutting and buttressing of the road could easily create a negative impact on these historic properties.

VI. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Historic properties, or sites, are normally evaluated for significance on a preliminary basis during an archaeological inventory survey, according to broad criteria established for the National and Hawaii State Registers of Historic Places. However, the scope of work for this study asked for significance evaluation of the sites during the reconnaissance survey of the alternate Kihei to Kula road corridor segments. Five criteria designations are used for site evaluation; the first four (A through D) are National Register criterion and the fifth (E) is unique to the Hawaii State Register. The meanings attached to the five criteria of significance are summarized as follows:

Criterion A	is used for a site that reflects major trends or events in the history of the state or nation.
Criterion B	is used for a site that is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
Criterion C	is used for a site that is an excellent example of a site type.
Criterion D	is used for a site that may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. And
Criterion E	is used for a site that has cultural significance, such as religious structures (shrines, <i>heiau</i>), or human burial locations.

The significance criteria assigned to each site is presented in Table 3, and is provided here in text.

All twenty-five sites identified during the reconnaissance survey are significant historic properties based on their potential to contain subsurface cultural deposits, and to provide comparative data on site architecture relative to site function and site distribution to settlement pattern.

Six sites meet multiple significance criteria: (1) State sites 50-50-50-1061, 50-50-10-1062, 50-50-10-4178 and 50-50-10-4764 are considered significant under Criterion C, D, and E, because they are likely to yield information important in history and prehistory, they represent excellent examples of site types, and the sites have cultural significance because of the presence of the petroglyphs. (2) State sites 50-50-10-4762 and 50-50-10-4779 are considered significant under Criterion C and D because the sites are likely to yield information important in history and prehistory and it is an excellent example of the site type (enclosure and shelter cave). The shelter-cave may yield varying types of scientific data which may include some or all of the following categories: a) subsurface cultural deposits; b) site architecture and function analysis; and c) site distribution and settlement patterns of inland land use.

The nineteen remaining sites are considered likely to yield information important to

Table 3: Significance of Sites Located During Reconnaissance Survey

Site #	Location	Site Type	Function	Probable Age	Significance/ Criteria
#50-50-10-1061	North and south sides of Kalinlinui Gulch, stake # 1581	Complex of Petroglyphs/overhang shelter	Recurrent habitation/ Petroglyphs	P	C,D,E
#50-50-10-1062	U2B stake #1581 & 85 ft north of stake #317 (316.15)	Kaluapulani Gulch petroglyphs	Symbolic	P	C,D,E
#50-50-10-4178	north side of the south fork of Kaluapulani Gulch	Petroglyphs (canoe)	Symbolic	P	C,D,E
#50-50-10-4180	North face of Kalinlinui Gulch, mauka of 50-50-10-1061	Historic Wall	Animal control	H	D
#50-50-10-4181	in swale between 2 pineapple fields	Complex of two mounds, two alignments	Agriculture (pineapple cultivation)	H	D
#50-50-10-4760	30 m. southeast of stake # 1578	Modified Outcrop	Undetermined	P ₁	D
#50-50-10-4761	At stake #1582	Enclosure	Recurrent habitation	P	D
#50-50-10-4762	Mauka of stake #1582	Enclosure	Permanent habitation	P	C,D
#50-50-10-4763	Southern side of stake # 723 along ridge	Wall (enclosure segment)	Animal control	H	D

prehistory and history (Criterion D)

The preferred route to minimize impact to the archaeological sites is K1-Segment C to approximately the 750 ft. amsl, where Segment D veers to the NE crossing Pulehu Road (P1) to Omaopio Road (O1), and then goes to the U1 terminus.

There is potential that Pu'uoweli will be recognized later as an historic site. Should this occur Alternate U2B would pose an impact to Pu'uoweli, and any realignment of the mauka portion of the corridor to the south side of the pu'u would impact other archaeological sites in the vicinity. The potential of Pu'uoweli to be recognized as an historic property in the course of planning the final Khei to Kula road corridor necessitates anticipating what significance criteria it would be assessed as follows:

(1) In the context of Hawaiian history the site would probably be assigned criterion "E" for its inferred association with the friezes of the Kaluapulani Petroglyphs 50-50-10-1062, that of 50-50-10-4179 south of Pu'uoweli, and CSH 101 and CSH 102 west of Pu'uoweli. These sites are significant under Criteria C, D, and E, of the National and State Historic Registers.

(2) In the context of the quarry being recognized as having historic significance Pu'u O Well would probably be assigned criterion A for its part in Maui's growth. Evidence of the quarrying activity is still extant in the remains of the cinder pu'u, and comparison of this and other contemporary cinder quarries on Maui could qualify Pu'uoweli as a good example of the cinder quarry site-type. This could translate into assigning it significance criterion C also.

Recognition of Pu'u O Well as an historic property would not be easily mitigated because Alternate U2B is designed to cut into the north side of the pu'u which would significantly alter its present condition.

Site #	Location	Site Type	Function	Probable Age	Significance/ Criteria
#50-50-10-4764	North side of Pūlehu Gulch at stake #578	Shelter/ Petroglyphs	Recurrent habitation/ symbolic	P	C,D,E
#50-50-10-4765	65 m. northwest of stake #1189	Complex of mounds, road berm, and irrigation ditch	Agriculture	H	D
#50-50-10-4766	Between stake #907 and 911 both <i>mauka</i> and <i>makai</i> of centerline	Complex of enclosures, alignments, mounds, C-shapes & enclosures	Agriculture/ habitation, temporary	P	D
#50-50-10-4767	On centerline between stake #913 & .915	Enclosure, circular	Agriculture	P	D
#50-50-10-4768	On centerline between stake #916 & .920	Wall	Animal control	H	D
#50-50-10-4769	45 m. east of stake #920	Complex of wall & cairn	Animal control /Boundary marker	P	D
#50-50-10-4770	At stake #923	Complex of enclosure & cairn	Habitation, temporary/ trail or boundary marker	P	D
#50-50-10-4771	300 m. <i>mauka</i> of Ke Ali'i Alanui Road & Pi'ilani Highway	Mound	Undetermined field clearing?	H	D
#50-50-10-4772	Between stake #928 & -929 along corridor centerline	Wall	Ahupua'a Boundary	P	D

59

Site #	Location	Site Type	Function	Probable Age	Significance/ Criteria
#50-50-10-4773	5 m. east of stake #390 & Both sides of centerline between stake #1118 & 1120	Complex of enclosures	Military rifle practice	H	D
#50-50-10-4774	Bisects numbered stake #545 along northern side of Waiakoa gulch	Wall	Animal control	H	D
#50-50-10-4775	On southern edge of Kolaloa gulch between stake #567 & 568	Wall	Animal control	H	D
#50-50-10-4776	East side of Kulanihakoi gulch between stake #3000 & -3001	Midden and lithic scatter	Recurrent habitation	P/H	D
#50-50-10-4777	Eastern edge of Kalialinui Gulch, <i>makai</i> of Pukalani	Wall	Animal control	H	D
#50-50-10-4778	Southern edge of Waiakoa Gulch at stake #1135	Enclosure, L-shaped	Habitation, temporary	P?	D
#50-50-10-4779	west edge of corridor U2A where the corridor crosses Kalialinui gulch	Shelter Cave	Recurrent Habitation	P	C, D

60

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

Conclusions

This report is meant to aid in planning the proposed Khei to Kula Upcountry Highway. The report is not meant to satisfy County, State or Federal standards for an archaeological inventory survey of the proposed highway.

There are twenty-five archaeological sites within the Alternate roadway alignments. All of the identified sites are evaluated as significant archaeological resources (refer to Table 3). These sites and associated features are present throughout all the proposed alignments and complete avoidance of them by road alignments is not possible (refer to Figure 3).

Traditional and historical activities affecting the project area include the following instances. Kula, traditionally an agricultural area, provided a major source of produce for Hawaii in the 1970s; the area still produces vegetables and flowers for the Hawaiian market. Heleakala, Ulupalakua, and Keonoulu Ranches continue to operate at this time. All of the proposed corridors pass through these ranch lands. Hawaii Commercial and Sugar Company and Maui Land and Pineapple Company, founded in the late 1800s and early 1900s, continue their operations within the study parcel. Military training use of specific lands within the project area is evidenced by live arms munitions present at and around sites 50-50-10-4773. The *makai* Alternates K1 and K2 will tie into Piihoni Highway, originally constructed to ease the congested Khei traffic.

Recommended Treatment

Mitigation of impact to historic properties could be addressed by realignment of the Alternate route. If realignment to avoid sites in a particular area is not an option then mitigation at specific sites would be recommended on a preliminary basis as follows:

State sites 50-50-10-4180, -4760, -4761, -4763, and -4765 through -4778, significant under National Register of Historic Places criterion D because they are likely to yield information important to history and prehistory, should be recorded to archaeological inventory survey level followed by data recovery at each site.

State site 50-50-10-4762, significant under National Registers of Historic Places criteria C and D because they may be likely to yield information important to history and prehistory and are considered excellent site types, should be recorded to archaeological inventory survey level followed by preservation or data recovery.

State sites 50-50-10-1061, -1062, -4178, -4764 and -4779 are significant under National Register criteria C and D because they may be likely to yield information important to history and prehistory and are considered excellent site types, and under Hawaii Historic Preservation draft administrative rules criterion E because they are culturally significant. The historic properties should be recorded to archaeological inventory survey level and ultimately preserved. Mitigation to avoid adverse impact to these sites may entail realignment of the alternate to avoid the sites.

The military site's (50-50-10-4773) significance is limited to our knowledge of its

presence at this location which would be completed during archaeological inventory level survey. However, it would seem appropriate that an assessment of ordnance remaining and ordnance clearing be conducted.

If Alternate U2B is to be seriously considered for the final road corridor the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) should be asked for a decision on consigning Pu'uoweli to historic properties status. If such status is to be conferred required mitigation may involve abandonment of the *mauka* portion of Alternate U2B for another alternative.

B. Summary of Results

The twenty-five archaeological sites recorded during the reconnaissance survey of the eight proposed alternate road segments fall into two general categories: 1) prehistoric sites including traditional sites in use in the early post-contact period, and 2) post-contact sites including historic and recent archaeological remains.

The prehistoric archaeological remains include simple shelter structures - which could have been used for temporary shelter or sheltered planting areas - and three areas of extensive petroglyphs. The prehistoric habitation and agricultural sites occur in the *makai* and *mauka* extremes of the project area which were permanently occupied in prehistoric times. The petroglyphs occur only in the *mauka* sections of the corridors, in Kula.

The post-contact sites include: (1) stone walls for ranch fencing and corrals throughout the alternate corridors from Kihel to Kula, (2) irrigation ditches, rock-clearing mounds and a road berm for sugarcane cultivation occur at the edge of still active sugarcane fields at the edge of Kula, (3) and enclosures for military bivouac and troop maneuvers which occur in the middle section of the area of study.

Part of State site 50-50-10-1062 is physically within the east, or *makai* side of corridor U2A, adjacent to centerline stake #314. The other part of -1062 is close to the corridor's eastern edge. Because of this we expanded the reconnaissance area in Kaluapulani gulch four hundred feet to the west of the center line. No archaeological sites were found in the expanded search area. Therefore, re-alignment of a short section of this corridor to *makai* in Kaluapulani gulch would not impact other historical properties and would avoid State site 50-50-10-1062.

The cave-shelter at the base of the south wall of Kalialinui gulch - State site 50-50-10-4779 was probably used for temporary habitation, and it has potential to provide additional information on area history and prehistory. The site lies on, or very near, the west edge of corridor U2A where the corridor crosses Kalialinui gulch. Its location could only be approximated because of the steep walls of the gulch. The site could be subjected to archaeological mitigation such as data recovery if necessary.

About four hundred feet east, or *mauka*, of the U2A corridor another four hundred foot wide alternative corridor - Alternate U2B - crosses Kalialinui gulch. Thus, the limits of the two corridors U2A and U2B nearly overlap here. In the field we found the walls of Kalialinui gulch to be nearly vertical from top to bottom in the vicinity of the two alternate crossings. Because of these conditions we inspected the entire section of the gulch from two hundred feet west, or *makai*, of corridor U2A (where State site 50-50-10-4779 is found) to this site in either corridor, or between them, within Kalialinui gulch.

The sites will potentially be impacted because of their proximity to Alternate U2A, but they are present only in the two prominent gulches - Kaluapulani and Kalialinui - and complete avoidance of the sites is possible by adjustment of the gulch crossing locations.

There also are no historic properties in Alternate U2A westward from Kalialinui to its intersection with Alternate U2B, nor to their combined *makai* termination point. Re-alignment of the U2A corridor to the east (*mauka*) within the limits of the reconnaissance as described here would not impact any historic properties.

During the survey of the Alternate U2B corridor, from the north edge of Kalialinui gulch westward to its terminus in the cane fields of Ōma opio, we did not locate any historic properties. The corridor passes through primarily cultivated fields of pineapple on the ridges. It crosses Kalialinui gulch about six hundred feet east, or *mauka*, of a shelter-cave (field #State site 50-50-10-4779) identified previously in corridor Alternate U2A, and over one thousand feet west, or *makai*, of the well known Kalialinui Petroglyphs - 50-50-10-1061.

At its *mauka* end the proposed Alternate U2B road would entail cutting into the west and north sides of Pu'uoweli, a cinder cone of Pleistocene age derived from the Kula volcanic series of Haleakalā. Our present research has not revealed a legendary history for Pu'uoweli, nevertheless, it must certainly have been a prominent feature on the Kula landscape in prehistoric times. Its literal meaning, "hill of fear" (Pukui *et al.* 1974: 205), in the context of the petroglyphs to the north, west and south allows us to infer cultural significance. Furthermore, during the modern development of Kula the Pu'uoweli cinder cone was used as a borrow pit, or quarry. Depending on the age of the quarry and its role in the development of Kula, Maui's road systems, or other formative events, the use of Pu'uoweli as a quarry should also establish the pu'u as an historic property.

Finally, the construction of Alternate U2B has the potential to indirectly impact the friezes of petroglyphs in Kaluapulani gulch. The frieze identified as State site 50-50-10-1062 in the Alternate U2A will require protective measures where the Alternate U2B road must cross the secondary stream west of Pu'uoweli along the south edge of Kaluapulani gulch. Further *mauka* on the north side of Pu'uoweli the Kaluapulani petroglyphs, which are also known by the SIHP # 50-50-10-1062, will potentially be impacted by construction of the U2B road. The petroglyphs are reportedly all on the north wall of Kaluapulani gulch, but cutting and buttressing of the road could easily create a negative impact on these historic properties.


In summary, we once again note that the preferred route to minimize impact to the archaeological sites would be the K1-Segment C to approximately the 750 ft. amsl, where Segment D veers to the NE crossing Pulehu Road (P1) to Omaopio Road (O1), and then goes to the U1 terminus.

VIII. REFERENCES

- Allen, Gwenfreed
1971 *Hawaii's War Years, 1941-1945*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Armstrong, Warwick, Ed.
1973 *Atlas of Hawaii*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Ashdown, Inez
1971 *Ko Alaloe o Maui*, Ace Printing Co., Wailuku, Maui, HI.
- Austin, Smith & Associates, Inc.
1974 *An Inventory of the Flora and Fauna of the Kāhe Area, Maui, Hawaii*, Austin, Smith & Associates, Inc., Honolulu, HI.
- Bartholomew, Gail and Bren Bailey
1994 *Maui Remembers: A Local History*, text by Gail Bartholomew, photo research by Bren Bailey, Mutual Publishing, Honolulu, HI.
- Brown, Roderick S. and Alan E. Haun with Helen Wong Smith
1989 *Archaeological Inventory Survey Kāheka and Waihuli Subdivisions: Lands of Kāheka and Waihuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02:55, 56)*, PHRI, Hilo.
- Burgett, Berdena and Robert L. Spear
1985 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of 22.25 acres of Land in Kula, Kananolu Ahupua'a Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-06:105)*, Scientific Consultant Services Inc., Kaneohe, HI.
- Clark, John R. K.
1980 *The Beaches of Maui County*, includes Maui, Molokai, Lanai and Kahoolawe, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Comprehensive Consulting Services of Hawaii
1991 *Site Selection Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement, New Kāhe Elementary School, Kāhe, Maui*, prepared for Dept. of Accounting and General Services, State of Hawaii, HI.
- Condé, Jesse C. and Gerald M. Best
1973 *Sugar Trains, Narrow Gauge Rails of Hawaii*, Glenwood Publishers, Felton, CA.
- Cordy, Ross
1977 *Kāhe Flood Control Project Archaeological Reconnaissance & Literature Search*, U.S. Corps of Engineers, Honolulu, HI.
- Cox, David Walter
1976 *The Archaeology of Kula, Maui from Pūhū Nui Ahupua'a to Kama'ole Ahupua'a: Surface Survey, Pitani Highway*, Dept. of Transportation, Honolulu, HI.
- Cox, J. Halley and Edward Stasack
1988 *Hawaiian Petroglyphs*, Bishop Museum Special Publication 60, Honolulu, HI.
- Creed, Victoria S.
1993 *Settlement Pattern for Waikapū, Wailuku District, Maui, Hawaii*, Vol. I. LCAs for the Ahupua'a of Waikapū, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii, Vol. II. In partial fulfillment for the Certificate of Historic Preservation, UH Manoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Donham, Theresa K.
1992 *Surface Survey of the Koyanagi Subdivision, Ōna'opio, Kula, Maui, TMK 2-3-03: 129*, State Historic Preservation Division, Wailuku, Maui, HI.
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990a *Archaeological Data Recovery Program, Site 50-50-10-2475, Pitani Residential Community - Phase I, Land of Waihuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui, (TMK:2-2-02:Por-42)*, PHRI, Hilo, HI.
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990b *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Pitani Residential Community, Phase II, Land of Kāheka, Makawao (Wailuku) District, Island of Maui, (TMK 2-2-02:42 por., PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990c *Archaeological Inventory Survey Potential Upcountry Maui High School Sites, Lands of Haliimaile, Hokuia, Kailua, and Makacha, Makawao District, Island of Maui, PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Folk, William H. and Hallett H. Hammatt
1993 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of Kula Lands in Ōnaopio, Kula, Maui (Portion of TMK 2-3-23)*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Footé, Donald E., E.L. Hill, S. Nakamura and F. Stephens
1972 *Soil Survey of the Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai and Lanai, State of Hawaii*, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

- Fredericksen, Demaris L., Erik M. Fredericksen and Walter M. Fredericksen
1994 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey For Keala Hills Subdivision, Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Waialua District, Maui Island (TMK:3-9-30-21)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Demaris L., Walter M. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1993 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey and of Data Recovery Report for Lokelani Intermediate School, Located in the Ahupua'a of Waiohuli, Makawao (Waialua) District, Island of Maui (TMK: 2-2-02:por 43)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Erik M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1995 *An Inventory Survey of a 1.78 Acre Parcel Located in Hokuula Ahupua'a, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMK: 2-3-44:31)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1993 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Parcel of Land in the Ahupua'a of Onaopio, District of Kula, Island of Maui (TMK 2-3-15: 2 & 24)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Giombelluca, ThÓmas W., Michael A. Nullet and ThÓmas A. Schroeder
1986 *Rainfall Atlas of Hawaii-I*, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Honolulu, HI.
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
1992 *Archaeological Survey and Testing of a 54-acre Parcel at Kama'ole, Waialua District, Island of Maui*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Hammatt, Hallett H., and David W. Shideler
1990 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey for a Kāhe'i Employee Housing Project at Kama'ole (Kāhe'i), Waialua District, Maui*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
1989 *Archaeological Reconnaissance of a 54-acre Parcel at Kama'ole, Waialua District, Island of Maui*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Handy, E.S. Craighill and Elizabeth G. Handy
1972 *Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment*, Bishop Museum Bulletin 233, Honolulu, HI.
- Hirota, Sam O.
1979 *Environmental Impact Statement, Kāhe'i Drainage Project, County of Maui*, Sam O. Hirota Inc., Honolulu, HI.
- Hommon, Robert J.
1981 *An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Kāhe'i Gateway Property, Kāhe'i, Maui, TMK 3-8-4-2-21 & Portions 20, 23*, Science Management Inc., Honolulu, HI.
- Hurst, Gwen
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of Proposed Kāhe'i Elementary School Site, Lots 1 and 2, Kama'ole, Waialua, Maui Island, Part 1, Historical Background*, Applied Research Group, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Janion, Aubrey P.
1977 *The Olouatu Massacre and Other Hawaiian Tales*, Illustrated by Guy Buffet, Island Heritage Norfolk Island Office, Norfolk Island, Australia.
- Keau, Charles
1981 *Archaeological Reconnaissance, Kamaole Beach Park, Kanaha Beach Park, Kahului Sewage Treatment Plant*, Department of Parks and Recreation, County of Maui, Waialua, HI.
- Kennedy, Joseph
1992 *An Archaeological Inventory Surface Survey Report for the Kanaokapu Vicinity Subdivision located at TMK 3-9-04:79, Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Waialua District, Island of Maui*, Revised, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii, Inc., Kāunā'i, HI.
- Kennedy, Joseph
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Report for TMK 3-9-02:14 Located at Kāhe'i, Island of Maui, June 1991*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii, Kāunā'i, HI.
- Kennedy, Joseph
1990 *Archaeological Investigations at a Suspected Heiau Site Located Near Pukalani, District of Kula, Maui*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii, Inc., Hale'iwa, HI.
- Kirch, P.V.
1971 *"Archaeological Excavations at Palauea, Southeast Maui, Hawaiian Islands." Anthropology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania*, IV (1):62-86, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Kolb, Michael J., Patty J. Conte, and Ross Cordy, eds.
1997 *Kula: The Archaeology of Upcountry Maui in Wainulu and Kēkēa; An Archaeological and Historical Settlement Survey in the Kingdom of Maui*, Historic Preservation Division, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Honolulu, HI.

- Macdonald, G.A., A.T. Abbott and Frank L. Peterson
1983 *Volcanoes in the Sea*, Second Edition, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Mayberry, J.D. and A. E. Haun
1988 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey: Maui Palisades Residential Subdivision. TMK:2-2-02:por.02*, PHRI, Inc., Hilo, HI.
- McPhatter, Blair and Paul H. Rosendahl
1996 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey 250-Acre Pukalani Project Area, Land of Aapuu, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK: 2-3-08:Por.5)*, PHRI, Hilo, HI.
- Miura, Marvin
1982 *Biological and Archaeological Reconnaissance, TMK 2-2-02: Portion of 42, Kāhei, Maui, Hawaii*, Environment Impact Study Corporation, Maui and Honolulu, HI.
- Neller, Earl
1982 *An Archaeological Reconnaissance at the Kaima County Beach Park, Kama ole, Maui*, State Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, HI.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena
1983 *Olelo No 'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*. Bishop Museum Special Publication No.71, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Pukui, Mary K., Samuel H. Elbert and Esther Mookini
1974 *Place Names of Hawaii*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Riford, Mary F.
1987 *Archaeological Services for Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, Waiohuli and Kāhaka Subdivision, Kūia, Makawao, Maui*, Public Archaeology Section, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, (Final Report), Honolulu, HI.
- Rosendahl, Paul H.
1975 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Haleakala Highway Road Realignment Corridor, Haleakala National Park, Maui*, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Sinoto, Aki and Jeffrey Pantaleo
1992 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kāhei Gateway Complex, Kāhei, Waialuku, Maui, Island. (TMK 3-8-77:9 3-8-05:34)*, Aki Sinoto Consulting, Honolulu, HI.
- Speakman, Cummins E.
1984 *Mouwe: An Informal History*, Pucro Press, San Rafael, CA.
- Stokes, John F.G.
1918 *Maui Heiau Sites*, Hawaiian Almanac and Annual, pp. 125, Honolulu, HI.
- Stokes, J.F.G.
n.d. *Maui Heiau*, manuscript, Bishop Museum, c. 1909-1916, Honolulu, HI.
- Tanji, Edwin
1997 "Searchers comb landfill for military artifacts," *The Honolulu Advertiser*, April 13, 1997, Honolulu, HI.
- Thrum, Thomas G.
1909-1918 "Heiau of Maui," *Hawaiian Annual* (compilation, as catalogued at SHPD), Honolulu, HI.
- Walker, Winslow
1931 *Archaeology of Maui*, Manuscript at B.P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Wulzen, Warren and Paul H. Rosendahl with Helen Wong Smith
1996 *Archaeological Inventory Survey, 44-Acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision III, Land of A'apuea, Makawao District, Island of Maui*, PHRI, Hilo, HI.



APPENDIX A: PHOTOGRAPHIC APPENDIX

The photographs selected for this appendix are representative of the site types present within the project area. For this reason, photographs of every site and/or feature are not included.




Figure 9 Overview of cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs, view to north, State site 50-30-10-1061



Figure 10 Closeup of petroglyph, single human figure with spear, pecked on north face of overhang State site 50-30-10-1061






FIG. 11 Modified outcrop, view to northeast, State site 50-50-10-4760



FIG. 12 Enclosure, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4761



FIG. 13 Enclosure, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4762



FIG. 14 Terrace, view to east, State site 50-50-10-4763




Figure 17 Overhang wall showing numerous pecked human petroglyph figures, view to north. State site 50-50-10-4764



Figure 18 Man with dog petroglyph, pecked, view to northeast. State site 50-50-10-4764



Figure 15 Wall, view to east. State site 50-10-10-4763




Figure 16 Cliff overhang shelter with petroglyphs located on Pulehu Gulch wall, view to northeast. State site 50-50-10-4764



Figure 18
Historic agricultural complex, showing berm segment with *panim*-covered clearing mound at left, view to southeast, State site 50-50-10-4765

Figure 18



Figure 19
Historic agricultural complex, showing clearing mound, view to northwest
State site 50-50-10-4765

Figure 19




Figure 21
Wall and *ahu*, view to west, State site 50-50-10-4769

Figure 21



Figure 22
Ahu and enclosure, view to west, State site 50-50-10-4770

Figure 22




Figure 24 Enclosure square, view to east, State site 50-50-10-4773



Figure 25 Wall, view to south, State site 50-50-10-4774

50



Figure 26 Wall, on southern edge of Kolaha Gulch, State site 50-50-10-4775




Figure 26 Midden and lithic scatter, view to southwest, State site 50-50-10-4776

51



Figure 29 L-shaped enclosure, view to east, State site 50-50-10-4775



Figure 30 Petroglyph site, north wall of south fork of Kaluapulani Gulch, view northwest, State site 50-50-10-4175



Figure 27 Midden and lithic scatter, view to northeast, State site 50-50-10-4776



Figure 28 Wall along eastern ridge of Kaliaimui Gulch, view to north, State site 50-10-4777




Figure 31 Canon with sail petroglyphs on wall panel, view north, State site 50-50-10-4178



Figure 32 View of the north wall of Kaluapulami gulch from the south side. The center of the photo is aligned with the centerline of Alternate U2A. State site State site 50-50-10-1062, first panel is on the north wall right of center line; State site State site 50-50-10-1062, second panel is out of the photo to the right.



Figure 33 Lava Bedrock exposure bearing the State site State site 50-50-10-1062, petroglyph frieze; the view is to mauka, or east.




Figure 34
 Examples of the petroglyphs at State site 50-50-10-1062. The 3 1/2
 min camera lens cap is included to show scale.




Figure 35
 Example of petroglyph groupings at State site 50-50-10-1062.
 Ruler used for scale is six inches long. Petroglyphs exhibit an unusual
 triangular pattern.



Figure 36
 Example of another petroglyph grouping at State site 50-50-10-
 1062, note the canoe-like petroglyph at top center of photo.




Figure 37
 Close-up of canoe-like figure in petroglyph grouping shown in Figure 36




Figure 3: The overhang shelter at State site 50-50-10-1062, beneath the petroglyph frieze



Figure 3: Remains of a small fire in the overhang shelter beneath the State site 50-50-10-1062 frieze.



Figure 40: The niche, or alcove, at State site 50-50-10-1062, second panel. The petroglyph frieze is to the upper left, the plunge pool at the upper center, obscured by the understory. Possible *mamahe* plants are at the lower left backed by the large boulder.



Figure 41: Shelter-cave site State site 50-50-10-1779 in the south wall of Kalininui notch. The front edge of the cave floor has five small boulders that level the floor of the shelter. View is to the west from near the streambed.



Figure 12 General view of the project area near 5 + 00, view to north, with pine and other plants visible in foreground



Figure 13 General view of the project area in the vicinity of 30 + 00, view to north



Figure 14 General view of State site # 50-50-10-2701, looking east, showing structure surface



Figure 15 General view of State site # 50-50-10-2701, looking northeast, showing SW side of structure



Figure 48 State site # 50-50-10-2701. *heiau*, view of a typical constructed pit in the structure surface at the northeast end.



Figure 49 Downslope view from State site # 50-50-10-2701. *heiau*, view to the southwest, showing the view plane from the structure



Figure 46 General view of State site # 50-50-10-2701. *heiau*, view to the northeast



Figure 47 View of State site # 50-50-10-2701. *heiau*, view to the southwest, showing the surface of the north end of the structure



Ahupua'a of Kula along the Potential Kihei Road Corridors with Land Commission Claims

Ahupua'a	Hi/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acres / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Aapueo	ahupua'a, aw		Keohokalo, A	8452	ahupua'a	TMK 2-3-05 R.M. 913
Aapueo	Kolonakapeelua / Kolonakapelena, aw Kauhuhu Kahanumaule, Kailikoa Papawahanui, aw	house lot, kula kula kula kula	Koolau	8630	1 ap. 7.3 Acs. 1 ap. 11.6 Acs.	
Aapueo	Pilikaula, aw	kula	Kekahuna	9022	1 ap. 22 Acs.	TMK 2-3-58; R.M. 913
Aapueo	Wnieli, aw	Irish potatoes	Kikina / Kikinua	9024	1 ap. 11.75 Acs.	
Aapueo	Wnieli Apopo, aw	kula, 8 mo kula, 3 mo?	Kama	9025	2 ap. 11.25 Acs.	
Aapueo I Aapueo II	Ohimukumuku / Kamukumuku, aw Kailikoa	kula, 2 sw. potatoes, 5 Ir. potatoes kula, sw. potatoes	Kanipohuehue	9026	1 ap. 6.08 Acs.	
Aapueo I	Kuaha / Kuaha Kanipe	kula kula	Knai	9030	na	
Aapueo	Aapueo	claim	Kuapuunui	10708	na	
Alae 3	ahupua'a, aw	none given	Keohokalo	8452	1 ap. ahupua'a, apana 20	TMK 2-2-6
Alae 3 & 4	not claimed, but appears on TMK map		Kaauwai	2383		TMK 2-2-12 shows 7.2 Acs
Alaenui			Kukuhaula	no number		

APPENDIX B: LAND COMMISSION AWARDS TABLE

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Alae	Alae	1 potato mala	Alihi	2651	na	
Alae	Alae	2 pasture ilis	Kujii	3759B	na	
Alae	not Kula, Hamakua, listed in location index under Kula		Kuuaua	5267B	1 ap. 2.18 Acs	mistake, awarded in Alae Hamakua, not Kula
Alae	Alae 1 Kula Alae 2 Makuu	2 kula lands 1 kula land	Kailio	5299	na	
Alae 1	Kula	pasture	Kanana	5303	na	
Alae	Alae	1r. potatoes (N.T. small sw. potatoes)	Kapuaa	5335	na	
Alae	Alae	ili pasture	Puha	5349	na	
Alae 1	Alae 1	1 mala sw. potatoes	Kamailio	5437	na	
Alae	Alae	see 5335	Kapuaa	6407	na	same as 5335
Alae	Hala	see 5349	Puha	6550	na	same as 5349?
Alae	Puukoa Hala Makuu	6 cultivated places 5 cultivated places 5 cultivated places	Kawelo	7952	na	
Alae	Alae 1, Kula Alae 4	1 Ir. potatoes, 1 sw. potatoes house site, cultivated plot	Akii / Aki	8041	na	
Alae	Kaula, aw	2 kihapai	Kailinuu	8462B	1 ap. 5.21 Acs	TMK 2-2-12, Ap. 7

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaliainui	ahupua'a		Kamaikua	4460	na, See Award 7124	
Kaliainui	Kaliainui	Ir. potatoes	Kauwai, Z.	2383	na	
Kaliainui	ahupua'a	ahupua'a	Kamaikua	7124	1 ap. 19.838 Acs.	TMK 2-3-08, 2-3-05; R.M. 913
Kaliainui	Makoleiki	kula (N.R. 4 claims)	Koolau	8630	na	
Kaliainui	Laukapili Kukuikolowai, aw /Kukuiohooa same? Pipio Kepa Hulaku Kaula, aw	kula kula kula kula kula	Kuuuulu	8550	1 ap. 8.40 Acs. 1 ap. 8.25 Acs.	
Kaliainui	Olupoko ('ili?) Pipio Kaimapahu	mala of Ir. potatoes wauke kula kula	Kaiwi	8602	na	
Kaliainui	Kaliainui	mala Ir. potatoes	Kaula	8649	na	
Kaliainui	Kaliainui	mala Ir. potatoes, another cultivated place	Kahele	8652	na	
Kaliainui	Koakua Kapua, aw Alulekua, aw Kepa Paha, aw	12 lo'i, 2 house lots 2 kula kula	Kaholopapa	8845	1 ap. 21 Acs 1 ap. 5.25 Acs 1 ap. 4.5 Acs	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaliainui		moku mau'u, sw. potatoes & Ir. potatoes	Kaulahea	8846	na	
Kaliainui	Puhua, aw Kumakahi, aw Hulaka, aw Huleuka, aw Kuaha	kula, winter kula, boggy place Ir. pot. & house kula aw. potatoes	Kikina	9024	1 ap. 4 Acs. 1 ap. 12 Acs. 1 ap. 6.25 Ac. 1 ap. 5.35 Ac	
Kaliainui	Kunukahi Kumuwiwili Kaluaokamaiki	3 kula 1 kula 1 kula	Makaikuhin	10143	1 ap. 10 Acs	
Kaliainui	Kahalianui	winter kula mukui, mala of bananas, mala of sw. potato tubers, mala of Ir. potatoes mauka	Napuaa	10480	na	
Kaliainui	Kahalianui	2 house lots (N.R. 3 claims)	Poepoe	10636	1 ap. 8.71 Acs	TMK 2-3-3
Kaliainui	Kukukolowai, aw	moku mau'u	Pihuale	10643	1 ap.	TMK 2-3-3, portion 2
Kamaole	Kamaole	3 potato mala	Hanawhine	491	na	
Kamaole	See 8558	potato ground	Kapehana	2416	na	
Kamaole	Kamaole aw	2 potato grounds	Kaili	3107	1 ap. 1.75 Acs	
Kamaole	Kamaole	sweet potato mala	Naanaa	3337	na	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	potato lot	Niheu	3343	1 ap. (loc. index)	amount not located
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	potato mala	Kawana	3522	1 ap. .5 Ac.	TMK 2-2-01
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	potato mala	Kamohui	3527	1 ap. 2 Acs	TMK 2-2-01

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamaole	Pahalana Kamaole, aw	potato mala	Kupule	3539	1 ap. .5 Ac.	TMK 2-2-01, appears to be 1+ acre
Kamaole	Kamaole	6 potato mala	Kanalua	3547	na	
Kamaole	Kamaole	some mala of Ir. potatoes	Kauhiahiwa	5267	na	
Kamaole	Kolea Kanenui Kaneiki		Natili	5404B	na	no. not listed in index
Kamaole	Luanui	house, pig enclosure, 3 mala sw. potatoes	Kupapa	6418	na	
Kamaole	Haola, aw	6 mala Ir. potatoes	Kanakalua	6419	1 ap. 8.7 Acs.	TMK 2-2-01, Ap. 1,2,4, & [3] not numbered (4 apana = 8.7+)
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw. Keahuia Kaueakea Molualau	Ir. potatoes	Kikau	6420	1 ap. 3.5 Acs	TMK 2-2-01
Kamaole	Kamaole?	mala Ir. potatoes	Keawe	6421	na	
Kamaole	Kapapa, aw Koleanui	4 mala Ir. potatoes, house lot an 'ili	Kekahuna	6442	1 ap. 7 Ac.	
Kamaole	aw. (which 'ili? or all?) Pama Keahunia Kaoua	5 mala Ir. potatoes kula kula kula	Kamoa	6445	1 ap. 13.3 Acs.	
Kamaole	Kiao	moku mau'u	Kanakaole	6446	1 ap. 3 Acs	TMK 2-2-01

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamaole	Kamaole (aw?)	5 mala Ir. potatoes, house lot	Kaili	6471	na	TMK 2-2-01, 9 Acs
Kamaole	Kamaole	moku mau'u moku mau'u of Ir. potatoes	Kalama	6479	na	
Kamaole	which/both apana? Keawekapu Kaiku	house lot house lot	Paupau	6596	1 ap. 23 Acs	
Kamaole	which/all apana? Kolea Puunui Kaiku	kula 2 mala Ir. potatoes & house lot moku mau'u	Panikaua	6597	1 ap. 5.5 Acs.	
Kamaole	Molala Pahalona Kaiku Koluaihakoko	moku mau'u moku mau'u moku mau'u, 3 mala potatoes, house lot moku mau'u	Nahuina	6619	na	
Kamaole	Papalona	moku mau'u	Ukukuu	6654!	na	wrong no., correct number unknown
Kamaole	Kapalakaia, aw Kaiku, aw	moku mau'u moku mau'u	Mahoe	6657	2 ap. 57 Acs	TMK 2-2-01, ap. 1 23 Acs; ap. 2 33 798 Acs

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw (N.R.) Mooiki Pahalona Popohoa (N.T.) Palaha, Mookahi, Kahapapa, Haleokano, Mafanui and Pahou, Kukuioiikea	2 mala Ir. potatoes houses & house makai moku mau'u moku mau'u	Opunui	6703	1 ap. 9.5 Acs	
Kamaole	Maolalo / Molaolao, aw	5 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala bananas, 4 mala Ir. potatoes, 1 house lot	Maleilua	6719	1 ap. 10 Acs	TMK 2-2-01
Kamaole	Kolea	kula	Kekuhuna	6721C	na, See Award 6642	
Kamaole	Palakai Kahapapa	kula kula	Mahoe	6721D	na	
Kamaole	Mamaki	kula	Papa	6721E	na, See 10662	
Kamaole	Kamaole	2 mala Ir. potatoes	Kahufukua	7971	na	
Kamaole	Award [which, all?] Kaukenka Moseloa Palakai	Ir. potato Ir. potato Ir. potato	Ili	7971D	1 ap. 49 87 Acs	
Kamaole	Kukuioiikea Makoio Halepili Laie	kula kula kula kula	Ahulau	7971G	na, See 8038	
Kamaole	Kino / Kinokio	kula	Kanakaloa	7971H	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamaole	Kukuiopiikea Makaouia Halepili Laie, uw (?)	kula kula kula 6 mala sw. potatoes, 1 house lot	Ahulau	8038	1 ap. 6.5 Acs.	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	1 potato mo'o	Kapahana	8558	1 ap. 2.2 Acs.	TMK 2-2-01
Kamaole	Kamaole	2 potato patches	Kekeleiaiku	8808	na	
Kamaole	Kamaole	mala Ir. potatoes	Konohin	8873	na	See 3108'
Kamaole	Kamaole	4 potato kula, 2 mo'o kalo	Kanaina	8875	na, See 8875B	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	4 sw. potato kula 2 mo'o dry kalo 1 mo'o sugar cane	Kanaina for Luukia	8875B	1 ap. 18 Acs	
Kamaole	Kaukeakea / Kauhakapa aw.	house lot, 2 kula, 1 kula taro	Kalawao	8881	1 ap. 47.5 Acs	
Kamaole	Kaikeakea	kula, kalo, house lot	Kealoha	8881B	1 ap. 3 Acs	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw	moku mau'u, mala of Ir. potatoes	Kekua	8882	1 ap. 2 Acs	TMK 2-2-01
Kamaole	Kaukeakea Kauhauiea Kaooa	4 moku mau'u 2 moku mau'u 1 moku mau'u in kula are 6 moku mau'u, 3 mala of Ir. potatoes	Ohilani	10578	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw Aikaua Kaooa Kaolulo Kaukeakea	moku mau'u, 6 mala Ir. potatoes, 2 house lots kula kula kula	Papa	10662	1 ap. 12.2 Acs	
Kamaole	Hauola Piliwale	2 mala Ir. potatoes, house lot	Pipio	10665	na	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw Kahiaihakoko	mala Ir. potatoes house lot	Naihe	10890	1 ap. 8.5 Acs	
Kamaole	Kamaole, aw Pahalona Kaukeakea	kula Ir. potatoes & mala of kalo house lot	Holani	10891	1 ap. 16 Acs	
Kamaole	Kamaole	potato mala	Wahinealii	11022	1 ap. 6.8 Acs	TMK 2-2-01
Kamehame	ahupua'a, aw		Keohakalole	8452	1 ap. ahupua'a part 2, par 6	TMK 2-3-53, R.P. 913 TMK 2-3-01 apana 6
Kamehame 2 Kamehame 1	Peeluakolo, aw Kamehameiki or Pulehuiki?	Ho'oulo (winter kula), pu'a, maele (bog), kilau (bracken) ho'oulo, pu'a, Ir. potatoes	Kaulaula	8816	2 ap. 8.35 Acs	TMK 2-3-53 TMK 2-3-01 apana 1 (Kamehameiki)
Kamehame	Kukuiokapio	kula	Kanakea	8862	na	
Kamehame 2	Halelani	not given	Helehuu, (aw?)	9019	na	Ap. 3 on map in Kamehameiki TMK 2-5-53
Kamehame	Holani, aw Kamehame or Pulehuiki?	2 jump mo'o claims	Kuapuu	9027	1 ap.	not located, not listed in location index

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kamehame 1	Kamehame 1	5 claims, a winter cultivation, a bog	Kaala	9670	na	TMK 2-3-53 por 1
Kamehame	Kamehame, or Pulehuiki?	a place	Kekahuna	9671	na	TMK 2-3-53; TMK 2-3-01 apana 2 Kamehameiki
Kamehame	Kamehame, or Pulehuiki?	Ir. potatoes	Lonoaea	9673	na	TMK 2-3-53 ap 3; TMI 2-1-01 ap 2
Kamehame	appears to be wrong number, listed on TMK map, claim appears to be for Island of Hawaii		Kaiala	9679	na	TMK 2-3-53, por 2 2.14 Acs, wrong claim number?
Kaonoulu	ahupuaa		Hewahewa	3237	1 ap. 5715 Acs	TMK 2-2-06; R.M. 913
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu	potato mulu	Alihi	2651	na	
Kaonoulu	Kupalaia	Ir. potato malata	Nahiona	2764	na	
Kaonoulu			Konohia	3108		
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu	2 loi	Kuumiuni	5066	na	
Kaonoulu	Kapukahawai, aw Kupalaia, aw Kaonoulu	1 potato patch potato patch & land house lot	Kuihelani	5228	1 ap. 28 Acs 1 ap. 1.8 Acs	
Kaonoulu			Kauhihiwa	5267		
Kaonoulu	Kaakaulua, aw	[no significant text?]	Kauaau	5267B	1 ap. 4.5 Acs	
Kaonoulu			Kalulukaani	5271		na
Kaonoulu	Kailua	winter kula	Konui	5293	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaonoulu	Kailua, aw	2 kula, 2 kalo (N.R. 1 mala Ir. potatoes, 1 bank of a stream, 2 mala Ir. potatoes, winter kula)	Koi	5294	1 ap. 3.3 Acs	
Kaonoulu	Kaakaulua Kaonoulu	3 claims, 1 Ir. potatoes winter kula	Kauaau II	5298	na	
Kaonoulu	Puuokahulu, aw Kaakaulua	22 claims, 7 kula	Kailua / Kailua	5299	1 ap. 1.40 Ac	
Kaonoulu	Kailua Kuluolaie	1 mala Ir. potatoes 1 mala Ir. potatoes winter kula	Kuao	5301	na	
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu	3 claims, 1 mala Ir. potatoes	Kapahi	5302	na	
Kaonoulu	Kaakaulua Kaakaulua II Alaekahi Kailua	3 kula, 5 claims 4 claims 2 claims 1 claim	Kauaau	5303	na	
Kaonoulu	Makailio (Koheo?) Kamalaawa Kailua	kula kula 2 kula	Kaneula	5304	na	
Kaonoulu	Kailua Kupukahawai	3 kula 1 kula	Kaauku	5305	na	
Kaonoulu	Konooohaukea Kupukahawai	1 kula 4 kula	Koolau	5306	na	
Kaonoulu	Kupalaia, aw Puuokuhewa, aw	kula, 2 mala Ir. potatoes kula	Pupuka	5328	1 ap. 2.04 Acs 1 ap. 5.14 Acs	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaonoulu	Kakalain	1 mala lr. potatoes	Pulu	5330	na	
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu	lr. potato patch	Kapuaa	5335	na	
Kaonoulu	Kailua	winter kula	Poohina	5347	na	
Kaonoulu	Kaakaulua Kaonoulu Kaalaie	3 claims, kula 1 claim, kula 1 claim, kula	Puha	5349	na	
Kaonoulu	Kalepolepo, aw Kaonoulu, aw	house lot kula	Lono	5376	1 ap. .022 Acs 1 ap. 2.17 Acs	
Kaonoulu	Kailua, aw	12 loi, 2 kula, 1 mala lr. potatoes	Kaoiwi	5397	1 ap. 3.7 Acs	
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu, aw Kalepolepo Kupalaia	small house lot on kuapa 3 lr. potatoes	Mahiai	5407	2 ap. 3.491 Acs	
Kaonoulu	Kailua, aw	3 claims, 1 lr. potatoes (4 kula)	Mukakuhi	5465	3 ap. 10.25 Ac.	
Kaonoulu	Kupalaia	1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 winter kula, kula	Mukakuhiko	5466	na	
Kaonoulu	Kailua	4 claims, 1 lr. potatoes	Leo	5475	na	
Kaonoulu	Malaawa, aw Kupukahawai, aw	4 claims, 6 claims on bank of stream, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 winter kula	Lapaku	5476	1 ap. 3.46 Acs 1 ap. 1.67 Acs	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaonoulu	Puukuihewa Kaakaulua	7 claims, 1 mala lr. potatoes small claim, winter kula mukui	Umnuma	5480	na	
Kaonoulu	Hoanulu Hai	lr. potatoes	Kapuaa	6407	na, See 5335	
Kaonoulu	Kapalaia	lr. potato ili	Kawelo	7952	na	
Kaonoulu	Kapukahawai, aw Kailua	2 kula kalo	Kalia wahine	7971K	1 ap. 2.10 Acs	
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu ahupuaa	see 3237	Huwahewa	8109	na, See 3237	
Kaonoulu	Kaonoulu	1 claim	Koolau	8630	na	
Kaonoulu	Kapukahawai, aw Kupalaia, aw	kalo potato kula	Kannai	9021	1 ap. .5 Ac. 1 ap. 5.54 Acs	TMK 2-2-06, ap 2
Kealahou 3 & 4	ahupua'a		Keohokulole	8452	1 ap. Ahupua'a, Ap. 21: 8452.6	TMK 2-3-01
Kealahou	Kealahou Aipuaa Kealahou 4	3 kihapai 4 kihapai	Kamailio	5437	na	
Kealahou 3 & 4	Kealahou 3 Aipuaa Kealahou 4 Kaulaala	4 sw. potato & 1 lr. potato 1 kihapai 2 kihapai	Pii	5449	na	
Kealahou	Pawila Aipuaa	2 kula lands, 1 lr. potato kula	Pii	5488	na	
Kealahou	Aipuaa	kula	Kamailio	7971C	na	
Kealahou 1	Aipuaa	2 kula lands	Aki	8041	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kealahou 1 Kealahou 4	Ahanamuli Keahunui	2 kula, 1 kihapai kula 1 kihapai	Kawaalau	8462	na	TMK 2-2-14 apana 1 & 2
Kealahou	Kealahou, aw Aipuaa Kaulaula, aw Kaopuopolu, aw Hanamuli, aw	kula 2 kula 2 kula kula kula	Kekapai	8653	6 ap. 10.25 Acs 1 ap. 2.6 Ac. 1 ap. .58 Ac 1 ap. .69 Ac.	2-3-02, apana 2 2.426 Acs
Kealahou	Kaulaula, aw Pawili	? 3 pastures	Kapole	8654	1 ap. 2.11 Acs	
Kealahou	Hanamuli	kula	Kahoopaki	8655	na	
Kealahou	Poolupehu Kaopuopolu	2 kula kula	Kamakea	8862	na	
Kealahou 4	Kealahou 4	winter lot	Helehua	9019	na	
Kealahou	Kealahou	winter claim	Kaula	9670	na	
Kealahou	Kealahou	a place	Kekahuna	9671	na	
Kealahou	Kealahou	1 claim	Poko	9672	na	
Kealahou	Kealahou	1 claim	Lonoena	9673	na	
Kealahou 2	Hanamuli, aw Kunanaualii, aw Paliku, aw Halepole (aw?)	pasture ili pasture ili pasture ili pasture ili	Makahiki	10144	1 ap. 2.87 Acs 1 ap. .84 Acs. 1 ap. 6.71 Acs Ap. 4 5.777 acs	TMK 2-2-14 apana 4; 2-2-11: apana 3
Kealahou 1, Kealahou 2 Kealahou 3 Kealahou 4	Aipuaa Hanamulei, aw Pawili	5 claims 2 claims 1 claim 1 claim	Manaole	10145	1 ap. 2.2 Acs	TMK 2-3-02 apana 1, 2 3 & 4; TMK 2-2-21 apanu 5

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kealahou	Aipuaa Kaulaula Kaopuopolu Noni	Ir. potatoes	Naipuala	10480	na	
Kealahou	Hanamulei, aw Hanamulei, aw Hanamulei	kula kula	Naha	10482	1 ap. 4.78 Acs. 1 ap. 2.6 Acs.	TMK 2-3-02, shows Ap. 1 & 2 6.19 Acs, & Ap. 5 unknown acreage
Kealahou	Pauili	pasture	Pahuaina	10883	na	
Kealahou	Hanamulei	3 kula	Ikiiki	11043	na	
Keokea	Pualoa	pasture	Nalopi	No number	na	
Keokea	Hookia	aw. potato kula	Kuamu	2225	na	
Keokea	Paluka (?) Koapuupuna (?)	kula kula	Hiona/Nahiona	2764	na	
Keokea	Wailuku Molokai Maunakilowua, aw Piimou, aw Pualoa Kalepolepo, aw Iluokenkeol, aw	pasture pasture taro taro 2 pastures house site fruit given	Kapohaku	4120B	1 ap. 2.9 Acs 1 ap. 11.7 Acs 1 ap. .25 Ac. 1 ap. 3.04 Acs	TMK 2-2-03 ap. 4 TMK 2-2-03 ap. 1 ap. 3 ap. 27 3.003 acs
Keokea	Alanoho [Kamakoa] aw	1 kula 1 kula [This he got in exchange with konohiki]	Kauhiihiwa	5267	1 ap. 3 1/8 Acs	TMK 2-2-03

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Puukeokea Paliku Koupuupuu [N.R. no 'ili given]	kalo kalo & kula kula 1 moku mau'u & 2 mala lr. potatoes	Kani	5269	na	
Keokea	Kupuni	2 kulas of lr. potatoes	Kahulukneiupio	5271	na	
Keokea	Kalepolepo, aw Paliku, aw Wailuku, aw (2 ap.) Piimoo Pualoa	house site taro taro pasture	Kapelekai / Palekai	5279	1 ap. .08 Ac. 1 ap. 10.4 Acs 2 ap. 2.75 Acs	TMK 2-2-03 ap. 1, 2 TMK 2-2-04 ap. 4 ap. 1 1± Ac. ap. 2 1.44 Acs TMK 2-2-02 Ap. 5 5± Acs
Keokea	Kaumana, aw	moku mau'u taro	Pupuka	5328	1 ap. 1 Ac.	TMK 2-2-03 ap. 1 2.16 Acs, ap. 3 2.5+ Acs.
Keokea			Pala	5330		
Keokea	Wailuku Kaluaohoana	moku mau'u moku mau'u & 2 mala lr. potatoes	Nalehu	5357	na	
Keokea	[Maunakilowaa] aw [Piimoo], aw	[no text?]	Kalama	6179B	1 ap. 3.22 Acs 1 ap. 8.11 Acs	TMK 2-2-04 ap. 2
Keokea	Kaluaohoana, aw Paliku, aw Maunakilowaa Hauola Koupuupuu	kalo kalo & house lot potato kula & banana & kalo potato kula	Kekua	6415	1 ap. 11.33 Acs 1 ap. 7.56 Acs, Ap. 1	TMK 2-2-04, ap. 2 TMK 2-2-03, ap. 1
Keokea	Alanoho	1 mala taro	Kuanaa	6416	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Kaumana, aw Wailuku Puukeokeo/ Puukeokeo?	2 taro lands potatoes pasture	Kaeo / Kaio	6417	2 ap. 3.55 Acs	TMK 2-2-03 ap. 1 2.94 Acs.; ap. 2 .41 Ac.
Keokea	Nokino II	some moku mau'u	Kannkaole	6419	na	
Keokea	Ahulua Pahala	some moku mau'u some moku mau'u	Keawe	6421	na	
Keokea	[Koupuupuu], aw Puukeokeo, aw Alanoho Kaumana	[ili not given; 1 mala sw. potatoes, taro, bananas, house lot] kalo & kula 1 kalo, 1 kula kalo	Kaehukulani wahine	6425	1 ap. 11.95 Acs, Ap. 2 1 ap. 5.54 Acs	TMK 2-2-04, ap. 2 TMK 2-2-03, Ap. 1
Keokea	Kaumana, aw Wailuku, aw Maunakilowaa Ahulua	kula [N.R. ili not given; 7 mala sw. potatoes, 8 mala taro, 1 mala bananas, house lot] 3 mala lr. potatoes kula kula	Kuiwialii	6429	1 ap. 7.28 Acs 1 ap. .82 Ac 1 ap. 1.1 Acs	TMK 2-2-03, ap. 3 9.671 Acs., ap. 2 1.1 Ac TMK 2-2-03, Ap. 2
Keokea	Keokea & Waiahuli	sw. potatoes, taro & house lot	Kuaha	6431	na	
Keokea	Kaumana	1 mala taro, 4 mala lr. potatoes	Kekua II	6434	na	
Keokea	Keokea	1 mala taro	Kuekaa	6436	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Keokea	1 mala Ir. potatoes and 2 small houses	Kaniaa	6445	na	
Keokea	Kaamana Keapuupuu (2 apana) Maunakilowaa Kamukoa	kulu kulu, taro taro taro	Kini	6447	na	
Keokea	Pualoa Paea Puliku Maunakilowaa Puukeoke Alenuho	moku mau'u [ili not given 7 mala Ir. potatoes, 3 house lots, fishing rights]	Kapohaku	6453	na, See 4120B	
Keokea	Elimakole Unauna Kuhau Maunakilowaa Piimoo Alenuho	moku mau'u house lot moku mau'u kalo kalo kulu, sw potatoes	Kalana	6479	Awarded but location index lists only ahupuaa, not ili nor apana #s	TMK 2-2-03, Ap. 1 3.17 Acs
Keokea	Keokea	6 sw. potatoes, 4 mala taro, 1 mala bananas, 2 mala Ir. potatoes, 1 house lot	Kukae	6492	na	
Keokea	Keokea	2 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala taro, 2 mala Ir. potatoes	Kaahu	6493	na	
Keokea			Kaunuu	6494		na

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Maunakilowaa, aw Koupuupuu	2 kulu, 1 kalo [N.R. no location] 4 mala sw. potatoes, 5 mala taro, 5 mala Ir. potatoes, 2 mala sugar cane] kulu, house lot	Apiki	6503	2 ap. 3.17 Acs	TMK 2-2-03, Ap. 2 & 3 Ac. Ap. 1 2.48 Acs
Keokea	Wailuku, aw Koupuupuu, aw Kaluahona, aw Kaamana	house lot & taro sw. potato & Ir. potato Ir. potatoes [N.R. no ili given 3 mala sw. potatoes, 3 mala taro, 3 mala Ir. potatoes, 1 house lot]	Halekahi	6540	1 ap. 1.7 Acs., ap. 3 1 ap. 4.85 Acs 1 ap. 3.37 Acs	TMK 2-2-03, ap. 2 & 3 TMK 2-2-04, ap. 1 Ap. 2 2.75 Acs. Roman Catholic church
Keokea	Keokea	1 mala taro	Pelapela	6593	na	
Keokea	Keokea	moku mau'u	Paupau	6596	na	
Keokea	Keokea	4 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala taro, 1 mala bananas, 1 house lot	Paea	6607	na	
Keokea	Muili Mololoa Pahalona Kaiku	moku mau'u moku mau'u moku mau'u, 3 mala potatoes	Nahuina	6619	na	
Keokea	Keokea	1 mala taro	Nakunaka	6622	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ii/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Kanupa & Maili Papalona	3 mala lr. potatoes, house on kula & house a shore moku mau'u	Ukukua	6654	na	Wrong number
Keokea	Kaamana, aw Wailuku Paliku Puaweoweo	kalo potato kula potato kula potato kula	Uilani	6655	1 ap. 4.13 Acs	TMK 2-2-03
Keokea			Uli	6656		
Keokea			Ohule	6704		
Keokea			Ohai	6705		
Keokea	Kamakoa Maunakilowaa	[N.R. no ili given 3 mahina sw. potatoes, 3 mala taro, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot]	Maikakui	6720	na	
Keokea	Punua, aw Kaluahouano Wailuku, aw	pasture pasture kalo	Nahelu	6720B	2 ap. 16.58 Acs 1 ap. 3.6 Acs.	TMK 2-2-02; Ap. 4 5± TMK 2-2-03, ap. 1 4± Acs
Keokea	Ahuloo Maunakilowaa Alenoho Wailuku	kula kula 3 kula (1 lr. potatoes), 3 kalo kula	Matola	6721	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ii/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Keokea	Kuokanaloa Kikaniho Piimoo, aw Konpuupuu	pasture pasture 2 ap. lr. potatoes, 1 kalo house lot	Makahakulai	6724	1 ap. 11.4 Acs	TMK 2-2-04
Keokea	Puukawakea	4 mala sw. potatoes, 5 mala taro, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Umauma	6762	na	
Keokea	Maunakilowaa Pukoo	moku mau'u kalo	Kahulukuai	7971	na	
Keokea	Keokea	3 small sw. potato mala, 1 mala taro	Keohokalole, A.	8452	na	
Keokea	Maili	2 kula, 2 kalo, house lot (3 apuna)	Kealoha	8881B	na	
Keokea	Keokea, aw	sw. potato kihapai	Pa	10639	1 ap. 1.9 Ac.	TMK 2-2-04
Keokea	Keokea	lr. potatoes	George Shaw	11032	na	
Koheo	ahupuaa		Keohokalole	8452	1 ap. Ahupua'a (Ap. 19)	TMK 2-2-06
Koheo	Kamakailio	lr. potatoes	Hewahewa	4507	na	
Koheo	Paholui	kalo	Kuakuhela / Kahinu	5291	na	
Koheo	Kaala / Koula Kamako Pahole	2 taro sections, 1 lr. potatoes [N.R. 8 claims, winter kula]	Kahinu / Kekini	5292	3 ap. 8.05 Acs 1 ap. 6.59 Acs	TMK 2-2-06, 6.92 Acs

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Koheo	Kamakailio	4 kula lands	Kalio	5299	na	
Koheo	Kamakailio	1 pasture section	Kuaio	5301	na	
Koheo	Kamakailio	ili kula	Kaneula	5304	na	
Koheo	Kamakailio	ili kula	Kaaukai	5305	na	
Koheo	Kamakailio	2 kula lands, 2 Ir. potato lands (4 apana)	Kauiwi	5397	na	
Koheo	Kuluolaie	1 mala Ir. potatoes	Makahaki	5465	na	
Koheo	Makailio	2 mala Ir. potatoes kula hooilo (Koheo or Kaonoulu?)	Leo	5475	na	
Kukuiaea	ahupua'a		Keohokalole	8452	1 ap. Kamehameha & Kealahou 3,4 5067 Acres	TMK 2-3-07, 150± Acs; Apana 7
Makaeha	Kukui	kula	Kekahuna	9022	na	
Omaopio	Omaopio	Ir. potatoes, aw. potatoes	Kaauwai, Z.	2383	na	
Omaopio			Kauiia	5502		
Omaopio	Kaohai, aw Kapalaninikila, aw	See Omaopio 8 & 9	Piliwale	10643	1 ap. 67.5 Acs. Ap. 1 1 ap. 1.64 Acs Ap. 2	TMK 2-3-03 apana 1 & 2; R.M. 913
Omaopio			Kaili	9015		
Omaopio 1			Mohu	10300		
Omaopio 1,2,3,4	ahupua'a	sugar cane	Ali	281B	1 ap. 1052.72 Acs. Ahupuaa	TMK 2-3-03; R.M. 913

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Omaopio 2 & 6			Napapa	10467		
Omaopio 1 & 3			Kumou	8864		
Omaopio 4, 6 & 7			Moeona	10166		
Omaopio 5	ahupua'a		Keohokalole, A	8452	na	
Omaopio 5	Omaopio 5, aw Kuaopohaku, aw	kula	Kaili	3759B	1 ap. 21.5 Acs 1 ap. 20 ac.	TMK 2-3-03 13.883 Acs 10.228 Acs; R.M. 913
Omaopio 5	Pauula 1 Kapaa Kuholehele 2	winter claim claim 4 mala Ir. potatoes	Kaeha	9023	na	TMK 3-3-03
Omaopio 5?	Omaopio		Kekee / Kekii	9028	na	
Omaopio?	Halemano Opuhaka Lumaliinui	3 loi 7 loi 10 loi	Kanuka	4456	na	Grant 1908 173 Acs
Omaopio 6	Kaawaha, aw	2 kula	Wahine	4567	1 ap. 7.75 Acs	TMK 2-3-3; Ap. 1
Omaopio 7	Omaopio 7	Ir. potatoes	Kuiahulu	8550	na	
Omaopio 7	Omaopio 7	Ir. potatoes mauka	Kealukane	8649	na	
Omaopio 7	Kamapouli, aw Kuaopohaku, aw	kula kula	Keku / Kekee	9028	1 ap. 12.96 Acs	TMK 2-3-03; R.M. 913
Omaopio 8	Halehu Kahoulii, aw	kula	Kaiwi	8602	1 ap. 9 Ac.	
Omaopio 8	Omaopio 8, aw	Ir. potatoes, winter kula	Poepoe	10636	1 ap. 8.71 Acs	TMK 2-3-03 & 2-3-04

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Omaopio 8	Nahaleokaawahia	kula	Kealakane	8649	na	
Omaopio 8	Kihimoa Nahaleokaawahia	kula 2 kula	Piliwale	10643	na	
Omaopio 9	Halelu, aw Kahoalii, aw Nahaleokaohia, aw Naipilopili, aw	kula kula kula kula [N.R. some moo and a house lot, wauke stream]	Kealakane	8649	1 ap. 3.5 Acs 1 ap. 1.05 Acs 1 ap. 7 Acs, Ap. 4 1 ap. 1.5 Acs Ap. 3	TMK 2-3-04, apana 3 & 4
Omaopio 9	Nahaleokaawahia	2 main potatoes	Kuuihulu	8550	na	
Omaopio 9	Kahoalii, aw Haahipuuili Nahaleokaawahia	kula kula	Kaiwi	8602	1 ap. .9 Ac.	
Omaopio 9	Waipilapila/Naipilopilo Kahoalii, aw Halilu / Halelau, aw Nahaleokaohia, aw	kula some mo'o & house lot, wauke, 3 kula [not given]	Kealakane	8649	1 ap. 1.5 Acs 1 ap. 1.05 Ac 1 ap. 3.5 Acs. 1 ap. 7 Acs	
Omaopio 9	Eliilii/ Kailiili Halelau Oleole Keahaihale Kaluanui Kawainekaawe / Kawahinekaawe Puukoa Kaimuilie	winter kula Permanent plot	Kaulahea	8846	na	
Omaopio 9			Kammi	9020		

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Omaopio 9	Puukoa Kupahuahi Kikiahulua	kula kula kula	Piliwale	10643	na	
Omaopio 10	Pipio, aw Puukulanui, aw.	kula kula	Kaiwi	8602	1 ap. 3.93 Acs 1 ap. .9 Ac.	
Omaopio 10	Haliluu	kula	Kealakane	8649	na	
Omaopio 10	Halelau/ Halelu, aw	kalo land	Kahele	8652	1 ap. 6 Ac.	R.M. 913
Pulehu	Halekane Kenku Kukuineenee Kaluanui	kula 2 kula 2 kula 2 kula	Kaili	3759B	na	relinquished for 20 acres in Omaopio
Pulehu	Aiolua, aw Kawiha, aw Kenku, aw Keekai, aw Kukuineenee, aw	pasture ili pasture ili pasture ili pasture ili pasture ili [N.R. 3 aw. potatoes, 1 fr. potatoes, other plots]	Poonui	4672	1 ap. .66 Ac. Ap. 2 1 ap. 1.47 Acs. Ap. 5 1 ap. 2.38 Acs. Ap. 3 1 ap. .98 Ac. Ap. 4 2 ap. 1.88 Acs. Ap. 1,6	
Pulehu			Kamakea	8862		
Pulehu	Halekane, 2 aw Kawiha, aw Kukuineenee, aw	pasture pasture pasture	Kanihu	8866	2 ap. 3.9 Acs Ap. 2,4 1 ap. 8.9 Acs. Ap. 3 1 ap. 4 Acs. Ap. 1	
Pulehu			Kaili	9015		
Pulehuiki	not claimed	aw?	Pauke	3829	[1 ap.]	TMK 2-3-40

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acres / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Pulehuiki	Haleokane, aw Keaku, aw Keaku, 2 aw Kukuineene, aw Koawihā	pasture ili 5 kula [N.R.] 10 places in sw. potatoes not all together; 3 plantings of Ir. potatoes] kula 2 kula	Wahine	4567	1 ap. 4 Acs Ap. 2 1 ap. 5.58 Acs. Ap. 4 1 ap. 1 Ac. Ap. 3 1 ap. 6.15 Acs Ap. 1 1 ap. 3.8 Acs, Ap. 5	TMK 2-3-03 TMK 2-3-13 shows apana 4 in Pulehunui
Pulehuiki	Keaku, 2 aw [Location index; not awarded according to numerical index]	at Kula some scattered potato mala	Paele	6613	2 ap. 1.97 Acs. Ap 1-2	
Pulehuiki	Kanao, claimed in Pulehunui	a claim	Kalalaula	8816	na	TMK 2-3-46; apana 1; TMI 2-3-40 apana 2
Pulehuiki	Kalihi	3 kula lands	Helehua	9019	3 ap. 9.08 Acs. 1-3	TMK 2-3-59 apana 1 2± Acs TMK 2-3-40 apana 2; TMK 2-3-60 apana 3
Pulehuiki	Kalihi, aw Helani, aw	[N.R.] pigs & Ir. potatoes (which claim?)	Kuapuu	9027	1 ap. 6.65 Acs. ap. 1 1 ap. 2.48 Acs. ap. 2	TMK 2-3-01 apana 2 TMK 2-3-01 apana 1
Pulehuiki	Kalihi, aw Kamamania, aw	kula kula [N.R. winter kula, a bog, 3 places]	Kaala	9670	1 ap. 3.92 Acs Ap. 1 1 ap. 2.27 Acs Ap. 2	TMK 2-3-53 apana 1; TMK 2-3-40 apana 2
Pulehuiki			Kekahuna	9671	See Kamehameiki	Award is given in Kamehameiki & Pulehu

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acres / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Pulehuiki	Kalihi, 2 aw	kula [N.R. 3 winter claims for Ir. potatoes	Napoho	9672	2 ap. 12.56 Acs. Ap. 1-2	TMK 2-3-40 apana 1 TMK 2-3-62 apana 2
Pulehuiki	Kalihi, aw	5 permanent winter claims	Lonoua	9673	2 ap. 4.06 Acs. Ap. 1- 2	TMK 2-3-40 apana 1 TMK 2-3-46 apana 2 TMK 2-2-01 no number
Pulehuiki	Kalihi, aw Kipaluna, aw Pauili, aw	kula kula kula	Kuapuunui / Kapauila	10708	1 ap. 6.14 Acs. Ap.1 1 ap. 1.3 Acs. Ap. 3 1 ap. 6.24 Acs Ap. 2	TMK 2-3-01 apana 1 TMK 2-3-02, apana 3 TMK 2-3-01 apana 2
Pulehunui	ahupua'a		Kawaemahi	5230	1 ap. 16,678.78 Acs.	TMK 2-3-05
Pulehunui			Kauhaule	4956		
Pulehunui			Hoeu	8073		
Pulehunui	Pulehunui	3 claims	Koolau	8630	na	
Pulehunui	Keaku	many plantings of sw. potatoes, 3 springs, 3 kihapai of Ir. potatoes	Anakalea	5513	na	
Pulehunui			Kapono, D.	9018		
Pulehunui	Kapalaa	kula, 5 sw. potatoes	Kuapuunui	10708	na	
Waiakoa	Waiakoa	2 claims & cultivated plot	Aki	8041	na	
Waiakoa	Waiakoa, aw Maulae, aw	Ir. potatoes 10 ac. (not in claim)	Kaauwai, Z.	2383	2 ap. 19 Acs, Ap.1-2 1 ap. 6.8 Acs	TMK 2-2-10, ap. 1 7.5 or 20.7 Acs TMK 2-2-12

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiakoa	Moonui, aw Kalihi	kula kula	Maina	4750	1 ap. 9.8 Acs.	TMK 2-2-13, R.M. 913 Grant 1210 2 ap. 9.13 Acs
Waiakoa	Moomoolea	kula kula kula	Kawelo	7952	na	
Waiakoa	claim relinquished, wished to enlarge lands		Maina	7971B	na, See 4750	
Waiakoa	Moonui, 2 aw Kalihi, aw	2 kula kula	Nauhuli	7971F	2 ap. 12.2 Acs 1 ap. 3.4 Acs	TMK 2-2-13, Ap. 1 TMK 2-2-10 Ap. 2 7.369 Acs, other 2.835 Acs.
Waiakoa	Kalihi, 3 aw Moonui, aw	7 kihapai sw. potatoes, 2 mala lr. potatoes (N.T. 5 ili pastures)	Kawaulau	8462	3 ap. 11.25 Acs 1 ap. 1.25 Acs	TMK 2-2-13, Ap. 1 2.613 Acs; 2-2-14 Ap. 2 5.5± Acs
Waiakoa	Kalihi, aw Pakaka Moonui, 3 aw Moomuku	kula 2 kula 2 kula kula	Kuilianu	8462B	1 ap. 3.45 Acs. (Ap. 1) 3 ap. 16.31 Acs	TMK 2-2-14 apana 1 & 8462B no apana #; TMK 2-2-12 apana 2; Apana 2-2-10 apana 3, 5, 7
Waiakoa	Kalihi	mala lr. potatoes mauka	Kekapui	8653	1 ap. .93 Ac.	TMK 2-2-11 apana 3 & 6
Waiakoa	Moonui, aw Kalihi, aw Pakaka	5 kula 6 kula	Kapaole	8654	1 ap. 3.9 Acs 1 ap. 7.58 Acs & 3 ap. 14.7 Acs	TMK 2-2-13 apana 1; TMK 2-2-11 apana 2 pt 2 & 6 TMK 2-3-14 apana 3
Waiakoa	Kalihi, 2 aw Moonui	5 claims for kula 2 kula	Kahoopaki/ Kihooapai	8655	2 ap. 16.99 Acs; Ap. 1-2	TMK 2-2-14 apana 1 & 2

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiakoa	Kalihi, aw Pakaka/Paliku, aw	kula kula	Makahiki	10144	1 ap. 1 Ac. 1 ap. 1.7 Ac	TMK 2-2-10 apana 1 & 2; TMK 2-2-11 apana 3; TMK 2-2-13 apana 4
Waiakoa	Kalihi, aw Kealahou, 3 aw	kula	Munaole	10145	1 ap. 6.5 Acs. 3 ap. 7.01 Acs, Ap. 1-3	TMK 2-2-13 apana 1; TMK 2-2-11 apana 2 pt 2
Waiakoa	Kalihi	lr. potatoes	Naipuala	10480	na	
Waiakoa	Kalihi, aw Kaliliu, aw Pakaka, aw	kalo, 5 kula, 2 lr. potatoes, house lot	Nuha	10482	4 ap. 18.54 Acs 1 ap. 3.21 Acs 1 ap. 1.4 Acs	TMK 2-2-14 apana 1 pt 2 & apana 3 pt 1; TMK 2-2-10 apana 2, 3 pt 2, 4 pt 2 & 6 pt 2
Waiakoa	Kalihi, aw Pakaka Moonui	3 kula kula kula	Pahuaina	10883	1 ap. 4.5 Ac.	TMK 2-2-13
Waiakoa	Kalihi Moonui	kula kula	Ikiiki	11043	na	
Waiakoa	Waieli, aw Pueu, aw	2 potato kula house lot & potato kula	Konohia	3108	1 ap. 2.7 Acs 1 ap. 4.3 Acs	TMK 2-2-05 apana 1; TMK 2-2-16 apana 2
Waiakoa			Kauhaha	5267		
Waiakoa			Palekai	5279		
Waiakoa			Kuukuhela	5291		na
Waiakoa			Pala	5330		

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Kahelepo, aw Papaanaiwi, aw Pueo, aw Puekooohalei Kukuihanau Laie	2 moku mau'u 2 moku mau'u 2 kula lands kula kula house lot & 1 moku N.R. 4 mala lr. potatoes	Paele	5332	1 ap. 3.8 Acs 1 ap. 1.9 Acs 1 ap. 8.2 Acs	TMK 2-2-02 apana 1; TMK 2-2-16 apana 2; TMK 2-2-05 apana 3 & 4 and another with no number
Waiohuli			Nalehu	5357		na
Waiohuli			Liuukai	5374		na
Waiohuli			Lono	5376		na
Waiohuli			Mahiau	5407		na
Waiohuli	Waielei, aw	potato ground	Eeka	6041	1 ap. 12.8 Acs	TMK 2-2-05
Waiohuli	Luakini & Puuaha /Puuaha/Punalau Kuhinaoaina Paapanaaiwi Kohelua	7 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 2 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Keawe	6414	2 ap. 11.28 Acs	TMK 2-2-05 apana 1 & 2
Waiohuli			Kuana	6416		na
Waiohuli			Kekau	6427		na
Waiohuli	Ahulua, aw	kula land	Kaiwinili	6429	1 ap. 1.10 Acs	names Keukea ahupuaa but 3 ili names correspond to Waiohuli; Ahulua is one of them

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli			Kaana	6431		na
Waiohuli			Kekua II	6434		na
Waiohuli			Kuekan	6436		na
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	6 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala taro, 2 mala bananas, 6 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Kalei	6444	na	
Waiohuli	Pohakuolauouli	foreign potato	Kini / Kini	6447	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	six mahina sw. potatoes, 1 mala sugar cane, 1 mala taro, 1 mala bananas, 3 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Kaunoe	6451	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	3 moku mau'u of sw. potatoes, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house site	Kaluli	6452	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	3 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala taro, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Kekaka	6470	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	moku mau'u small potatoes	Kalamu	6479	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Mahana	5 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 1 house lot, 1 mala lr. potatoes	Kawna	6490	na	
Waiohuli	Puapaanai (4 ap.) Kulu	2 mala bananas, 3 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot 9 mala potatoes	Kekua	6491	na	
Waiohuli	Ohia Pueo Mailepo Laie	kula & kula kula 2 kula 2 kula of huale potato	Kaikaia	6494	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	1 mala lr. potatoes	Helekuhi	6540	na	
Waiohuli	Hiiipali, aw Kahelepo, aw Kukuihanau, aw Paaiki, aw Waieli, aw Kupahu	2 kula, house lot kula kula kula kula (N.R. 12 mahina sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 2 mala lr. potatoes & house lot)	Koopiopio	6543	1 ap. 1.9 Acs 1 ap. 3.7 Acs 1 ap. 2.16 Acs 1 ap. 3 Acs 1 ap. 1.3 Acs	TMK 2-2-05 apana 1 & 3; TMK 2-2-16 apana 2; TMK 2-2-05 apana; TMK 2-2-16 another one 3.04 Acs
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	3 moku mau'u sw. potatoes, 2 moku mau'u taro, 1 moku lr. potatoes	Hainaka	6550	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Kukuihanau, aw Pahakiloa, aw Pueo, aw Pahilikoa Luukini Puuala & Luukini	kula land kula kula & kalo kula kalo & kula foreign potato kula foreign potato N.R. 6 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 4 mala lr. potatoes & 1 house lot	Puana	6592	3 ap. 2.41 Acs 1 ap. 1.5 Acs 1 ap. 1.06 Acs	TMK 2-2-02 apana 1, 3, 4, & 5
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	1 mala taro, 2 mala lr. potatoes	Pelapela	6593	na	
Waiohuli	Mukanui Luukini & Puuala Koholua Laie Paapaanaiwi	kula house lot & kula kula kula foreign potato kula N.R. 5 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala taro, 2 mala bananas, 4 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Pae / Poe	6598	na	
Waiohuli	Koholua Kahilinaaenae Laie Ohia Pohakuolaauli	house lot, potatoes taro 2 foreign potato kula sw. potatoes 2 kula sw. potatoes	Puhau	6599	na	

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Kuululu Pohakuolauali Puawewewo	2 kula & kula kalo & kula kalo & kula N.R. 6 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala taro, 2 mala bananas, 1 mala sugar cane, 6 mala sw. potatoes & 1 house lot	Nakanaka	6622	na	
Waiohuli	Puawewewo	kula land	Uilani	6655	na	
Waiohuli	Laie, aw Waiali, aw Waikalua, aw Paapunnaiwi	kula foreign potatoes 2 kula kula foreign potatoes N.R. 3 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 3 mala lr. potatoes & 1 house lot	Uli	6656	1 ap. 3.18 Acs. 1 ap. 3.2 Acs 1 ap. 3.06 Acs	TMK 2-2-17 apana 1; TMK 2-2-05 apana 2 & 3
Waiohuli			Ohule	6704		na
Waiohuli	Luakini, 2 aw Pahalekoa Paiiki Laie Pulehu	house lot & haole potatoes kalo kalo kulu kula N.R. 2 mala sw. potatoes, 3 mala taro & 1 house lot	Ohui	6705	1 ap. 2.63 Acs 1 ap. 2.93 Acs	TMK 2-2-16 apana 2 & 3; TMK 2-2-05 3 Acs

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Paapunnaiwi (award?) Kauwehiwa Ohia Nakooku Puuniani	kula sw. potato kula sw. potato kula small potato kalo house lot N.R. 4 mahina sw. potatoes, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Oio	6706	na	TMK 2-2-05 apana 1 3± Acs
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	9 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala taro, 1 mala bananas, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Ohule	6707	na	
Waiohuli	Kahuihanau Kahilinanannuene	kula kula	Nahelu	6720B	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	6 mala sw. potatoes, 1 mala bananas, 1 mala lr. potatoes, 1 house lot	Mukuaikei	6726	na	
Waiohuli	Kahihinnuene, aw Pueo, aw Laie	house lot kula kula N.R. 7 mala sw. potatoes, 2 mala lr. potatoes	Luheluhe	6738	1 ap. 1 Ac. 1 ap. 2.25 Acs	TMK 2-2-02 apana 2

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Ahupua'a	'Ili/Ahupua'a, Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acreage / not awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Waiohuli	Kaulii/Kaulu Punopai/Puukaia Lapolapaiki Ohia Kuuhele Ahuluu	kalo potato kula potato kula small potatoes small potatoes small potatoes N.R. 1 mala sw. potatoes 1 mala lr. potatoes	Unauna	6762	na	
Waiohuli	Ohia, aw Pulehupapaa Waiele Pukohale Laie	2 kula kalo kula kula house lot	Kahulukuai	7971	2 ap. 15.2 Acs	TMK 2-2-05 apana 1 & 2
Waiohuli	Kaluu Puweoweo Paupannaiwi	kula kalo kula	Kakae	7971E	na	
Waiohuli	Laie & Kawilaha, aw	2 potato grounds	Kekeleiniku	8808	1 ap. 20 Acs	TMK 2-2-05
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	2 mala potatoes, fallow section & house lot	Konohiu	8873	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	2 potato grounds	Kanaina	8875	na	
Waiohuli	Pukohale	kula of potatoes	Kamai	9021	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	sw. potatoes, lr. potatoes	Kaapohuehue	9026	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	lr. potatoes	Kuai	9030	na	
Waiohuli	Waiohuli	house lot	Namauu	10474	na	
Waiohuli	Pueo, aw	mala of potatoes	Wahinealii	11022	1 ap. 4.5 Acs	TMK 2-2-05 8.3 Acs

ABSTRACT

An archaeological inventory survey with limited subsurface testing was conducted by Cultural Surveys Hawai'i (CSH), Inc. for the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway on the island of Maui, TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009, 2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016 and 3-09-001: por. 016. The road corridor extends 9.8 miles (15.8 kilometers) from the Haleakala Highway/Hailimaile Road Intersection, at approximately 850-foot elevation, to the intersection of Ka'ono'ulu Street and Pi'ilani Highway at approximately the 40-foot elevation. The study corridor is 300 ft (91.5 m) wide and encompasses approximately 360 acres. The proposed highway, which is on the western slopes of Haleakala, extends from Kailua Ahupua'a in the northeast through Keshua, Kaliahina, Oma'opio, Pulehu nui, Wainaka Ahupua'a, to Ka'ono'ulu Ahupua'a to the southeast. The study corridor was identified as the preferred alternative by the State of Hawai'i Department of Transportation among eight alternative alignments considered in the projects Draft Environmental Impact Statement. CSH conducted reconnaissance surveys of the eight alternative alignments.

The survey and testing were conducted between August 28, 2000 and October 3, 2000 by a crew that ranged from two to four archaeologists. A total of eleven days were spent in the field for a total of 36 person days. Crew members included Ka'ohulani McGuire, B.A., Mary Perzinski, B.A., Lokelani Alpa, B.A., Thomas Devereux, B.A., Tony Bush, B.Ed., and Ian Masterson with Brian Colin, B.A., acting as field director and Dr. Hal Hammett as the principal investigator.

A total of 126 structural and nonstructural features were identified. The archaeological features were organized into seventeen distinct sites that were evaluated as significant in accordance with the criteria of the National and Hawai'i Register of Historic Places. These sites are associated with a variety of functions, including traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation (3742, 3743, 3745, 5032, 5033, 5034, and 5035), agriculture (3727 and 3728) symbolic art (petroglyphs) (5029 and 5031), historic agriculture (4765), animal husbandry (5030) and historic military training activities (4773, 4776 and 4778). Six of the sites, 3727, 3728, 3742, 3743, and 3745 were initially recorded by Xamanek Researches (Fredericksen *et al.* 1994c). Three of the sites, 3742, 3743, and 3745 were surface scatters in which the majority of cultural material was collected (*ibid.*). Limited subsurface testing was conducted at six sites (4773, 4776, 5032, 5033, 5034 and 5035) to determine the presence or absence of subsurface deposits.

The results of the inventory survey reflect the broad range of land use varying from traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation and petroglyphs, to historic military, ranching and agricultural activities. Temporary habitation sites were encountered between 45 to 460 ft. a.m.s.l. along the lower portion (see project area description) of the corridor above Kihai. A large historic military site was encountered in a cluster between 500 and 740 ft. a.m.s.l. also above Kihai. Petroglyphs were encountered in both Wainaka and Kaliahina Gulches. Remnants of historic sugar cane cultivation were observed and recorded in the section of the corridor between Pulehu and Oma'opio Roads. Sections of cattle walls were encountered along the north side of Wainaka Gulch.

Of the seventeen sites recorded, both petroglyph sites (5029 and 5031) are recommended for preservation, data recovery is recommended for three temporary

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVENTORY SURVEY OF THE PROPOSED KIHAI TO KULA ROAD CORRIDOR, KAILUA TO KA'ONO'ULU AHUPUA'A

(TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009
2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016
and 3-09-001: por. 016),

MAKAWAO AND WAILUKU DISTRICTS, ISLAND OF MAUI

by

Brian Colin, B.A.
David W. Shideler, A.B.D.
Victoria S. Creed, Ph.D.
Anthony Bush, B.Ed.
and
Hallett H. Hammett, Ph.D.

prepared for
Persons, Brinkhoff, Quade, and Douglas, Inc.

Cultural Surveys Hawai'i, Inc.
December 2000

habitation sites (5032, 5033, and 5035) and no further work is recommended for the military sites (4773, 4776 and 4778), the agricultural sites (3727, 3728, and 4765), the stone cairn marker (3729), the four temporary habitation surface scatters (3742, 3743, 3745 and 5034) and the cattle wall site (5030).

The two petroglyph sites (5029 and 5031), which are both recommended for preservation, are both located outside of corridor. Site 5029 is located on the north side of Kaliahuni Gulch approximately 200 ft to the east of the study corridor centerline. Site 5031 is located on the south side of Waikoa Gulch approximately 200 ft to the west of the study corridor centerline. Site 5031 was originally located near the center of the study corridor (50 ft west of centerline) but the alignment was modified (moved 150 ft to the east at Waikoa Gulch) to avoid any impact to the site.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Project Area Description	1
II. NATURAL HISTORY	4
Geology	4
Geography	4
III. HISTORIC BACKGROUND	8
A. Pre-Contact Period	8
i. The Coastal Zone in the Pre-contact Period	8
ii. The Barren Zone in the Pre-contact Period	11
iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Pre-contact Period	12
iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Pre-contact Period	13
B. Early Historic Period	13
i. The Coastal Zone in the Early Historic Period	14
ii. The Barren Zone in the Early Historic Period	15
iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Early Historic Period	15
iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Early Historic Period	15
C. Mid-1800s (Land Commission Claims / Awards)	16
i. The Coastal Zone in the Mid 1800s Period	17
ii. The Barren Zone in the Mid 1800s Period	17
iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Mid 1800s Period	21
iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Mid 1800s Period	25
D. Late 1800s Period	26
i. The Coastal Zone in the Late 1800s Period	26
ii. The Barren Zone in the Late 1800s Period	27
iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Late 1800s Period	27
iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Late 1800s Period	27
E. Early 1900s To The Present	27
i. The Coastal Zone in the Twentieth Century Period	27
ii. The Barren Zone in the Twentieth Century Period	28
iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Twentieth Century Period	30
iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Twentieth Century Period	30
IV. SUMMARY AND PREDICTIVE MODEL	31
V. PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH	32

VI. SURVEY METHODOLOGY	45
VII. SITE DESCRIPTIONS	51
50-50-10-3727	51
50-50-10-3728	51
50-50-10-3729	53
50-50-10-3742	53
50-50-10-3743	53
50-50-10-3745	53
50-50-10-4765	54
50-50-10-4773	57
50-50-10-4776	73
50-50-10-4778	75
50-50-10-5029	75
50-50-10-5030	79
50-50-10-5031	79
50-50-10-5032	84
50-50-10-5033	84
50-50-10-5034	87
50-50-10-5035	89
A. Testing Results Section	89
VIII. SURVEY RESULTS	103
Traditional Hawaiian Sites	103
Temporary Habitation	103
Petroglyphs	105
Historic Land Use	105
Military Sites	106
Historic Sugar Cane Agriculture	106
Cattle Walls	107
IX. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HISTORIC PROPERTIES	108
X. RECOMMENDED TREATMENT	108
XI. REFERENCES	109
APPENDIX A: PHOTOGRAPHIC APPENDIX	121

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographical maps of the Pu'u O Kait and Paia quadrangles, displaying corridor.	2
Figure 2	Rain Isohytes (in inches) in the Project Corridor and Kula Region	5
Figure 3	Map of Kula District Showing Relationship of Project Area to Environmental Zones	7
Figure 4	Map of Major Archaeological Sites in Kula District (Adapted from Kolb et al. 1997:29)	10
Figure 5	Map showing the location of <i>Kuleana</i> land claims at Kalepolepo in Relation to the West End of the Project Area	19
Figure 6	1880 Monsarrat & Dodge Map of Kula Upland Settlement Area, RM 913, Annotated to Show <i>Māhele</i> and <i>Kuleana</i> claims	23
Figure 7	Map Showing Areas Impacted by Commercial Agriculture Adjacent to the Project Area	29
Figure 8	Previous archaeology conducted in the Kula Zone of the Kula District	44
Figure 9	Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographical maps of the Pu'u O Kait and Paia quadrangles, showing the corridor and location of historic properties.	50
Figure 10	State site 50-50-10-3727: Series of Mounds, Plan View	62
Figure 11	State site 50-50-10-4765: Plan View	55
Figure 12	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature Location Map	58
Figure 13	State site 50-50-10-4773: Features D, F, G, H, J, and K Plan View	59
Figure 14	State site 50-50-10-4773: Features Q, R, S, V, W, Y, AF, AG, AH and AI, Plan View	60
Figure 15	State site 50-50-10-4773, Features Z, AA, AB, AC, AD, AE, AL, AM and AN, Plan View	61
Figure 16	State site 50-50-10-4773: Features AO, AP and AQ, Plan View	62
Figure 17	State site 50-50-10-4773: Features AR, AS, AT, AU, AV and AW, Plan View	63
Figure 18	State site 50-50-10-4773, Features BW, CC, CD, CE, CF, CG, CH, CI and CJ, Plan View	64
Figure 19	State site 50-50-10-4773: Features CU, Plan View	65
Figure 20	State site 50-50-10-4776: Plan View displaying test unit location	74
Figure 21	State site 50-50-10-4778: Plan View	76
Figure 22	State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs	77
Figure 23	State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs	78
Figure 24	State site 50-50-10-5030: Plan View	80
Figure 25	State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Plan View	81
Figure 26	State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Panel 1	82
Figure 27	State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Panel 2	83
Figure 28	State site 50-50-10-5032: Plan View	85
Figure 29	State site 50-50-10-5033: Plan View displaying test unit location	86
Figure 30	State site 50-50-10-5034: Plan View displaying test unit location	88
Figure 31	State site 50-50-10-5035: Plan View displaying location of test probe	90

Figure 32	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature U, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to north	92
Figure 33	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature AI, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northeast	93
Figure 34	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature AW, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to southwest	94
Figure 35	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CS, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to east	95
Figure 36	State site 50-50-10-4776: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south	97
Figure 37	State site 50-50-10-5032: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south	98
Figure 38	State site 50-50-10-5033: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south	99
Figure 39	State site 50-50-10-5034: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northwest	101
Figure 40	State site 50-50-10-5035: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northwest	102
Figure 41	State site 50-50-10-3727, view to east	122
Figure 42	State site 50-50-10-4765, Feature A, view to south	122
Figure 43	State site 50-50-10-4765, Feature B, view to west	123
Figure 44	State site 50-50-10-4765: Feature C, view to west	123
Figure 45	State site 50-50-10-4765: Feature D, view to west	124
Figure 46	State site 50-50-10-4765: Feature E, view to east	124
Figure 47	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature E, view to north	125
Figure 48	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature L, view to south	125
Figure 49	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature H, view to south	126
Figure 50	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature M, view to south	126
Figure 51	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature N, view to south	127
Figure 52	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature O, view to southeast	127
Figure 53	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature Q, view to southeast	128
Figure 54	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature R, view to east	128
Figure 55	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature T, view to north	129
Figure 56	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature Z, view to south	129
Figure 57	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature BJ, view to south	130
Figure 58	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CB, view to south	130
Figure 59	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CE, view to south	131
Figure 60	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CK, view to south	131
Figure 61	State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CU, view to southwest	132
Figure 62	State site 50-50-10-5033, view to south	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Kuleoua Claims to the Land Commission in Kalepolepo Village and Vicinity	18
Table 2:	Kula Zone Elevations of Kula District (from South to North)	20
Table 3:	Upland Field Zone Elevations of Kuleoua claims in Kula District (from South to North)	24
Table 4:	Elevations of Zones Further Upslope in Kula District	25
Table 5:	Previous Archaeology	32
Table 6:	Archaeological Inventory	47
Table 7:	State Site 50-50-10-4773 Feature List	66
Table 8:	Comparisons of Temporary Habitation Sites	104

I. INTRODUCTION

At the request of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade and Douglas Inc., Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc. conducted an archaeological inventory survey with limited subsurface testing for the proposed Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway on the island of Maui, TMK 2-05-001: por. 001, 002, 003, 009, 2-05-002: por. 001, 002, 005, 015, 016 and 3-09-001: por. 016.

Project Area Description

The proposed highway (Figure 1) extends 9.8 miles (15.8 kilometers) from the Haleakala Highway/Hailimaile Road Intersection, at approximately 850-foot elevation, to the intersection of Ka'ono'ulu Street and Pi'ilani Highway at approximately the 40-foot elevation. The study corridor is 300 ft (91.5 m) wide, 150 ft on either side of a staked centerline corridor chosen based on previous research (Folk *et al.* 1997) and encompasses approximately 360 acres. The proposed highway, which is on the western slopes of Haleakala, extends from Kailua *Ahiupua'a* in the northeast through Keshua, Kaliainui, Oma'opio, Palehu nui, Waiakoa *Ahiupua'a*, to Ka'ono'ulu *Ahiupua'a* to the southeast. The route is divided into three segments, Segments A, D and E. The segment designations are carried over from the reconnaissance survey of the area in which six different segments were analyzed.

1. Segment A is approximately 20,800 ft long. It begins at Haleakala Highway at the intersection Hailimaile Road, at 850 ft. amsl and then proceeds south through cultivated fields of sugarcane, crosses Kaliainui gulch, to Oma'opio Road. Segment A then continues south from Oma'opio Road across old cane lands that have been converted to pasture. It then crosses Palehu gulch to end at Palehu Road at approximately 1000 feet above sea level. Segment A crosses TMK 2-5-01:02, and :09 in addition to TMK 2-5-02:01, 02, 04, and 05. Segment A is owned by Alexander and Balawin, Inc.
2. Segment D is approximately 10,000 ft long. It begins at Palehu Road and extends southwest across active pineapple fields and pastureland to its end at Waiakoa Gulch at approximately 810 ft amsl. Segment D crosses TMK 2-5-01:03 which is owned by Haleakala Ranch Company and leased by Maui Land & Pineapple Company, Inc.
3. Segment E is approximately 20,600 ft long and extends in a westerly direction to the end of the corridor at the intersection of Pi'ilani Highway at Ka'ono'ulu Street at the approximate elevation of 40 ft amsl. The segment traverses gently sloping pastureland. Segment E crosses TMK 2-2-02:016 owned by Haleakala Ranch and TMK 2-2-02:15 and 3-9-01:016 owned by Kaonoulu Ranch.




Figure 1
Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographical maps of the Pu'u O Kuli and Paha quadrangles, displaying corridor.

The following Scope of Work is based on Title 13, subtitle 13, Chapter 276: Rules Governing Standards for Archaeological Inventory Survey and Report, was utilized for the present project:

1. A complete ground survey of the entire project area for the purpose of site inventory. All sites were located, described, and mapped with evaluation of function, interrelationships, and significance. Documentation included photographs and scale drawings of selected sites and complexes. All sites will be assigned State site numbers.
2. Limited subsurface testing to determine location, boundaries, depth and quantity of cultural materials within archaeological sites and to obtain datable samples for chronological information for sites in the immediate area, if such data is not available from previous studies.
3. Research on historic and archaeological background, included a search of historic maps, written records, Land Commission awards, and Native Testimony. Research focused on the specific area with general background on the *ahupua'a* and district and will emphasize settlement patterns.
4. Preparation of a survey report which includes the following:
 - a. A topographic map of the survey area showing all archaeological sites and site areas;
 - b. Description of all archaeological sites with selected photographs, scale drawings, and discussions of function;
 - c. Historical and archaeological background sections summarizing prehistoric and historic land use as they relate to the archaeological features;
 - d. A summary of site categories and their significance in an archaeological and historic context;
 - e. Recommendations based on all information generated which will specify what steps should be taken to mitigate impact of development on archaeological resources, such as data recovery (excavation) and preservation of specific areas. Recommendations will be developed in consultation with the landowner and State and County agencies.

II. NATURAL HISTORY

Geology

The project corridor traverses approximately 15.8 kilometers of the slightly dissected uplands in the traditional district of Kula on the western slope of Haleakala Volcano, Island of Maui. Haleakala is a shield volcano composed of pahoehoe and 'a'a flows and associated pyroclastic materials.

Terrain in the project area is associated with the Kula Volcanic Series of the Pleistocene epoch (Macdonald *et al.* 1983). Lavas of the Kula Series consist mostly of 'a'a eruptions were explosive to the extent that many large cinder cones were formed and beds of ash are common. These cones are present mostly on the summit and northern slopes of the mountain but also occur on the western slope. One such cone, Pu'u Kahala, lies approximately one kilometer south of the central portion of the project area.

Soils of the Keahua soil series (including Keahua silty clay, Keahua cobbly silty clay, and Keahua very stony silty clay loam) dominate the north half of the project corridor north of Kolalea Gulch. Soils of the Waiakoa soil series (including Waiakoa very stony silty clay loam and Waiakoa extremely stony clay loam) dominate the area south of Kolalea Gulch. All of these soils are well drained and developed in material weathered from basic igneous rock (Foote *et al.*) though the Waiakoa series differs in being influenced by volcanic ash.

Geography

The western slopes of Haleakala are cut off from the northeast, tradewind pattern and typically receive scant rain owing to this rain shadow effect (Figure 2). The southern half of the project area receives approximately 400 mm. (15 inches) of rainfall annually with the northern end of the project area receiving approximately 800 mm (30 inches) (Giambelluca *et al.* 1986:112). Mean monthly rainfall records show the heaviest rainfall to occur between November and March, ranging from 50-100 mm. (from approximately 300 ft. to 2000 ft. amsl), with the months of April to October averaging between 5-25 mm. During the driest month, June, the area receives 5-10 mm. (Giambelluca *et al.* 1986:113-124). There are no perennial streams in Kula district but flash floods of considerable volume periodically inundate the lowlands.

Typically, Kihui is sunny and dry with an average temperature of 77°F with occasional variations ranging from the low 60s to the high 80s.

Vegetation consists predominantly of *kiawe* and lowland shrubs and grasses, including *koa haole*, finger grass, *pili* grass, *lantana*, *kula*, *panini*, *itima*, and Natal redtop grass. Wildlife consists mostly of upland game birds (Foote *et al.*:6).

Environmental Zones

Based on archaeological and ethnographic studies in the Kula District three land use zones consisting of 1) coastal, 2) barren or transitional, and 3) inland have been postulated (Cordy 1977:3-6).

The coastal zone has been characterized as a quarter mile (400 m) wide band paralleling the shore. The coastal zone is defined as the flat area near the sea with brackish marshlands at the mouth of gulches (behind the coastal dunes) and with associated raised dry areas. Cordy (2000:1) notes that this was a narrow zone along the shore with permanent habitations, *heiau*, some fishponds, fishing shrines and burials. Twelve of the seventeen *ahupua'a* of Kula District (not including the subdivisions, i.e. *oma opio* 1-10) appear to have never extended to the coast and had no coastal zone. Seven of the nine *ahupua'a* traversed by the project area (Kailua, Keshua, Mka'eha, 'A'apueo, Kalalinui, Oma'opio and Pūlehunui) have no coastal zone as they are cut off to the west (*makai*) by Wailuku District.

The intermediate or barren zone (Cordy 1977 prefers the latter designation as having greater meaning for social patterning) is the dry area of slopes back of the coast with less than 30 inches of annual rainfall. This zone of broad stoney grass land with gulches is about 16 kilometers (10 miles) wide in the southernmost *ahupua'a* of Kula District, and narrows down to 4 kilometers (2½ miles) wide in the north at Kailua. Cordy (2000:1-2) notes that this zone seemed to mainly have had trails and associated shelters leading to the uplands, but with some small dryland fields and associated field shelters near the shore. This zone is suggested (Cordy 2000:2) to have a very low density of sites. The entire present project area lies within this barren zone.

The inland or upland field zone is stipulated to begin 8-11 kilometers (5-7 miles) inland and "essentially is characterized by lush vegetation and the occurrence of agricultural fields." (Cordy 1977:3) The down-slope edge of the inland zone is suggested (Cordy 1977:5) to approximate the 30-inch rainfall isohyte which lies close to the alignment of Haleakala Highway and Kula Highway (see Figure 2). This is suggested to be the approximate lower limit for large scale aboriginal agriculture. Cordy (2000:2) notes that this zone had continuous dryland fields, permanent houses, some burials, *heiau* of small-moderate size, and petroglyphs in many gulches. Cordy notes that a major trail passed through these fields just seaward of today's Kula Highway and that this is a high density site zone.

Cordy (2000:2) posits the existence of two additional zones further up slope: a forest zone and a zone above the tree-line. He notes that the historic site patterns of the forest zone are poorly known but that site density is expected to be low. The above the tree-line zone is associated with quarries, trails and shelters. The approximate boundaries of these environmental zones are shown on Figure 3.




Figure 2 Rain Isohyets (in inches) in the Project Corridor and Kula Region

III. HISTORIC BACKGROUND

The project area lies entirely in the intermediate or barren zone, referred to by Hawaiians as the "kula or dryland plain zone", located between the narrow coastal zone and the "inland zone" which begins at approximately 2000 ft. amsl (Cordy 1977:4). Although the field work for this project developed no data pertinent to any other zones this historic background review seeks to develop data pertinent to other zones of Kula District to provide the basis for a settlement pattern model discussion and indicate the types of anticipated finds in the present project area.

A. Pre-Contact Period

Our knowledge of patterns of settlement in the pre-contact period comes from mythological and traditional accounts, archaeological studies, early explorer accounts and inferences drawn from patterns in the early historic period.

i. The Coastal Zone in the Pre-Contact Period

Traditional accounts related to the upland district of Kula emphasize the lack of familiarity of the kula people with the sea. Perhaps most famous is the saying:

"Kula unahi pikapika he'e."
 "Kula people, scalers of the suckers on the tentacles of the octopus"
 (Pukui 1983:#1911)

This proverb was said in fun of the people of Kula, Maui. The tradition is that a Kula chiefess who lived inland did not know what the suckers on an octopus were and tried to scale them as one scales fish. That an adult Hawaiian would not be familiar with octopus would indeed be remarkable and the account suggests the remarkably terrestrial focus of the pre-contact Hawaiians of Kula District, Maui. Two other traditional sayings similarly deride the lack of maritime acumen of the Kula people.


"No Kula ia po'e he hoc hewa nei."
 "To Kula belong the people who are such poor paddlers."
 (Pukui 1983:#2339)

and

"O Kula i ka hoc hewa."
 "Kula of the ignorant canoe-paddlers."
 (Pukui 1983:#2473)

Pukui offers an explanation: "Said of Kula, Maui, whose people did not know how to paddle canoes because they were uplanders." The Kula people were proverbial as uplanders.

The historical settlement survey by Kolb et al. (1997:29) discusses the distribution of notable archaeological sites (fish ponds and heiau) based on Winslow Walker's 1931 survey augmented by Kolb's 1991 research (Figure 4). The only "notable" sites discussed



that initial permanent settlement of coastal Kula may have begun during A.D. 1200s-1400s and that "the presence of settlement both on the shore and in the uplands seems to mark the establishment of a dual settlement pattern (shore and uplands) from the very start of permanent occupation in Kula" (Kolb *et al.* 1997:281). The dating for the initial permanent settlement of coastal Kula appears to be a geographic extrapolation from two early dates from coastal sites in Honua'ula District (Kolb *et al.* 1997:189).

The few available radiocarbon dates from the general vicinity of the current project area are consistent in their rather broad, later prehistoric age determinations, most commonly post 1500 A.D. (Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1995b; Fredericksen 1994; Fredericksen *et al.* 1993). This fits with the model that the more intensive use of the Kihai shoreline was a later prehistoric development that corresponded with the expansion of upland permanent habitation, ceremonial constructions, and agricultural clearing after 1400-1500 A.D. (Kolb *et al.* 1997:281-282). The fishponds are traditionally thought to date to the late 1600s (Kolb *et al.* 1997:66).

The presence of three additional fishponds (Waiohuli kai, Keokea kai and an unnamed pond) in the two kilometer long stretch south of Kalepolepo Fishpond testify to pre-contact activities along the Kula coast.

Even with the record of development and the potential for destruction of the archaeological record, it still seems inescapable that few areas in the Hawaiian Islands abutting sandy beaches have less in the way of Hawaiian cultural deposits than coastal Kula District. For example, as far as we can determine, the only account of any burials in coastal Kula (Waiahoia, Ka'ono'ulu, Waiohuli, Keokea or Kama'ole *Ahiupua'a*) is Neller (1982a)'s account of burials reported (but not seen) at Kalama Beach Park. This general lack of burial accounts is supportive of the general conclusion that habitation (and associated burial activities) in Kula district were overwhelmingly focused on the inland zone.

The general absence of coastal habitation was noted by George Vancouver while lying off the east side of Ma'alaea Bay in 1793 when he recorded: "A few habitations were promiscuously scattered near the water side."

ii. The Barren Zone in the Pre-contact Period

Most of the Kula District fits into the Hawaiian land category of "kula" defined as (1974:123) indicate the District name was derived from the land category.

According to Corty this *kula* or "barren" zone was probably most utilized in the late pre-contact era as a route between the inhabited coastal and inland areas with corresponding intermittent habitation (Corty 1977:12). Inventory surveys of portions of this intermediate zone have found remnants of dispersed, low-intensity, dryland agricultural features, such as mounds and alignments, as well as temporary habitations (Chaffee *et al.* 1997; Donham 1990; Miura 1982). Site densities are typically quite low within this barren zone with many studies of large parcels (Kennedy 1986c; Watanabe 1987; Hammatt and Shideler 2000b; Kikiloi *et al.* 2000) identifying no pre-contact sites at all.

The general absence of human endeavor on the vast barren zone slope was noted by George Vancouver while lying off the east side of Ma'alaea Bay in 1793 when he recorded: "The appearance of this little appearance was scarcely less forbidding than of its southern parts, ...yet the soil had little appearance of fertility and no cultivation was to be seen...the inhabitants who came off to us, like those seen the day before, had little to dispose of."

iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Pre-contact Period

As the map of notable pre-contact archaeological sites (*heiau* and fishponds) of Kula District (Figure 4) clearly shows, these sites were overwhelmingly located between the 2000-foot and 4000-foot elevation contours. If, as seems likely, there is a rough correlation between *heiau* density and habitation density then "almost all settlement was concentrated there as well" (Kolb *et al.* 1997:28). The location of notable archaeological sites runs remarkably closely to the 30-inch isohyete (Figure 2) running along approximately the 3000-foot elevation in the southern half of Kula District (as far north as Puiehu Iki *Ahiupua'a*) and then dropping down to lower elevations further to the north. The distribution of notable archaeological sites would seem to suggest that prehistoric occupation in Kula was quite dispersed across this inland or upland field zone with perhaps slightly lower population densities in the northernmost *ahupua'a* (Kaupakalua, 'A'apueo, Maka'eha and Hōkū'ula *ahupua'a* appear to have only one *heiau* amongst them).

The settlement survey by Kolb *et al.* (1997: 281ff) concludes that prior to circa A.D. 1200 human activity in this zone was limited to intermittent exploitation of forest resources (particularly of birds). Settlement and farming are understood as beginning circa A.D. 1200-1400 and "the first large scale period of up-country permanent settlement occurred in the 1400s-1500s." Forest-clearing was increasing during this period as the dryland field systems expanded. The settlement survey concludes that:

In the A.D. 1600s, even more permanent habitations appear in the archaeological record along with more medium sized *heiau* and the larger garden enclosures. Grasslands with shrubs begin to dominate the area under agriculture, showing the expansion of lands under farming...no evidence of population decline or stabilization appears. (Kolb *et al.* 1997: 282)

Some traditional Hawaiian sayings probably dating to this late pre-contact period note environmental characteristics of Kula. The multiple references to smoke probably indicates the practice of burning the land before planting new sweet potato patches.

"*Mo'e kōkolo ka uahi o Kula, he Hau.*
The smoke of Kula traveled low and swift, borne by the Hau wind.
(Pukui. 1983:#2170)

"*Kōkolo ka uahi o Kula, he Kāhau.*
The smoke of Kula creeps along when the Kāhau breeze blows.
(Pukui. 1983:#1824)

Another saying, relating a story of a man from Kula and a woman from Ke'anae, emphasizes the sense of identity of the man with the agriculture/sweet potato production of Kula.

"O ka wai kau no ia o Ke'anae; o ka 'ūlei ho'owai i uuala ia o Kula."

"It is the pool on the height of Ke'anae; it is the 'ūlei digging stick for the potato [patch] of Kula."

(Pukui, 1983:#2447)

Kula was traditionally famous for its *uala* (sweet potato) "plantations" (Handy 1940:161; Handy and Handy 1972:131,276, 611; Kolb 1997: 26). The combination of good soil developed in volcanic ash, cool temperatures and frequent clouds to lower evapotranspiration and bring moisture as fog drip, and rainfall distributed fairly evenly throughout the year would also have allowed for taro cultivation.

Archaeological studies in this upland field zone (Riford 1987, Brown 1989, Moore and Kennedy 1996) indicate high site densities, and by logical extension high pre-contact population densities. In her study of Ōma'opio, Donham (1992:4) discusses the presence of *hetau* and the subsequent inference that a large permanent population must have been present, as well.

iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Pre-contact Period

Relatively little archaeological research has been undertaken on the Kula slope above 4,000-foot elevation. Work at higher elevations (P. Rosendahl 1975, M. Rosendahl 1978, Masterson *et al.* 1995) have identified primarily cave shelters, wall shelters, and cairns. One of the main routes of access to Haleakalā Crater ascended through the *ahupua'a* of Palēhu nui and Kaliaiinu of Kula District with a rest house located just north of Pu'u Kūlohana (Sterling 1998:269). Kaliaiinu *Ahupua'a* extends into the crater. A number of burial places and *hetau* were associated with the summit region (Sterling 1998:264 ff).

The pre-contact utilization of one higher elevation resource, *māmāne* wood, is suggested in one proverbial saying about the Kula people. *Māmāne* was used for making the wooden digging sticks, the most important tool of potato farmers (Malo 1996:154).

"Na keiki uneune māmāne o Kula."

The kids of Kula, who tug and pull the māmāne up by the roots.

(Pukui, 1983:#2238)

B. Early Historic Period

For elaboration on the subjects of whaling, the Irish potato industry, the Chinese presence in Kula, ranching, and sugar cultivation the reader is referred to Helen Wong Smith's research as presented in Brown and Haun (1989:Appendix C). A general overview of these subjects is provided in the following sections along with supplemental information not covered by Wong Smith.

i. The Coastal Zone in the Early Historic Period

In 1820, the whaling industry arrived and although the whaling centered around Lahaina, Clark (1980:47) notes that "From the 1840s to the 1860s a small whaling station was maintained at Kalepolepo [Kihai]." This station both serviced the international Pacific whaling fleets and supported a local "bay whaling" industry that lasted at least as late as the 1860s. Shore parties would go off in small boats to take humpback and sperm whales. The Hawaiian Kingdom licensed the Mā'āheua fishery at least as early as 1847 (Jones 1938:20). The fisheries expert Cobb (1902:13) relates that "According to several of the old inhabitants of Waifuku the natives used to kill whales in the bay quite often in the 'forties'."

Around 1849 John Halstead built The Kon House at Kalepolepo in Kihai. The building, part store and part residence, thrived on the whaling industry and the resultant potato industry. The store also served as a gathering place for the whaling sailors. David Malo created a balance for this boisterous crowd by constructing a church at Kalepolepo sometime after 1843. During the Gold Rush years, the store became "an emporium for Irish potatoes."

Kuykendall (1938:313) notes that in the period from 1830 to 1854:

The commercial development during this period, by magnifying the importance of a few ports, gave momentum and direction to a towardward drift of population; the population of the kingdom as a whole was steadily going down, but the population of Honolulu, Lahaina and Hilo was growing.

We believe that Kuykendall's observation was most likely the demographic pattern at the Kalepolepo entrepot as well. The development of Kalepolepo as an entrepot and a focus of Christian life in the 1840s and 1850s most likely increased the population in the immediate vicinity above the pre-contact population figures, contrary to the island-wide trend of depopulation. That the population and a real extent of the Kalepolepo community reached its zenith during the mid 1800s appears to be supported by the settlement study by Kolb *et al.* (1997:68):

The ancient village of Kalepolepo was relatively small, and was built around an economy primarily based upon the exploitation of ocean resources--primarily the excellent fishing grounds as well as three large fishponds. However, as the number of visiting ships increased, Kalepolepo soon became an important provisioning area. By 1850 we know that the economic opportunities were attracting a number of European entrepreneurs.

This study (Kolb *et al.* 1997:69) goes on to discuss how Kalepolepo, with Captain John Halstead's Kon House establishment, "became the hub of activity for all of Kula". Based on the available evidence it appears most likely that the settlement of Kalepolepo was greatest c. 1850.

ii. The Barren Zone in the Early Historic Period

Developments in the barren zone during the early historic period remain largely undocumented. Presumably the Kalepolepo Trail, which ran up the middle of Waiohuli *Ahupua'a*, would have been more heavily utilized and perhaps somewhat developed to provide the major artery between the upland field zone and the Kalepolepo entreat. Another major development was the establishing of ranching in the Kula region prior to the 1840s (Brown and Haun 1989:C-6). While the locus of early ranching endeavors is not well documented, the Kula grass lands would have been a natural focus. Cordy (in Fredericksen, et al. 1994:3) notes that the majority of *Kama'ole Ahupua'a* at that time, as noted in Māhele awards, was government cattle range.

iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Early Historic Period

The whaling industry mainly effected the Kula/Khei area with its agricultural demands. The introduction of whaling to the Maui community brought with it an increased demand (from the sailors) for the potato. As a result, after 1830 dryland agriculture in the upland field zone of Kula District expanded to include the Irish potato. The California Gold Rush of 1849 intensified this demand as a California-Hawai'i potato trade began to flourish. Kula became the area of highest potato production and came to be known as "the potato district" (the area between 2000 and 5000 ft. AMSL).

Jarvis (in Kuykendall 1980:313) describes the Kula area in July 1846 in the midst of the cash cropping boon of Irish potatoes there.

"It ranges along the mountain (Haleakala) between 2000 and 5000 feet elevation, for the distance of 12 miles. The forest is but partially cleared, and the seed put into the rich virgin soil."

Potato production thrived in Kula from 1830-1850 until successful potato cultivation and production in California and Oregon resulted in a decline in the Hawai'i trade (Burgett and Spear 1995:6-7). Donham (1992:6) notes that the inundation of land clearing and cultivation associated with the Gold Rush resulted in "deforestation (which) adversely affected the amount of rainfall in the district, and periods of drought became more common." Substantial forest clearing for commercial agriculture, especially potatoes and sugar cultivation, does not appear to have occurred until the mid-1800s.

While it lasted, the increase in agricultural production associated with the potato industry encouraged many Hawaiians to venture into cash-cropping (Speakman 1984:116) and attracted Chinese immigrants to Kula in the 1840s. During the subsequent 30 to 40 years the Chinese created a thriving community (Burgett and Spear 1995:7).

Sugar cultivation was present prior to 1846, with six sugar producers operating on the slopes of Haleakala (Wong-Smith in Brown and Haun 1989:C-7). In or by the 1840s plantation camps, such as at Kēhua, grew up, with small communities with churches, stores and homes (all which have since disappeared).

iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Early Historic Period

We really have no data on this subject. It seems not unlikely that the introduction of temperate cultigens ("Irish" potatoes and wheat) encouraged cultivation at higher elevations but this would really have been an inland extension of the traditional upland field zone.

C. Mid-1800s (Land Commission Claims / Awards)

According to Kame'eiehiwa (1992:52) Kekau'ōnohi had the District of Kula before the *Māhele*. In the Māhele land division of 1848 the "Crown" (Kauikēnouli Kamehameha III) kept certain lands including *Kōkeā Ahupua'a* and the 'i'i of Keauhou 1 & 2. The Kingdom retained as "Government lands" 'A'apueo 3, Hoku'ula *Ahupua'a*, *Kama'ole Ahupua'a*, Kamehame 1 & 2, 'Ōma'opio 6-11, Pālehu, and Waiokeā *Ahupua'a*. No particular pattern is suggested in these Crown and Government claims.

Certain 'Aii'i received very large parcels of Kula district lands. The high chiefs, Ane Keohokālole (also known as Keohokālole wahine, she was the great granddaughter of Keawahelulu and Kame'eiamoku, two of Kamehameha's four Kona "Uncles"), claims and gets the *ahupua'a* of 'A'apueo, Alae 3, Kamehame, Kealahou 3 & 4, Kōkeo, and Kukuinēa. The *Kaukau Aii'i*, Hapākūka Hewahewa, claimed and was awarded the entire *ahupua'a* of Ka'ono'ū, as 1 'apuea of 6,715 Acs (LCA 3937). The little known "Aii'" received Ōma'opio 1-4. Another important personage of the time Ka'awa'i, the land commissioner of Maui, received Alae 3 without a claim and three 'apuea in Waiakeo.

Seemingly a relatively large number of 'aii'i claimed Kula district lands but had their claims denied. Keohokālole wahine claimed but didn't receive Ōma'opio 5. *Kaukau Aii'i*; Nāmanu'a claims but doesn't get Waiohuli. Hewahewa claims but doesn't get Kōkeo. The *konohiki*, Kealoa, claims but gets neither *Kama'ole* or Kōkeo. Kālama, claims but doesn't get *Kama'ole*, Kōkeo and Waiohuli lands. Kā'aha claims but doesn't get Kōkeo or Waiohuli. Nāhaina claims Kama'ole and Kōkeo but gets neither. Kamaika'ala's claim is for the entire *ahupua'a* of Kaliainui. Kaawai is not awarded his claims in Ōma'opio and Kaliainui. Of the 'aii'i, only three, Kealoa, Kaaha and Hewahewa, claim house lots.

Of greater interest in reconstructing patterns of land use are the commoner *kūleana* claims. In the records of the Land Commission (1847-1851) there were 203 claims made for the District of Kula on Maui, and almost half of these are for parcels in more than one *ahupua'a*. The number of parcels claimed by each claimant range between one and 14. Claimants range from the 'aii'i to local residents and included in this range are many claimants from outside the Kula District, who are raising potato crops or have ranching pastures. An article in the Polynesian newspaper for November 24, 1849 noted: "Kula, however, is full of people. Strangers from Wailuku, Hamakua, and Lahaina are there preparing the ground and planting."

Table 1: Kuleana Claims to the Land Commission in Kalepolepo Village and Vicinity

Ahupua'a	Ali/Ahupua'a Award	Land Use	Claimant	Claim #	Acres/mot awarded (na)	TMK located, Other comments
Kaseoulu	Kupahala	fr. potato malaka	Mahiana	2764	na	
Kaseoulu	Kapuhawai, aw Kupahala, aw	1 potato patch potato patch & land house lot	Kuhiamani	5225	1 sp. 28 Acs 1 sp. 18 Acs	
Kaseoulu	Kaseoulu, aw	fr. significant [text]	Kaseoulu	5257B	1 sp. 4.5 Acs	
Kaseoulu	Kupahala, aw	kula, 2 mala fr. potatoes	Pupuka	5328	1 sp. 2.04 Acs 1 sp. 5.14 Acs	
Kaseoulu	Puukuhikawa, aw	house lot kula	Lana	5376	1 sp. 0.22 Acs 1 sp. 2.17 Acs	
Kaseoulu	Kaseoulu, aw Kalepolepo	small house lot on kura	Mahani	5407	2 sp. 3.491 Acs	
Kaseoulu	Kupahala	3 fr. potatoes	Kapohaku	4120B	1 sp. 2.9 Acs 1 sp. 11.7 Acs	TMK 2-2-03 sp. 4 TMK 2-2-03 sp. 1
Keokea	Waiuku Makahi Mauakilowaa, aw Puuoa, aw Puuoa Kalepolepo, aw [Puukohole, aw]	pasture pasture taro 2 pastures house site food green			1 sp. 25 Ac 1 sp. 3.04 Acs	sp. 3 sp. 27.2 003 acs
Keokea	Kupuni	2 kulas off fr.	Kahukacuppo	5271	na	
Keokea	Kalepolepo, aw Pahike, aw Waiuku, aw (2 sp) Puuoa Puuoa	house site taro taro pasture	Kapekai / Taketai	5279	1 sp. 08 Ac 1 sp. 10.4 Acs 2 sp. 2.75 Acs	TMK 2-2-03 sp. 1, 2 TMK 2-2-04 sp. 1 sp. 11.4 Ac sp. 21.41 Acs TMK 2-2-02 sp. 5.5 L Acs
Keokea	Keokea	fr. potatoes	George Shaw	11032	na	
Waiehu	Keohuanuu Kahimananense	kula kula	Mahelu	6750B	na	

No kuleana land claims lie within any of the ahupua'a traversed by the project area within a distance of approximately one kilometer of the project area. There may have been kuleana claims in Waialuku District within a kilometer of the north end of the project. The closest kuleana land claims in Kula District were those at Kalepolepo Village (Figure 5) discussed below.

i. The Coastal Zone in the Mid 1800s Period

At Kalepolepo in Ka'ono'ou there were numerous kuleana located just southeast of the Kalepolepo fishpond and approximately a kilometer southwest of the west end of the project corridor (Table 1, Figure 5).

There appear to be five awarded kuleana claims at Kalepolepo, three awarded under Ka'ono'ou Ahupua'a (LCAs 4120b, 5228, and 5376) and two awarded under Keokea Ahupua'a (LCAs 5279 and 7791). The rationale for the awards under Keokea Ahupua'a is unclear as the nearest point of this ahupua'a is understood as lying approximately 3.3 kilometers to the south of Kalepolepo Village. Possibly this represents a pattern of migration to commercial centers discussed previously, with people from "rural" Keokea claiming land near the Kalepolepo entreat, but this is by no means certain. It appears that Māhele records (Table 1) report approximately a dozen kuleana at Kalepolepo (the majority unawarded). As is often the case, it is unclear whether all of the parcels (ipona) claimed are in the vicinity of the Kalepolepo settlement or not. Possibly the potato patches, taro lands, and pastures mentioned were all near the settlement. Wilcox (1921:67) describes Kalepolepo of the eighteen-fifties as a place where "Coconut trees and kou trees grew beside pools of clear water, along the banks of which grew the taro and the ape". Some of these claims, however, could have been quite distant.

Hapakaka Hewahewa (the kahui for the Maui lands of Kahaiheimalie - one of Kamehameha's wives) claimed and was awarded the entire ahupua'a of Ka'ono'ou, of 5,715 acres (LCA 3237). He claimed this land from the time of Kamehameha I in 1782 (well before the Kamehameha forces conquered the Island of Maui), through one of Kamehameha's wives who was from Maui. Hewahewa also claims the fish pond at Kalepolepo in another claim. His permanent place of residence was Kalepolepo.

We are unable to identify any kuleana claims awarded anywhere else in coastal Kula District beside Kalepolepo. Māhele records indicate a few (2-4) unawarded kuleana claims at "Lala", which may be the Lala at the coast where Waiehu and Keokea Ahupua'a meet, but this is uncertain.

ii. The Barren Zone in the Mid 1800s Period

That no kuleana land claims are known to lie within any of the ahupua'a traversed by the project area within a distance of approximately one kilometer of the project area attests to just how barren the barren zone was in the mid 1800s.




Figure 5 Map showing the location of kuleana land claims at Kalepolepo in Relation to the West End of the Project Area

It is certainly possible that some of the "pasture land" claims lay in the barren zone. Pasture lands are claimed 36 times throughout the District, but it is possible some might have been more generic kula or grassland claims, translated into pasture in English. Eight of these claims were in Pūlehu, one in Pūlehuiki, and five in Waiakoa. Except for Ali's pastures (LCA 281B), at circa 2,600-foot to 3,000-foot elevation in Oma'opio, most of these pasture claims were not awarded and their location in terms of zone is uncertain. The location of the Ali pasture suggests that many or all of the "kula" or "pasture land" claims were in fact in the upland field zone.

The kuleana land claims in the upland field zone allow for an estimate of the width of the kula zone in the various Ahupua'a of Kula District. The kula zone lies between the following approximate elevations at the time of the Māhete and kuleana claims (Table 2).

Table 2: Kula Zone Elevations of Kula District (from South to North)

Ahupua'a	Approx. Elevation (in Feet)	Approx. Distance from Coast to top of Kula Zone (Km)	Comments
Kama'ole	40' to 2,400'	8.1	-
Kōkeke	40' to 2600'	11.0	-
Waiohuli	40' to 2800'	12.0	-
Kōheo	40' to 3000'	13.4	Ahupua'a does not quite reach the coast
Ka'ono'ula	40' to 2900'	13.7	-
Alae	1000' to 3200'	15	Seaward end of Ahupua'a is at approx. 1000' elevation
Waiakoa	40' to 2700'	14	-
Kamehame-nui	1800' to 2400'	16	Seaward end of Ahupua'a is at approx. 1800' elevation
Pūlehu iki	2400'	17	Seaward end of Ahupua'a is at approx. 1800' elevation
Pūlehu nui	450' to 2400' elevation	17	No coastal zone, cut off by Wailuku District
Oma'opio	450' to 2000'	16	No coastal zone, cut off by Wailuku District

Ahupua'a	Approx. Elevation (in Feet)	Approx. Distance from Coast to top of Kula Zone (Km)	Comments
Kaliainui	450' to 2300	16	No coastal zone, cut off by Waialuku District
'A'apuae	450' to 2200	16	No coastal zone, cut off by Waialuku District
Maka'eahu	450' - ?	17	No coastal zone, cut off by Waialuku District, no data is available on the upland field zone
Keahua	450' to 1075'	-	Cut off by Waialuku District seaward and Kaliainui landward; lies entirely in <i>kula</i>
Kailua	450' to 1075'	-	Cut off by Waialuku District seaward and Kaliainui landward; lies entirely in <i>kula</i>
Hokua'ula	450' to ?	-	No coastal zone, cut off by Waialuku District, no data is available on the upland field zone

About the same time as the *Māhele* (late 1840s-early 1850s) land grants show foreigners coming into the District to establish ranches and plantations for sugar cane in this *kula* zone.

iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Mid 1800s Period

"*Wao-karaka*" is used by Malo to describe that area below the various forest and mountain ones: "Here grows the *amau* fern and here men cultivate the land" (Malu 1976:17). It is this band of *wao-karaka* that is most particularly detailed in the land claims.

In the Kula area, unlike most other areas of the islands in general, claimants did not confine their claims to one *ahupua'a* or even one district. A large number of claimants request *āpana* in two, three, or more *ahupua'a* and the same claimant may also register several different claim numbers. We find "migrant farmers" who come from elsewhere on Maui (i.e. Leihana or Waikapu or Waialuku) who either come occasionally to work in their fields, or are absentee landlords having others raise various crops (in particular Irish potatoes) for them. The booming victualing trade for whalers and the Californian gold fields may have significantly changed residential and agricultural patterns by the mid 1850s from what they had been in pre-contact times.

By the time of the *Māhele*, the major locus of settlement and food production was along the Government Main and the Old Kula roads. The vast majority of *kula* land claims (c. 1847-1853) in the Kula District are situated along the old Kula Road between 1200-foot elevation (in the north) and 3,800-foot elevation in the southern part of the district within a zone where there is sufficient natural rain and where it is cool enough for tuber crops. Of the land claims for the entire Kula District, by far, the greatest number are for plots of potatoes, both sweet and Irish (494 plots claimed). There are also claims for banana patches particularly in Waiohū and Kēōken *āhupua'a* at around the 3,000-foot elevation. Sugarcane is mentioned in one claim in Oma'opio at about 2,600-foot elevation. There are only two claims for pig pens in the district and one is in Pūlehuiki about 3,200-foot elevation. There are three mentions of *waʻuke*, one (unawarded) in Kaliainui, and two in Oma'opio at about 3,000-foot elevation, with one of these latter being a *waʻuke* stream. Claims of "*kula*" lands in this upland zone included pastures while other "*kula*" lands in this upland field zone were used for dryland crops, such as bananas, some dryland taro, with occasional sugar cane patches, and grass lands. A few pig pens are also mentioned. In the southern area of Kōkeā, there were the claims for taro lands.

In the Kula District *kula* claims there is special kind of claim that is claimed no where else in the islands, "*ho'oi'o*" or "winter *kula*". While the concept of "*ho'oi'o*" claims is not entirely clear it appears likely that these were typically lands which could be cropped in the wetter winter months but which did not support agriculture during the drier summer months. Twenty "winter *kula*" are claimed in Kula Maui: one in Kaliainui, two in Kamehame, three in Kealahou, three in Oma'opio, three in Pūlehuiki and eight in Ka'ono'u. While many of these are unawarded claims and cannot be located on today's maps, many of the *ho'oi'o* claims that can be located appear to typically be on the downslope edge of the upland field zone, just seaward of present-day Kula highway. One claim (10180) specifies that this winter *kula* is "*maka'i*" but how far "seaward" this claim lay is unclear. Only two winter *kula* claims mention the types of crops grown there and these two specify Irish potatoes. Three of the claims for winter *kula* (Kaliainui, Kamehame I and II - at about 2,400-foot elevation) are, however, associated with a bog (*noele*) which calls into question the conception that these were exclusively rainy season plots.

Another unusual term, used in Kula District and a few other places on Maui, is "*moku mau'u*" (which the Archive's translator believed might be small pockets of plantings, probably of sweet potatoes) found throughout the upland field zone.

The Kula map drawn by Monsarrat and Dodge (1872-1879; Registered Map No. 913) (Figure 6) shows only some of the awarded claims, and some differ from numbers those shown on the TMIs. What is evident on the Monsarrat and Dodge map is that some of the names of Land Commission claimants appear rather with grant numbers. Helen Wong-Smith (in Donham 1990:B-4) notes that prior to the *Māhele*, land in Makawao was offered for sale, fee-simple, to native Hawaiians. These parcels (numbering close to 100) ranged from 5 to 10 acres and were purchased for \$1.00 an acre, and may explain why many *kula* are not shown on maps as the owners had already opted for grant status. Land Grants were also purchased by Hawaiians and appear to consolidate scattered holdings, and occur particularly in the upland cultivating area (See McGarty and Spear 2000).




Figure 6 1880 Monsarrat & Dodge Map of Kula Upland Settlement Area, RM 913, Annotated to Show *Māhela* and *Kūleana* claims

Table 3: Upland Field Zone Elevations of *Kūleana* claims in Kula District (from South to North)

Alupua'a	Approx. Elevation (in Feet)	Comments
Kama'ole	2,400' - 3800'	38 claims with potato fields, 13 with houses, 4 with taro and 1 with bananas
Kākaea	2600' - 3200'	29 claims with potato fields, 14 with houses, 24 with taro and 4 with bananas
Waiahuli	2600' - 3300	35 claims with potato fields, 23 with houses, 9 with taro and 12 with bananas
Kōheo	3000'	5 claims with potato fields, 1 with taro
Ka'ono'ulu	2900'	20 claims with potato fields, 1 with taro
Alae	3200'	1 claim with potato fields, 1 with a house
Waiaka	2600' - 3800'	6 claims with potato fields, 1 with a house
Kealahou	2600 - 3000'	3 claims with potato fields
Kamehame	2,400' - 3,400'	2 claims with potato fields
Pūlehu	2,400' - 3,400'	7 claims with potato fields
Ōma'opio	2000' - 3800'	5 claims with potato fields, 2 with houses
Kaliainui	2300	7 claims with potato fields, 2 with houses, 1 with taro and 1 with bananas
'A'apueo	2200	2 claims with potato fields, 1 with a house
Maka'ehu	n.d.	No claims?
Keāhua	nd.	No claims?
Koilon	n.d.	No claims?
Hōka'ula	n.d.	No claims?

The settlement pattern in the upland field zone indicated on the Monsarrat and Dodge map (Figure 6) and on Table 3 shows that this habitation/agricultural zone follows a relatively uniform contour as far as it can be documented. From Kama'ole in the south to Kaliainui in the north this zone typically begins on the downslope side between 2300 to 2600-foot elevation close to the 30° rain isohyte. There is really very little evidence for this zone further north but it appears to be descending in elevation - presumably following the same rain isohyte (see Figure 2). The Monsarrat and Dodge map (Figure 6) and Table 3, however, also show that this "zone" should not be construed as a uniform band of

habitation and agricultural activity across slope. The upland field zone of three *ahupua'a* (Kama'ole, Ke'okea and Waiohuli) account for 60 house claims and 102 potato fields while the fourteen northern *ahupua'a* (Kohico - Hōkū'ula) collectively account for only seven house claims and fifty-seven potato field claims. This may in part reflect a random bias of the data, as there was clearly a good deal of activity in the upland field zone of Waiahoa *Ahupua'a* (Figure 6) despite the few houses and potato fields specifically claimed there. It still appears, however, that the upland zone of the southern portion of Kula District supported a much higher density of habitation and agriculture than did the northern lands.

iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Mid 1800s Period

Traditional activities in zones further upslope probably decreased in the mid 1800s as a result of Hawaiian population decline. Cattle and goats probably made incursions in upper forests which had never been subjected to swidden agriculture resulting in the increased erosion noted below. The approximate limits of the "zones further upslope can be estimated by locating the upslope limit of *kuleana* claims and noting the upslope extent of the *ahupua'a* of Kula District (Table 4).

Table 4: Elevations of Zones Further Upslope in Kula District

Ahupua'a	Approx. Elevation (in Feet)	Comments
Kama'ole	3800'-7000'	ends at Pu'u Ke'okea
Ke'okea	3200'-7200'	Behended by Papa'anui
Waiohuli	3300'-8800'	Ends at Kalepeamoa
Kohico	3000'-6000'	Pinched out by Ka'ono'ulu and Waiohuli
Ka'ono'ulu	2900'-9000'	Behended by Papa'anui
Alae	3200'-7400'	Pinched out by Ka'ono'ulu and Waiohuli
Waiahoa	3800'-10000'	To summit
Kealahou	3000'-10000'	To summit
Kamehame	3400'-9500'	To caldera
Pūlehu	3400'-9500'	To caldera
Oma'opio	3800'-4600'?	Pinched out by Kaliahuni and Pūlehuni
Kaliahuni	2300'-7500'	To caldera
'A'apuo	2200'-3200'	Behended by Kaliahuni, perhaps no zones further upslope

Ahupua'a	Approx. Elevation (in Feet)	Comments
Maka'eia	n.d.-3200'	Behended by Kaliahuni, perhaps no zones further upslope
Keahua	nd.-1500'	Pinched out by Hoku'ula and Maka'eia, perhaps no zones further upslope
Kailua	n.d.-1500'	Pinched out by Hoku'ula and Maka'eia, perhaps no zones further upslope
Hōkū'ula	n.d.-2400'	Behended by Maka'eia, perhaps no zones further upslope

D. Late 1800s Period

i. The Coastal Zone in the Late 1800s Period

Coastal activity remained focused at Kalepolepo. Bay whaling was evidently still going strong in 1862 with O. J. Harris "meeting with such success that try-works were erected at his Kalepolepo Station." (Thrum 1913:56) Halstead ran his Koa House store at Kalepolepo until 1876, closing shop when the potato industry diminished and moving to 'Ulu'palakua. (Janion 1977:25-31). Wilcox (1921:66) relates an account of acute environmental degradation in Kula circa the 1870s as follows:

In the [eighteen-] seventies and later, the Kula mountains had gradually become denuded of their forests, torrential winter rains were washing down earth from the uplands filling with silt the ponds at Kalepolepo, cattle trampling down the brush and grass of the nearby fields caused sand dunes to drift, filling up the Kalepolepo pond, and the daily breezes which once cooled the heated air had changed to a scorching daily simoon, sweeping clouds of dust and drifting sand over the partly abandoned site of the [Kalepolepo] village. In the seventies, ruins of grass huts partly covered by drifting sand, and a few weather beaten houses perched on the broad top of the old fishpond wall at the edge of the sea, with the Halstead house looming over them dim and shadowy in the daily swirl of dust and flying sand, impressed on the passerby that unlabeled name bestowed on the village in song and story as a reproach - Kalepolepo, "the dirty place."

This was a far cry from the Kalepolepo of the eighteen-fifties in which "Coconut trees and kou trees grew beside pools of clear water, along the banks of which grew the taro and the ape."

The coastal portions of Kula, were used for ranching activities by Haleakala Ranch Company in the late 1800s (Donham 1990b:6).

ii. The Barren Zone in the Late 1800s Period

By the 1880s the barren zone consisted primarily of pasture land for ranching (Wong Smith in Donham 1990b:B-6). The Land Grants show that Haleakalā Ranch Co. patented 2165 acres in Kula in 1891. Kennedy (1992:7) notes that at this point *kiawe* was imported to feed cattle and provide wood. Maps from late 1800s/early 1900s indicate that several ranching companies owned and operated land in the broad expanse of *kula* land in the barren zone of Kula District.

iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Late 1800s Period

Wilcox (1921:66) relates that: "In the late [eighteen-] sixties the Irish potato trade had become unimportant and later ceased all together." The declining decades of the potato industry were somewhat off-set by wheat. Wilcox (1921:66) relates that: "during the wheat boom of the [eighteen-] fifties and early sixties when the upper Makawao country was cropped to wheat." In the later decades of the 1800s the upland field zone was used increasingly for ranching. E. D. Baldwin relates that in 1888 "There were none of the owners of *Waiakoa kuleanas* living above the Government Road and only a few *makai* of said road (Sterling 1998:252). A major reason for abandonment was that "Waiakoa had been over run with cattle for years."

iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Late 1800s Period

While the acute environmental degradation of the 1870s Wilcox related above probably affected all environmental zones, it may have been most severe on the native forest of the higher slopes. Cattle and goats probably continued to make inroads in upper forests which had never been subjected to swidden or commercial agriculture.

Sugar companies began operating in the Makawao area in the late 1800s. The Hawaiian Commercial Company was founded in 1878 by Claus Spreckels and in 1882 became the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&SC), located in Pu unene. In 1899 the company was acquired by investors headed by J.B. Castle, with Alexander & Baldwin replacing the plantations agents.

E. Early 1900s To The Present

i. The Coastal Zone in the Twentieth Century Period

The Kihei Plantation Company, located on the shores of Mā'alaen Bay was chartered in 1899 by an illustrious group including B. F. Dillingham, H.P. Baldwin, L. A. Thurston, J. P. Cooke and M. P. Robinson. Following poor returns, the Kihei Plantation Company was absorbed or merged into the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company in 1908 (Conde and Best 1973:230). It seems probable that the Kihei Plantation Company sugar lands were quite similar to the Kihei lands of the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company shown on a map by H. I. Shoemaker dated 1910. This 1910 map indicates extensive sugar cane fields with some pastures lying seaward of the "Lowrie Ditch" at approximately 150-foot elevation. Some of these fields went virtually to the coast. The

best KPC fields continued to be cultivated (some are still productive), while the remaining plantation lands became cattle pasture. (Cox 1976:14:16) The upslope limit of these fields corresponds closely with the modern Waiuku/Makawao District boundary, or the seaward edge of Pūlehuui, Oma opio, Kāhālinui, 'A'apueo, Māka'eha Keāhuna, Kailua and Hōkū'ula *Alupua* ō. It appears that there was no commercial sugar cane cultivation near the project area at that time.

While World War I had little impact on Maui, World War II brought with it a significant military presence. Speakman (1984:166-176) provides a detailed review of the Marines on Maui including an account of training maneuvers held at Mā'alaen Bay, along its beach and in the *kiawe* groves to the east of the Bay. Allen (1971:230) notes that the Marines conducted amphibious landing training at Mā'alaen Bay. Allen (*ibid.*) also gives an extensive account of the Navy presence on Maui, which included a Combat Demolition Training Station at Kama'ole. The training station at Kama'ole was responsible for research work at Kihei as early as 1940.

Kihei underwent a rapid residential and commercial development beginning in the 1970s. Clark (1980:49) notes that the groundwork for this development was established in the late 1950s when investors began purchasing coastal property. However, the construction boom of high rise apartments, hotels, and condominiums and corresponding shopping centers, restaurants, and real estate offices didn't occur until the 1970s. Speakman (1984:188) notes that along with the condominiums and "classy" hotels (Maui's "hallmark") came congestion and overcrowding which resulted from this development: "It was partially blamed on the fact that Kihei was owned by many proprietors or speculators, each with individual plans uncoordinated with general planning, and partly on the failure of the County planners to hold the line against the runaway development. Kihei became the model for the wrong way to go about expansion." Pūlehuui Highway was constructed to ease the congested Kihei traffic which resulted from this development and expansion of the tourist industry.

ii. The Barren Zone in the Twentieth Century Period

In 1909 Henry P. Baldwin receives a grant for 873 acres (Grant 5167 seen on TMK: 2-5-01:2) in Oma opio and Pūlehuui. With pineapple, sugar, and dairy in the area, "a sizeable plantation community developed at Keāhuna, a few miles below Pūlehuui, complete with school post office, and churches, all of which has now disappeared and been replaced with sugar cane" (Bartholomew and Bailey 1994:121). Keāhuna Camp lay approximately 4 kilometers west of the north end of the project area at the seaward edge of Kailua *Alupua* ō. A 1949 map of Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company lands shows extensive fields extending up to the Hamakua Ditch at approximately 1000-foot elevation extending across an expanse of Pūlehuui, Oma opio, Kāhālinui, 'A'apueo, Māka'eha




Figure 7
Map Showing Areas Impacted by Commercial Agriculture Adjacent to the Project Area

Keshua, Kailua and Hōkū'ula *Alupua*'a. Thus it can be safely assumed that most of the sugar cane field infrastructure observed in the northern 60% of the project area dates between 1910 and 1949. HC&SC currently operates the cane fields which blanket the northern third of the study parcel (Figure 7).

Pineapple cultivation was introduced to Makawao in the early 1900s. The Maui Agricultural Company (M.A.Co.), primarily a sugar producer, began planting pineapple in its upland parcels. "Some of the M.A. Co. fields in the higher elevations were too far from the main line railroad and lacked a water supply for fluming and irrigation. In 1923 the plantation started planting pineapple on these lands...the C.P.C. [California Packing cannery] concern then built a large cannery...The M.A. Co. move[d] the cannery workers from Paia to Kahului." (Condé and Beat 1973:233)

Maui Land and Pineapple Company also had its beginnings during this time period. According to Speakman (1984:130-131) the company started as Baldwin Packers which then became Maui Pineapple Company, owned by Alexander & Baldwin. The company developed over the 1950s and 1960s, becoming "the largest producer of pineapple on Maui." The Cameron family then took control and the company became Maui Land and Pineapple Company. Maui Land and Pineapple Company continues to cultivate pineapple within the western reaches of the study parcel (Figure 7).

Burgott and Spear (1995:8) discuss the introduction of ranching ventures into the uplands of Kula in the early 1900s. Haleakala Ranch and Ka'ono'ono Ranch continue to run cattle over a huge expanse of the "barren zone" of Kula District.

Speakman (1984:188) notes that along with the Kihei construction boom in the late twentieth century came the construction of millionaire homes in the dry hills overlooking Kihei and the view beyond of Ka'oholawe and Molokai.

iii. The Upland Field Zone in the Twentieth Century Period

In 1905 the Kula Pipeline was built during a harsh drought, expanding the water resources of the Kula area (Mark in Kennedy 1992:7). Haleakala Ranch and Ka'ono'ono Ranch continue to run cattle over a huge expanse of the "upland field zone" of Kula District.

iv. Zones Further Upslope in the Twentieth Century Period

Haleakala Ranch and Ka'ono'ono Ranch continue to run cattle over a huge expanse of the "zones further upslope" of Kula District. During the 1970s, Kula produced the majority of Hawaii's locally grown produce and livestock ranches comprised most of the remaining land use. At present, non-residential areas are still in use as centers of agricultural production.

IV. SUMMARY AND PREDICTIVE MODEL

The project area appears to be located entirely in the *kula* (dryland plains) or "barren zone" of Kula District (see Figure 3). The vicinity of the upper roads on the slopes of Haleakala, above this *kula* zone has served as an "upland field zone" or agricultural center since the pre-contact era. The *wala*, or sweet potato was traditionally cultivated in Kula in elevations above 2000 ft. a.m.s.l. in an upland field zone belt. Corresponding with this agricultural activity was relatively dense habitation in the uplands, particularly in the southern *ahupua'a* of Kama'ole, Ke'okea and Waiohuli. This upland field zone is poorly defined in its northern extent in land documents with no *kuleana* land claims for houses or agricultural fields awarded in the uplands of the northern *ahupua'a* of Maka'eha, Keahua, Kailua, or Haku'ula (there is one claim 8452.7 for *kula* land in Kailua *ahupua'a*). It appears that the upland field zone most likely approximated the 30-inch rainfall isohyte, dipping in elevation to the north (Figure 2), but this remains largely conjectural in north Kula District owing to the absence of land claims for houses or agricultural fields. The extensive historic disturbance in this area by commercial agriculture probably obliterated most traces of what few fields and homesteads there were here.

Cordy (2000:2) notes that the barren zone in which the project area lies seemed to mainly have had trails and associated shelters leading to the uplands, but with some small dryland fields and associated field shelters near the shore. This zone is suggested (Cordy 2000:2) to have a very low density of sites. It seems probable that the more populous southern *ahupua'a* of Kula District, which had a coastal zone (Kama'ole, Ke'okea, Waiohuli, Ka'ono'ulu, Waiakoa), had more activity in the barren zone. This greater activity would be due to the greater traffic between uplands and coast and also to small dryland fields associated with coastal settlement.

The prediction for the most likely area of pre-contact and early post-contact Hawaiian sites thus would focus on the southwestern third of the project area in Waiakoa and Ka'ono'ulu *ahupua'a*. It seems probable that trails from the uplands to the coast would have traversed these narrow *ahupua'a* (such as the Waiakoa Trail; see McGerty and Spear 2000:44) and that associated temporary shelters, midden scatters etc. might be encountered. Another focus of pre-contact and early post-contact Hawaiian sites would be expected to be in the gulches. McGerty and Spear (2000:51) quote Charles Maxwell as asserting knowledge of petroglyphs in at least four gulches and of at least six burial caves in these gulches. The over-riding conclusion however is that the entire *kula* or barren zone in which the project entirely lies is an area in which low to very low site densities might be anticipated. This is supported by a recent study (McGerty and Spear 2000:55) "which did not identify any specific Traditional Cultural Properties within the project area".

The results of the present study suggest that the vast majority of Kula District land, including the Barren Zone and zones above the upland field zone, would be expected to have low densities (perhaps less than one site per ten acres on average) of pre-contact to mid 1800s sites. Areas with anticipated high site densities (averaging perhaps one or more sites per acre) would include the vicinity of Kalepolepo settlement and the upland field zone of Kama'ole, Ke'okea, Waiohuli, Ka'ono'ulu. Other portions of the coastal zone and the upland field zone might be anticipated to have moderate site densities (perhaps averaging 0.1 to 1 site per acre).

V. PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Previous archaeological research in Kula District has predominantly been done at the elevations above 2,000 ft. a.m.s.l. -- upcountry Kula -- or in the coastal Kihui region. An overview of research relevant to the study parcel is presented in Table 5 and is discussed below.

Table 5: Previous Archaeology

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1909	T. Thurum	Island wide	Heiau study	1 heiau in Kailua Ahupua'a
1918				
n. d. c.	J. Stokes	Island wide	Reconnaissance, Heiau study	Documents a settlement and agricultural zone around 2,000' elevation
1909				
1931	W. Walker	Entire Island	Reconnaissance	three heiau in the ahupua'a of Waiohuli above 3,000' elevation
1970	J. Cox & E. Stasack	Archipelago Wide	Petroglyph study	Inventories petroglyphs
1971	I. Ashdown	Island Wide	Study of Ke Alaola o Maui	Collection of cultural information
1971	P. Kirch	Palauca	Survey & Excavations	Documents a coastal settlement and settlement patterns
1973	W. Kikuchi	State-wide fishpond survey	Fishpond survey	Notes 3 fishponds in the Kalepolepo area
1975	P. Rosendahl	Haleakala Hwy.	Reconnaissance	Identified 7 sites
1976	D. Cox	Pulehunui to Kama'ole	Surface Survey	Identified 6 sites
1977	R. Cordy	Pulehunui to Paehahu	Reconnaissance	Identified 38 sites: 30 in Waiohuli, 0 in Kaonoulu and 8 in Ke'okea
1978	M. Rosendahl	Haleakala	"Overview"	Located & reported sites
1978	A. Sinoto	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	Recorded 6 sites including 4 probable habitation features

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1981	R. Hommon	Coastal Waikoa	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1981 (a)	C. Keau	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1981 (b)	C. Keau	Coastal Kaonoulu	Reconnaissance	Notes historic features & significance of area
1982	M. Miura (R. Bordner & D. Cox)	Coastal Waiohuli & Keokea	Reconnaissance	Reports 9 sites
1982 (a)	E. Neller	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	Relates report of "large number of burials"
1982 (b)	E. Neller	Coastal Kaonoulu	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings but relates history on pond & graves
1986	W. Kam	Waiohuli & Keokea 2100' to 2700' elevation	Field Inspection	2 possible pre-contact house sites & walls
1986 a	J. Kennedy	Coastal Keokea	Reconnaissance	No archaeological features were located
1986 b	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waikapu	Reconnaissance	Notes mounds (discounted in 1988a)
1986 c	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waiohuli	Reconnaissance	No archaeological sites were found
1987	M. Riford	Uplands (1800' to 3000') of Waiohuli & Keokea	Monitoring & Reconnaissance Survey	Identified 113 sites mostly pre-contact
1987	F. Watanabe	Uplands (280' to 380') of Waiohuli	Reconnaissance	No archaeological sites were found
1988	A. Estioko-Griffin	Uplands (2680') of Keokea	Field Inspection	Notes human remains in a cave site
1988	A. Haun	Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	Identified 33 sites, mostly military, revisited by Mayberry & Haun 1988
1988 (a)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waikapu	Testing & Monitoring	No archaeological findings

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1988 (b)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Kaonoulu	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1988 (c)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waiohuli	Reconnaissance	No archaeological Findings
1988 (d)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waiohuli	Reconnaissance	No archaeological Findings
1988	J. Mayberry & A. Haun	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	Identified 33 sites
1989	R. Brown	Upland (1800' to 3000') Keokea and Waiohuli	Inventory Survey	Identified 159 sites (part of this area was studied by Riford in 1987)
1989	R. Brown & A. Haun	Keokea and Waiohuli	Inventory Survey	A more detailed study of the same parcels described by Brown 1989
1989	T. Donham	Waiohuli	Inventory Survey	Identified 4 sites in a portion of the Miura 1982 study area and recommended data recovery
1989	W. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
1989	H. Hammett & D. Shideler	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	Identified 8 sites
1989 (a)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Kama'ole	Survey	No archaeological findings judged significant
1989 (b)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1989 (c)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Palehu	Inspection	No archaeological findings
1989 (d)	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waiohuli	Subsurface Testing	No archaeological findings
1989	H. Leidemann	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings, area extensively bulldozed
1989	A. Sinato	Coastal Kama'ole	Surface Survey	Identified 8 sites

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1990 (a)	T. Donham	Coastal Waiohuli	Data Recovery	Site 2475 was excavated
1990 (b)	T. Donham	Coastal Kōōkea	Inventory survey	Part of Miura 1982 study area. 16 sites were identified
1990 (a)	W. Fredericksen & D. Fredericksen	Coastal Kōōkea	Monitoring	No archaeological findings
1990 (b)	W. Fredericksen & D. Fredericksen	Coastal Kōōkea	Survey & Monitoring	No archaeological findings
1990	W. Fredericksen <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
1990	H. Hammatt & D. Shideler	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1990 a	J. Kennedy	Coastal Waiakoa	Survey	No archaeological findings
1990 b	J. Kennedy	Kama'ole, 300' elevation	Archaeological Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
1990 (a)	A. Sinoto	Coastal Waiakoa	Survey & Testing	No archaeological findings (other than 2 pieces of midden)
1990 (b)	A. Sinoto	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1991	T. Donham	Upland (3200') Kaonoulu	Field Inspection	Study of the Wonderland Mushroom House (1933-1936) historic structures
1991 a	W. Fredericksen <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Subsurface Inventory Survey	No significant archaeological findings (2 modern dog burials and a modern trash pit)

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1991 b	W. Fredericksen <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Subsurface Inventory Survey	No significant archaeological findings (only modern trash)
1991	J. Kennedy	Coastal Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	No archaeological findings
1991	J. Kennedy & M. Breithaupt	Coastal Kōōkea	Inventory survey	No archaeological findings
1991	J. Pantaleo <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory Survey	Covered part of same area as Hammatt & Shideler 1989, 1991
1991	L. Hazuka & J. Pantaleo	Coastal Kama'ole	Surface Survey	No archaeological findings
1992	H. Hammatt & D. Shideler	Coastal Kama'ole	Survey & Testing of H. Hammatt & D. Shideler 1989 study area	Identified 2 probable <i>koa</i> (fishing shrines) among 8 sites
1992	J. Kennedy	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory survey	Identified 4 sites including a permanent pre-contact habitation/religious site
1992	J. Kennedy <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory survey w/ Subsurface Testing	Identified 4 sites all believed to be historic; two military and 2 ranching
1992	Sinoto & Pantaleo	Coastal Pālehunui	Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings other than a bridge foundation (site -3131)
1992	R. Spear	Coastal Kōōkea	Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
1993	W. Folk and H. Hammatt	Ōma'opio, 2500 ft elevation	Inventory Survey	Three sites identified
1993	D. Fredericksen <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Waiohuli	Inventory Survey/Data Recovery	A rock shelter excavation yielded lithic artifacts, midden and a date of A.D. 1569 to 1800
1993	W. Fredericksen & D. Fredericksen	Ōma'opio	Inventory Survey	No sites identified

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1994	D. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Inventory Survey	2 sites were identified including a midden scatter & a concrete slaughterhouse foundation
1994 ^a	E. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Kama'ole	Inventory Survey	Radiocarbon date reported as AD 1520 to 1570
1994 ^b	E. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Kama'ole	Subsurface Testing	Work at Site 60-50-10-2636
1994 ^c	E. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Kaonoulu, mauka of Pi'ilani Hwy.	Inventory Survey	21 sites were identified, some military and some pre-contact
1994	W. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Coastal Waiohuli	Inventory Survey	22 backhoe test trenches were excavated but there were no significant archaeological findings
1994	M. Kolb <i>et al.</i>	Upland Waiohuli and Kōkeā	Settlement Survey	Archaeological & historical settlement survey
1995	Burgott & Spear	Upland Kaonoulu (3100' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	6 post contact sites were identified
1995 ^a	E. Frederickson & D. Frederickson	Waiohuli	Inventory Survey	one rock shelter site was identified as a pre-contact temporary habitation site
1995 ^b	E. Frederickson & D. Frederickson	Waiohuli	Data Recovery	Four carbon dates were obtained suggesting late pre-contact use.
1995 ^a	D. Hibbard	Coastal Kōkeā	Environmental Assessment	Determined Phase III South Khei Road Improvements project would have "no effect"
1995 ^b	D. Hibbard	Coastal Kōkeā	Historic Preservation Review	Determined Phase II South Khei Road Improvements project would have "no effect"
1995	Minsterson <i>et al.</i>	Kalepeama at 9,250' elevation	Inventory Survey	Identified five sites

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
1995	Moore and Kennedy	Upland Kōkeā and Kaonoulu (2600' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	8 sites were identified (3 historic ranching, 5 possibly pre-contact ag.
1996	E. Frederickson <i>et al.</i>	Upland Kaonoulu (3060' to 9700' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	4 sites were identified including 2 rock shelters and 2 historic sites
1996	B. McPhatter & P. Rosendahl	'A'apueo (Pukalani) 1600' elevation	Reconnaissance	Two sites were identified
1996	W. Wulzen <i>et al.</i>	'A'apueo (Pukalani) 1800' elevation	Archaeological Inventory Survey	5 Sites reported on
1997	Chaffee <i>et al.</i>	Waiohuli (120' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	3 sites were identified, all interpreted as agricultural
1997	Kolb <i>et al.</i>	Waiohuli & Kōkeā	Settlement Survey	Focuses on sites in Waiohuli & Kōkeā mauka of Kula Hwy.
1998	C. Kawachi	15 kilometer corridor	Reconnaissance	Notes a large area of agricultural features
1999 (in press ?)	Pepalia, J. & Michael J. Kolb	Waiohuli	Archaeological Excavations	Found evidence of a stream-fed pond near Kalepolepo Church
1999	A. Dunn <i>et al.</i>	Waiohuli (2,700' elevation)	Data Recovery	11 sites were studied, 15 carbon samples were dated
1999	H. Hammatt and W. Folk	Kailua to Kama'ole	Reconnaissance	23 sites were identified
1999	Erik and Demaris Fredericksen	Kama'ole (170' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	3 sites were identified including 5 small enclosures and a rock pile
1999	E. Gordon & J. Brent	Waiohuli (2800' elevation)	Archaeological Inventory Survey	3 sites were identified
2000 ^a	H. Hammatt & D. Shideler	Waiohuli	Assessment	No archaeological findings

Date	Author	Ahupua'a	Nature of Study	Findings
2000b	H. Hamamatt & D. Shideler	Kōkeke	Archaeological Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
2000	S. Kikiloi et al.	Kōkeke	Archaeological Inventory Survey	No archaeological findings
2000	McDermott, Shideler, and Hammatt	Waiohuli, adjacent to the Kōlepo Church	Additional Archaeological Inventory Survey (Backhoe Testing)	Document Site 50-50-09. 1981, former inland pond that contains evidence of early occupation at coastal Kīhei--approximately A. D. 600-900

General Kula District Research

The earliest archaeological studies on Maui begin with descriptive lists of religious sites by Thomas Thurum (1906-1918) and John Stokes (n.d.) in the early 1900s and culminate with the first island wide site survey by Winslow Walker (1931). Throughout the Kula region of Maui from Olinda and Makawao to Kaniio beyond Ulupalakua, the sites recorded by Walker (all *heiau* - 33 total) are located in a continuous band between roughly 2000 ft. and 3000 ft. amsl.

From around 1930 to the 1970s only sporadic visits were made to Kula by archaeologists, primarily for the purpose of recording individual archaeological sites reported by local residents.

Inez Ashdown (1899-1992) spent her lifetime collecting information about Maui. This information she collected was put together in the book *Ke Aialoa o Maui* (1971). Regarding Kula (including the current project area and areas nearby), she notes that the largest fields of *ki'i* were at Nu'u, and the next largest could be found throughout Honua'ula, "particularly around the ancient temple of Lono in Oama'opio (sic). In Kamehameki area and on across into Ka-ono-ulu many petroglyphs are known and new ones can be found" (*op. cit.*:48). She also remarks that in the Kōkeke and Waiakeas areas:

are many structures, fields of petroglyphs and temples around the two temples called Pa'uahu and Ka-imu-pe'e-lua. Also in this area the temples of Mahua and Ka-imu-o-pahu (or Ka-unu-o-pahu) may still remain, along with Po'o-nu-hoe-hoe and Mana' the latter now part of a modern cemetery. At Pūlehu stood the temple of Ni-ni-ni-wei, and at Kama'ole the two on the Mao land, one named Wailuku because of the battle there and the destruction during the time when Ka-lani-ku-pule ousted a brother of Pūlehu Kamehameha (*op.cit.* 57-58).

W. Folk et al. (1999) located 23 sites during a reconnaissance survey of six different alternate routes for the Kīhei to Kula road corridor. The alternate corridors were four hundred feet wide. Sites encountered included petroglyphs, cattle walls, military features (C-shapes, enclosures, etc.), temporary habitation enclosures, a midden scutter and agricultural features. Two of the six alternatives were chosen as the final routes. The present study is an inventory of those two alternatives.

Coastal Kīhei Region (Figure 8)

Numerous archaeological surveys were conducted along the south coast of the Makawao District, particularly in the Kīhei, Wailea, and Mākena area and the from Kama'ole to Waikoa as a result of the 1970s resort development.

From 1969 to 1971, Kirch (1971) conducted a survey and subsequent excavations at Palauca, south of K1 and K2 terminal at Pi'ilani Highway. Through his analysis of coastal sites 50-50-1028 and 60-50-1029, Kirch concluded that settlement patterns in this area were characterized by transient coastal habitation involving the use of ocean resources with permanent settlements and agricultural activities in the upland region. (Donham 1990b: 4)

Donham (1990), in a report on Phase II of the Pi'ilani Residential Community in Kōkeke lists numerous reconnaissance and testing projects conducted in the Wailea and Mākena area from the early 1970s to the late 1980s. These studies, as stated by Donham, include: Barrere 1974, Clark 1974, Cleghorn 1974 and 1975, Barrere 1975, Hommon 1976, Cordy 1978, Haun 1978, Sinoto 1978, Jourdana and Sinoto 1979, Bordner 1980, Schill and Dobyas 1980, Bordner and Cox 1982, Walker, Rosendahl and Haun 1985, Dicks and Haun 1987, Dobyas 1988, Haun 1988, and Shapiro and Haun 1988. According to Donham, the findings from the Jourdana and Sinoto 1979 and Schill and Dobyas 1980 studies also support Kirch's hypotheses regarding settlement and subsistence patterns involving the inland and coastal regions of Makawao.

Other projects were also conducted in the coastal region of Kīhei extending from Kama'ole *Ahupua'a* in the south to Waikoa *Ahupua'a* in the north (Figure 8). These projects provide useful information about the coastal area of Kīhei and settlement patterns relating to the inland zone, as discussed by Kirch (1971). However, since these studies reiterate already mentioned information and are located outside of our current study parcel, they will not be discussed here. For the reader's reference, these projects include (but are not limited to) a flora and fauna survey by Austin, Smith & Assoc. Inc. in 1974 and the following archaeological studies: Cox 1976, Hirota 1979, Hommon 1981, Keau 1981, Miura 1982, Neller 1982, Mayberry and Haun 1988, Hammatt and Shideler 1989, Hammatt and Shideler 1990, Donham 1990(a&b), Hurst 1991, Kennedy 1991, Hammatt and Shideler 1992, Kennedy 1992, Sinoto and Pantaleo 1992, Fredericksen et al. 1993, and Fredericksen et al. 1994.

Kula Zone (above Pi'ilani Highway at the coast)

In 1970 J. Halley Cox and Edward Stasack (1970) compiled a listing of identified petroglyph sites throughout Hawaii, including the Kula area. Two of these sites, MA-B22-2 (State site 50-50-10-1061, Kaliainui Gulch petroglyphs) and MA-B23-1 (identified as MA-B23-1 in Cox and Stasack; State site 50-50-10-1062, Kaluapulani Gulch petroglyphs), were relocated during the present project (designated CSH 1 and CSH 23, respectively).

In January 1993 (Folk and Hammatt 1993), Cultural Surveys Hawai'i conducted an inventory level survey of approximately 25 acres on the southern edge of Oma'opio *Ahupua'a*. This survey resulted in the relocation of several previously recorded sites, which in relation to the current study parcel are located east of terminus U3, between Kula Highway and Halekai's Highway. These sites, already documented by Griffin and Donham, included a large enclosure (site 50-50-11-1349) and the Upper Pulehu Gulch Petroglyphs (site 50-50-11-1268). Additional archaeological features consisting of a stacked boulder alignment and few low mounds were also located and collectively assigned site number 50-50-11-3121. Charcoal analysis of site 50-50-11-1349 suggests the site dates to be possibly as early as the 15th century A.D.

Mayberry and Haun's study in Kama'ole (1988) identified 33 sites with formal features including C-, U- and L-shaped alignments or walls, enclosures, terraces, cairns, alignments, upright boulder, mounds and roadbeds and modified cuttings. They interpreted these to include military sites, temporary habitations, transportation, markers and agriculture. Which the majority of sites (20) interpreted as military-related remains.

E. Fredericksen *et al.* (1994) located 21 sites in Kaonoulu ranch land and these sites included a petroglyph (Site 3746), stone piles, cairns, enclosures, alignments for roadbed, walls, midden and lithic scatters. The stone piles are interpreted as possible clearing piles, possibly for agriculture, the cairns as markers, the enclosures as both a military and a pre-contact shelter, alignments for a military road, erosion walls from ranching period, and the midden and lithic scatters as possible sites of temporary habitations.

Upper Settlement and Agricultural Zone

In 1995, Burrett and Spear (1995) of Scientific Consultant Services, Inc. conducted an inventory survey of a 22.5 acre parcel located in Ka'ono'ulu *Ahupua'a*, Makawao District. A total of six sites comprised of 29 features were identified during the survey. The identified features included the following formal types: terrace, wall, enclosure, cistern, mound, building and platform. It was determined that all sites are post-contact in age and associated with agriculture and habitation activities.

In February 1996 McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996) conducted an archaeological reconnaissance survey of a 250-acre parcel located in the land of 'A'apueo, Makawao District (TMK: 2-3-08: Por.5). Most of the project area consists primarily of former pineapple lands between Kaluapulani and Kaliainui Gulches. This survey resulted in the identification of two sites: (1) a site assigned the temporary number 1707-1 and described as a sailing canoe petroglyph, and (2) temporary site number 1717-2 described as a wall. In

addition to these sites several land clearing piles associated with historic pineapple cultivation were also reported but were not assigned site numbers. It was determined that further data collection activities should take place at the wall site 1707-2, and that the petroglyph site 1707-1 be preserved with interpretive development.

In March 1996 Wulzen, *et al.* (1996) conducted an inventory survey of a 44-acre parcel that is the *mauka* portion of McPhatter and Rosendahl's February 1996 project area. The 44-acre parcel is also described by Wulzen as part of the 305-acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision Unit III located in the land of 'A'apueo, Makawao District (TMK: 2-3-08: Por.5). Wulzen's project area contained three previously recorded sites: (1) the Kaliainui petroglyph site 50-50-10-1061, (2) 50-50-10-1179, the "sailing canoe petroglyph site" recorded as temporary site number 1707-1 by McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996); the description of this site was upgraded to multiple petroglyphs, and (3) 50-50-10-1178, the wall recorded as temporary site number 1707-2 by McPhatter and Rosendahl (1996). One new site (Site 50-50-10-1181) was identified during Wulzen's survey; it consisted of four features including two agricultural clearing mounds and two stone alignments. Testing conducted at the stone alignments yielded historic artifacts associated with pineapple agriculture. The Kaluapulani petroglyph site 50-50-10-1062, originally described as being only on the north side of Kaluapulani gulch, was relocated by Wulzen although his project area boundary is on the south side of that gulch. They reported their concurrence with the original recorded data on the site, except they found the petroglyphs to extend further *mokai* than originally described.

Other research in the upcountry Kula area includes Donham (1990(e); 1992), and Fredericksen and Fredericksen (1993; 1995).

Two archaeological surveys conducted during the 1980s in the *ahupua'a* of Waiohuli and Keōkea by Mary Riford (1987) and Roderick Brown and Alan Haun (1989) have contributed the bulk of data on site patterning and land use prior to the 20th century in "up-country" Kula Maui. These studies, and a selection of others relevant to the upcountry Kula area, are summarized below.

Riford's (1987) monitoring and reconnaissance survey for the Waiohuli and Keōkea Subdivisions identified 113 sites with 262 features consisting of "agricultural terraces and mound features as well as a number of possible habitation- and religious-related stone-walled enclosures..." (*op. cit.*:55). Riford suggests that human occupation in the area extended from prehistoric times to the 1950s based on artifacts observed at the sites (*op. cit.*:56). This time frame is further documented by Brown and Haun (1989:18-21).

Brown and Haun (1989) conducted an inventory survey for the same study parcels in Waiohuli and Keōkea, covering 1,025 acres of uncultivated pasture land located between 1,800 ft. and 3,000 ft. amsl. Within the survey area 159 sites with 274 features were identified, including agricultural, residential, and ceremonial complexes. Fifty-three of the sites had been identified during the Bishop Museum (Riford 1987) survey.

In general Brown and Haun (1989:27) found that the Keōkea division was intensively exploited in a variety of ways for at least two-thirds of the entirety of Hawaiian prehistory. "They suggest similar land use and chronology but lesser density in the

Waiohuli area, probably due to a greater amount of recent land clearing activities. Sixteen radiocarbon dates provided overlapping ranges from A.D. 1270 through A.D. 1955. One 1157. (op. cit.:19,20)

In 1996 Xamanek Research located 4 sites of which two are in the Upper Settlement and Ag zone: a historic house platform with cistern and agricultural terracing at 3600 ft. a.m.s.l. and an historic habitation area between 3080 and 3200 ft. a.m.s.l. which the authors believe is probably associated with potato production during the Gold Rush.

In 1996 Farley Watanabe did an assessment followed up by Carol Kawachi's recordation of sites in the upper reaches of the Upper Settlement and Agricultural zone. Three Chinese corn-growing agricultural sites including a historic house foundation were recorded at the 4169 ft. Elevation. The recordation of sites was between the 3988 to 4214 a.m.s.l. Other retaining walls and an historic road were also noted.

"Watanabe's (1996) research suggest that the project area may have been in forest in pre-contact times and at the upper reaches of early post-contact cultivation" (Kawachi 1997:10).


Michael J. Kolb, editor, *et al.* (2000), has provided an extensive historical and archaeological background for the Kula District in Waiohuli and Kōhlea. They identified 1093 features of which 52% were interpreted as having an agricultural function. The features included terraces, enclosures, mounds, walls, outcrops, alignments, and C-U, and L-shapes, platforms, garden enclosures, rock shelters, notched enclosures, overhangs, lava tubes, depressions, an 'auwai, a pavement and a road. Their 161 test pits determined agricultural, permanent and temporary habitations, ritual and burial functions.

Mountain and Forest Region including Kallalinui section of Haleakala

In 1975 Paul Rosendahl conducted an archaeological reconnaissance for the Haleakala road Realignment corridor in the National Park. He located 2 cave shelters, 6 walled shelters, 1 platform, and 3 cairns. In 1978 Margaret Rosendahl wrote an overview of National Park archaeological resources including Emory's and others' works, although none of these resources appears in Kula, the types of sites she noted were caves, pits, walls, resting places with *ahu* or cairns, trail, platforms, terraces, a *heiau*, various shelters and enclosures and fireplaces.

In 1995 Ian Masterson, William Folk and Hallett Hammatt conducted an inventory survey of the summit in Papa 'anui *Ahupua'a* and found two walled shelters. Tina Bushnell and Hallett Hammatt (in progress) *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of 1.5 Acres of the University of Hawaii's Facility at Haleakala, Papa 'anui Ahupua'a, Māhānui District, East Maui, (TMK 2-2-07-8)* located two rock enclosures which are interpreted as trash burning pits and are associated with military use of Kolekole in the early 1940s and subsequent University of Hawaii's Research use. Another site was a terrace, an enclosure and a wall segment (Bushnell & Hammatt 2000:2). In 1996 Xamanek Research located 4 sites of which two are in the Mountain & forest zone of which 2 in the upper reaches of the Upper Settlement and Ag zone: the 2 rock shelters are found at the 6000 and 7400 ft. a.m.s.l.

Figure 8 Previous archaeology conducted in the Kula Zone of the Kula District



VI. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey and testing were conducted between August 28, 2000 and October 3, 2000 by a crew that ranged from two to four archaeologists. A total of eleven days were spent in the field for a total of 36 person days. Crew members included Ka'ohulani McGuire, B.A., Mary Perzinski, B.A., Lokelani Alpa, B.A., Thomas Devereux, B.A., Tony Bush, B.Ed., and Ian Masterson with Brian Colin, B.A., acting as field director and Dr. Hal Hammatt as the principal investigator.

Different survey methods were utilized during the course of the inventory survey. In the sections of the project that were active sugar cane fields the corridor was followed by two archaeologists in a vehicle. The active cane fields were not traversed by foot. The section of the corridor that traverses active pineapple fields was traversed by four archaeologists on foot following the existing pineapple roads. All clearing mounds in the pineapple fields along the corridor were inspected. All other areas of the project including the gulches, valleys and ravines within the active cane fields were swept by four archaeologists with the distance between members ranging from 1 to 15 meters. Generally the gulches, valleys and ravines within the project area were covered with team members being one to three meters apart due to the potential for petroglyphs within these areas. The rest of the project area corridor consisted of open savannah with scattered *kiawe*. The open savannah portions of the project were swept by four archaeologists with distances ranging from 5 to 16 meters between members covering 100% of the area. The centerline of the corridor was staked every 200 feet in all portions of the project area that were not in active agriculture. A 400 foot wide corridor, 200 feet on either side of the staked centerline was surveyed. Therefore the entire project area, with the exception of the areas in active sugar cane or pineapple cultivation, were covered 100% by pedestrian sweeps. Visibility was excellent at the time of the survey due to ongoing drought conditions.

All sites and features were plotted on a 1 inch = 500 ft project area map with 25 ft contours. All sites were located on the contour map by tape and compass measurements to at least two centerline stakes. A metal site tag was placed at each feature and labeled with the feature designation, state site number (when available, for new sites a temporary field number was assigned preceded by CSH(see Table 6).

Each site was described in detail and photographed. All of the sites were mapped to scale with the exception of State site -4773. State site -4773 is a large complex of simple military features that cover an approximate 6000 ft of section of the road corridor (see Survey Results section for complete details). Dr. Melissa Kirkendall SHPD/DLNR Maui Island archaeologist was informed of the extent and type of military features that were encountered within State site -4773. The SHPD/DLNR provided guidelines for the recording of the site. Based on the provided guidelines for site -4773, all features were plotted on the overall project map, all features were photographed, all features were described including type, size, the presence or absence of surface remains, and overall condition. A representative sample, 17 out of 102 features (16%), were mapped to scale. Mapped features represent the range of feature types in different states of preservation from a range of different elevations.

Each site and feature were recorded by formal site type using descriptive categories (i.e. mounds, C-shape enclosure, wall etc.), presented in the SURVEY RESULTS section of this report. Functional interpretation of sites were established on the basis of structural characteristics, spatial associations with other sites and in some cases, associated artifacts as well as external correlations with other archaeological studies and interpretations in the general region. Significance and recommended treatment of each site was determined on the basis of type, complexity, configuration, apparent function, probable age, and comparable characteristics to other sites in the region.

During the field work, an effort was made to consolidate related features into complexes. Feature associations were typically based on the following considerations; proximity, similarity in construction technique, similarity in states of preservation, functional interrelationships and similarity of artifactual materials observed on the surface.

Limited subsurface testing was conducted at six sites. A total of five 1.0 m by 50 cm test units were excavated at two sites (-4773 and -4776) and two traditional temporary habitation sites (-5033 and -5034). One 50 by 50 cm unit was excavated at another temporary habitation site (-5032). The features were tested using controlled excavation. Excavations were extended well into sterile soil layers with contents sifted through 1/8-inch mesh screens. One profile was prepared for each excavation. In addition three shovel test probes were conducted at two sites (-4773 and -5035) to determine the presence or absence of subsurface deposits. Results of the subsurface testing are presented in the EXCAVATION RESULTS section of this report. All excavations were back-filled and structures reconstructed.

Subsequent to the field work all sites were given SHHP (State Inventory of Historic Properties) site numbers. As a result of the inventory survey, seventeen sites were identified on the property (Table 6 and Figure 9).

Table 6: Archaeological Inventory Survey: Summary of Sites

State Site # 50-50-10-	Feature/ CSH #	Site Type	Function	Distance/ orientation to center line(CL)	Age	Significance	Recommendation
3727*		Stone Piles	Agriculture	50 ft/south CL	Indeterminate	D	No Further Work
3728*		Stone Pile	Agriculture	150 ft/south CL	Indeterminate	D	No Further Work
3729*		Stone cairn	Marker	165 ft/south CL	Indeterminate	D	No Further Work
3742*		Surface scatter	Temporary Habitation	On CL	Indeterminate	D	No Further Work
3743*		Surface scatter	Temporary Habitation	200 ft/south CL	Pre-contact	D	No Further Work
3745*		Surface scatter	Temporary Habitation	130 ft/south CL	Pre-contact	D	No Further Work
4765		Ditch and Mound Complex	Agriculture		Historic	D	No Further Work
	A	Clearing Mound	Agriculture	300 ft/west CL	Historic		
	B	Irrigation Ditch	Irrigation	Crosses CL	Historic		
	C	Irrigation Ditch	Irrigation	Crosses CL	Historic		
	D	Irrigation Ditch	Agriculture	Crosses CL	Historic		
	E	Mounds	Agriculture	On CL	Historic		

State Site # 50-50-10-	Feature/ CSH #	Site Type	Function	Distance/ orientation to center line(CL)	Age	Significance	Recommendation
4765	F	Irrigation Ditch	Agriculture	Crosses CL	Historic		
	G	Irrigation Ditch	Agriculture	Crosses CL	Historic		
4773	A-CX (see separate table)	Military Complex	Military	Encompasses corridor section	Historic	D	No Further Work
4776		Oval Enclosure	Military	50 ft/north CL	Historic	D	No Further Work
4778	CSH 22	L-shape Enclosure	Military	75 ft/east CL	Historic	D	No Further Work
5029	CSH 1001	Petroglyphs	Symbolic	200 ft/east CL	Historic	C, D	Preserve
5030	CSH 1002	Walls	Animal husbandry	On CL	Historic	D	No Further Work
5031	CSH 1003	Petroglyphs	Symbolic	200 ft/west CL	Pre-contact	C, D	Preserve
5032	CSH 1004	Alignments	Temporary Habitation	100 ft/north CL	Pre-contact	D	Data Recovery
5033	CSH 1005	Rectangular Enclosure	Temporary Habitation/ Military	150 ft/north CL	Pre-contact/ Historic	D	Data Recovery
5034	CSH 1019	Square Enclosure	Temporary Habitation	75 ft/south CL	Pre-contact	D	No Further Work

State Site #	Feature/CSH #	Site Type	Function	Milance/ orientation to center line(CL)	Age	Significance	Recommendation
5036	CSH 1020	C-Shape Enclosure	Temporary Habitation	50 f/north CL	Indeterminate	D	Data Recovery

* = Site Type, Function, Age, Significance and Recommendation taken from Fredericksen et al. 1994c

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

State Site # 50-50-10-	Feature/ CSH #	Site Type	Function	Distance/ orientation to center line(CL)	Age	Significance	Recommendation
5035	CSH 1020	C-Shape Enclosure	Temporary Habitation	50 ft/north CL	Indeterminate	D	Data Recovery

* = Site Type, Function, Age, Significance and Recommendation taken from Fredericksen *et al.* 1994c




Figure 9 Project area map based on USGS 7.5 minute series topographical maps of the Pu'u O Kali and Pu'u Oka quadrangles, showing the corridor and location of historic properties.

VII. SITE DESCRIPTIONS

State Site #: 50-50-10-3727
 Site Type: Series of Mounds
 Site Function: Agriculture
 Features: 3

Description: State site 50-50-10-3727 is comprised of three irregular shaped mounds (designated features A-C) (Figure 10) with a previously excavated 1.0 m by 0.5 m test unit. The site was initially documented by Xamanek Researches (Fredericksen, et. al. 1994c:61). The site is located approximately 50 ft to the south of the study corridor centerline. The mounds are roughly in a straight line which is oriented at roughly 225°T.

Feature A the northernmost mound was partially excavated during the 1994 Xamanek study. A 1 m by 50 cm test unit was excavated into the northern portion of the mound. Feature A presently measures 1.5 m in diameter. It is constructed of a rough stacking of basalt cobbles to medium boulders with a maximum height of 35 cm in the center of the structure. There is a small mound located approximately 1.2 m to the east of the northern mound is a small mound, approximately 70 cm in diameter, which appears to be the byproduct of the excavation.

Feature B, located in the center of Feature A and Feature C, is constructed in a similar style to Feature A. Feature B is located approximately 2.5 m from the Feature A. The mound measures 1.9 m NNESSW by 1.1 m NWSE. The maximum height of the mound, near its center, is 50 cm.

Feature C, the southern most mound, is located approximately 1.0 m from the southern end of Feature B. It is irregular in shape and is also constructed of stacked basalt cobbles to medium boulders. Heights of the mound range from 20-50 cm. A few fragments of cowrie shell were observed just to the south of Feature C. The site was relocated.

State Site #: 50-50-10-3728
 Site Type: Mound
 Function: Agriculture
 Features (#): 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-3728 was initially recorded by Xamanek Researches in 1994 (*Ibid.*:62). The site consisted of an isolated stone mound. During Xamanek's recording a 1.0 m² test unit was excavated through the mound dismantling the majority of the structure. No cultural material was observed at the site. The site was relocated 150 ft to the south of the study corridor centerline.




Figure 10 State site 50-50-10-3727: Series of Mounds, Plan View

State Site #: 50-50-10-3729
Site Type: Mound
Function: Agriculture
Features (#): 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-3729 was initially recorded by Xamanek Researches in 1991 (Ibid.:62). The site was a mound. During Xamanek's recording a 1.0 m by 50 cm test unit was excavated through the mound dismantling the majority of the structure. No cultural material was observed at the site. The site was relocated 165 ft south of the study corridor centerline.

State Site #: 50-50-10-3742
Site Type: Surface Scatter
Function: Temporary Habitation
Features (#): 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-3742 was initially recorded by Xamanek Researches in 1991 (Ibid.:69). The site was a very sparse surface scatter consisting of only a few marine shell fragments, a basalt flake, waterworn stones and coral fragments. During Xamanek's recording a surface collection was conducted, collecting all of the cultural material at the site with the exception of the marine shell midden. The site was located on the study corridor centerline. The site area was relocated and the marine shell midden was observed.

State Site #: 50-50-10-3743
Site Type: Surface Scatter
Function: Temporary Habitation
Features (#): 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-3743 was initially recorded by Xamanek Researches in 1991 (Ibid.:70). The site was a very sparse surface scatter consisting of approximately 25 pieces of marine shell, two basalt flakes, two basalt cores, waterworn stones and coral fragments. During Xamanek's recording a surface collection was conducted, collecting all of the cultural material at the site with the exception of the marine shell midden. The site was located 200 ft south of the study corridor centerline. The site area was relocated and the marine shell midden was observed.

State Site #: 50-50-10-3745
Site Type: Surface Scatter
Function: Temporary Habitation
Features (#): 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-3745 was initially recorded by Xamanek Researches in 1991 (Ibid.:71). The site was a very sparse surface scatter consisting of approximately six pieces of marine shell, three basalt flakes, a basalt core, a waterworn stone and coral fragments. During Xamanek's recording, a surface collection was conducted, collecting all of

53

the cultural material at the site with the exception of the marine shell midden. The site was located 130 ft south of the study corridor centerline. The site area was relocated and the marine shell midden was observed.

State Site #: 50-50-10-4765
Site Type: Mounds and irrigation ditches
Function: Agriculture
Features (#): 7 (CSH #8)

Description: State site 50-50-10-4765 is a complex of features that are all related to sugarcane cultivation on the parcel of land between Pūlehu Road and Oma'opio Road (see Figure 11). The study corridor traverses this site. The area is currently utilized as a cattle pasture. Feature A is a single agricultural clearing mound, Features B, C, D, F and G are historic irrigation ditches, and Feature E consists of a series of agricultural clearing mounds covering a large area. These features are located on gently sloping pasture land. Vegetation in this section of the corridor consists of a few monkeypod trees, *paimit* cactus, *kiawe*, and *Koa holo*; groundcover consists of low grass. In addition to the seven features detailed below, remnants of other smaller less formal cross slope earthen ditches, also associated with sugarcane irrigation systems, were also observed within this area.

Feature A is a historic agricultural clearing mound located just off Pūlehu Road approximately 300 feet from the corridor centerline. The mound is constructed of stacked and piled boulders and cobbles. Some sections are neatly stacked, while others are piled with less organization. Moss is visible on most of the rocks. Feature A has a maximum height of 2.9 m, a maximum length of 8.65 m NS and a maximum width of 7.8 m EW. No cultural material was observed at the feature.

Feature B is a historic irrigation ditch, currently not in operation, which is primarily earthen in construction. It passes through the corridor from east to west, perpendicular to the road alignment. Four small bridges cross the ditch within the corridor. The bridges are constructed of lumber, concrete and set stone. Some of the lumber elements have been damaged or destroyed by fire. The ditch portion of Feature B has a maximum width of 3.6 m and a maximum depth of 0.7 m. The bridges of Feature B average 1.85 m wide and 0.7 m high. The irrigation ditch runs under the bridge through a rectangular opening that measures 0.65 m wide by 0.4 m high. Feature B is in poor condition; it is clearly part of an old irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature C is a historic irrigation ditch, currently not in operation which is primarily earthen in construction. It passes through the corridor from east to west, perpendicular to the road alignment. Three small bridges cross the ditch within the corridor. The bridges are constructed of lumber, cement and set stone. Some of the lumber elements have been damaged or destroyed by fire. Feature C bridges are similar to those in Feature B, with the added feature of an adjacent side-chute, constructed of cement and set stones. The side-chute is at a right angle to the bridge, allowing for lateral ditch flow. The ditch portion of Feature C has a maximum width of 2.1 m and a maximum depth of 0.85 m. The bridges of Feature C average 2.1 m wide and 0.85 m high. The ditch runs under the bridge through a rectangular opening that measures 0.6 m wide by 0.66 m high. The side-chute wall is 0.95 m

54




Figure 11 State site 50-50-10-1765: Plan View

wide and 0.7 m high, with a circular opening approximately 0.4 m in diameter. Feature C is in poor condition; it is clearly part of an old irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature D is a historic irrigation ditch, currently not in operation, which is primarily earthen in construction. It passes through the corridor from east to west, perpendicular to the road alignment. Three small bridges cross the ditch within the corridor. The bridges are constructed of lumber, concrete and set stone. Most of the lumber in the bridge sampled for measurement had been destroyed by fire. Feature D bridges are similar to those in Feature C due to the presence of a side-chute. The side-chute is at a right angle to the bridge, allowing for lateral ditch flow. Feature D ditch has a maximum width of 1.4 m and a maximum depth of 0.65 m. Feature D bridges average 1.65 m wide and 0.8 m high. The ditch flowed through a rectangular opening beneath the bridge which measures 0.6 m wide. The side-chute wall is 0.95 m wide and 0.7 m high, with a circular opening approximately 0.4 m in diameter. Feature D is in poor condition; it is clearly part of an old irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature E includes a number of historic agricultural clearing mounds distributed across a large, sloping area approximately midway between Pulehu Road and Oma'opio Road. The mounds range in form from circular/elliptical to long and linear. Construction also varies from stacked to piled, and size of basalt materials range from very large boulders to cobbles. Mechanical scarring and lichens are evident on many of the stones. A small, discrete mound was measured and tagged. The sample measures 2.5 m E/W by 2.7 m N/S and 1 m high. All of the constituents of Feature E are associated with clearing activities for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature F is a historic irrigation ditch, primarily earthen in construction. Feature F passes through the corridor from east to west, perpendicular to the road alignment. Three small bridges cross the ditch within the corridor. The bridges are constructed of lumber, concrete and set stone. Some of the lumber elements have been damaged or destroyed by fire. Bridges are similar to those in Feature C and D (Feature F also has a side-chute). The side-chute is at a right angle to the bridge, allowing for lateral ditch flow. The ditch has a maximum width of 1.97 m and a maximum depth of 0.65 m. Feature F bridges average 2.1 m wide and 0.95 m high. The irrigation ditch flowed through a rectangular opening beneath the bridge that measures 0.55 m wide by 0.6 m high. The side-chute wall is 0.95 m wide and 0.7 m high, with a circular opening approximately 0.4 m in diameter. Feature F is in poor condition; it is clearly part of an old irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

Feature G is a historic irrigation ditch, primarily earthen in construction. It passes through the corridor from east to west, perpendicular to the road alignment. Three small bridges cross the ditch within the corridor. The bridges are constructed of lumber, concrete and set stone. Some of the lumber elements have been damaged or destroyed by fire. Feature G is similar to Feature C with an adjacent side-chute. The side-chute is at a right angle to the bridge, allowing for lateral ditch flow. The ditch has a maximum width of 1.66 m and a maximum depth of 0.35 m. The bridges average 2.1 m wide and 0.85 m high. The ditch formerly flowed through a rectangular opening beneath the bridge that measured 0.6 m wide by 0.55 m high. The side-chute wall is 0.95 m wide and 0.7 m high, with a circular opening approximately 0.4 m in diameter. Feature G is in poor condition; it is clearly part of an old irrigation system for sugarcane cultivation.

56

State Site #: 50-50-10-4773 (CSH # 16 & # 17)
Site Type: Complex of enclosures, alignments and foxholes
Function: Military training
Features (#): 102

Description: State Site 50-50-10-4773 consisted of 102 features, all composed of cobbles to large boulders that are typical and plentiful in the area (Figures 12-19). Of these features, there were 28 C-shapes, 17 U-shapes, 22 square enclosures, 5 circular/oval enclosures, 12 rectangular enclosures, 9 alignments/walls, 4 L-shapes, 1 remnant, and 4 sets of foxholes. The study corridor traverses this site.

A total of 28 C-shaped rock structures were encountered with the most were in fair to poor condition, with several being collapsed to almost indefinable remnants. Most consisted of a single alignment of cobbles to medium size boulders, though stacking to 2 to 3 courses high was observed in approximately thirteen structures (46% of C-shapes). Angles of the actual "C" shape ranged from very wide to an almost U-shape, with corners typically being rounded. Over 1/3 of the C-shapes had an slightly excavated interior similar to the foxhole construction. This excavation typically did not extend deeper than 30 cmbs. Construction style was generally similar in all cases. One C-shape was built against an existing kiawe tree, demonstrating the relatively recent age of construction.

The 17 U-shaped structures were also generally in fair to poor condition with a number being almost undefinable. The majority were constructed of a single alignment of cobble to medium boulders with stacking only occurring in six examples of U-shapes (35%). None of the U-shapes exhibited an excavated interior.

The 22 square enclosures, 5 circular/oval enclosures, and 12 rectangular enclosures are similar in all ways except for their actual shape. Most are composed of small to medium boulder alignments. Six of the square/rectangular enclosures exhibit an excavated interior, no deeper than 30 cmbs. Most features are deteriorating, with gaps in the wall.

The nine alignment/walls within the site complex are consistent in construction style with all the other feature types previously described: less than 15 boulders long (1-3 m long, 0.8 m wide) and the walls being no more than three courses in construction.

The 4 L-shaped stone structures are also consistent with typical construction style of the features in this area, with alignment segments ranging from 0.7-3.5 m in length. L-shape Feature CA exhibits some portions of 2 course stacking and Feature AC exhibits a partial excavated interior. Both other L-shapes are formed by a single alignments.

The remnant was most likely a rectangular enclosure that has been severely altered by the placement of a waterline through the center of the feature. The stones from the feature appear to have been re-utilized to create a support for the waterline. The center of the remnant is partially excavated to a depth of 20 cmbs.

The four series of fox hole-type features, which have no associated rock structures consist of excavated hole in the terrain that average 20 to 30 cmbs. It is possible that the fox holes may be the product of explosions from military activity rather than human excavation.

57




Figure 12 State site 60-50-10-4773: Feature Location Map




Figure 13 State site 50-50-10-4773: Features D, F, G, H, J, and K Plan View




Figure 14 State site 50-50-10-4773: Features Q, R, S, V, W, Y, AF, AG, AH and AI, Plan View




Figure 17 State site 50-50-10-4773: Features AR, AS, AT, AU, AV and AW, Plan View




Figure 18 State site 50-50-10-1773, Features BW, CC, CD, CE, CF, CG, CH, CI and CJ, Plan View

Military debris was observed throughout the entire site area and was common at most features. Ordnance encountered included a variety of small arms ammunition including spent cartridges from 30 cal., 50 cal., and 20 mm ammunition. Springfield ammo clips were observed scattered throughout the area. In addition a number of casings for 60 mm mortars were observed scattered through the site area. A single shell casing for a 75 mm Howitzer was also observed within the site area. An illumination rounds were also observed. In addition to ordnance assorted metal fragments and communications wire were observed throughout the site area. The site area contains evidence of widespread bulldozing. No other cultural material was observed within the site area.

Two 50 cm by 1.0 m test units were excavated at Features U and CS to determine the presence or absence of subsurface cultural material. In addition, shovel test probes were conducted at Features AI and AW to determine the presence or absence of cultural material. All excavations, test units and test probes, were completely sterile of cultural material.

The table below lists each feature, its type, individual measurements, description, and condition, and whether the feature was mapped or not.

Table 7: State Site 50-50-10-1773 Feature list

Feature	Type	Measurements	Condition	Map	Description and materials
A	C-shape; collapsed	2.4 m E/W 2.8 m N/S	Poor		1 mortar casing
B	Alignment; collapsed	2.5 m E/W 0.8 m wide	Poor		14-stone alignment; 2 sections with 2 course stacking
C	C-shape	2.0 m E/W 2.2 m N/S	Poor		Opening to west; 3 mortar casings
D	C-shape	4.0 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair	x	Opening to southwest; east and north sections 2 course stacking
E	C-shape	3.5 m E/W 3.4 m N/S	Fair	x	Opening to west; square corners; composed of medium sized boulders
F	U-shape	2.9 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair	x	Opening to west; square corners; some 2 course stacking
G	U-shape	2.9 m E/W 2.8 m N/S	Fair	x	Opening to west; square corners; 1 artillery dummy round and 1 mortar casing
H	U-shape; collapsed	2.3 m E/W 2.35 m N/S	Poor	x	Opening to northwest; several collapsed sections
I	U-shape; partial	2.85 m E/W 2.35 m N/S	Fair		Opening to northwest; southeast section is stacked 2 courses
J	U-shape	2.1 m E/W 1.65 m N/S	Fair/poor	x	Opening to north; square corners; construction not complete




Figure 19 State site 50-50-10-1773: Features CU, Plan View

K	U-shape; collapsed	3.2 m E/W 2.65 m N/S	Very poor	x	Opening to east; very poor alignment; construction not complete
L	Square enclosure	2.7 m E/W 2.5 m N/S	Fair		Composed of medium boulders; metal fragments present; numerous features in vicinity of this feature but just outside the project corridor;
M	U-shape	2.3 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair		Opening to south (toward existing road); impacted by existing road improvements
N	Square enclosure	3.1 m E/W 3.3 m N/S	Fair		Composed of medium to large boulders; 2 course stacking on south side; near existing road
O	Circular enclosure	3.3 m E/W 3.5 m N/S	Fair		Alternating alignment to 2 course stacking; near existing road
P	U-shape	2.2 m E/W 2.5 m N/S 0.35 m average height	Fair		Opening to north; up to 3 course stacking in some sections
Q	Circular enclosure	3.25 m E/W 3.9 m N/S 10-40 cm high	Fair	x	Alignment composed of medium boulders; 4 mortar castings and several bullet castings present
R	Rectangular enclosure	1.9 m E/W 2.6 m N/S 10-40 cm high	Fair	x	Alignment composed of small boulders; square cement
S	U-shape	1.6 m E/W 2.2 m N/S 5-25 cm high	Poor	x	Opening to south; incomplete construction
T	Square enclosure	2.9 m E/W 2.95 m N/S 10-40 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	Single to 3-course (south side) stacking
U	Square enclosure	2.9 m NE/SW 2.7 m NW/SE 10-30 cm high	Fair	x	Single course alignment; small gaps at northwest section
V	Square enclosure	2.5 m E/W 2.8 m N/S 10-25 cm high	Fair	x	Single course small boulder alignment
W	Square enclosure	2.1 m E/W 2.5 m N/S 5-40 cm high	Fair	x	Medium boulder to cobble alignment; previously 2-3 courses but now mostly collapsed

X	Foxhole and associated rock alignment	1.8 m E/W 2.2 m N/S Foxhole 10 cm deep. Alignment 1.2 m long 0-30 cm high	Poor		Excavated soil interior; edges now slumped; possibly from erosion; 7 small boulder alignment along south edge
Y	C-shape	2.5 m E/W 2.3 m N/S 15-40 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	Opening to north; ranging from alignment to 2 course stacking (north side)
Z	Square enclosure	2.6 m E/W 2.6 m N/S 15-40 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	Small boulder to cobble alignment; ranging from 1 to 2 course stacking
AA	Square enclosure	3.1 m NE/SW 2.6 m NW/SE 15-17 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	Small boulder to cobble alignment; ranging from 1 to 3 course stacking; partially excavated interior; metal fragments and ammo clips present
AB	Square enclosure	2.7 m NE/SW 3.0 m NW/SE 10-17 cm high	Poor/ Incomplete	x	Small boulder to cobble alignment; north section incomplete; south section 2 course stacking; east and west sections 1 course stacking; built on a slope in the terrain
AC	L-shape/ Right Angle	2.5 m NE/SW 3.5 m NW/SE	Poor	x	NE/SW alignment composed of 5 small boulders; NW/SE alignment composed of cobbles; interior section is partially excavated
AD	Square enclosure	3.15 m NE/SW 3.3 m NW/SE 15-40 cm high	Fair/ Poor/ Incomplete	x	Small boulder to cobble alignment; incomplete construction; interior partially excavated
AE	Square enclosure	3.1 m E/W 3.2 m N/S 10-30 cm	Fair/ Good	x	Small boulder to cobble alignments; south side 3 courses high; interior excavated to 30cm; 1 modern brown beer bottle within enclosure
AF	Square enclosure; collapsed	2.7 m E/W 3.25 m N/S 10-45 cm high	Poor	x	Composed of small boulders; soil pushed up into south side during existing road construction; several waterworn boulders present
AG	Oval enclosure	2.1 m E/W 2.7 m N/S 10-35 cm high	Poor	x	Small to medium boulder alignment; railon can lids

AH	Square enclosure	2.8 m E/W 2.7 m N/S 7-55 cm high	Good	x	Southern section composed of medium boulders with some 2 course stacking, other sections lower; northern section also contains some 2 course stacking; numerous bullet casings scattered throughout site area
AI	Square enclosure	3.2 m E/W 3.3 m N/S 10-55 cm high	Good	x	East and west sections 2 courses high small boulders; north and south sections cobbles to small boulders; interior excavated to 20 cm; bullet casings, tin cans, communications wire present at site area; 6 small boulder c-shape alignment between AH and AI
AJ	Rectangular enclosure	1.8 m E/W 3.0 m N/S 7-35 cm high	Good	x	Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking; ammo clips near feature
AK	Square enclosure	2.8 m E/W 2.2 m N/S 5-35 cm high	Good	x	Small boulder alignment with some 2 course stacking
AL	U-shape	3.1 m E/W 3.5 m N/S 10-55 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	Opening to north; southwest section 3 course stacking; east side now only 2 remnant; large gap in south side; bullet shell casings present
AM	Military remnant	3-45 m E/W 4.0 m N/S 5-40 cm high	Poor	x	No sides intact; existing modern water pipe cuts through the middle of the site, utilizing feature rocks to prop pipe up off ground surface; interior excavation to 20 cm; metal fragments present
AN	Square enclosure	3.1 m E/W 3.4 m N/S 18-42 cm high	Good	x	Small to medium boulder alignments with some 2 course stacking; just off existing road
AO	C-shape	2.1 m E/W 1.8 m N/S 5-35 cm high	Good	x	Opening to north; square corners; small boulder alignments
AP	C-shape	2.3 m E/W 1.8 m N/S 10-25 cm high	Fair/ Poor	x	Opening to north; small boulder alignment; interior excavated 10 cm; ammo clips present
AQ	Rectangular enclosure	3.5 m E/W 2.4 m N/S 10-40 cm high	Fair/ Good	x	2 course stacking on north, east, and west sides; south side impacted by existing road; canister bomb (?) observed at center of structure; bullet casings present
AR	Alignment	1.8 m long 20 cm high	Fair		Seven stone alignment, bullet casings present

AS	Rectangular enclosure	3.8 m E/W 2.8 m N/S 10-50 cm high	Fair/ Poor	x	Small boulder to cobble alignments; interior excavation to 15 cm; bullet casings and ammo clips present
AT	C-shape	2.1 m E/W 2.0 m N/S 10-35 cm high	Poor	x	Opening to north; 12 small boulders total; interior excavated to 10 cm; bullet casings and metal fragments present
AU	C-shape; collapsed	2.5 m E/W 1.5 m N/S 5-25 cm high	Very poor	x	North section impacted by erosion
AV	C-shape	2.0 m E/W 1.4 m N/S 5-30 cm high	Good	x	Structure generally 2 course stacking of small boulders; bullet casings present
AW	C-shape; collapsed	2.5 m E/W 2.15 m N/S 10-35 cm high	Poor	x	Opening to north; terrain sloping to north; small boulder alignment
AX	Rectangular enclosure	2.4 m E/W 3.0 m N/S 15-30 cm high	Fair/ Poor		Small boulder alignment; gaps in south and west sections
AY	C-shape	1.5 m E/W 2.0 m N/S 10-40 cm high	Fair		Center section (south) 2 course stacking w/ longer west wall (1.5 m) and shorter east wall (30 cm); ammo clips present
AZ	U-shape	2.2 m E/W 1.95 m N/S 10-30 cm high	Fair		Opening to north; Small boulder alignment; 50 caliber casings present
BA	U-shape	2.2 m E/W 2.2 m N/S 7-35 cm high	Fair/ Good		Small boulder alignment with some 2 course stacking; ammo clips present
BB	C-shape	2.4 m E/W 2.0 m N/S	Fair		Opening to north
BC	C-shape	2.3 m E/W 2.0 m N/S	Fair		Bullet casings present
BD	C-shape and associated collapsed wall	2.0 m E/W 1.3 m N/S	Poor		Opening to north; structure composed of 12 small boulders only
BE	4 Footholes	see map	Poor	x	see map
BF	Alignment	2.5 m long (E/W)	Fair		Composed of 12 small boulders only
BG	Alignment	3.0 m long (E/W)	Fair		Small boulder to cobble alignment
BH	Alignment	3.0 m long (E/W)	Fair		Small boulder alignment

BI	Alignment	2.3 m long (E/W)	Fair	Small boulder to cobbles alignment; metal fragments present
BJ	Square enclosure	2.7 m E/W 3.2 m N/S	Fair	Some gaps/collapse in walls
BK	Alignment	2.4 m long (E/W)	Poor	Medium to small boulders alignment
BL	C-shape	2.4 m E/W 1.3 m N/S 30 cm high	Fair	Opening to south; shallow angle; some two course stacking
BM	U-shape	2.2 m E/W 1.4 m N/S	Fair	Small boulder alignment
BN	C-shape	2.1 m N/S	Fair	Opening to north; small boulder alignment; "1943" 75 mm Howitzer casing in interior
BO	C-shape	2.0 m E/W 2.4 m N/S 30 cm high	Good	Opening to north; small boulder to cobble alignment
BP	Rectangular enclosure	1.4 m E/W 2.2 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Incomplete alignments
BQ	Rectangular enclosure	1.4 m E/W 2.4 m N/S	Fair	Small boulder alignments
BR	Rectangular enclosure	1.6 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Small boulder alignments; most of east and west sides missing; interior excavated less than 10 cm
BS	L-shape	2.4 m E/W 2.0 m N/S	Poor	Very rough small boulder alignments
BT	3 alignments	1) 2.4 m E/W 2) 2.1 m E/W 3) 1.0 m E/W	Poor	Alignments consist of medium to small boulders
BU	Square enclosure	2.1 m E/W 2.0 m N/S	Poor	Rough small boulder to cobble alignment
BV	Square enclosure	2.2 m E/W 2.3 m N/S	Good	Small boulder to cobble alignments
BW	C-shape	3.2 m E/W 1.0 m N/S	Poor	Opening to north; shallow angle of "C"; erosion evident
BX	Rectangular enclosure	1.4 m E/W 2.4 m N/S	Fair/Good	Small boulder to cobble alignment
BY	Square enclosure	1.4 m E/W 1.2 m N/S	Poor	Small boulder to cobble alignment

BZ	Square enclosure	1.6 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Interior excavated less than 10 cm
CA	L-shape		Fair/Poor	Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking
CB	U-shape	0.8 m E/W 1.4 m N/S	Good	Very narrow alignment
CC	Circular enclosure	see map	Fair	Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking and piling
CD	C-shape	2.1 m E/W 1.2 m N/S	Fair	Opening to north; Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking
CE	U-shape	see map	Fair	Opening to north; Small boulder to cobble alignment
CF	Square enclosure; remnant	see map	Poor	Small boulder to cobble rough alignment with gaps / collapses
CG	Rectangular enclosure; remnant	see map	Poor	Small boulder to cobble rough alignment with gaps / collapses
CH	Rectangular enclosure; remnant	see map	Poor	Small boulder to cobble rough alignment with gaps / collapses
CI	Circular enclosure; very remnant	see map	Poor	See map
CJ	Rectangular enclosure	see map	Fair/Good	Small boulder to cobble alignment with gaps / collapses in south section; communications wire present
CK	C-shape	1.2 m E/W 2.6 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Opening to west; Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking
CL	L-shape	0.7 m E/W 1.3 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Small boulder to cobble rough alignment
CM	C-shape	1.2 m E/W 2.2 m N/S	Poor	Small boulder to cobble rough alignment some stacked and piled two course areas
CN	C-shape w/foxtail	2.2 m E/W 2.8 m N/S	Good	Opening to west; One course alignment on north, east, and south sides; well excavated interior; 4+ c-mason cans in structure interior

CO	Foxhole	2.1 m E/W 2.4 m N/S	Poor	Small boulder alignment; possible bomb crater; otherwise, excavated interior; 4 other similar features nearby
CP	C-shape w/ foxhole	2.4 m E/W 1.7 m N/S	Fair/Poor	Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking on the east side; interior excavated less than 10 cmbs
CQ	C-shape	1.6 m E/W 3.2 m N/S	Fair/Good	Opening to west; Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking
CR	Foxhole	1.1 m E/W 1.4 m N/S	Fair	Small boulder to cobble alignment with some 2 course stacking along east side
CS	C-shape	2.0 m E/W 3.2 m N/S	Fair	Opening to west; abutting kiawe tree to south; collapsed sections appear to have once been 2 courses high
CT	C-shape	2.2 m E/W 1.2 m N/S	Fair	Opening to south; Small boulder to cobble alignment with some rough 2 course stacking; 2 ammo clips present
CU	U-shape	see map	Good	see map
CV	C-shape	2.5 m E/W 1.2 m N/S	Fair	Opening to north; just off existing road; small boulder alignment with some 2 course stacking
CW	U-shape	1.4 m E/W 2.2 m N/S	Fair/good	Possible utilization of existing bulldozer push or vice versa; large flat stone in structure; unique to this area
CX	2 alignments and 1 rock wall		Fair	Very simple construction

State Site #: 50-50-10-4776

Site Type: Circular Enclosure

Site Function: Military

Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-4776 is a oval enclosure (see Figure 20). The enclosure measures 1.8 m N/S by 2.3 E/W with the enclosure wall averaging 0.25 m in width. The site is constructed of basalt cobbles to medium boulders with heights ranging from 15-30 cm. Construction ranges from a single coarse alignment to two-course stacking on the western section of the site. The site is partially constructed on exposed bedrock outcrop and partially on soil. The soil at the interior of the site is slightly higher than on the outside of the site, possibly due to erosion. The site is located approximately 50 ft to the north of the study corridor centerline.

A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated at the eastern interior section of the site, partially dissecting the enclosure wall (see Testing Results section for complete results).

73




Figure 20 State site 50-50-10-4776: Plan View displaying test unit location

74

State Site #: 50-50-10-4778 CSH Site #: 22
 Site Type: L-shape enclosure
 Site Function: Military
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-4778 is a roughly constructed L-shaped enclosure situated on the southern edge of Waiakea Gulch (Figure 21). The L-shaped enclosure measures 2.8 m E-W by 2.3 m N-S and is constructed of small to medium boulders stacked 1 to 3 courses high to a maximum height of 0.65 m. The site is open to the south and southwest. The interior of the enclosure appears to be shallow soil over bedrock. No cultural material was observed at the site. The site is located approximately 75 ft to the east of the study corridor centerline.

State Site #: 50-50-10-5029 CSH Site #: 1001
 Site Type: Petroglyphs
 Site Function: Symbolic
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-5029 is comprised of three historic petroglyphs on two panels located on the northern cliff of Kalalinui Gulch approximately 200 ft north of centerline (Figures 22 and 23), outside the study corridor. The petroglyphs consist of three words in block lettering, all capitals with pronounced serifs. The words have been pecked and abraded into the vertical fine grain basalt cliff face near the top of the north side of the gulch approximately 6.1 m below the top of the cliff face. A narrow ledge trail allows access to this portion of the cliff. All petroglyphs are faint and in fair condition. Lichen growing on the gulch face obscures the petroglyphs. The petroglyphs appear to spell KUAANA, MILIMIL(A?), and MEHAME. The word KUAANA measures 33 cm long and 5 cm high, except the "K" which is 7 cm tall. The word MILIMIL measures 40 cm long and 5 cm tall, with an "A" at the end that has been scratched in, as opposed to pecking. The word MEHAME measures 40 cm long and 10-11 cm tall. All words appear to have had the outline of each letter pecked, then the interior was pecked and abraded to fill it in. Sections of the word MEHAME are very faded, especially the "E's."




Figure 21 State site 50-50-10-4778: Plan View

Figure 23 State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs 78





Figure 22 State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs 77



CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING




Figure 22 State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs

77




Figure 23 State site 50-50-10-5029: Petroglyphs

78

State Site #: 50-50-10-5030
 Site Type: Historic Wall
 Site Function: Cattle barrier
 Features: 2 within corridor

CSH Site #: 1002

Description: State site 50-50-10-5030 consists of a series of short wall segments constructed along the northern edge of Waikoa Gulch (see Figure 24). The wall segments are constructed at strategic points along the cliff effectively preventing cattle from either exiting or entering the gulch. Wall segments were observed along the north side of the gulch both to the east and the west of the present road corridor. Two of the wall segments are located within the project area corridor and have been designated features A and B (see Figure 24). A total of six more segments were observed to the west of the corridor along the gulch and a total of three segments were observed to the east of the corridor along the gulch. Only the portions of the site within the corridor were recorded. Surrounding terrain outside of the gulch consists of gently sloping grassland with scattered basalt boulders and cobbles. Vegetation consists of *kioua*, several monkeypod trees, *panini* cactus, *koa haole*, and grass.

Feature A is a wall segment which measures 4.5 m E-W by 0.7 m wide, with a maximum height of 0.85 m, and a minimum height 0.1 m at the western end. The wall is constructed of small to medium basalt boulders, stacked 4 - 5 courses high. The wall appears core filled. Feature A is in good condition.

Feature B is another short wall segment measures 3.7 m E-W by 0.7 m wide. Feature B wall heights range from 0.85 - 0.9 m on the south side, and 1.8 - 2.0 m on the north side. Feature B is constructed of small to medium basalt boulders, stacked 4 - 5 courses high on the exterior face. The wall is core-filled with cobbles.

State Site #: 50-50-10-5031
 Site Type: Petroglyphs
 Site Function: Symbolic
 Features: 3

CSH Site #: 1003

Description: State site 50-50-10-5031 consists of two petroglyph panels located on the southern side cliff face of Waikoa Gulch. The first panel contained two petroglyphs (Figures 25 and 26) and the second panel contained a single petroglyph (Figures 25 and 27). All three petroglyphs are of anthropomorphic figures. The petroglyphs were originally located 50 ft to the west of the corridor centerline, but the corridor was redesigned (150 ft to the east) to place the site 200 ft from the corridor centerline. The corridor was redesigned to avoid any impact to the site.

Panel #1 consists of two anthropomorphic figures, possibly male. The figures have been pecked into the surface. The first figure, designated Figure 1, measures roughly 16 cm tall and 9 cm wide. Figure 1 has a triangular shaped torso. Additional pecking is visible just above the figures' head. Figure 2 is a pecked stick figure, possibly male measuring roughly 14 cm tall by 9 cm wide. Both figures are very faint.

79




Figure 24 State site 50-50-10-5030: Plan View




Figure 25 State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Plan View

81




Figure 26 State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Panel 1

82




Figure 27 State site 50-50-10-5031: Petroglyphs, Panel 2

83

Panel #2, located 1.8 m west of Panel #1, consists of a single anthropomorphic stick figure, possibly male, holding something (club, paddle?) in the left hand. The right hand tip has definite claw-like points (fingers?). The basic figure is approximately 18 cm tall and 8 cm wide it is located 2.5 m up the cliff face from the gulch floor. The figure was made by pecking rather than with an incising style. Additional pecking is visible connecting to the right hand of the figure, suggesting the figure is holding something. It is very faint, almost impossible to see when sunlight is directly shining on it. It appears to be very old and worn.

No other cultural material was observed in the vicinity (i.e. midden, artifacts). Vegetation consists of *kiaue* brush along the sides of the gulch, sporadic grass, and sparse *koa haole*. No water was observed in the gulch during the time of the survey.

State Site #: 50-50-10-5032 CSH Site #: 1004
 Site Type: Alignments
 Site Function: Temporary Habitation
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-5032 consists of a series of alignments (see Figure 28). The alignments are constructed of single rows of small basalt boulders, which are set into the soil in a row. The longest section, which is discontinuous and L-shaped, measures 25 m N/S by 4 m E/W. Extending from the midpoint of the E/W section is a second, smaller L-shaped alignment that measures 3 m N/S by 1.7 m E/W. There is another small L-shaped alignment that begins 4 m to the east of the north end of the largest alignment. The alignment generally parallels the larger alignment. The surrounding terrain is gently sloping pasture land. The site is located approximately 190 ft to the north of the study corridor centerline. Vegetation consists of *kiu*, *kiaue* and *koa haole*; groundcover consists of sparse grass. Cultural materials observed at the site consist of a single fragment of cowry shell (*Cypraea* sp.), a basalt sinker stone and a basalt adze preform fragment. The sinker was collected for further analysis.

A 50 x 50 cm test unit was excavated in the south corner of the enclosure (see Testing Results section for complete details). No cultural material was encountered during the excavation.

State Site #: 50-50-10-5033 CSH Site #: 1005
 Site Type: Rectangular enclosure
 Site Function: Temporary Habitation
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-5033 is a roughly rectangular enclosure (Figure 29). It is constructed of basalt stones, cobble- to small boulder-sized, stacked one to three courses high, with a maximum height of 55 cm on the south wall. The site is located approximately 150 ft to the north of the study corridor centerline. Vegetation near the site consists of

84




Figure 28 State site 50-50-10-5032: Plan View




Figure 29 State site 50-50-10-5033: Plan View displaying test unit location

Kiaue, *Kiū*, and various sparse grasses. The enclosure appears to be constructed directly upon Stratum I soil. The interior of the enclosure is soil-filled and is slightly higher than the ground surface at the exterior of the enclosure. The north side and portions of the east and west sides appear to be core-filled. The south and east sides of the structure have gaps in their construction.

Two sections appear to be more recent modifications. The southwest corner section of the structure appears to be a newer stacking of small basalt boulders constructed on top of the existing older core-filled western wall section. This modification, similar to the military features construction style possibly functioned as a wind break. The site tag has been placed within this newer construction. The southeast corner section is also created with a different construction style of stacked small basalt boulders and cobbles constructed alongside the existing southern wall. The stone stacking seems to delineate a hole, 15 cm deep, in its center, which appears to have functioned as a fire pit. No cultural material was observed on the surface at the site.

An additional alignment of small basalt boulders is located to the southwest of the site, constructed parallel to the south wall section of the enclosure. The alignment is composed of 6 boulders. This may have been the former southwestern edge of the site, from which material was removed to create the more recently modified sections of the site.

A 1 m x 50 cm test excavation unit was excavated in the northwest corner of the site, just inside the west wall and just north of the newer constructed mound. A total of 29.8 g of marine shell midden and a 146.7 g piece of coral were collected from the excavation (see Testing Results Section of complete details).

State Site #: 50-50-10-5034 CSH Site #: 1019
 Site Type: Square Enclosure
 Site Function: Temporary Habitation
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-5034 is a square enclosure situated on relatively level pasture land (Figure 30). The site is located approximately 75 ft to the south of the study corridor centerline. Vegetation consists of *Kiū*, *Kiaue* and *Koa haole*, and sparse grasses. The enclosure measures 2.7 m N/S x 2.4 m E/W, with alignment heights ranging from 0.05 - 0.35 m. The enclosure is constructed of small to medium basalt boulders set into the soil with some segments stacked up to 3 courses high. The interior of the enclosure is level soil. The entire enclosure, including the interior, is constructed on a raised soil base, about 0.5 m higher than the surrounding ground surface. The northwest half of the site has been damaged by bulldozing. No cultural material was observed.

A 1.0 m by 50 cm test unit was excavated in the interior of the enclosure to determine the presence or absence of subsurface cultural materials (see Testing Results section for complete details).




Figure 30 State site 50-50-10-5034: Plan View displaying test unit location

State Site #: 50-50-10-5035 CSH Site #: 1020
 Site Type: C-shaped Enclosure
 Site Function: Temporary Habitation
 Features: 1

Description: State site 50-50-10-5035 consists of a large C-shaped enclosure and associated mound at its southeast end (Figure 31). The surrounding terrain is gently sloping pasture land. The site is located approximately 50 ft to the north of the study corridor centerline. Vegetation consists of *ku*, *kiaue*, and *koa haole* and various sparse grasses. The enclosure is constructed of stacked basalt boulders, 1 to 3 courses high (15-62 cm high), constructed directly on bedrock outcrop. The interior of the structure is completely soil-covered with some exposed bedrock and a few scattered cobbles. Three *kiaue* trees are growing just inside the enclosure. The north end of the C-shape is in good condition; the eastern and western sides are more weathered and collapsed. The adjacent mound consists of piled basalt cobbles to small boulders, 1 - 3 courses high, measuring 1.9 m N/S x 1.2 m E/W. The mound is collapsed on the south side.

A shovel test probe was excavated in the northwest interior of the structure (see Testing Results section for complete details). No cultural material was observed.

A. Testing Results Section

Limited subsurface testing was conducted at six sites. A total of five 1.0 m by 50 cm test units were excavated at two military sites (4773 and 4776) and two traditional temporary habitation sites (5033 and 5034). One 50 by 50 cm unit was excavated at another temporary habitation site (5032). In addition three shovel test probes were conducted at two sites (4773 and 5035) to determine the presence or absence of subsurface deposits.

A 1 m x 50 cm test units were excavated site 4773 Features U (Square Enclosure) and Feature CS (C-Shaped Enclosure). A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was also excavated at two of the temporary habitation sites 5032 (Square Enclosure) and 5033 (Rectangular Enclosure). The last 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated at a military site 4776 (Oval enclosure). In addition, shovel test probes were excavated at SS# 50-50-10-4773 Features AI and AW, 5032, and 5035 to determine presence or absence of subsurface cultural material.

The features were tested using controlled excavation. Excavations were extended well into sterile soil layers. One profile was prepared for each excavation. All excavated materials were screened through 1/8-inch wire mesh and cultural material recovered from the excavations were measured and analyzed. Each test unit was backfilled and the sites were reconstructed as close as possible to their original form.




Figure 31 State site 50-50-10-5035: Plan View displaying location of test probe

Test Excavation Unit Descriptions

State Site # 50-50-10-4773 Feature U

A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated in the northern interior of Feature U, a historic military square enclosure. A single stratigraphic layer was observed, very compact, fine grain, yellowish red (5YR 5/6) clay silt (Figure 32). The unit was excavated to a depth of approximately 60 cmbs. The top 20-25 cmbs contained approximately 20% root/rootlet inclusions and a basalt cobble concentration of approximately 50%. The cobble concentration increased with depth to a maximum of approximately 80% cobble inclusion at 25 cmbs that was the base of excavation. The base of the unit contained decomposing bedrock. No cultural material was encountered during excavation. A profile was drawn of the north face. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.

SSH 50-50-10-4773 Feature AI

A shovel test probe was excavated in the center of military Feature AI to aid in determining the presence or absence of subsurface cultural material. The probe was approximately 60 cm N/S x 40 cm E/W. The probe was excavated to a maximum depth of 46 cmbs. One stratigraphic layer was encountered, a very compact 5YR 5/6 yellowish red silt, containing small cobbles and abundant roots and rootlets (Figure 33). No cultural material was noted during excavation. A profile was drawn of the northeast face of the probe. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.


SSH 50-50-10-4773 Feature AV

A shovel test probe was excavated in the southwest corner of military Feature AV to aid in determining the presence or absence of subsurface cultural material. The probe measured approximately 60 cm N/S x 42 cm E/W (at the surface) and was excavated to a maximum depth of 48 cmbs at which point bedrock outcrop was exposed throughout the majority of the base of the probe (Figure 34). Two strata were encountered: the O-Stratum I to the base of excavation, a very compact 5YR 4/4 reddish brown silt, and contained small cobbles and decomposing bedrock and abundant roots and rootlets. No cultural material was encountered during the excavation. A profile was drawn of the southwest face. Photos were taken of the pit, pre- and post-excavation.

State Site # 50-50-10-4773 Feature CS

A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated in the northern interior of Feature CS, a historic military C-shaped enclosure. A single stratigraphic layer was encountered that consisted of a very compact, fine grain, yellowish red (5YR 4/6) clay silt (Figure 35). The unit was excavated to a maximum depth of 70 cm. At approximately 25 cmbs the cobble content increased to 80%. The root content throughout the excavation was extremely high. Bedrock outcrop was encountered at the base of excavation. No cultural material was encountered during the excavation. A profile was drawn of the eastern face. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.


91




Stratum I: (0-ROE) Very compact, fine grain, yellowish red (5YR 5/6) clay silt

Figure 32 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature U, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to north

92



Stratum I: (0-BOE) Very compact 5YR 5/6 yellowish red silt, containing small cobbles and abundant roots and rootlets.



O-horizon: (0-2 embs) 5YR 4/4 reddish brown silt
 Stratum I: (2-BOE) Very compact 5YR 5/6 yellowish red silt which contained small cobbles and decomposing bedrock and abundant roots and rootlets.

Figure 33 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature A1, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northeast

Figure 34 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature AW, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to southwest

State Site 50-50-10-4776


A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated bisecting the eastern wall and extending into the eastern interior of the enclosure (Figure 36). The excavation was terminated at a maximum depth of 25 cmbs. A small pocket of a very dark brown (10YR 2/2) silt was observed in the northwest corner of the unit extending a maximum of 2 cmbs. No cultural material was observed in this darker stained surface pocket. Besides the pocket only a single stratigraphic layer was encountered throughout the rest of the excavation. No cultural material was encountered during the excavation of this unit. A profile was drawn of the south face. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.

State Site #50-50-10-5032

A 50 x 50 cm test unit was excavated at Site 5032. The unit had a maximum depth of 41 cmbs. A single stratigraphic layer (Stratum I) was encountered, a 6YR 4/6 yellowish red silt (Figure 37). Stratum I contained decomposing bedrock and abundant roots and rootlets. No cultural material was encountered during the excavation. A profile was drawn of the south face. Photos of the unit were taken pre- and post-excavation.


State Site #50-50-10-5033

A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated in the interior of Site # 5033, a rectangular temporary habitation enclosure. Three stratigraphic layers were encountered (Figure 38). Stratum I, consisted of a very compact, fine grain, yellowish red 6YR 6/6 clay silt. Stratum I contained no cultural material. Stratum I contained a high concentration of roots and rootlets. Stratum II consisted of a compact very fine grain dark reddish brown (6YR 3/2) silt which contained cultural material. Cultural material encountered consisted of 3.2 g of *Conus* sp., 12.4 g of *Cypraea caputserpentis*, 0.1 g of *Nerita picea*, 1 g of *Isognomon* sp., 3.1 g of unidentified marine shell and a 146.7 g piece of coral. All cultural material encountered appeared very weathered and brittle. Stratum II was encountered between 18-25 cmbs. with both boundaries, with Stratum I and Stratum III, were gradual and wavy. Stratum III was encountered at approximately 25 cmbs and it extended to the base of excavation at 60 cmbs. Stratum III consisted of very compact fine grained yellowish red (6YR 4/6) silt which contained no cultural material. The cobble concentration increased throughout Stratum III so that at the base of excavation the cobble concentration was approximately 80%. The base of excavation unit was at depth of 60 cmbs. A profile was drawn of the southern face. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.



Stratum I: (0-BOE) Very compact, fine grain, yellowish red (6YR 4/6) clay silt.

Figure 35 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature C5, Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to east




Stratum I: (0-BOE)

Very compact, fine grain 5YR 4/6 yellowish red silt with decomposing bedrock and abundant roots and rootlets

Pocket:

A small pocket of a very dark brown (10YR 2/2) silt was observed in the northwest corner of the unit extending a maximum of 2 cmbs



Stratum I:

Very compact fine grain 5YR 4/6 yellowish red silt with decomposing bedrock and abundant roots and rootlets

Figure 36 State site 50-50-10-4776: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south


Figure 37 State site 50-50-10-5032: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south

State Site #50-50-10-5034

A 1 m x 50 cm test unit was excavated in the interior of Site # 5034, a square temporary habitation enclosure. Three stratigraphic layers were encountered (Figure 39). Stratum I consisted of a very compact, fine grain, reddish brown 2.5YR 4/4 clay silt and contained no cultural material. Stratum I contained a high concentration of roots and rootlets. Stratum II consisted of a compact very fine grain brown (7.5YR 2/4) silt which contained cultural material. Cultural material encountered consisted of 0.5 g of unidentified marine shell. The marine shell encountered appeared very weathered and brittle. Stratum II was encountered between 29-42 cms. with both boundaries, with Stratum I and Stratum III, were diffuse and wavy. Stratum III was encountered at approximately 42 cms and it extended to the base of excavation at 51 cms. Stratum III consisted of very compact fine grained yellowish red (5YR 4/6) silt which contained no cultural material. The cobble concentration increased throughout Stratum III so that at the base of excavation the cobble concentration was approximately 80%. A profile was drawn of the northwestern face. Photos were taken pre- and post-excavation.


State Site# 50-50-10-5035

A shovel test probe was excavated within the interior of site 5035. The test probe was approximately 54 cm x 48 cm (at the surface), and was excavated to a maximum depth of approximately 29 cms. Two strata were encountered during excavation (Figure 40), Stratum I, a 2.5YR 4/4 to 4/6 reddish brown compact silt, and Stratum II, a 7.5YR 2/3 to 2/4 brown. Stratum II was only encountered in a small pocket in the northwest corner of the probe. Both strata contained plentiful roots and rootlets, and numerous basalt cobbles. Stratum II appeared similar to the weak cultural layers encountered at site 5033 and 5034, although no cultural material was encountered at site 5035. Decomposing bedrock was encountered at the base of excavation. A profile was drawn of the northwest face. Photos of the test pit were taken pre- and post-excavation.



- Stratum I: (0-18)** Very compact, fine grain, yellowish red 5YR 5/6 clay silt with a high concentration of roots and rootlets.
- Stratum II: (18-26)** Compact very fine grain dark reddish brown (5YR 3/2) silt which contained cultural material.
- Stratum III: (25- BOE)** Very compact fine grained yellowish red (5YR 4/6) silt which contained no cultural material.


Figure 38 State site 50-50-10-5033: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to south



- Stratum I:** Very compact, fine grain, reddish brown 2.5YR 4/4 clay silt with a high concentration of roots and rootlets.
- Stratum II:** Compact very fine grain brown (7.5YR 2/4) silt which contained cultural material.
- Stratum III:** Very compact fine grained yellowish red (5YR 4/6) silt which contained no cultural material.

Figure 39 State site 60-50-10-5034: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northwest

101



- Stratum I:** Compact 2.5YR 4/4 to 4/6 reddish brown clay silt
- Stratum II:** Compact 7.5YR 2/3 to 2/4 brown clay silt. Stratum II was only encountered in a small pocket in the northwest corner of the probe.

Figure 40 State site 50-50-10-5035: Post excavation profile displaying test unit, view to northwest

102

VIII. SURVEY RESULTS

The study corridor is 300 ft wide, 150 ft on either side of centerline. An area 400 ft wide, 200 ft on either side of centerline, was surveyed to insure complete coverage of the study area. During the inventory survey a total of 126 structural and nonstructural features were identified within the study area. The archaeological features were organized into seventeen distinct sites. Of the seventeen sites encountered during the present study twelve are located within 150 ft of the corridor centerline. The other five sites (3729, 3743, 5029, 5031, and 5032) are located within 200 ft of the corridor centerline.

The seventeen sites are associated with a variety of functions, including traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation (3742, 3743, 3745, 5032, 5033, 5034, and 5035), agriculture (3727, 3728, and 4765), symbolic (petroglyph sites 5029 and 5031), animal husbandry (5030), a marker (3729) and historic military training activities (4773, 4776 and 4778).

A portion of the Kihai end of the corridor was subject to an inventory level survey by Xamanek Researches prior to the present study (Fredericksen et al 1994c). Six sites from the Fredericksen et al 1994c survey are located within our present project area, they are 3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743, and 3745. Site type, function, age, significance and recommendations for the aforementioned six sites are taken directly from the Fredericksen et al 1994c report.

The results of the inventory survey reflect the broad range of land use varying from traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation and petroglyphs, to historic military, ranching and agricultural activities.

Traditional Hawaiian Sites

Temporary Habitation

Traditional temporary habitation sites were encountered from 45 to 460 ft a.m.s.l. portion of the corridor above Kihai within the *ohupua* of Waiakoa and Kaonoulu (Table 8). A total of six sites within the project area are interpreted as having functioned as temporary habitation sites. Sites types include surface scatters (3742, 3743, and 3745), three types of small enclosures (5033 (rectangular), 5034 (square), and 5035 (c-shape)) and finally a rather unique site that consists of a series of boulder alignments (5032). Generally we can place the temporary habitation sites into two broad categories: structural and non structural.

In general all of the non-structural temporary habitation sites (i.e. surface scatters of cultural material) were located between the elevations of 45 to 105 ft a.m.s.l., while all of the temporary habitation sites that contained structural elements (i.e. enclosure) were located at elevations between 205 to 460 ft a.m.s.l. Due to the fact that the majority of the cultural material from the three surface scatter sites (3742, 3743, and 3745) was collected during a previous inventory survey (Fredericksen et al. 1994c) it is difficult for us to re-evaluate those three sites based on the evidence observed in the field. Therefore sites 3742, 3743, and 3745 will not be discussed in detail here (see Fredericksen et al. 1994 for complete analysis).

Table 8: Comparisons of Temporary Habitation Sites

State Site # 50-50-10-	Type	Sub-surface Deposits	Cultural material on surface	<i>Ohupua</i> 'a	Const. Style	Elev. ft a.m.s.l.
3742	Surface Scatter	No	Yes	Kaonoulu	NA	65
3743	Surface Scatter	No	Yes	Kaonoulu	NA	45
3745	Surface Scatter	No	Yes	Kaonoulu	NA	105
5032	Alignments	Possibly	Yes	Waiakoa	Alignment	360
5033	Rectangular Enclosure	Yes	No	Waiakoa	Core	460
5034	Square Enclosure	Yes	No	Waiakoa	Core	235
5035	C-shaped Enclosure	Possibly	No	Waiakoa	Indeterminate	205

Site 5032, a series of boulder alignments, was determined to be a temporary habitation site based on the presence of cultural material observed on the surface which is typically associated with pre-contact Hawaiian culture. Items observed on the surface included a basalt net sinker stone, a basalt adz preform or core and a single piece of marine shell midden. The construction style of the site, which is an alignment, is typical of the two military sites within the project rather than the other structural temporary habitation sites. The size of 5032 is unique when compared to the other temporary habitation sites or military sites in that it is considerably longer (the western alignment at the site is approximately 26.0 m in length). 5032 is located 190 ft to the north of the study area centerline at approximately 360 ft a.m.s.l. within the *ohupua* of Waiakoa. A 50 by 50 cm test unit was excavated at the site. No cultural material was observed during the excavation and only a single stratigraphic layer was observed.

Site 5033 is a rectangular enclosure that appears to be a traditional Hawaiian temporary habitation site that was modified historically either by the military or by hunters (see Figure 29). The unmodified portions of the site enclosure wall are collapsed but appear to have been core filled at one time. This contrasts with the construction style of the military features at site 4773, which were normally alignments or rough stacking lacking core filling. No cultural material was observed on the surface at site 5033. A 1.0 m

by 50 cm test unit was excavated at the site. Traditional marine shell midden was encountered from a weak cultural layer during the excavation. A total of 29.8 g of marine shell midden was collected from the excavation. The site is located 150 ft north of the study area centerline at approximately 460 ft a.m.s.l.

Site 5034 is a square enclosure located 75 ft south of the study area centerline at approximately 235 ft a.m.s.l. The site appears to have been impacted by bulldozer, which appears to have crossed the northwest corner of the site damaging both the west and north walls of the enclosure. A 1.0 m by 50 cm test unit was excavated at site 5034 to better ascertain function. A very sparse amount (0.5 g) of marine shell midden was encountered from a weak cultural layer during the excavation. The construction style of the site is similar to site 5033 in that the walls are severely collapsed but appear to have been core filled.

Site 5035 is a C-shaped enclosure located 50 ft north of the study area centerline at approximately 205 ft a.m.s.l. No cultural material was observed at the site. A shovel test probe was excavated at the site. No cultural material was encountered during the probe but a darker stained layer, similar to the weak cultural layers at Sites 5033 and 5034, was encountered.

Temporary habitation sites were expected in the project area along former trails from the uplands to the coast (such as the Waikoa Trail; See McCarty and Spear 2000:44). No physical evidence of a former trail was observed in the project area but it is probable that a trail traversed the Kaonoulu and/or the Waikoa portions of the project area.

Petroglyphs

Petroglyphs were encountered in both Kaihalinui and Waikoa Gulches (5029 and 5031). Site 5029 consists of a panel of three historic petroglyphs pecked into the northern cliff face of Kaihalinui Gulch. Site 5031 consists of at least three traditional petroglyphs of anthropomorphic figures located on the southern side of Waikoa Gulch. The petroglyphs are pecked into the cliff face. Kaihalinui Gulch has previously identified petroglyph sites located at higher elevations. Both petroglyph sites are located 200 ft from the study area centerline, site 5029 is 200 ft to the east of centerline and site 5031 is 200 ft west of centerline. Site 5031 was originally located 50 ft west of centerline, but the corridor was adjusted 150 ft to the east to avoid any impact to site 5031.

Agriculture and Marker

Three sites from the Kihai end of the survey (i.e. Fredericksen *et al.* 1994c) are functionally associated with agriculture and a marker. All three sites consist of stone piles or stone cairns. All three sites are of an indeterminate age. Site 3729 and 3729 were almost completely excavated during the 1994 inventory survey (*ibid.*) which makes re-evaluation difficult.

Historic Land Use

Military Sites

A large historic military site, State site 50-50-10-4773, was encountered between 500 and 740 ft. a.m.s.l. The corridor passes directly through the site. A total of 102 features were documented. Features were generally very simple boulder alignments of varying shapes including C-shape, U-shape, rectangular, square, oval and circular enclosures. In addition fox holes were encountered typically consisting of a hole excavated into the soil with a small stacking or alignment of boulders along one side. Two 1.0 m by 50 cm test units and two shovel test probes were excavated at four separate features from different areas of the site. None of the test probes or excavations at the site encountered any cultural material and only a single stratigraphic soil layer was encountered. The site extends well outside of both the east and west sides of the corridor. The overall extent of the site was not determined.

Site 4776 is a small oval enclosure located 50 ft north of the study area centerline at approximately 65 ft a.m.s.l. The feature is isolated with no other features of similar type within the area. A 1.0 m by 50 cm test unit was excavated at the site. A single stratigraphic layer was observed. No cultural material was observed at the site either on the surface or from the test excavation. The site is interpreted as a military site based on the construction style, size, location and lack of traditional cultural materials. It must be noted that there is a considerable evidence of bulldozing in the area of site 4776 so it is possible that it was not an isolated site and that the surrounding sites or features have been destroyed.

Site 4778 is a small L-shaped enclosure situated 75 ft east of the study area centerline on the southern edge of Waikoa Gulch. The feature is similar to 4776 in that it is isolated and there is no observable cultural material on the surface. There does not appear to be the potential for subsurface cultural deposits in the area. The wall of the enclosure appears to be constructed partially on exposed outcrop and partially on exposed C-horizon. The site is interpreted as a military site based on the construction style, size, location and lack of traditional cultural materials. No cultural material of any kind was observed in the area.

Historic Sugar Cane Agriculture

Remnants of historic sugar cane cultivation infrastructure were observed and recorded in the section of the corridor between Pulehu and Oma Opio Roads (site 4765). The corridor passes directly through the site. Recorded features included five inactive irrigation ditches that cross the corridor perpendicularly. The ditches are earthen. Each ditch is crossed by two to three small bridges. The bridges are constructed of concrete and lumber and are in poor condition. Two of the recorded features consist of clearing mounds associated with historic sugar cane cultivation. In addition to the recorded features barely discernable cross slope earthen sugar cane irrigation ditches were also observed.

Cattle Walls

Sections of cattle walls were encountered along the north side of Waiahoa Gulch. Site 5030 documents the sections of cattle walls within the corridor. The cattle walls are short sections that prevent the cattle from either entering or exiting Waiahoa Gulch. The walls were encountered throughout the corridor along the north side of Waiahoa Gulch.

IX. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A total of seventeen sites of archaeological significance are present in the project area (see Table 6). Sites were evaluated for significance according to the broad criteria established for the National and State Registers. The five criteria are:

- Criterion A Site reflects major trends or events in the history of the state or nation.
- Criterion B Site is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Criterion C Site is an excellent example of a site type.
- Criterion D Site may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.
- Criterion E Site that has cultural significance, such as religious structures (shrines, *heiau*) or human burial locations.

All seventeen sites recorded all are classified under significance criterion D. Two sites were also classified under significance criterion C.

Criterion D - "site may be likely to yield information important in prehistory and history" - is assigned to all of the sites. It is believed that these sites have yielded varying types of scientific data and contribute to some or all of the following analyses: (1) material culture; (2) site architecture and function; (3) chronology; and (4) settlement patterns. We believe that twelve of the seventeen sites lack any additional scientific data beyond what was acquired during the inventory survey (i.e. site configuration, description and plotted location).

Criterion C - "site is an excellent example of a site type" - is assigned to the two petroglyph sites (5029 and 5031). Sites 5029 and 5031 are considered excellent examples of smaller petroglyph sites in the lower *Kūia* gulches.

X. RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

Of the seventeen sites recorded in the project area, it is recommended that three sites be subjected to a program of data recovery and two sites be preserved. The remaining twelve sites (3727, 3728, 3729, 3742, 3743, 4765, 4773, 4776, 4778, 5030 and 5034) in the project area are not recommended for further work. Based on documenting location, type, age and function sufficient data has been generated from the present inventory level survey that no further research appears warranted for the 12 sites.

The three sites (5032, 5033 and 5035) recommended for data recovery should be subjected to a program of additional data collection. All of the sites recommended for data recovery have been assigned a temporary habitation function. Data recovery at these sites will probably consist of further excavations in accordance with a data recovery plan, which will need to be approved by SHPD/DLNR.

The two petroglyph sites (5029 and 5031) are recommended for preservation. The specifics regarding preservation of the two sites will need to be addressed in a preservation plan.

XI. REFERENCES

- Allen, Gwenfread
1971 *Hawaii's War Years, 1941-1945*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Armstrong, Warwick, Ed.
1973 *Atlas of Hawaii*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Ashdown, Inez
1971 *Ke Ala o Maui*, Ace Printing Co., Wailuku, Maui, HI.
- Austin, Smith & Associates, Inc.
1974 *An Inventory of the Flora and Fauna of the Kihui Area, Maui, Hawaii*, Austin, Smith & Associates, Inc., Honolulu, HI.
- Bartholomew, Gail and Bren Bailey
1994 *Maui Remembers: A Local History*, text by Gail Bartholomew, photo research by Bren Bailey, Mutual Publishing, Honolulu, HI.
- Brown, Roderick S.
1989 *Interim Report: Archaeological Inventory Survey Kēēka and Waiohuli Subdivisions: Lands of Kēēka and Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02-55, 56)*, PHRI, Hilo.
- Brown, Roderick S. and Alan E. Haun with Helen Wong Smith
1989 *Archaeological Inventory Survey Kēēka and Waiohuli Subdivisions: Lands of Kēēka and Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02-55, 56)*, PHRI, Hilo.
- Burgett, Berdena and Robert L. Spear
1995 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of 22.25 acres of Land in Kula, Kaonoulu Ahupua'a Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-06-105)*, Scientific Consultant Services Inc., Kaneohe, HI.
- Bushnell, Tina and Hallett H. Hammatt
(in progress) *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of 1.5 Acres of the University of Hawaii Facility at Haleakala, Papa Anui Ahupua'a, Makawao District, East Maui, (TMK 2-2-07-8)*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Chaffee, David B., Berdena Burgett, Mike Carson and Robert Spear
1997 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Portion of the Proposed Expansion of the Maui Research and Technology Park, Kihui, Maui Island, Hawaii (TMK 2-2-2-54)*
- Clark, John R. K.
1980 *The Beaches of Maui County*, includes Maui, Molokai, Lanai and Kahoolawe, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Cobb, Scott
1992 *Commercial Fisheries of the Hawaiian Islands*, U.S. Fish Commission Report for 1991, Government Printer, Washington D.C.
- Comprehensive Consulting Services of Hawaii
1991 *Site Selection Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement, New Kihui Elementary School, Kihui, Maui*, prepared for Dept. of Accounting and General Services, State of Hawaii, HI.
- Condé, Jesse C. and Gerald M. Best
1973 *Sugar Trains, Narrow Gauge Rails of Hawaii*, Glenwood Publishers, Felton, CA.
- Corby, Ross
1977 *Kihui Flood Control Project Archaeological Reconnaissance & Literature Search*, U.S. Corps of Engineers, Honolulu, HI.
- Corby, Ross
2000 *Review of Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of Proposed Kihui-Kula Road Corridors (FHWA/DOE) Kihui-Kula Highway, Kula district, Maui (Draft)*
- Cox, David Walter
1976 *The Archaeology of Kula, Maui from Pāhehu Nui Ahupua'a to Kamia ole Ahupua'a: Surface Survey, Pāhehu Highway*, Dept. of Transportation, Honolulu, HI.
- Cox, J. Halley and Edward Stasauck
1970 *Hawaiian Petroglyphs*, Bishop Museum Special Publication 60, Honolulu, HI.
- Creed, Victoria S.
1993 *Settlement Pattern for Waikapū, Wailuku District, Maui, Hawaii*, Vol. I. *LCAs for the Ahupua'a of Waikapū, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii*, Vol. II, In partial fulfillment for the Certificate of Historic Preservation, UH Manoa, Honolulu, HI.
- Danham, Theresa K.
1992 *Surface Survey of the Koyanagi Subdivision, Ōma'opio, Kula, Maui, TMK 2-3-03-129*, State Historic Preservation Division, Wailuku, Maui, HI.

- Donham, Theresa K.
1991 *The Wonderland Mushroom House (Site 50-11-2845) Kaonoulu, Makawao District, Maui (TMK 2-2-06:26)*
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990a *Archaeological Data Recovery Program, Site 50-10-10-2475, Piihoni Residential Community - Phase I, Land of Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui, (TMK 2-2-02:Por. 42), PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990b *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Piihoni Residential Community, Phase II, Land of Kākae, Makawao (Waikutu) District, Island of Maui, (TMK 2-2-02:42 por., PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Donham, Theresa K.
1990c *Archaeological Inventory Survey Potential Upcountry Maui High School Sites, Lands of Haliuuaile, Hokuula, Kailua, and Makoeha, Makawao District, Island of Maui, PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Donham, Theresa K.
1989 *Archaeological Inventory Survey Piihoni Residential Community - Phase I, Land of Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui, PHRI, Hilo, HI.*
- Dunn, Amy, Michael Carson, Michael Dege, and Robert Spear
1999 *Archaeological data Recovery of the DHHL Kula Residential Lots Unit 1 of Waiohuli, Kula, Maui Island, Hawaii, SCS Honolulu*
- Estioko-Griffin
1988 *Field Inspection Report on Site T-45 Kākae, Makawao Maui DLNR*
- Folk, William H. and Hallett H. Hammatt
1983 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of Kula Lands in Ōnaopio, Kula, Maui (Portion of TMK 2-3-23), Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.*
- Folk, William H., Melody Heide, Victoria Creed, Thomas Devereux, Ian Masterson and Hallett H. Hammatt
1999 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kīhei to Kula Road Corridors, Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a (TMK 2-2 and 2-3), Makawao and Waikutu Districts, Island of Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.*
- Foots, Donald E., E.L. Hill, S. Nakamura and F. Stephens
1972 *Soil Survey of the Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai and Lanai, State of Hawaii, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.*
- Fredericksen, Demaris L., Erik M. Fredericksen and Walter M. Fredericksen
1994 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey For Keala Hills Subdivision, Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Waikutu District, Maui Island (TMK 3-9-30:21), Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.*
- Fredericksen, Demaris L., Walter M. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1993 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey and of Data Recovery Report for Lokelani Intermediate School, Located in the Ahupua'a of Waiohuli, Makawao (Waikutu) District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02:por 43), Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.*
- Fredericksen Erik M., and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1999 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a 1.5 Acre Parcel for the Dekalb Genetics Corporation Office Structure in Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMK 2-2-02:por 69)*
- Fredericksen Erik M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Walter M. Fredericksen
1996 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of GTE Hawaiian Telephone Halekaka fiber Optics Ductline Corridor, Papanui and Kaonoulu Ahupua'a, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMK 2-2-07:1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 12, 2-2-06:9)*
- Fredericksen Erik M. & Demaris L. Fredericksen
1995a *Inventory Survey Report for Road "C" Corridor, Waiohuli Ahupua'a, Makawao and Waikutu districts, Maui Island (TMK 2-2-02: por. 66, 67, 3-9-02:109)*
- Fredericksen Erik M. & Demaris L. Fredericksen
1995b *Data Recovery Report for Site 50-50-10-3529 in the Road "C" Corridor, Waiohuli Ahupua'a, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMK 2-2-02:67)*
- Fredericksen, Erik M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1995c *An Inventory Survey of a 1.78 Acre Parcel Located in Hokuula Ahupua'a, Makawao District, Maui Island (TMK 2-3-44:31), Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.*
- Fredericksen, Erik M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Walter M. Fredericksen
1994a *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a 24-Acre Parcel, Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Waikutu District, Island of Maui (TMK 3-09-18:1), Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.*
- Fredericksen, Erik M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Walter M. Fredericksen
1994b *Archaeological Subsurface Testing at Site 50-50-10-2636, Kama'ole Ahupua'a, Waikutu District, Maui Island, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.*

- Fredericksen, Erik M., Walter M. Fredericksen and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1994c *Archaeological Inventory Survey and Botanical Survey Report, Kaonohi
Ahupua'a, Wailuku and Makawao Districts, Island of Maui (TMK 3-9-01:16
and 2-2-02: Por. 15)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1993 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Parcel of Land in the Ahupua'a of
Onaopio, District of Kula, Island of Maui (TMK 2-3-15: 2 & 24)*, Xamanek
Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1992 *Additional Archaeological Research at Keowakapu View Subdivision (TMK
3-9-04:79) Kihui Maui*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1991 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a 3.14 Acre Parcel in Kihui Maui,
Hawaii (TMK: 3-9-17:26)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1990a *Report on Archaeological Monitoring of Azeke Place Commercial Center
Kihui, Maui, Hawaii*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M. and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1990b *Report on Archaeological Monitoring of HTE Longs Drugs Project, Kihui,
Maui, Hawaii*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1994 *Archaeological Inventory Survey on Smith Trust Property (Kihui) in Waiohuli
Ahupua'a, Wailuku District, Maui Island, Hawaii (TMK: 3-9-02: 91, 92, 93,
94, 133, 134, 135)*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Survey, Subsurface Testing Required by State of
Hawaii, Historic Sites Section, Honolulu, Hawaii*, Xamanek Researches,
Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1990 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of an 8.5 Acre Parcel Tax Map 3-9-20:07,
Kihui, Maui, Hawaii*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.
- Fredericksen, Walter M., Demaris L. Fredericksen and Erik M. Fredericksen
1989 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a 1 Acre Parcel, Tax Map 3-9-20:10,
Kihui, Maui, Hawaii*, Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui, HI.

- Giambelluca, Thomas W., Michael A. Nullet and Thomas A. Schroeder
1986 *Rainfall Atlas of Hawaii*, Department of Land and Natural Resources,
Honolulu, HI.
- Gordon, Elizabeth and James Brent
1999 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Derago Subdivision (TMK:
(2) 2-2-05), Kula, Maui, Hawaii*
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
2000a *Archaeological Assessment for South Kihui Road Improvements, Lipoo Street
to Ka'anuihiko'i Street, Waiohuli Ahupua'a, (Kihui) Kula, Maui, Cultural
Surveys Hawaii, Inc.*
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
2000b *Archaeological Inventory Survey for Fuji Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.'s 4.75
Acre Algae Farm Site in Kekeka Ahupua'a (Kihui), district of Makawao,
Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02: por 42) Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Inc.*
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
1992 *Archaeological Survey and Testing of a 5.4-acre Parcel at Kama'ole, Wailuku
District, Island of Maui*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Hammatt, Hallett H., and David W. Shideler
1990 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey for a Kihui Employee Housing Project
at Kama'ole (Kihui), Wailuku District, Maui, Cultural Surveys Hawaii,
Kailua, HI.*
- Hammatt Hallett H. and David W. Shideler
1989 *Archaeological Reconnaissance of a 5.4-acre Parcel at Kama'ole, Wailuku
District, Island of Maui*, Cultural Surveys Hawaii, Kailua, HI.
- Handy, E.S. Craighill and Elizabeth G. Handy
1972 *Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment*, Bishop
Museum Bulletin 233, Honolulu, HI.
- Hau, Alan
1988 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey Maui Palisades Residential
Subdivision, Land of Kama'ole, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-
02: Por 2)*
- Hibbard, Don
1995a *Environmental Assessment, South Kihui Road Improvements Phase III
(County of Maui Job No. 94-81), Kepuka, Wailuku District, Maui TMK 3-9-
02:09, 10 Letter to Richard Takase dated 4/21/1995, Log No 14160, Doc No
9504KD08*

- Hibbard, Don
1995b "Historic Preservation Review of the Proposed South Kihai Road Improvements Phase II Waimahaihai Street to Welaikao Road Kēkēa, Wailuku District, Maui TMK Por. of 3-9' Letter to Conrad Stephenson dated 9/26/1995, Log No 15317, Doc No 9509SC22
- Hirota, Sam O.
1979 *Environmental Impact Statement, Kihai Drainage Project, County of Maui*, Sam O. Hirota Inc., Honolulu, HI.
- Hommon, Robert J.
1991 *An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Kihai Gateway Property, Kihai, Maui, TMK 3-8--4:2, 21 & Portions 20, 23, Science Management Inc.*, Honolulu, HI.
- Hurst, Gwen
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of Proposed Kihai Elementary School Site, Lots 1 and 2, Kama'ole, Wailuku, Maui Island, Part I, Historical Background*, Applied Research Group, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Janion, Aubrey P.
1977 *The Olouatu Massacre and Other Hawaiian Tales*, Illustrated by Guy Buffet, Island Heritage Norfolk Island Office, Norfolk Island, Australia.
- Jones, Maude
1938 "Whaling in Hawaiian Waters," *Paradise of the Pacific*, Volume 50 No. 4 April 1938
- Kam, Wendell
1986 *Field Inspection Report Waiohuli-Kēkēa Farmplot subdivision, waiohuli, Makawao Maui TMK 3-2-02:14, State of Hawaii; DLMR, Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, HI.*
- Keau, Charles
1981a *Archaeological Reconnaissance, Kamaole Beach Park, Kanaha Beach Park, Kahului Sewage Treatment Plant, Department of Parks and Recreation, County of Maui, Wailuku, HI.*
- Keau, Charles
1981b *An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Kaunoulu Beach Park, Maui, TMK 3-9-01: 87, 17, 1, State Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, HI.*
- Kennedy, Joseph
1992 *An Archaeological Inventory Surface Survey Report for the Keaukapu View Subdivision located at TMK 3-9-01:79, Kaunoulu Ahupua'a, Wailuku District, Island of Maui, Revised*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii, Inc.
- Kennedy, Joseph
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Report for TMK 3-9-02:14 Located at Kihai, Island of Maui, June 1991*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1990a *Archaeological Survey Report for TMK 3-9-01:99 and TMK 3-9-01:64*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1990b *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Brewster Rest Haven, Located at Kihai, Maui, TMK: 2-2-02:24*
- Kennedy, Joseph
1989a *Archaeological Survey Report for TMK: 3-9-04:135 and TMK: 3-9-04:132 Located at Kihai, Maui July 1989*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1989b *Preliminary Walk-Through Reconnaissance of the Proposed Keonekai Villages September 1989*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1989c *Letter Report (Inspection of TMK 3-8-4:29) July 1989*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1988a *Archaeological Monitoring Report Concerning Kihai Village, TMK: 3-8-14:19 June 1988*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1988b *Archaeological Walk-Through Survey of the Proposed Kaunoulu Subdivision, (TMK: 3-9-01:15, 148 & 149) Located at Kihai, Maui, Ahupua'a of Kaunoulu July 1988*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1988c *Archaeological Examination of TMK: 3-9-02:95 & 84 Located at Kihai, Maui, October, 1988*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1986a *Archaeological Walk-Through Examination of TMK 3-9-01 Parcels 144 and 145*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii
- Kennedy, Joseph
1986b *Preliminary Inventory Survey for the Proposed Kihai Village Subdivision TMK 3-8-14:19* Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii; [Wailuku]

- Kennedy, Joseph
1986c *Preliminary Archaeological Reconnaissance of Proposed Golf Course, Ahupua'a of Waiohuli, Island of Maui* Archaeological Consultants of Hawai'i
- Kennedy, Joseph and Maryanne B. Maigret
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Report for TMK 3-9-02:14 Located at Kihai, Island of Maui*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawai'i
- Kennedy, Joseph, Laura Reintsema, Patrick Trimble and Maryanne B. Maigret
1992 *Archaeological Inventory Survey with Subsurface Testing Report for a Property at TMK 3-9-04: (Parcels 76, 77 & 78) in Kauna'ole Ahupua'a, Waialuku District, Island of Maui*, Archaeological Consultants of Hawai'i
- Kikioi, Scott T., David W. Shideler and Hallett H. Hammatt
2000 *Archaeological Inventory Survey for the Expanded 20 Acre Algae Farm Site in Ke'ekoa Ahupua'a (Kihai), District of Makawao, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2-02: par 42)*, Cultural Surveys Hawai'i, Inc.
- Kikuchi, William K.
1973 *Hawaiian Aquaculture Systems*, A Dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tempe, AZ.
- Kirch, P.V.
1971 "Archaeological Excavations at Paluoa, Southeast Maui, Hawaiian Islands." *Anthropology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania*, IV (1):62-86, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Kolb, Michael J., Patty, J. Conte, and Ross Cordy, eds.
1997 *Kula: The Archaeology of Upcountry Maui in Waiohuli and Ke'ekoa: An Archaeological and Historical Settlement Survey in the Kingdom of Maui*, Historic Preservation Division, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Honolulu, HI.
- Kuykendall, R. S.
1938 *The Hawaiian Kingdom Volume 1, 1778-1854, Foundation and Transformation* The University Press of Hawai'i
- Leidemann, H.
1989 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey for Keonekai Development, Kihai, Maui, TMK 3-9-14-02*
- Mcdonald, G.A., A.T. Abbott and Frank L. Peterson
1983 *Volcanoes in the Sea*, Second Edition, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Masterson, Ian, William H. Folk and Hallett H. Hammatt
1995 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey and Subsurface Testing of the Proposed Kelepelema Transmitter Site, Makawao, East Maui (TMK 2-2-07: portions 1 and 5)*, Cultural Surveys Hawai'i, Kailua, HI.
- Mayberry, J.D. and A. E. Haun
1988 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey, Maui Palisades Residential Subdivision, TMK:2-2-02:par.02*, PHRI, Inc., Hilo, HI.
- McDermott, Matthew, David W. Shideler, and Hallett H. Hammatt
2000 *Additional Archaeological Inventory Survey Investigation for the 7.4-acre Parcel Proposed for the Kinca Mauka Parcel Development on Kalamihiko'i Road, Waiohuli Ahupua'a, Kihai, District of Kula Maui (TMK: 3-9-01:155)*, Cultural Surveys Hawai'i, Inc.
- McPhatter, Blair and Paul H. Rosendahl
1996 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey 250-Acre Pukalani Project Area, Land of Aopuoa, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK: 2-3-0&Par.5)*, PHRI, Hilo, HI.
- Miura, Marvin
1982 *Biological and Archaeological Reconnaissance, TMK 2-2-02: Portion of 42, Kihai, Maui, Hawai'i*, Environment Impact Study Corporation, Maui and Honolulu, HI.
- Moore, James R. and Joseph Kennedy
1995 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey Report for the Proposed Lower Kula Water Transmission Main, Phase 1 Passing Through TMK 2-2-02:15 and TMK 2-2-13-14 and the Ahupua'a of Kaheo 1st and 2nd, Kaonoulu, and Alae 1st to 4th, Makawao District, Island of Maui*
- Neller, Earl
1982a *An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Kalama County Beach Park, Kama'ole, Maui*, State Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, HI.
- Neller, Earl
1982b *An Archaeological Reconnaissance at the Kaonoulu Beach Park, Maui, TMK: 3-9-01:87, 17, 1* State Historic Preservation Office, Honolulu, HI.
- Pepalis, Jeanne and Michael J. Kolb
In press "Early Human Activity at a Leeward Coastal Pondfield Near Kelepele, Maui" In *Hawaiian Archaeology* Volume 8

- Pukui, Mary Kawena
1983 *Olelo No'ea: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*. Bishop Museum Special Publication No. 71, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Pukui, Mary K., Samuel H. Elbert and Esther Mookini
1974 *Place Names of Hawai'i*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Riford, Mary F.
1987 *Archaeological Services for Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, Waiohuli and Ke'okea Subdivisions, Kula, Makawao, Maui*, Public Archaeology Section, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, (Final Report), Honolulu, HI.
- Rosendahl, Margaret L.K.
1978 *Preliminary Overview of Archaeological Resources at Haleakala National Park, Island of Maui*, Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Rosendahl, Paul H.
1975 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Haleakala Highway Road Realignment Corridor, Haleakala National Park, Maui*, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Sinoto, Aki
1990a *Post-Field Summary, Kihai Kai Makani Testing B. P. Bishop Museum*
- Sinoto, Aki
1990b *Post-Field Summary for the Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey for the Diamond Resort Parcel, Kihai, Maui Island, TMK 3-9-17:23 B. P. Bishop Museum*
- Sinoto, Aki
1989 *Post-Field Summary of Surface Survey for the Residential Subdivision Development, TMK 3-9-18:01 B. P. Bishop Museum*
- Sinoto, Aki
1978 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of Proposed Kihai Boat Launching Ramp, Keauakapu, Maui. Appendix 4 of EIS, and Hawai'i Register of Historic Places Cover Sheet*, Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Sinoto, Aki and Jeffrey Pantaleo
1992 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of the Proposed Kihai Gateway Complex, Kihai, Wailuku, Maui, Island, (TMK 3-8-77:9 3-8-05:34)*, Aki Sinoto Consulting, Honolulu, HI.
- Speakman, Cummins E.
1984 *Maui: An Informal History*, Peco Press, San Rafael, CA.
- Spear, Robert L.
1992 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of Parcel TMK 3-9-10:77, Town of Kihai, Ke'okea Ahupua'a, Wailuku District, Island of Maui*
- Sterling, Elspeth P.
1998 *Sites of Maui*, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.
- Stokes, J.F.G.
n.d. *Maui Heiau*, manuscript, Bishop Museum, c. 1909-1916, Honolulu, HI.
- Tanji, Edwin
1997 "Searchers comb landfill for military artifacts," *The Honolulu Advertiser*, April 13, 1997, Honolulu, HI.
- Thrum, Thomas G.
1909-1918 "Heiau of Maui," *Hawaiian Annual* (compilation, as catalogued at SHPD), Honolulu, HI.
- Walker, Winslow
1931 *Archaeology of Maui*, Manuscript at B.P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, HI.
- Watanabe, Farley
1987 *Appendix A: Archaeological Reconnaissance of Three Parcels in Maui County Being Considered for Use with the Relay Mirror Experiment*
- Wilcox, Charles
1921 "Kalepolepo" in *Paradise of the Pacific*, December 1921 Vol. 34, No. 12, pgs. 65-67.
- Wulzen, Warren and Paul H. Rosendahl with Helen Wong Smith
1996 *Archaeological Inventory Survey, 44-Acre Pihakani Terrace Subdivision III, Land of 'A'opua, Makawao District, Island of Maui, PHRI, Hilo, HI.*

APPENDIX A: PHOTOGRAPHIC APPENDIX

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

The photographs selected for this appendix are representative of the site types present within the project area. For this reason, photographs of every site and/or feature are not included.



Figure 11 State site 50-50-10-3727, view to east



Figure 12 State site 50-50-10-1765, Feature A, view to south



Figure 43 State site 50-50-10-1765, Feature B, view to west




Figure 44 State site 50-50-10-1765, Feature C, view to west




Figure 45 State site 50-50-10-4765. Feature D, view to west




Figure 46 State site 50-50-10-4765. Feature E, view to east



Figure 47 State site 50-50-10-4773. Feature E, view to north



Figure 48 State site 50-50-10-4773. Feature L, view to south

CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS
BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE
LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S)
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING




Figure 15 State site 50-50-10-4765. Feature D, view to west



Figure 16 State site 50-50-10-4765. Feature E, view to east



Figure 47 State site 50-50-10-4773. Feature E, view to north



Figure 48 State site 50-50-10-4773. Feature L, view to south




Figure 49 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature H, view to south



Figure 50 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature M, view to south

126




Figure 51 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature N, view to south



Figure 52 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature O, view to southeast

127




Figure 53 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature Q, view to southeast




Figure 54 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature R, view to east



Figure 55 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature T, view to north



Figure 56 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature Z, view to south




Figure 57 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature B1, view to south



Figure 58 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature C1, view to south

130



Figure 59 State site 60-50-10-4773: Feature C1, view to south




Figure 60 State site 60-50-10-4773: Feature C1, view to south

131




Figure 61 State site 50-50-10-4773: Feature CU, view to southwest



Figure 62 State site 50-50-10-5033, view to south

**IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF
POTENTIAL TRADITIONAL CULTURAL IMPACTS
WITHIN THE KĪHEI-UPCOUNTRY
MAUI HIGHWAY PROJECT AREA,
MAUI, HAWAII
[TMK: 2-2 AND 2-3]**

Prepared by:
Leann McGerty, B.A.
and
Robert L. Spear, Ph.D.

Revised October 2000

Prepared for:
Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.

SCIENTIFIC CONSULTANT SERVICES, Inc.

711 Kapolei Blvd. Suite 1475 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc., Scientific Consultant Services (SCS) conducted a Traditional Cultural Impact Study to be included within an Environmental Impact Statement for the Kīhei-Upcountry Maui Highway project (TMK 2-2 and 2-3).

This project contains several components which primarily include appropriate archival/background research, identification and consultation with a number of informants, and a synthesis and assessment of findings from applicable archaeological work, archival/background, and ethnographic research.

Many individuals were recommended to SCS through consultation with OHA (O'ahu and Maui Island representatives) as well as suggestions from long term Maui and Kula community Residents. Interviews were conducted on Maui between the dates of June 19 to August 4, 2000 with Charles Ke'au, Ed Uweko'olani, Henry Silva, Sonny Manoa, Randal Moore, Henry Rice, Nancy Purdy, Silvia Hont, Eihel Nagata, and Frank Gouveia. Telephone interviews were also conducted.

Numerous cultural features were reported during this study including religious sites, trails, petroglyphs, and the general location of burial caves. Topographic anomalies associated with pre-Contact events, individuals, or recorded in legends and stories were also noted. Several of these sites are not located within the project area. Other sites are considered archaeological as they are no longer in use and their location is unknown.

Interviews with individuals did not lead to the identification of any specific Traditional Cultural Properties as defined by the National Register Criteria for Evaluation as:

Any historic property associated with the traditional practices and beliefs of an ethnic community or members of that community for more than fifty years. These traditions shall be founded in a community's history and contribute to maintaining the community's cultural identity. Traditional associations are those demonstrating a continuity of practice or belief until present or those documented in historical source materials, or both. These properties include but are not limited to, some types of archaeological sites.

Presently, the only known culturally significant sites in the project area are the archaeological features that have been previously identified.

APPENDIX B

Interview with Frank Gouveia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

LIST OF FIGURES iii

INTRODUCTION 1

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES 4

SCOPE OF WORK 6

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AREA 7

TRADITIONAL AND HISTORICAL LAND TENURE 10

PRE-CONTACT 13

Traditional Legends and Associations 15

TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENT PATTERNS 20

HISTORIC PERIOD 21

The Chinese in Kula 25

The Māhele 26

Ranching 30

Sugarcane 33

Pineapple 36

20th Century 36

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGY 37

METHODOLOGY 42

INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES 43

IMPACT ASSESSMENT 52

CONCLUSIONS 55

REFERENCES CITED 57

APPENDIX A

Individuals contacted regarding the Kīhei-Upcountry Maui Highway

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Kīhei-Upcountry Maui Highway Planview Map of Project Area (From Draft EIS 1999) 2

Figure 2: Map Showing Highway Alignments (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, 1999) 3

Figure 3: Kula Lands (June 21, 2000) 8

Figure 4: Photograph of Up-Country Kula Lands (June 21, 2000) 9

Figure 5: Photograph Showing Downslope Kula Looking Towards West Maui (June 21, 2000) 9

Figure 6: Map Showing Approximate Route of Proposed Highway Alignment and Ahupua'a in Traditional Kula District (Kolb *et al.*, 1997:24) 11

Figure 7: Map of Traditional Districts of Maui (Kolb *et al.*, 1997:5) 14

Figure 8: Diagram of Maui's Chiefly Lineages (Kolb *et al.*, 1997:15) 18

Figure 9: Photograph of a Chinese Society Building in Keōkea Kula (June 21, 2000) 27

Figure 10: Photograph of Fong Store Kāākea View to West (June 21, 2000) 27

Figure 11: Photograph of Post-Māhele Boundary Walls in Kula (June 21, 2000) 28

Figure 12: Map Showing LCA Claims on the Coast (Kolb *et al.*, 1997:65) 31

Figure 13: Photograph Showing Keōkea Historic Pasture Lands, Mauka (June 21, 2000) 32

Figure 14: Map Shows Proposed Highway Alignments Through Sugar and Ranch Lands (Modified from Map by Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company) 35

Figure 15: Ca. 1938 Map Showing Trails and Footprint Petroglyphs Near Pu'u O Kali (Brown and Haun, 1989) 39

Figure 16: Kīhei-Upcountry Maui Map Showing Historic and Archaeological Sites on Proposed Highway Alignments (From Draft EIS 1999) 41

Figure 17: Photograph of Mr. Ed Uweko'olani of Halekalā Ranch (June 19, 2000) 44

Figure 18: Photograph of Mr. and Mrs. D. Purdy of 'Ulupalakua Ranch (August 4, 2000) 46

Figure 19: Photograph of Mr. Frank Gouveia at Home in Hali'imaile (August 3, 2000) 47

Figure 20: Ca. 1929 Map of Maui by W. E. Wall Showing Old Government Road from Kula to the Coast 48

Figure 21: Mrs. Ethel Nagata at Her Shop in Kahului (August 4, 2000) 49

Figure 22: Plan View Map of Kealiua Village, a Typical Plantation Camp (Hawaiian and Commercial Sugar, N.D.) 50

Figure 23: Ca. 1872-1879 Map of Kula by W. D. Alexander and M. D. Monsarrat Showing Waiakoa Trail 54

Figure 24: Ca. 1929 Map by W. E. Wall Showing Trail from Kama'ole to the Coast 56




Figure 2: Map Showing Highway Alignments (Cultural Surveys Hawaii, 1999).

A property could be considered a cultural site and eligible for the National Register if association with a significant event or activity can be established, even if there is no tangible evidence of the event or activity (National Park Service 1990).

Although the National Register does not encompass intangible resources as actual "cultural properties", it recognizes the relationship between the property and the activities and beliefs associated with it as significant, in as much as it may be these activities and beliefs that give the property its importance.

According to the Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts adopted by the State of Hawai'i (1997):

The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual customs. The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both man made and natural, including submerged cultural resources, which support such cultural practices and beliefs.

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

Several publications pertaining to the process of evaluating and documenting Traditional Cultural Properties and for assessing cultural impacts provided guidance in gathering information for this report. The National Park Service was directed to prepare guidelines to assist in the documentation of intangible cultural resources and to encourage the identification and documentation of such resources by State and Federal agencies. National Register Bulletin No. 38 (National Park Service 1990) was developed and intended to be an aid in determining whether properties thought to have traditional cultural significance are eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

The National Register of Historic Places states:

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Criteria established within the National Register for evaluating a property's eligibility for listing in the National Register includes properties that:

- (a) are associated with events that have made significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- (c) embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) have yielded, or may be likely to yield information important in prehistory or history. [36 CFR, part 60.4]

Guidelines adopted by the State of Hawai'i's Environmental Council provide information concerning cultural practices and cultural features that may be impacted by certain activities, such as land development, and requires environmental assessment of cultural resources in determining the significance of a proposed project (OEQC 1997).

Consultation on February 10, 2000 with a State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) representative resulted in guidance provided in the "Draft Procedures For Ethnographic Inventory Surveys" (pers comm. Holly McEldowney, State Historic Preservation Office 1999).

Preparation for the archival-historical section of this report included reviewing Hawaiian Land Commission Award (LCA) records from the Māhele (Land Division) of 1848; archival issues of *The Honolulu Advertiser, The Polynesian*; journal information recorded by Capt. King (in Beaglehold 1967), LaPétouse (1798), George Vancouver (1984), Archibald Menzies (1920); Samuel Kamakau (1961); Abraham Fomander (1917-1919 and 1969); Isabella Bird (1974); Elspeth Sterling (1998); Inez Ashdown (1970); Daisy Kalaupa and Mary Kawena Pukui (1983); and Craighill and Elizabeth Handy (1972).

An archaeological reconnaissance conducted within the proposed bypass highway segments identified 25 historic sites (Folk et al. 1997). Other archaeological projects through the years have contributed to our understanding of traditional settlement patterns and economic strategies. Preparation of this report included reviewing articles and documents describing archaeological data and surveys of the project area including those by Thomas Thurum (1906-18), John Stokes (1909-16), Winslow Walker (1931), and more recent scholars.

SCOPE OF WORK

The Scope-of-Work (SOW) for this project includes archival/background research, identification and consultation with a limited number of informants, a synthesis and assessment of the findings from appropriate archaeological work, and archival/background and ethnographic research.

The general intent of this Section 106 effort focused on a selected number of knowledgeable individuals to aid in determining the spatial relationships between potential Traditional Cultural Properties and locations for the proposed highway corridors and characteristics and uses of any potential properties. Of particular concern to the present project was the identification of places and/or natural features or objects that may not have been physically modified by humans and were, therefore, not readily recognized as historical properties during conventional archaeological work. In addition, the identification and description of associated cultural practices were deemed of utmost importance.

Archival/background research required accessing both published and unpublished sources including surviving recorded legendary and traditional accounts, early historical journals, narratives and other written accounts describing life-styles and noted events, missionary accounts, land records such as Land Commission Awards and their associated claims and testimonies, Royal Patent Grants, Boundary Commission records containing survey notes and maps, and information supplied by previous archaeological studies.

Informant interviews form a critical part of the assessment process. Individuals having knowledge of traditional practices and beliefs associated with a project area or knowing of historical properties within a project area are sought for interviews. Those persons whose knowledge is founded in a continuity of traditions passed down from preceding generations and the individual's personal familiarity with the project area, are important. Ethnographic inventory survey, which identifies and acceptably documents historic properties within the project area is founded on this information.

Preliminary contact was made to individuals recommended to SCS by OHA and Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. An announcement was sent over the Internet to members of the Hawaiian

Nation on Maui asking for contacts of individuals that were familiar with the project area. During this project, more than 50 people were contacted and interviewed pertaining to Traditional Cultural Properties and activities in the project area. Unless the interviewee indicated knowledge of Traditional Cultural Properties, the conversation was not taped. General points of interest were recorded in field notes and summarized below.

The proposed Kihai-Upcountry Highway alignments mainly impact ranch and agricultural lands. Several avenues of investigation were, thus selected, including contacting individuals associated with the ranches and those previously living in plantation camps near the proposed highway alignments. A descendant of an upcountry Land Commission Award recipient whose family had remained was also contacted (Mrs. D. Purdy).

This report contains a cultural historical overview of the project area, a review of archaeological and ethnographic studies of the project area, land tenure history, the results of consultations with knowledgeable individuals in the community, and a synthesis and assessment of the findings.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AREA

The island of Maui encompasses 1,873 square kilometers (729 square miles) and ranks second in size of the eight main islands in the Hawaiian Archipelago. The island was formed by two volcanoes, Mount Kulkui in the west and Haleakalā in the east. The younger of the two volcanoes, Haleakalā, soars 2,727 m (10,023 feet) above sea level and embodies the largest section of the island.

Unlike the amphitheater valleys of West Maui, the flanks of Haleakalā are distinguished by gentle slopes. Although it receives more rain than its counterpart in the east, the permeable lavas of the Honomanū and Kula Volcanic Series prevent the formation of rain fed perennial streams. The few perennial streams found on the windward side of Haleakalā originate from springs located at low elevations. Valleys and gulches, such as Waiohūi Gulch, were formed by intermittent water run-off.

Along the coastal side of the windward side of Haleakalā, rainfall has been measured to 4,000 mm a year and over 9,000 mm near the mountain's summit (Stearns and Macdonald 1942:35-42).

Kula, situated on the leeward slope, is located in the rain shadow of Haleakalā. On the leeward side of East Maui, rainfall averages range from 500 mm to 750 mm in the project's uplands to less than 400 mm in the coastal section. The combined arid conditions and lack of reliable water sources resulted in the importance of the expensive upland dryland field systems established within the project area. Kula consists of sloped plains with finger ridges and a outcrops (Figures 3, 4, and 5).

The boundaries of the project area extend from Pi'ilani Highway on the coast, west, to the western flank of Haleakalā and Kula Highway (Upcountry Maui). Project area elevation ranged from approximately 18 to 31 meters (60-100 ft.) above mean sea level (amsl) on the Khei coast to approximately 732 meters (2,400 ft.) amsl at terminus U3 in the upland *ahupua'a* of Pūehunui (see Figure 2).




Figure 3: Kula Lands (June 21, 2000).




Figure 4: Photograph of Up-Country Kula Lands (June 21, 2000).




Figure 5: Photograph Showing Downslope Kula Looking Towards West Maui (June 21, 2000).

The north/south boundary extends from Kailua to Kama'ole Ahupua'a. A total of 13 ahupua'a, or portions thereof, are incorporated within project boundaries including Kailua, Keahua, 'A'apueo, Kaliahinui, Oma'opio, Pūlehuini, Kealahou 3 and 4, Waiakoa, Ka'ono'ulu, Kōheo 1 and 2, Waiohuli, Kōkōea, and Kama'ole.

TRADITIONAL AND HISTORICAL LAND TENURE

Traditional Hawaiian subsistence was based on agricultural production, marine exploitation, animal husbandry, and wild plant and bird collecting. Extended household groups settled in various ahupua'a, smaller land divisions within a district, that customarily continued inland from the ocean. Within the ahupua'a, residents were able to harvest from both the land and the sea. Ideally, this situation allowed each ahupua'a to be self-sufficient by supplying needed resources from different environmental zones (Lyons 1875:111). Many ahupua'a (Kōheo, Alae, Kamehame Nui, Pūlehu Iki, etc.), in the traditional Kula District were not typical as they were land locked (Figure 6).

In pre-Contact Hawai'i there were primarily two types of agriculture, wetland and dryland, both of which are dependent upon geography. Conditions in West Maui with its perennial streams were ideal for wetland *kalo* (*Colocasia esculenta*) agriculture incorporating pond fields and irrigation canals. Other cultigens such as *kō* (sugar cane, *Saccharum officinarum*) and *māi'a* (bananas, *Musa sp*) were also grown and where appropriate, the production of such crops as *'uala* (sweet potato, *Ipomoea batatas*) occurred. This was a typical agricultural pattern seen during traditional times on all the islands of Hawai'i (Kirch and Sahlins 1992:5, 119; Kirch 1985).

Dryland agriculture was an important component of Kula's traditional economy. Although West Maui contained vast wetland pond fields, they produced the least amount of taro of the main Hawaiian islands. East Maui's extensive dryland fields are thought to have produced crops of sweet potato equal to Hawai'i Island, and outproduced O'ahu and Kaua'i (Handy and Handy 1972:488).

An account of traditional planting methods from the newspaper *Ka Nūpepa Ku'ōko'ū* began: "...rocky lands in the olden days were walled up all around with the big and small stones of the patch until there was wall (*kuaiwā*) about 2 feet high..." (March 24, 1922).




Figure 6: Map Showing Approximate Route of Proposed Highway Alignment and Ahupua'a in Traditional Kula District (Kolb et al. 1997:24).

More relevant to the project area is Handy and Handy's description of environmental conditions on the leeward side of Haleakalā:

The great bulk and altitude of Haleakalā makes its southern flank practically a water less desert, and the southeast and west flanks relatively dry, so that there were no *lo'i* (pond fields) cultivation at all. The arid country below the west and south slopes of Haleakalā, including Kula, Honua'ula, Kahikinui, and Kaupo, were dependent on sweet potato (Handy and Handy 1972: 488).

Handy and Handy described planting methods in the drier sections of Kula:

Where potatoes are planted in crumbling lava with humus, as on eastern Maui and in Kona, Hawaii, the soil is softened and heaped carelessly in little pockets and patches using favorable spots on slopes the crumbling porous lava gives ample aeration without much mounding (1972:131).

As the land was cleared for dryland agricultural fields, the upland native forest deteriorated. The forest was an important resource to pre-Contact populations as well as historic settlements as it provided medicinal plants, wood, and birds hunted for food as well as their feathers. However, as agriculture expanded, deforestation occurred. Traditional clearing methods are illustrated in the story of Kihapi'iiani, a chief of Maui in the 1600s. The chief went to the boundary of Kula and Makawao: "...Seaward of this place, along the stream on the side adjacent to Kula...that is the place Kihapi'iiani set fire to. There he farmed and planted sweet potatoes" (Mamu 1884).

A typical dryland forest might include a mixture of *mamane* (*Sophora chrysophylla*), *'ōhi'a lehua* (*Metrosideros polymorpha*), *naio* (*Myoporum sandwicense*), *koa* (*Acacia koa*), *'ilahi* (*Santalum* sp.), *lama* (*Diospyros hillebrandii*), *olopua* (*Nestegis sandwicensis*) and others. Avifauna valuable for feathers would have most commonly included *'amakihi* (*Hemignathus virens*), *'apapane* (*Himatione sanguinea*), *'i'iwi* (*Vestiaria coccinea*), and *'oma'o* (*Alysdastes obscurus*). A number of flightless ground-dwelling birds, now extinct (*Porzana* sp.), were hunted as food as were other endemic and indigenous birds (Kolb et al. 1997:227).

Kula was always an arid region. In spite of this factor, a considerable population existed along its extended, low seashore (where the fishing was excellent) and the lower westward slopes of Haleakalā. So far as is known, the Kula region supported no Hawaiian taro and the fishermen in this section must have been dependent mainly on *poi* brought from the wet lands of Waikapū

and Wailuku across the plain. This supplemented their usual sweet potato diet: "...*ivala* was the staple of life here" (Handy and Handy 1972:511).

In spite of the dry, inhospitable conditions of Kula, many chose to settle on the coast as well as inland. An important component of the traditional Kula subsistence economy was fish ponds, several of which were constructed on the south Maui coast. The remnants of two ponds still exist: those of Kalepolepo and Waiohuli. Three other fishponds were identified in aerial photos along the coastline of Waiohuli and Kēōkea (Kolb et al. 1997:27).

Kalepolepo, located on the boundary of Ka'ono'ono and Waiohuli Ahupua'a was a royal fishpond containing mullet. Although it is not known when it was first built, it is recorded that while acting as overlord on Maui in the sixteenth century, Hawai'i Island chief Umi rebuilt the sea walls of three ponds one of which may have been Kalepolepo (Sterling 1998:251). When Kamehameha I ruled as chief over Maui, it is reported that he rebuilt the collapsed south side of Kalepolepo (Kamakau 1869).

PRE-CONTACT

The division of Maui's lands into districts (*moku*) and subdistricts was supposedly performed by a *kahuna* named Kalāina'ōhi'a, during the time of the *ali'i* Kaka'ālanoo (c. 1500s) (Beckwith 1940:383). Traditionally, Maui consisted of twelve political districts: Honua'ula, Kula, Hāmākuapoko, Hāmākuāloa, Kahikinui, Kaupō, Kīpahulu, Hāna, and Ko'olau in East Maui and Wailuku, Ka'anapali, and Lahaina in West Maui (Figure 7).

In historic times, the original twelve traditional districts were reduced to four: Lahaina, Wailuku, Hāna, and Makawao which included the former Hāmākuapoko, Hāmākuāloa, Kula, and Honua'ula. Makawao is also the name of an individual *ahupua'a* located inland of the present town of Hāli'imaile.

Traditional boundaries occurring between Kula and Hāmākuapoko were the lands of Hāli'imaile and Hōkū'ula. These *ahupua'a*'s are not typical as they are land locked and do not extend to the sea.




Figure 7: Map of Traditional Districts of Maui (Kolb et al. 1997:5).

Kula translates as "plain, field, open country, pasture" and is used to describe the country in back of the seashore or the name of a region near the base of a mountain (Pukui and Elbert 1957:164; Lucas 1995). In 1884, a governmental act differentiated between dry or *kula* land and wet or *kaio* land (Pukui and Elbert 1957:164).

The few references to the Kula District found in traditional sources illustrates its relative lack of importance compared to Hana, Lahaina, Wailuku and other population centers on Maui. Most references to Kula are minimal even when describing important battles and their participants.

Traditional Legends and Associations

A chant from the 1800s reproduced in Sterling (1998:7) notes the names of the winds of Maui and Moloka'i, including mention of Kula:

...The cold wind travels over the uplands of Kula
 And tears down on the pili grass.
 The wind of Kula is the Nau [The kehaui is of Kula]... (Fornander 1919:100).

Several historical and legendary sayings regarding Kula and the lands contained therein survived and were recorded by Mary Kawena Puku'i (1983). Some are derogatory and some compare natural phenomena of Kula to human qualities representing some of the traditional cultural values held by the Hawaiians of Maui.

According to surviving traditions, the skills of the people of Kula appear to have been confined to the upland environment. It was said that in their ignorance of fishing matters, they would try and scale the suckers off a squid's legs (Sterling 1998:243).

*He aina o Kula ua kaulana
 Mai na aiti kahalo
 Ie aina i pihia ka e'epa
 Kau na nahi i ka pikopiko i ka he'e*

Kula is a land that is famous
 From the days of the ancient chiefs
 A land full of peculiarities
 For the scaling of the suckers of the octopus (Daisy Kalaupa, in Sterling 1998).

Handy and Handy reported that Haleakalā crater was a final resting place for the people of Kula and Honua'ula of the "Clan of Pele" (1972:336). These devotees would travel at night to the edge of the crater and throw the bones of their dead into the volcano.

Kula, lying in the lee of Haleakalā, would periodically suffer from droughts resulting in famines. During a drought in the time of Kihapi'ilani (c., A.D. 1500-1600s) people were forced to subsist on weeds such as *lanilele*, *pualele*, and *popolo* (Kamakau 1961:23). They could restore their crops only by obtaining potato slips from neighboring Hāmākuapoko and Hāhi'imaile.

The place names of political entities were often derived from legends, significant events, or land features. An example of this is the story of A'apueo, the owl.

According to legend, a female owl lived in the upland of Kula during the reign of Kanenuiakiwaikalu (n.d.). A man named Kapoi from Wailuku smashed her eggs inciting a battle between the owls and the people of Wailuku. A'apueo found revenge for the destruction of her eggs at the death of Kanenuiakiwaikalu during the battle (Jaua 1871:2). Thus, the origin of the name of one of the *ahupua'a* in Kula.

The sacred site of Pu'u Pane is located in the *ahupua'a* of A'apueo (up slope of the project area). Located on a crest of a hill, east of Haleakalā Highway at approximately 2573 feet amsl, Pu'u Pane was described by M. Manu in an article in *Xuoko'a* (Feb 23, 1884). Manu stated that Pu'u Pane was declared by Kihapi'ilani as sacred and no commoner could climb the hill because it was a *heiau* for the high chiefs of Maui from ancient times to Kihapi'ilani. A *kahuna* lived at A'apueo to guard the hill. Several one course high basalt rock alignments were identified on the hill in 1973 and may be the remains of the religious structure.

A small land division named Kohoilo located between Makaehe-Keahua and A'apueo Ahupua'a appears on a map surveyed between 1872-1879 (W. D. Alexander and M. D. Monsarrat). Within this section is a hill named Pu'u o Weli. Although distinctive in form, no traditional references were found associated with it except that it was included in Grant No. 1829 held by someone named Keawe in the 19th century.

According to Ashdown, Central Maui was known as the Kula o Ka Ma'omao, or the land of mirages. It was here that the lost souls wandered until they could find their way to rest (Ashdown n.d.). Ashdown recorded:

In the area of Waialeale (now called the "Baseball Park" above the modern Poli-Poli camp) and nearby Iua-na-na-ne in the ahupua'a of Kama'ole, was a structure said to be for bird catching ceremonies because that region was full of birds... The woman of 'Omamo dwelt at Mamane and she was called Mamane because she was of very high rank. She was so sacred that others must keep their distance... A handsome lesser chief tried to win her. Of course this was kapu. Her heart was heavy with the knowledge that because he came near to her shadow he had to be punished. A high priest conducted ceremonies of purification at the temple there and revived happiness... (1971:46)

Maui is home to important chiefly lineages and paramount chiefs of the Ulu-hema line. Leaders including Haho, who played an important role in formally establishing chiefly prerogatives of rulership and prestige by forming an archipelago-wide chiefly council, Pi'ilani and his son Kihapi'ilani, who began construction of public works, Kekaulike, paramount chief of Maui in the 1700s, the great warrior chief Kahakii, and Ka'ahumanu, *kāna waihi* ali'i o ka 'ili (the favorite wife) of Kamehameha I, are but a few (Formander 1969, vol. 2:28-29; Kamakau 1963; Desha 2000:49).

By A.D. 1400 to 1500, Maui's political districts were consolidated into two polities: East and West Maui (Formander 1969, Vol. 2:79; Kolb *et al.* 1997:16). The ruling ali'i of each polity were from separate genealogical lines (Figure 8) which contributed to the mutual hostility which was frequently sustained by skirmishes and wars. The ali'i of East Maui traced their origins to Kalahimoku, a Hawaiki Island chief who had emigrated to Hāna and those in West Maui to a much older Maui line (Formander 1969, Vol. 2:78-79).

East Maui's ruling center was in Hāna but just as important were the districts of Ko'olau, Kīpahulu and Kaupō. West Maui had political centers at both Wailuku and Lahaina (Formander 1969, Vol. 2; Kamakau 1961, Kolb *et al.* 1997:15). Even by this early period, large settlements were appearing at Waialeale, Waikapū, Honua'ula, Lahaina, and upcountry Kula, and the building of religious temples flourished (Kolb *et al.* 1997:17).

Maui became a unified political entity during the seventeenth century by the marriage of Kihapi'iiani of West Maui to Kōleamoku, the daughter of an East Maui chief. Under the aegis of Pi'i'iani, father of Kihapi'i'iani, public works, such as an island-wide pedestrian highway and chiefly residential additions to temples, were built (Formander 1969, Vol. 2; Kolb 1995, Kolb *et al.* 1997:19). During the reign of Kaka'alaneo, *ali'i nui* of this period initiated changes such as the reorganization of land tenure under the paramount chief.

Inter-island upheavals marked the period between A.D. 1650 to 1820. Maui was often at war with Hawai'i Island and O'ahu with battles for supremacy fought back and forth. Kekaulike, rose to power in the 1700s with help from his son Kauhū, who was commander-and-chief of the army. Kauhū led attacks in the battles of Kī'imūmuku and Kipuka-ōhelo at Kama'ōle in Kula and of Ka-eulu and Ka-hale-mamahoa at Kaupō, which brought about peace.

Kekaulike, Maui Island's paramount chief, built war temples (*mamala koo*) and proceeded to invade Hawai'i Island causing much damage to Kona, Kekaha, Kawaihae, and Kohala as he retreated from the defending forces of Alapa'i of Hawai'i (Kamakau 1961:66; Formander 1969, Vol. 2:133).

Kekaulike was taken ill upon his return to Maui. Kamakau recorded the following:

When Kekaulike heard that Alapa'i, the ruling chief of Hawai'i was at Kohala on his way to war against Maui, he was afraid and fled to Waikuku in his double war canoe named Ke-aka-milo. He sailed with his wives and children.... his officers, war leaders, chiefs, and fighting men, including warriors, spear men, and counselors. Some went by canoe and some overland, and the fleet landed at Kapa'ahu [Kama'ōle] at the pit of 'Ahiakoko in Kula. Here on the shore the chiefs prepared a litter for Kekaulike and bore him upland to Haleki'i in Kuahua. There Kekaulike died, and the sound of lamentation for the dead arose (Kamakau 1961:69).

Upon his death, Kekaulike's sons jostled for dominance with one enlisting the assistance of O'ahu chiefs and the other allied by Hawai'i Island chiefs. The resulting outcome was one of devastation to the land and the eventual dominance of a junior son named Kamehamehanui (*ibid:* 141-142). Upon the death of Kamehamehanui, his half-brother Kahekili (II), ascended to power, maintaining his control until the invasion of Hawai'i Island chief, Kalaniopu'u around 1775. After a series of invasions by Kalaniopu'u, Kahekili successfully repulsed the Hawai'i Island chief from Maui and moved on to secure Mōloka'i and O'ahu, establishing his residence at Waikāki, and becoming the ruler of all the islands except Hawai'i.




Figure 8: Diagram of Maui's Chiefly Lineages (Kolb *et al.* 1997:15).

Trails extended from the coast to the mountains, linking the two for both economic and social reasons. Several trails were identified and described in a study of Waiohuli and Kēōkea conducted in 1997 (Kolb *et al.* 1997:33). A trail known as the *alanui* or "king's trail" was located along the coast and traversed all the major communities of Kula. An upland trail running from 'Ujupalakua in Honua'ula to Olinda, extended through the same communities at an altitude of 700 m amsl. Two community trails linked the coast to the uplands. One trail called Kēkuawaha'ula'ula or the "red mouthed god," extended from upcountry Kēōkea down to the Kāhehi coast. It extended very near Pu'u o Kali. Kalepolepo Trail is the second coastal/upland trail network that extended from upland Waiohuli down to Kalepolepo fishpond. It also, followed a course very close to Pu'u o Kali, in the *alupua'a* of Waiohuli.

The documented agricultural system of Waiohuli and Kēōkea can serve as a model for traditional settlement and cultivation in the Kula region (*ibid.*:99). Based on archaeological studies and early historic records, this would include small sets of linear terraces descending down intermittent drainages and informal agricultural features on rocky ridges along the swales. The latter were indicated by short irregularly-shaped terraces, mounds, modified outcrops, short walls, oval and irregularly-shaped alignments and enclosures near house sites often consisting of several structures. Agricultural features extended downslope as far as 460 meters amsl (1,500 feet) in Kēōkea and Waiohuli.

HISTORIC PERIOD

Much knowledge of traditional land use patterns is based on what was recorded at the time of, and shortly after, known Western Contact (1778). Early records (such as journals kept by explorers, travelers and missionaries), Hawaiian traditions that survived long enough to be written down, and archaeological investigations have assisted in understanding the past. However, early descriptions of the project area are brief and infrequent.

Captain King, Second Lieutenant on the *Revolution* during Cook's third voyage, briefly describes the coastal portion of the project area from a vantage point of "eight or ten leagues" out to sea as his ship departed the islands in 1779 (Beaglehold 1967). He mentions "...a small hillock to the Southward off which there is a fine sandy bay with several huts on the shore and a number of coconut trees growing about them." It is probable that the hillock was Pu'u Olai located south of Kāhehi. King describes the island, enumerates the observed animals, thriving groves of breadfruit, the excellence of the taro, and almost prophetically, says the sugar cane is of an unusual height.

While Kahekili was subduing O'ahu's population, all was not well in Kula. Kamakau

says:

During this period there were disturbances among the country people, not only on Oahu but also on Maui. The trouble arose through one of the lesser chiefs (*kaukani'i'i*) named Ku-keawe, a favorite (*aikāne*) of Kahekili to whom Kahekili had given the privilege of letting his pigs run over the land of Kula and roasting them as he needed them. But he seized also the pigs belonging to the country people of Kula, Honua'ula, and Kahikinui, as far as Kaupo, and went with a large party to rob them of their wealth even with violence. This was the cause of the uprising of the country people called the "Battle of the pig-eating of Ku-keawe" (*'Ihipua 'a-o-Ku-keawe*) (1961:142).

Both Maui and Hawaii, now under the leadership of Kamehameha I, continued their war for dominance with Maui eventually being annexed by Kamehameha as he consolidated the Hawaiian Islands under his rule.

TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

Kula can be divided into four environmental zones (Kolb *et al.* 1997:147). The first is the coastal zone which includes the shoreline and surrounding area up to approximately 0.25 miles inland. The second is the "barren" or intermediate zone which is the largest and least agriculturally productive. The third is the upland zone located above the 30 inch rainfall line and extending into the fourth, or forest zone. Gardens were cultivated here during traditional times. The project area extends through portions of the first, second, and third environmental zones.

Archaeological investigations indicate a large amount of permanent settlement in the upland, at elevations above the 30 inch rainfall line in Kula (1997:191). Based on the feature types, number and size of *heiau* (9), rock art sites, and ancient agricultural fields found in this part of Kula (vicinity of alignments K2, U3, U2B), a large, permanent population is indicated.

Coastal settlement was also common. The existence of fish ponds (three at Kalepolepo in the vicinity of terminus K1) and coastal *heiau* (2) confirm the presence of a stable population relying on coastal and marine resources. Agriculture may have been practiced behind the dune berms in low-lying marsh land in the vicinity of Kēalia Pond (*ibid.*:101). It is suggested that permanent habitation and their associated activities occurred from A.D. 1200 thru the present in both the uplands and coastal regions (*ibid.*:101)

The next reference to the southwestern coast occurs eight years after Cook's initial arrival in the islands.

In 1786, LaPérouse sailed up the western coast of Maui, stopping and recording his impressions while anchored in Keone'ō'io (south of the K2 terminus). Although the seaward section of the island appeared hot, dry, and rough, the visitors were offered "...hogs, potatoes, bananas...taro, with cloth and some other curiosities..." (LaPérouse 1798:345). Landing on the morning of the 21st of May, he was greeted by approximately 120 natives. LaPérouse notes the soil is "...wholly composed of lava and other volcanic matter". Water was scarce and the villagers drank from a shallow, brackish well.

LaPérouse continues:

"During our excursions we discovered four little villages, each containing about ten or twelve houses, which are not only covered but built with straw and shaped like those of our poorest peasants; the roofs being in the form of a penthouse. The door, placed at the gable end is only three feet and a half high, admits of no entrance without stooping, and is shut only with a hurdle which anyone may open. The furniture of these islanders consists of mats, strewn like carpets on which they sleep; and their only kitchen utensils are very large gourds which they shape at pleasure white green. They varnish and delineate various designs on them in black...Their cloths, of which they have a great quantity, are made like those of the other islands, but not withstanding, they are variously painted yet in manufacture they are not equally skillful with the latter." (*ibid.*:113-129).

Nathaniel Portlock and George Dixon sailed down the southern coast in 1786 without landing and missing LaPérouse, who was at that moment anchored in Keone'ō'io. Vancouver recorded his impressions of the southern and then the western coast of Maui during his second visit in 1793:

...it may be useful to remark, that the part we were abreast of [east of Pohakuena Point] at day-light in the morning, though terminating very abruptly in the ocean, and though its surface was very uneven, had yet a verdant and fertile appearance, and was seemingly in an advanced state of cultivation. From the number of villages and distinct houses, we were led to consider it as tolerably well inhabited. This pleasant scene was shortly changed on our advancing a few miles to the westward. The face of the country became totally different, the shores and sides of the hills had no indications of being inhabited and were almost destitute of vegetable productions. They appeared to be a rude mass of naked barren rocks, broken into many deep gulleys, that extended from the mountains to the water side. Beside these, were many small circular hills that appeared to be composed either of sand or stones, and had acquired a very smooth surface of a light brown colour.

Perpendicular veins separated the different strata, and descended down the mountains; these, so far as our glasses enabled us to distinguish, betokened this part of the island to have undergone some violent effects from volcanic eruptions (1984:850).

Vancouver was greeted by some of the inhabitants who paddled out to meet the foreign ship:

We passed the south point before mentioned at the distance of about half a mile; it is formed by rugged craggy rocks, and the sea breaks at a little distance to the north west of it... Whilst in this situation, we were visited by a few of the poor natives from a small sandy cove, where they had some miserable habitations. The poverty of these people was apparent, by their bringing only a few small packages of salt to dispose of, and by their canoes being very small and out of repair...In the afternoon, we were visited by a chief in the only decent canoe we had yet seen at Mowee. From him I learned, that he was sent by *Titeere* [Kahekili] to inquire who we were and if we had friendly intentions towards the island...He informed me that the best anchorage was near the north-west part of the Island, called Raheina [Lahaina], and that if I would proceed thither, *Titeere* would not hesitate, under this, and my other assurances of friendship, to pay us a visit (*ibid.*:855).

Archibald Menzies, a naturalist accompanying Vancouver stated "... We had some canoes off from the latter island [Maui], but they brought no refreshments. Indeed, this part of the island appeared to be very barren and thinly inhabited" (Menzies 1920:102). According to Kahekili, the extreme poverty in the area was the result of the continuous wars between Maui and Hawai'i causing the land to be neglected and human resources wasted (Vancouver 1984:856).

Other explorers and traders followed. Lahaina, which provided a sheltered roadstead and where the *ali'i* were in residence, was the hub of activity. The importance of Hawai'i to merchants increased with the discovery of sandalwood and the growth of the trans-Pacific fur trade. Subsequently, the whaling industry, lasting to ca.1860, brought hundreds of ships every year to Lahaina. The winter months would find ships replenishing their supplies from the produce grown on Maui, much of it from the upcountry Kula region.

Cultivation of Irish potatoes in the Kula District began shortly before 1840. The Kula area became known as "the potato district" because of the great success in their cultivation. The most extensive potato cultivation area in the Hawaiian islands was Kula. In the 19th century, during Kula's peak potato producing period, dryland gardens in the uplands extended all the way from Kula to Kaupō. The resulting deforestation for potato cultivation adversely affected the amount of rainfall in the district and periods of drought became more common. Before the mid

1800s, the forest began just above the Kula Highway, approximately 1,036 meters amsl (3,400 feet) in Kēōkea and Waiōhuli (Kolb *et al.* 1997:99).

Jarvis describes the potato fields as they appeared in 1846:

It ranges along the mountain (Halekaialā) between 2000 and 5000 feet elevation, for the distance of 12 miles. The forest is but partially cleared, and the seed put into the rich virgin soil. The crop now in the ground is immense. The fields being all in blossom have a fine appearance, spreading as they do, over the broad surface of the mountain (*Polymerian*, Feb. 20, 1846).

It was estimated that by the spring of 1847 the crop would amount to 20,000 barrels and in 1854, G. D. Gilman stated that the local Hawaiian market including the whale ships would consume about 20,000 barrels of Irish potatoes (*ibid.*)

In 1849, the California gold rush opened a new market for Hawaiian produce. Along with potatoes and other vegetables, sugar, molasses, and coffee were suddenly in great demand (Kuykendall 1968:321).

In November of 1849 an article in the *Polymerian* stated:

The call for [potatoes] is loud and pressing, as some vessels bound for California have taken as many as a thousand barrels each. The price is high, and the probability is that the market can not be supplied this autumn. Kula, however, is full of people. Strangers from Waiuku, Hamakua and Lohaina are there preparing the ground and planting, so that if the demand from California shall be as urgent next spring as it is now the people will reap a rich harvest...They often repeat the saying of a foreigner, who, after having visited the mines of California, came back to Maui quite satisfied, and said to his neighbors at Waikapū, "California is yonder in Kula. There is the gold without the fatigue and sickness of the mining country." (November 24, 1849).

The Honolulu Advertiser describes the changes to Kula brought about by extensive cultivation:

Before 1850 Kula was supplied with moisture naturally through the existence of a large forest. "That forest was cut down when land was cleared in Kula to open farm plots in 1850. This was in answer to the demand for food in California during the gold rush... [and] by ranchers clearing for pasture." Secondary result of clearing forests was destruction of existing fresh water ponds in Kīhei on the Maalaea Bay coast below Kula. When forest was cleared, water was free to rush down the mountains carrying soil from Kula and filling with mud, the ponds for which Kīhei was once famous. Meanwhile Kula is dependent on Pipe for Waikamoi watershed (1962 A:15).

A small whaling station had previously been established at Kalepolepo in Kīhei. John Halstead built his residence and a store referred to as the Koa House in 1849. The store flourished due to the whaling and potato industry and providing an accessible port for exported produce.

The privy council voted to sell government lands in one to ten acre sections to Hawaiians at three dollars per acre to support the growing economy. In 1851, 43,923 barrels of Irish potatoes, along with 56,717 barrels of sweet potatoes, were exported. In 1851, as California endured several disasters and Hawai'i suffered a drought, the potato industry continued to excel (Kuykendall 1968:321). It was not long before potatoes were being grown in California and Oregon and by the fall of 1851, the potato boom was over in Hawai'i.

In reply to petitions from his subjects, Kūikeyouli had made experimental efforts to sell some land to Hawaiian subjects on O'ahu (Mānoa Valley) and in Makawao, Maui. In 1845 and '46, while the king was at Makawao, it was announced that the entire district would be offered for sale at \$1 per acre (except for McLan's plantation). Reverend Green handled the sale of land and Reverend Armstrong contributed by making surveys of the mostly five to ten acre sections. The bought parcels were registered as Grants and were not listed in the Indices of Land Commission Awards beginning in 1848. Eventually, approximately 9000 acres were sold and the experiment was pronounced a success (Kuykendall 1968:283). However, this was an isolated instance and it soon became necessary to revamp the traditional land tenure system.

The Chinese in Kula

The expanding agricultural markets opened by the growing whaling fleet and the California gold rush attracted many Chinese to Kula in the 1840s. Government lands were leased to ranchers who then subleased the lands to the Chinese.

Initially, the Chinese were accepted on their own merit, as were all new comers, by the native Hawaiians. In fact, their association with the people of Hawai'i was congenial with, in some cases, Chinese men marrying *ali'i* women. Land was made available to Chinese by the Governors of Maui and Hawai'i for sugar cultivation. Often, the governors would arrange for Hawaiian laborers to work in the cane fields (Glick 1980:328). With the rising influence of the Caucasians and the influx of larger numbers of Chinese as servants and laborers, the status of the Chinese in Hawai'i changed for the worse (*ibid.*:329).

The Chinese moved to Kula lands from Makawao, Pa'ia, and Wailuku on Maui, from Kohala on Hawaii'i Island, and from Honolulu. Many went directly from China to Kula. About 95% of the Chinese were Hakkas from Kwangtung Province. As stated, much of the Kula land was owned by the government which leased it to the ranchers, who would then sublease to Chinese. Payment was often made in farm produce, as exemplified by a farmer leasing from Ulupalakua Ranch who paid five bags of corn for every acre of land he farmed (Mark 1975).

Even as the demand for potatoes declined the Chinese population continued to grow. Between 1880 and 1910 there were approximately 80 Chinese families living in Kula. There were some 700 Chinese living in Kula by 1900 (*ibid.*). By this time, Kula had become cosmopolitan supporting such activities and institutions as Chinese and English schools, Christian churches, the Hung Men Society, gambling houses, opium dens, and general stores along with the cattle ranches and vegetable farms (*ibid.*).

The Chinese and other Kula farmers planted corn, beans, onions, Chinese cabbage, round cabbage, sweet potatoes, wheat and other grains, and cotton. Much of the produce was transported to Mākena harbor where it was then sent to Honolulu where it would be sold by markets in Chinatown (*ibid.*, Figures 9 and 10).

Water was not piped into Kula until 1905. Farmers depended mostly on rainfall, as was done in pre-Contact times. When droughts occurred every few years, water was brought from Polipoli Springs or from the beach at Olinda in barrels on the back of mules (*ibid.*).

The Māhele

In the 1840s a drastic change in traditional land tenure resulted in a division of island lands, this system of private ownership was based on western law.

While a complex issue, many scholars believe that in order to protect Hawaiian sovereignty from foreign powers, Kamehameha III was forced to establish laws changing the traditional Hawaiian economy to that of a market economy (Daws 1968:111; Kuykendall Vol. I, 1938:145 footnote 47, 152, 165-6, 170; Kame'eleihewa 1992:169-70, 176; Kelly 1983:45).




Figure 9: Photograph of a Chinese Society Building in Kōōkea Kula (June 21, 2000).



Figure 10: Photograph of Fong Store Kōōkea View to West (June 21, 2000).

Among other things, foreigners demanded private ownership of land to insure their investments (Kuykendall Vol. 1, 1938:138, 145, 178, 184, 202, 206, 271; Kame'eleihewa 1992:178; Kelly 1998:4). Once lands were made available and private ownership was instituted, the *maka āina* (commoners) were able to claim the plots on which they had been cultivating and living, if they had been made aware of the foreign procedures (*kaulana* lands, Land Commission Awards, LCA). These claims could not include any previously cultivated or presently fallow land, *ōkupu* or stream fisheries, or many other resources necessary for traditional survival (Kelly 1983; Kame'eleihewa 1992:295; Kirch and Sahlins 1992). This land division, or *Māhele*, occurred in 1848. The awarded parcels were called Land Commission Awards. If occupation could be established through the testimony of two witnesses, the petitioners were awarded the claimed LCA, issued a Royal Patent number and could then take possession of the property (Chinen 1961:16, Figure 11).



Figure 11: Photograph of Post-Māhele Boundary Walls in Kula (June 21, 2000).

Individual LCA claims within the present project area are discussed in detail by Folk *et al.* (1999) and will only be briefly considered here. The thirteen *ahupua'a* impacted by the alternative termini were acquired by various individuals and the government. (LCA information from Waihoia Aina Corporation, 1998 Database, Honolulu).

Kailua (U1 terminus), Ōma'opio (O1 intersection), and Makaehū-Keahua (U2A terminus) were *ahupua'a* included among Kula lands controlled by Miriam Keohokalole, mother of Kalākaua and Lili'uokalani (see Figure 7). She transferred these *ahupua'a* to the government in lieu of commutation fees and retained A'apūco (U2B terminus) and Kamehame Ahupua'a, both containing eight claims. A large portion of Makaehua was eventually sold to the Maui Land and Pineapple Company. Keohokalole also received Kealahou (3&4) which had 22 land claims.

Keōkea was Crown land from the beginning and had 46 LCA claims. Waiohūi was made Crown Land in 1890 by Kalākaua and had 41 land claims. Kōhco Ahupua'a (1&2) with 11 land claims, Pūlehu Iki and Nui (P1, P2 intersection and U3) and Waiakoā Ahupua'a with 17 land claims each, were government lands.

In the Indices of Land Commission Awards, 25 LCAs were claimed for Ōma'opio. Most of these LCAs were located in the area of the Ōma'opio Homesteads between the Hamakua Ditch and Kula Highway. Forty-six LCAs were claimed in Keōkea and forty-one in Waiohūi. The majority are listed as *kula* land and house lots suggesting dryland agriculture. Based on the testimony for the *ahupua'a* of A'apūco, primary usage was pasture (LCA 9026, Native Testimony Vol. 7:53).

The *ahupua'a* of Kailialini was awarded to Kamaikaōa and had 14 LCA claims and Kama'ole (K2 terminus), received 49 claims. Hapakūka Hewahewa, whose family had supported Kamehameha I, received the *ahupua'a* of Ka'ono'ulu (K1 terminus) which had 35 land claims.

Traditional settlement patterns are reflected in the land records of the 1800s. A total of 254 *āpana* (section, parcel) were granted by the Land Commission in Kula to 187 claimants. No located claims were identified within any of the road alignments which were surveyed to a width of two hundred feet either side of the center line (Folk *et al.* 1999:7). The majority of claims

were located upland, between the 610 meter (2,000 foot) and 1,219 meter (4,000 foot) elevation along the old Kula road (which was called the *ala airipuni*), and extending down to the 700 meter (2,300 foot) elevation in Kama'ole and the 335 meter (1,100 foot) elevation in 'A'apueo. Only a few coastal claims were awarded (15, represented by black dots on Figure 12). They were clustered in close proximity to, and slightly inland from, Kalepolepo Fishpond (east of KI terminus).

The historic records of both awarded and unawarded claims suggest that many individuals had house lots on the coast as well as an upland residence. Some potato and banana plots were claimed in conjunction with some coastal house sites. The majority of the claims were for *kula* lands to be used for sweet potato or Irish potato. There were some claims for "dry lo'i", "winter *kula makai*" (a term particular to Maui-Kula), bananas, and house lots. A number of claims was for *moku muu 'i*, suggested to mean small arable pockets of stony soil (by the Native Register translator; see Folk *et al.* 1999:21).

Ranching

Ranching was present in Kula prior to the 1840s (Land Court Awards, State Archives). Large sections of Crown Lands were leased for grazing cattle and by the 1880s, lower Kula consisted primarily of pasture land for ranching (Figure 13). The Māhele awards list large portions of Kama'ole Ahupua'a as government cattle ranges with Irish potato being cultivated on other parcels.

In 1888, Edwin H. Baily, Lorrin A. Thurston, W. H. Baily, and Henry P. Baldwin met in Honolulu and purchased Maui ranch lands owned by Charles Alexander for \$50,000. The resulting ranch included 33,817 acres with 400 to 500 acres set aside for corn cultivation. A dairy was started in 1896 which eventually evolved into Haleakalā Dairy. The land of Kōōkea, particularly the lowland/coastal portion, was historically used for ranching activities by Haleakalā Ranch Company. Segment E of the proposed highway extends through these ranch lands. In addition to Haleakalā Ranch, large land portions were used for cattle by Ka'ono'ūlu Ranch Co., Ltd. and 'Ulupalakua Ranch, Inc.




Figure 12: Map Showing LCA Claims on the Coast (Kolb *et al.* 1997:65).




Figure 13: Photograph Showing Kōkeā Historic Pasture Lands, Mauka (June 21, 2000).

By the late 1800s, the changes occurring in Kula lands were dramatic. White surveying in Kula, E.D. Baldwin recorded his impressions of the terrain. He stated:

During 1888, Kula was an open country, there were no fences to stop you from riding in any direction that you wished, even as far as Makawao or Wailuku. There were none of the owners of Waiahoa kuleanas living above the Government Road and only a few makai of said road (Sterling 1998:252).

He continued:

...Waiahoa had been over run with cattle for years and about a mile above the Government road Chinamen had planted Irish potatoes and corn for years so that the location of the numerous kuleana had been almost obliterated. We found only one old kamaaina left on mauka Waiahoa, old "Puanau," who knew approximately the location of the kuleanas. But he piled many of them on top of each other and as we had to lay out the Government portion of the land in Homesteads, there was only one thing to do and that was to give each kuleana its location, bathed as close as necessary, as the land seemed all of equal value; this we did and they have ever since stayed where we located same...[we] appraised it from 3, 5 to 6 dollars an acre (ibid.:253).

Sugarcane

As early as 1828, sugar was being grown on Maui by two Chinese merchants who formed the Hungtai sugar works in Wailuku (Speakman 1981:114). Sugarcane was cultivated in Honua'ula in 1845 by a man named Torbert who had purchased large portions of several *ahupua'a*. The Torbert Plantation holdings included a road and landing at Mākena to expedite the shipping of potatoes, animal stock, and sugar. Captain James Makee, owner of Rose Ranch, purchased the Tolbert Plantation in 1856 and continued stock raising and sugar cultivation (Barrère 1975:70; Kuykendall 1968:316).

With the discovery of the less expensive kerosene for lamps and a number of shipping disasters in the late 1850s came the end of the whaling industry. The Civil War provided the next agricultural niche for Hawai'i to fill with its growing sugar industry. As southern U.S. sugar disappeared from the market, sugar plantations in Hawai'i could make an ever-growing profit exporting their product to the continental United States.

In 1873, Isabella Bird traveled by inter-island schooner to Hawai'i Island, stopping at Mākena which was bustling with activity:

We called at Maalea, a neck of sandy scorched, verdureless soil, and at 'Ulupalakua [Mākena Landing], or rather at the furnace seven times heated, which is the landing of the plantation of that name, on whose breezy slopes cane refreshes the eye at the height of 2,000 feet above the sea. We anchored at both places, and with what seemed to me a needless amount of delay, discharged goods and natives, mats, and calabashes were embarked... It was all glorious, this fierce bright glow of the Tropic of Cancer, yet it was a relief to look up the great rolling, verdureless slopes above 'Ulupalakua to a forest belt of perennial green, watered, they say, by perpetual showers, and a little later to see a mountain summit [Haleakalā] uplifted into a region of endless winter, above a steady cloud-bank as white as snow (Bird 1974:32, 33).

After her ascent of Haleakalā in 1873, Isabella Bird journeyed to Makee's 'Ulupalakua Ranch (then called Rose Ranch) while still in sugar and before it was converted to a cattle ranch:

The plantation is 2000 feet above the sea, and is one of the finest on the islands; and owing to the slow maturity of the cane at so great a height, the yield is from five to six tons an acre. Water is very scarce; all that is used in the boiling-house and elsewhere has been carefully led into concrete tanks for storage, and even the walks in the proprietor's beautiful garden are laid with cement for the same purpose. (ibid.:228).

Sugar had been established in the Makawao area in the late 1800s and by 1899, the Kihai Plantation Company (KPC) was growing cane in the plains above Kihai. In 1878, Claus Spreckels founded the Hawaiian Commercial Company which was located in Pu'u Nene. In 1882, it became known as the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S). The Kihai Plantation was absorbed by the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company (HC&S) in 1908, which continued to cultivate the most productive KPC fields. Nineteen years later, HC&S was bought by investors who replaced the plantation's agents with Alexander and Baldwin. Lands under the new management expanded and in 1948, HC&S acquired the Maui Agricultural Company located in Pā'ia (Conde and Best 1973:208-210, 213). Portions of the U1 alignment of the proposed highway extends through HC&S land (Figure 14).

Abraham Formander toured Maui in 1865 as Inspector General of Schools. His visit to the southwestern coast included a stop at a school at Kalepolepo, Mākena Bay attended by many children from Upcountry, Kamaheha, Keone'o'io, and Kanaio. In his report, Formander, praised the benefits brought to the Hawaiian people through commercial farming of sugar.

It may not be amiss, here to remark briefly on the influences which the establishment of the sugar plantations on the island of Maui is exercising on the material and social condition of the Hawaiian people in the immediate vicinity and within reasonable distance of said plantations. They furnish steady and remunerative employment to all, male or female, who wish to work. The work thus obtained sets large sums of ready money in circulation among those who formerly, even if disposed to work, had no way of obtaining a dollar except at the expense of immense labor, time, and trouble. The engagements are short, the pay fixed and sure. The health of the laborers is well attended to—on the Maakee plantation not one had died in five years.—In many and increasing instances the money thus obtained goes to build better houses, improve the homesteads and to clothe themselves and their children better. In places where the sugar mills grind for others the cultivation of the cane among the native population and others is systematically pursued and rapidly increasing, adding largely to the wealth and comfort of the people, and they begin to appreciate the value of their lands and take a pride in their culture. It keeps the people more at home and diminishes that roaming, loafing propensity, which was engendered after the breaking up of the feudal system, from unbounded and ill-directed liberty, want of means and ignorance and inability to obtain them [sic]. Even those who do not choose to engage as laborers on the plantations, feel the influence of them in the remotest valleys, stimulating to labor to furnish poi, firewood and many other things of which the plantations are constantly in need, and for which fair prices and ready cash are always paid... (Formander in Barrère 1975:58).




Figure 14: Map Shows Proposed Highway Alignments Through Sugar and Ranch Lands (Modified from Map by Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company).

Pineapple

In addition to sugar, conditions on some Kula lands were ideal for cultivating pineapple. The same Baldwin who developed the sugar lands became a company called Baldwin Packers which evolved into Maui Pineapple Company (MPC), the largest producer of pineapple on Maui (Speakman 1984:130). When the Cameron family took control in the mid-20th century, the name was changed to Maui Land and Pineapple Company (ML&P Co.). Kailua Ahupua'a and Hali'imaile Plantation have been under cultivation by ML&P Co. or Baldwin Packers for over 30 years (Donham 1990a). Pineapple was being grown in the ahupua'a of A'apueo as late as 1979 and is still being grown in western portions of the project area. Portions of proposed segments B, C, and D extend through pineapple fields (see Figure 14).

20th Century

Living conditions deteriorated in Kula during the 1910s and 1920s and many families moved to other places. Severe drought, poor crops due to exhausted soil, and the promise of better opportunities elsewhere depleted the population. Much of the upcountry land had been parceled into homesteads with the previous tenants losing their farms. A large portion of the Kula land had become pasture for cattle ranching by the early 1900s. In 1918, forty more families left as their leased lands were purchased by Harold Rice for use by the Ka'ono'ulu Ranch (Speakman 1978:143). Ka'ono'ulu Ranch, Halekaia Ranch, and 'Ulupalakua Ranch, are still in operation.

Twentieth century activities in the Kula District included a significant WW II military presence along the beach of Ma'alaea Bay, a Combat Demolition training Station at Kama'ole, two naval air stations at Pu'unene and Kahaluu, and Army camps and hospitals in the Kula and Makawao area.

In the 1970s, Kula was producing 35% of Hawai'i's vegetables. There were 35 family-operated farms of five to fifty acres that produced Kula crops of various vegetables and flowers. Large acreage was used for livestock breeding for approximately 20 full and part-time cattle ranchers comprising the majority of the land use (Mark 1975). Rapid commercial resort development and private residences, especially in the Kūhei area, has occurred in the Kula coastal section since the 1970s.

PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeological studies have been conducted in both upland and coastal Kula. For an in depth discussion of the archaeology of Kula the reader is referred to Folk *et al.* (1999) and Kolb *et al.* (1997). Some of the findings are mentioned below. Table 1 is a list of archaeological studies conducted in the project area.

Table 1: Previous Archaeology Within The Kula/Makawao Districts.

Name	Area	Type
Cox 1976	Pūlehu Nui, Kama'ole	Inventory Survey
Condy 1977	Pūlehu Nui, Kama'ole, Pūlehu	Inventory Survey
Minna 1982	Kōōkea-Waiohuli	Inventory Survey
Riford 1987	same as above	Inventory Survey
Brown and Haut 1989	Waiohuli-Kōōkea	Inventory Survey
Hammar and Shindler 1989	Kama'ole	Inventory Survey
Donham 1990a	Kailua, Māhala	Inventory Survey
Donham 1990b	Kōōkea	Inventory Survey
Kolb 1991	Kōōkea	Data Recovery
Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1991, 1992	Hōkū'ula	Data Recovery
Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1993	Waiohuli	Data Recovery
Folk and Hammar 1993	Ōma'opio	Data Recovery
Fredericksen <i>et al.</i> 1994	Kama'ono'ulu	Inventory Survey, and Botanical Survey
Fredericksen and Fredericksen 1995	Hōkū'ula	Inventory Survey
Burgert and Spear 1995	Ka'ono'ulu	Inventory Survey
McPhatter and Rosendahl 1996	'A'apueo	Reconnaissance Survey
Walzen 1996	'A'apueo	Inventory Survey
Kolb <i>et al.</i> 1997	Waiohuli and Kōōkea	Data Recovery
Dunn <i>et al.</i> 1999	Waiohuli	Data Recovery
Folk <i>et al.</i> 1999	Kula	Reconnaissance Survey

The earliest archaeological studies of the Kula region were conducted by Thomas Thrum between 1906 to 1918, John Stokes in the early 1900s, and Winslow Walker in 1931. The primary focus of these reports were identifying religious sites. In total, 33 *heiau* from Olinda to Kanaloa at the 526 to 915 meter (2,000 to 3,000 ft.) elevation amsl were recorded (Walker 1931).

A few of the more significant sites within the relative vicinity of the proposed road segments and termini are noted below.

Several petroglyph sites were identified in Kaliainui Gulch (State Site 1061) and Kaluapulani Gulch (State Site 1062, vicinity of segment B) in the 1970s and relocated as part of archaeological reconnaissance survey for the proposed Kīhei to Kula Road corridors (Cox and Stasack 1970; Folk *et al.* 1999, Site 4178). Additional petroglyphs and religious structures are mentioned by Inez Ashdown for Ōma'ōpio, Ka'ono'ūlu, Pūlehu, Waiakoa, Kēōkea, and Kama'ole Ahupua'a (1971). Folk and Hamman (1993) also re-identified 20 petroglyphs in Upper Pūlehu Gulch (State Site 1268), east of terminus U3, a small rock shelter with 15 pictographs and approximately 139 petroglyphs downstream was delineated State Site 1267. A sailing canoe petroglyph site (State Site 4178) was identified near the UZA terminus in 'A'apueo during a 1996 inventory survey (McPhatter and Rosendahl 1996). This survey also extended the boundaries of the Kaluapulani petroglyph site to the south side of the gulch and further *makai*.

A large burial cave (State Site 1264) was located at the southwestern edge of Pukalani town along the cliffs of Kaliainui Gulch near its intersection with Hamakua Ditch (between segment B and C). It is an approximately 33 meter long lava tube containing the remains of between 30 to 50 individuals.

An extensive survey of 1,025 acres of pastureland in Kēōkea and Waiohuli between 1,800 and 3,000 ft amsl identified 159 sites including 335 features representing agricultural, residential, and ceremonial complexes, trails, and "footprint" petroglyphs (Figure 15). The study, conducted in the 1980s, resulted in 16 radiocarbon dates providing overlapping ranges from A.D. 1270 through A.D. 1955 for activities in *mauka* Kēōkea (Brown 1989, Brown and Haun 1989).




Figure 15: Ca 1938 Map Showing Trails and Footprint Petroglyphs Near Pu'u O Kaili (Brown and Haun, 1989).

Traditional references to bird-catching sites are found in recorded oral histories concerning Kula upcountry (Ashdown 1971:46). Corroborating evidence for bird-catching was recovered from Molohai, Kāōkea in a small temporary habitation at approximately 700 meters amsl (2,200 feet). A variety of extinct forest bird species were recovered from the earliest occupation level and dating between A.C. 1057 and 1440 (Kolb 1994).

Data from the same project indicated that initial permanent habitation and agricultural pursuits in the Kula region began as early as ca. A.D. 1200 to 1400 (*ibid.*). Radiocarbon and pollen analysis suggests a settlement pattern including expanding agricultural fields and habitations through the 1600s to 1700s when less desirable lands both *mauka* and *makai* of the prime upland region were utilized.

Archaeological data recovery was conducted at ten permanent habitation sites and one agricultural site (Dunn *et al.* 1999). Fifteen charcoal samples were submitted for radiocarbon dating from ten of the sites. Dating results indicated that the first of the permanent habitation sites between 549 to 915 meters (1,800 to 3,000 ft) in Waiohuli dated to the A.D. 1400s, slightly later than those suggested by earlier studies (Kolb *et al.* 1997). However, it was concluded that the small sample size precluded having strong confidence in the results of the distributional analysis (*ibid.*).

A total of 25 archaeological sites were identified within the various segments of the proposed bypass highway (Figure 16). Five archaeological sites were identified in Segments A, D, and E of the proposed bypass corridor during the initial reconnaissance (Folk *et al.* 1999).

Site 4765, located between Pūlehu Road and Ōmā'opio Road, contained an historic irrigation ditch, historic agricultural clearing mounds, and a small road segment. Site 4773, located in segment E, consisted of two square enclosures and seven U-shaped enclosures interpreted as WW II temporary military command post and rifle positions. Site 4776, located in segment E near the K1 terminus, consisted of a midden and lithic scatter/mound that was interpreted as recurrent habitation and agriculture. Site 4777, located along the north side of Kaliahinui Gulch in segment A, consisted of a wall interpreted as a field boundary or animal control. Site 4778, located on a southern edge of Waiahoa Gulch in segment D, was an L-shaped enclosure interpreted as a temporary habitation.




Figure 16: Kīhei-Upcountry Maui Map Showing Historic and Archaeological Sites on Proposed Highway Alignments (From Draft EIS 1999).

METHODOLOGY

Initial assistance was provided by a number of organizations and many individuals including the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), O'ahu and Maui branches, the Hawai'i Sugar Museum, Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company, Maui Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Division Maui and O'ahu Branches, Haleakala Ranch, 'Ulupalakua Ranch, Ka'ono'ulu Ranch, Maui Land and Pineapple Co., Kona Historical Society, the Hawai'i State Archives, State Survey Office, and the Hawai'i State Library. A list of the contacted individuals can be found in Appendix A.

Preliminary contact was made to individuals recommended to SCS by OHA and Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. General points of interest were recorded in field notes. Unless the interviewee indicated knowledge of Traditional Cultural Properties, the conversation was not taped. As a result, only one interview was recorded (Appendix B). Several individuals demonstrated reluctance at being taped. However, their information did not lead to the identification any Traditional Cultural Properties. None of the interviewees knew of any specific Traditional Cultural Properties although they supplied the names of more contacts, suggesting additional avenues of investigation. Several had interesting anecdotes concerning life in Hawai'i in the early 1900s.

An announcement was sent over the Internet to members of the Hawaiian Nation on Maui asking for recommendations of individuals that may be residents, may be familiar with the project area, or know of those who were, to e-mail responses and suggestions to a Maui contact.

As the proposed road alignments mainly impact ranch and agricultural lands, several avenues of investigation were selected. All three of the large ranches, Haleakala, Ka'ono'ulu, and 'Ulupalakua, were contacted and asked for names of long-time cowboys who would be the most likely familiar with the land in the project area and its history.

The mapping department of Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company, under the jurisdiction of Randal Moore, was most helpful in supplying maps of the fields and locations of the former plantation camps. It was hoped that individuals that lived in some of these camps near the proposed road alignments could be interviewed as they also may have special knowledge of Traditional Cultural Properties in the project area vicinity.

Cultural Surveys Hawai'i, Inc. (CSH), was contracted by Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. to conduct an archaeological investigations for the proposed highway alignments. To save time and prevent repetitive interviews, a list of questions from CSH were presented to the interviewees when appropriate, along with the inquiries concerning Traditional Cultural Properties.

INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES

An archaeological report (Brown and Haun 1989) includes a previous interview with two former employees of Ka'ono'ulu Ranch, William Poepe and Henry Kekiki. The information was summarized here as it refers to land features in the vicinity of the road alignments.

Mr. Poepe, an employee of Ka'ono'ulu Ranch for 46 years before he retired in 1983, reported that in the past people grew corn near Pu'u Kali (Red Hill). According to Mr. Poepe, there was once a Hawaiian settlement, including sidewalks and grave sites, on the border of Kama'ole and Kōōkea. He also added that within the caldera of Pu'u Kali is a fence that the Army erected during WWII for target practice.

Mr. Kekiki, an employee of Ka'ono'ulu Ranch for 42 years before he retired, stated that the ranch had previously run 2,500 head of cattle. Stone walls to contain the cattle had been built in 1800s on the ranch lands. Land use necessitated that cattle be kept at lower elevations near Pu'u o Kali in winter and then moved to *mauka* areas in June. Due to heat, Hawaiian and Chinese inhabitants would also move from the Pu'u o Kali area further upland to Kōōkea during the summer months. Mr. Kekiki pointed out many *heiau* to the archaeologists in the general vicinity of Molohai and Papakea in Kōōkea and in Waiohuli and identified three left footprints imprinted in the lava rocks on the way to Pu'u Kali (see Figure 16).

Additional information is presented in Kolb *et al.* (1997:30) concerning Pu'u o Kali:

...the most prominent landmark in Kula is the cinder cone of Pu'u o Kali, or "Hill of Wainiing." It is located at an elevation of 300 m AMSL (1000 ft) and marks the border between the *ahupua'a* of Waiohuli and Kōōkea. Commonly called "Red Hill" in modern times, this cinder cone has a prominent history. It is associated with the Goddess Pele, who was reputed to smite those who spoke evil from this very place (Ashdown, n.d.).

A major component of the pre-historic upcountry settlement landscape is located upslope of the Pu'u Walker identified three *heiau* in the upcountry Waiohuli section and three *heiau* and a rain shrine in Kēōkea.

Conversations with several cowboys of Haleakalā Ranch on June 19 and 20, 2000, revealed that information concerning significant places was most likely known by those of the previous generation who had since disappeared. Sonny Manoa, Henry Silva, and Ed Uweko'olani were aware of old stone foundations and walls within the ranch boundaries, but none with associated stories. A road extending off Na'alea Road in Kēōkea was reportedly called the Army Road and had originally been an old horse road to the coast. This closely followed a traditional Hawaiian trail known as the Waiakoa Trail. Mr. Metfin Kekiwi and Michael Purdy of 'Ulupalakua Ranch referred the author to older residents of Kula for further information. Unfortunately, a field trip within the boundaries of the Haleakalā Ranch that was tentatively scheduled for the beginning of August was unable to be completed due to ranching activities occurring at the same time.

Although only 64 years of age, Mr. Uweko'olani described a very traditional Hawaiian upbringing in Kanaiio including seasonal living locations (*makai*, *mauka*), planting methods, water procurement, and instruction from his parents, who were native speakers, as to *ahupua'a* protocol. He moved to the mainland at the age of 17 and did not begin work as a cowboy on Haleakalā Ranch until ten years ago (Figure 17).



Figure 17: Photograph of Mr. Ed Uweko'olani of Haleakalā Ranch (June 19, 2000).

An interview was conducted in Kahului on August 4, 2000 with Mr. Henry Rice, owner of Ka'ono'uila Ranch. Mr. Rice descended from a *kama'āina* family long established in Hawaii. The ranch consists of approximately 9,000 acres of land that has been held by the Rice family since 1916.

Mr. Rice revealed that land use on the three main holdings in Kula (Haleakalā, Ka'ono'uila, and 'Ulupalakua) are similar and may vary only slightly in timing of ranching activities throughout the year. Land at all elevations is used for pasturage with rotation of sections according to vegetation growth. Yearly ranch activities range from calving, brandings, weaning, moving calves to better pasture, picking replacement heifers, and shipping of yearlings to market. In the 1950s, most of the breeding herds were kept on the *makai* lands, with *mauka* lands being used for pasture for the cows. Presently, breeding herds are kept both *mauka* (above the Kula highway) and *makai* with the yearlings in between.

Calves from the *makai* herd are born in October and November when the winter rains brings grasses providing for successful lactation of the cows. Calves from the *mauka* herd fall (are born) in April and May and benefit from the rains that can still occur as late as March. Water is brought down for the cattle from the Upper Kula Line which provides water for agriculture and residential use in Kula.

Mr. Rice knew of a foot-print near Pu'u Kali and had been told it was a that of a child's, imprinted and preserved in lava (See Brown and Haun 1989). No old trails or other traditional properties on ranch lands were known to him. He reported that in the late 1800s, people from Kula were obtaining fish from the still viable Ka'ono'uila fishpond in Kūhei (*makai* and in close proximity to the project area).

An interview was held with Mrs. Nancy Purdy on August 3, 2000 at 'Ulupalakua Ranch where she now lives (Figure 18). Mrs. Purdy was raised on family (Wilcox) *kūleana* land located about one mile *makai* of Kula Highway in 'Ulupalakua. Her great grandfather was a farmer growing such crops as corn, sweet potato, beans, and Irish potatoes. People would walk down the dirt road of what is now Kula Highway to Kēōkea to catch a bus when they needed to go to Kahului. The family would walk down the Old Mākena Road to the beach at Mākena for swimming and fishing. She also remembers fish being sold door-to-door by the Japanese. The Chinese peddlers would bring big bags of *poi* several times a week. Although Mrs. Purdy has spent her entire life in the region, none of her comments indicated knowledge of any specific Traditional Cultural Properties in the area.



Figure 18: Photograph of Mr. and Mrs. D. Purdy of Ulupalakua Ranch (August 4, 2000).

An interview was held with Mr. Frank Gouveia in Hali'imaile on August 3, 2000 (see transcript of Mr. Gouveia's interview and release form in Appendix B)(Figure 19). Mr. Gouveia, now 85 years old, began his career as a water boy for the pineapple company at 10 cents a day. His family originally came from the Madeira Islands off Portugal in the late 1800s. Once his father had settled on Maui they "never looked behind." One of 16 children, Mr. Gouveia's father worked for the pineapple company and later, at the dairy at Pu'uhēnā. While at the dairy, Mr. Gouveia remembers the Chinese bringing their vegetables by donkey from Kula down an old county road, skirting what is now Pukalani and meandering through the cane fields to the landing at Kŕhei. While Mr. Gouveia was an excellent source of information concerning life on Maui, he did not know of any Traditional Cultural Properties.

Mr. Bob Hobby, District Manager of Forestry for the Department of Land and Natural Resources on Maui, was contacted to obtain more details on Mr. Gouveia's trail/county road information. Mr. Hobby knew of three *mauka-makai* trails in Kula. The Waiakoa trail extended from the bottom of Nā'ala'e Road in Kula and was a horse and wagon trail in the 1800s. The old Mākena Road zig-zagged from Ulupalakua Ranch to the landing in Mākena and was used for animal and produce transportation. This trail would also date from the 1800s. The third trail extended from Kalama to Ulupalakua. All of these trails are evident on an 1885 map drawn by W. D. Alexander, Surveyor General for the Hawaiian Islands.



Figure 19: Photograph of Mr. Frank Gouveia at Home in Hali'imaile (August 3, 2000).

Mr. Hobby noted that an Old Government Road is still shown on tax map keys for the region of Kula extending from Haleakalā Highway just below what is now Pukalani, through the cane fields and eventually disappearing in cane field 13, directly *mauka* of Kŕhei where the landing would have been. A 1929 map of the island of Maui, surveyed by W. E. Wall and compiled from all previous available data, identifies the same road (Figure 20). This is most likely the trail/road referred to by Mr. Gouveia.

A telephone interview was conducted with Mr. L. Douglas MacCluer, manager of the Maui Pineapple Company, Ltd. (a subsidiary of Maui Land and Pineapple Company, Inc.). Before pineapple cultivation, land parcels near Pūlehu Road on the Kŕhei side were used for pasture. In the early 1900s there had been small farms growing corn and onions in the vicinity of what became known as Cornmill Camp. Maui Pineapple brought their own water for irrigation in




Figure 22: Plan View Map of Kaula Village, a Typical Plantation Camp (Hawaiian and Commercial Sugar, N.D.).

Okinawans, Japanese, Filipino, and Portuguese all lived, shared, and helped each other there. Not only would they work together, but celebrations and picnics were held where everyone was welcome. Mrs. Nagata feels there is more separation between cultural groups today than there was amongst the first generation of immigrants.

Camp life was basic and nothing was wasted. Piles of newspapers were sewn together as disposable mattresses for babies. There was a communal toilet for several families where the Sears and Roebuck catalogue was an important item along with the highly prized, soft tissue paper used to wrap individual fruits. These valued items were collected from the plantation store. Colorful comics were saved for special wrapping paper and soda cans, bottle tops, magazine pages, and even the large Saloon crackers, were modified for festive Christmas decorations. Dried shrimp stored in wooden barrels was a special treat from the plantation store. There was no electricity so firewood and kerosene were delivered to the camps. In the camp was a Catholic church, a plantation store, and a Japanese school for the children.

Mrs. Nagata's family was hard working but very poor. None of the children could go to high school except for the youngest, who everyone in the family supported through dress making school at the Community College. Tragically, this sister died at only 53 years of age. Mrs. Nagata's grandfather was buried at Waiakoa Cemetery near the Waiakoa sugar camp. Later, his remains were moved to the Buddhist church in Pā'ia.

There were no Hawaiians in Kaula camp and it was not until they had moved to Waikapū that Mrs. Nagata remembers seeing Hawaiian people. She spoke highly of the traditional *kūfema* water rights instigated by the Hawaiians that allowed her family to farm for so many years, as well as the excellent rock walls built and fitted together with out mortar. However, Mrs. Nagata was not aware of any Traditional Cultural Properties within the vicinity of the camps in Kula.

A telephone interview was conducted with Mr. Charles Maxwell on 1 August 2000. He confirmed information previously recorded as testimony that in general, both Kaluapūlani and Kalialimui Gulches, as well as those in Ōma'opio and 'A'apueo, contain numerous petroglyphs and sealed burial caves which were not mentioned in the archaeological reports. Mr. Maxwell said he had personal knowledge of six sealed caves in these gulches. Two wooden images (*ki'i*) previously recovered from a cave in one of the gulches are now on display at the Bishop Museum.

According to Mr. Maxwell, the area of Kamahameha Schools in 'A'apueo is associated with a female goddess of the same name and past agricultural plots were associated with Maui's *Ali'i*, Kihapi'ilani. He reported that Kenneth Emory of the Bishop Museum had referred to the area impacted by the proposed termini UZA and U2B (and upper portions of segment B) as "most likely a place where the annual Makahiki were held". A *Heiau* has been identified close to the UZA terminus (Site 2701). It was Mr. Maxwell's opinion that it would be, "a cultural and spiritual insult to have a highway impacting (visually) a site such as this."

IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Numerous cultural features were reported during this study including religious sites, trails, petroglyphs, and the general location of burial caves. Topographic anomalies associated with pre-Contact events, individuals, or recorded in legends and stories were also noted. Several of these sites are not located within the project area. Other sites are considered archaeological as they are no longer in use and their location is unknown. Based on the previously presented definition for a Traditional Cultural Property stated by the Procedures For Ethnographic Inventory Surveys (Draft), no specific Traditional Cultural Properties were identified.

Archaeological sites and features associated with traditional legends, stories and important individuals were identified and reviewed during this study, including Pu'u Pane, Pu'u o Kali, the *alanui*, ancient trails, and various fishponds.

As religious and cultural significance are associated with archaeological features such as *heiau* and Makahiki sites, it is necessary to apply the criteria of adverse effect to properties such as those mentioned by Mr. Maxwell (36 CFR Part 800, Sec. 800.5). Adverse effect is found when:

... an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, characteristics that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association... (National Preservation Institute 1999:49).

Examples of adverse effects include physical damage to all or part of the property, and the "...introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features" (*ibid.*:50).

It appears that the alignment involving segment B may have an adverse impact on the integrity of the *heiau* site, both visually and aurally. Therefore, any alignment using segment B may need to be re-routed so as not to affect this archaeological feature. However, the *heiau* along with the other archaeological sites are addressed by Folk *et al.* (1999).

Pu'u Pane, located in the *ahupua'a* of 'A'apueo, was declared sacred by the paramount chief, Kihapi'ilani. Commoners were not allowed to climb the hill as it was considered a *heiau* for the high chiefs of Maui (Sterling 1998:258). This site will not be impacted by the proposed highway alignments as it is situated out of the project area (see Figure 2).

None of the informants or archival material provided any information concerning Pu'u o Wei located in close proximity to the U2 terminus (see Figure 2).

Several old trails were discovered in the course of research. However, none of them were Traditional Cultural Properties because they are no longer used. Some of these archaeological features are found out side of the immediate project area and would, therefore not be impacted by any of the proposed alignments. For example, situated in the vicinity of Pu'u o Kali, located in the *ahupua'a* of Waiohuli, are two trails and petroglyph foot prints. These archaeological features will not be impacted by the proposed highway alignments as they are situated outside the project area (see Figure 2).

The ancient *alanui* coastal trail (Site 572) and the upland trail, only portions of which are now visible, are also archaeological features that will not be impacted by the proposed highway alignments as they are located outside of the project area. The fish ponds, such as Kalepolepo and others, are archaeological sites listed with the State Historic Preservation Division and will not be impacted by the proposed highway alignments as they are situated along the coast outside of the project area (see Figure 2).

A Map of Kula, Maui, surveyed by W. D. Alexander and M. D. Monsarrat in 1872-1879, shows a trail extending from the bottom of the present Na'alaie road in Alae Ahupua'a down slope where it splits, one leg continuing in Alae, and the other crossing into Waiaikos Ahupua'a (north).

Another split occurs and continues a short distance into Pulehunui. The two original trails eventually intersect and continue as a single trail until slightly more than half way between Kula Highway and the coast (Figure 23)

Sometime between 1879 and 1929 the north fork of the same 1872-1879 trail is intersected by a trail from Palauca and continues all the way to Kīhei, becoming a road and eventually joining the coastal highway (Figure 24). The southern fork of the trail on the earlier map disappears. The remaining trail was the Waiakoa trail mentioned by Mr. Hobdy and known to Mr. Manoa as an old horse trail. On a current USGS map, a jeep road loosely follows in the direction of the old Waiakoa trail to the coast. Physical evidence of the Waiakoa trail today has not been identified but it is shown on the 1929 map to be in close proximity to the K2 terminus in the western portion of the project area.

Other ancient foot trails reportedly extending from Kēōkea to Kīhei (Kekua'wahā'ula'ula) and from Waiohuli down to Kalepolepo fishpond (Kalepolepo Trail), would be intersected by segment E and segment F of the proposed highway, as would the old trail/government road through the upland cane fields to Kīhei referred to by Mr. Gouveia. However, because none of these trails are still in use, and archaeological surveys have not identified physical evidence of their routes, these trails are not Traditional Cultural Properties. For the proposed alignments to be in close proximity to these trails would not constitute a cultural impact.

CONCLUSIONS

Interviews of appropriate individuals were conducted by SCS. These informants were recognized by other community members as knowledgeable, long-time residents of Maui and the Kula region. Conversations with these individuals did not identify any specific Traditional Cultural Properties within the project area as defined in the Criteria for evaluation. Presently, the only known culturally significant sites are the archaeological features that have been identified within the project area. Mitigation of these resources are discussed within the archaeological report presented by Folk *et al* (1999).




Figure 23: Ca. 1872-1879 Map of Kula by W. D. Alexander and M. D. Monsarrat Showing Waiakoa Trail.

- Daws, G.
1982 *Shoal of Time: History of the Hawaiian Islands*. University of Hawai'i Press. Honolulu.
- Desha, Stephen L.
2000 *Kamehameha and His Warrior Kekūāiwi*. Kamehameha Schools Press. Honolulu.
- Dunn, Amy, Michael T. Carson, and Michael F. Dega
1999 *Archaeological Data Recovery of the DHHL Kula Residential Lots Unit 1 of Waiohuli Subdivision Waiohuli, Kula, Maui Island, Hawai'i*. Prepared for Kiewit Pacific Co.
- Donham, Theresa K.
1992 *Surface Survey of the Koyanagi Subdivision, Omaoipo, Kula, Maui, TMK: 2-3-03: 129*. For State Historic Preservation Division, Wailuku, Maui.
- 1990a *Archaeological Inventory Survey Potential Upcountry Maui High School Sites. Lands of Haliimaile, Hokuila, Kailua, and Makaeha, Makawao District, Island of Maui*. PHRI Report 599-040590.
- 1990b *Archaeological Data Recovery Program Site 50-50-10-2475, Pillani Residential Community-Phase 1, Land of Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui*. Prepared for Baldwin Pacific.
- 1989 *Archaeological Inventory Survey Piliani Residential Community-Phase 1, Land of Waiohuli, Makawao District, Island of Maui*. Prepared for Baldwin Pacific.
- Folk, William H. and Hallett Hammatt
1993 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of Kula Lands in Omaoipo, Kula, Maui (Portion of TMK 2-3-23)*. Cultural Surveys Hawaii. Kailua, HI.
- Folk, William H., Melody Heidei, Victoria Creed, Thomas K. Devereux, Jan Masterson, Kenneth Hillyard, and Hallett H. Hammatt
1999 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Kihei to Kula Road Corridor, Kailua to Kana'ole Ahupua'a, Makawao and Waiohuli Districts, Island of Maui (TMK 2-2 and 2-3)*. Prepared for Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade, and Douglas, Inc.
- Formander, Abraham
1917-1919 *Formander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-Lore*. Bishop Museum Memoirs, 5 (2)
- 1969 *An account of the Polynesian Race Its Origins and Migrations*. Vol. 1 to 3. Charles E. Tuttle Co. Inc, Rutland.
- Fredericksen, Walter M., and Demaris L. Fredericksen
1991 *Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Parcel of Land in Kula, Maui*. Xamanek Research, Pukalani, Maui.
- 1992 *Report on the Data Recovery During Excavations to Disinter Human Remains Inadvertently Discovered at Site 2498, Pukalani, Maui, Hawaii (TMK 2-3-44:20)*. Xamanek Researches.
- 1993 *An Archaeological Inventory Survey of a Parcel of Land in Kula, Maui (TMK 2-2-14: 00)*. Xamanek Researches, Pukalani, Maui.
- 1995 *Inventory Survey Report for Road "C" Corridor, Waiohuli Ahupua'a, Makawao and Waiohuli Districts, Maui Island*. Xamanek Researches.
- Fredericksen, Erik M., Demaris Fredericksen and Walter Fredericksen
1994 *Archaeological Inventory Survey and Botanical Survey Report, Kaonohu Ahupua'a, Waiohuli and Makawao Districts, Island of Maui (TMK 3-9-01:16 and 2-2-02: Por. 15)*.
- Glick, Clarence E.
1980 *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii*. Hawaii Chinese History Center and The University Press of Hawaii. Honolulu.
- Hammatt Hallett H., and David W. Shideler
1989 *Archaeological Reconnaissance of a 54-acre Parcel at Kama'ole, Waiohuli District, Island of Maui*. Cultural Surveys Hawaii. Kailua, HI.
- Handy, E.S. Craighill and Elizabeth Green Handy
1972 *Native Planters in Old Hawaii*. Bishop Museum Bulletin 233. Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu, Hawai'i.
- Kamakau, Samuel M.
1869 *"Ka Moololo o Hawaii". Ke Au Okoa*. December 2.
- Kame'eiehiwa, Lilikala
1992 *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea La E Pono Ai?* Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu.

- Kelly, Marion
1983 *Nā Māia o Kona: Gardens of Kona*. Dept. of Anthropology Report Series 83-2. Bishop Museum. Honolulu.
- 1998 "Gunboat Diplomacy, Sandalwood Lust and National Debt." In *Ka Wai Ola o OHA*. Vol. 15, No. 4, April 1998.
- Kirch, Patrick V.
1985 *Feathered Gods and Fishhooks: An Introduction to Hawaiian Archaeology and Prehistory*. University of Hawai'i Press. Honolulu.
- Kirch, Patrick V. and Marshall Sablins
1992 *Anahulu*. Vol. 1 and 2. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.
- Kolb, M.
1991 *Social Power, Chieftly Authority, and Ceremonial Architecture, in an Island Polity, Maui Hawaii*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- 1994 Ritual Activity and Chiefly Economy at an Upland Religious Site on Maui, Hawaii. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 21, 3:1-21
- 1995 The Political Dynamics of Ritual Pig Sacrifice in the Hawaiian Kingdom. *American Anthropologist*, in review.
- Kolb, Michael J., Patty J. Conte, Ross Condy (eds.)
1997 *Kula: The Archaeology of Upcountry Maui in Ikaoluhi and Keokea*. Prepared for The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands.
- Kuykendall, R.S.
1938 *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. Vol. 1. University of Hawai'i Press. Honolulu.
- LaPérouse, J.F.G., de
1798 *A Voyage Round the World, performed in the years 1785...1788, by the Boussole and Astrolabe*. . 2 Vols. A. Hamilton. London.
- Lucas, Paul F. Nahoa
1995 *A Dictionary of Hawaiian Legal Land-Terms*. Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, Hawaii.
- Lyons, C.J.
1875 "Land Matters in Hawaii". *The Islander*, Vol. 1. Honolulu.
- Manu, Moses
1884 "The Story of Kihapiliāni". *Ka Nuipepa Kirokoa*. Feb. 23.
- Mark, D.M.L.
1975 *The Chinese in Kula: Recollections of a Farming Community in Old Hawaii*. Hawaii Chinese History Center. Honolulu.
- McPhatter, Blair and Paul H. Rosendahl
1996 *Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey 250-Acre Pūkalani Project Area, Land of Aupūea, Makawao District, Island of Maui (TMK: 2-3-08:Por. 5. PHRI. Hilo, HI.*
- Menzies, Archibald
1920 *Hawaii Nei 128 Years ago*. Edited by W.F. Wilson. New Freedom Publishers. Honolulu.
- Miura, Marvin
1982 *Biological and Archaeological Reconnaissance, TMK 2-2-02: Portion of 42, Kōhei, Maui, Hawaii*. Environmental Impact Study Corporation, Maui and Honolulu, HI.
- National Park Service
1990 *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*. *National Register Bulletin, No. 38*. U.S. Dept. of the Interior. National Park Service. Interagency Resources Division. National Park Service, Washington.
- National Register of Historic Places
"36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties". U.S. Department of the Interior.
- OEQC (Office of Environmental Quality Control, State of Hawai'i)
1997 "Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts." Adopted by the Environmental Council, November 1997.
- Pukui, Mary K.
1983 *Olelo No'ea: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*. Bishop Museum Special Publication No. 71. Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu.
- Pukui, Mary K., and Samuel H. Elbert
1957 *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English-English-Hawaiian*. University Press of Hawaii. Honolulu.

Riford, Mary
1987 *Archaeological Services for DHHL Waipihuli & Keokea Subdivisions, Kula, Makawao, Maui for County of Maui*. B.P. Bishop Museum. Honolulu.

Speakman, C.E., Jr.
1978 *Mowee-An Informal History of the Hawaiian Islands*. San Raphael: Pucio Press.

State of Hawaii
Ms. Files cited in text from the collections of the:
Bureau of Conveyances
Hawaii State Archives
Land Management Division
State Survey Division

State Historic Preservation Office
1999 "Procedures for Ethnographic Inventory Surveys", (Draft). Honolulu. On file:
State Historic Preservation Office.

State of Hawaii
1997 Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 11, Department of Health, Chapter 200, Environmental Impact Statement Rules. (Unofficial version).

1997 Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts. Adopted by the Environmental Council, State of Hawaii.

Stearns, Harold T., and Gordon A. Macdonald
1942 *Geology and Ground-water Resources of the Island of Maui, Hawaii*. Advertiser Publishing Co., Ltd. Honolulu.

Sterling, Elspeth P.
1998 *Sites of Maui*. Bishop Museum Press. Honolulu.

Stokes, J.F.G.
n.d. *Maui Heiau*. Manuscript, Bishop Museum, c. 1909-1916. Honolulu. Hawaii.

Thrum, Thomas G.
1909-1918 *Heiau of Maui*. Hawaiian Annual. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Uaua, W. H.
1871 "The Battle of the Owls". *Ke Au Okoa*. June 29.

Vancouver, George
1984 *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean and Round the World*, Vol. III. Edited by W. Kaye Lamb. The Hakluyt Society. London

Walker, Winslow
1931 *Archaeology of Maui*. Manuscript at State Historic Preservation Division. Honolulu. Hawaii.

Wulzen, Warren and Paul H. Rosendahl with Helen Wong Smith
1996 *Archaeological Inventory Survey, 44-Acre Pukalani Terrace Subdivision III. Land of 'A'opueo, Makawao District, Island of Maui*. PHRI. Hilo.

APPENDIX A

Individuals contacted regarding the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway

Individuals contacted regarding the Kihai-Upcountry Maui Highway:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Residence</u>	<u>Title or Association</u>
Lynn Lee	O'ahu	Office of Hawaiian Affairs
Theima Shimaoka	Maui	Office of Hawaiian Affairs
Isaac Haap	Maui	Hawaiian Nation Information
Mahealani Davis	Moloka'i	Kula resident
Charles Ke'au	Maui	Kula resident
Marion Kelly	O'ahu	University of Hawaii, Dept. of Ethnic Studies
Luciano Minerbi	O'ahu	University of Hawaii, Dept. of Urban and Regional Studies
Lisa Hamilton	Maui	Maui resident
Art Medeiros	Maui	Ethno-Botanist
Mary Evanson	Maui	Former president of Sierra Club
Elizabeth Russel	Maui	Kula resident
Kathy Riley	Maui	Maui Historical Society
Henry Lau	Maui	Chinese Oral History
Hugh Star	Maui	Real Estate Agent
Melissa Kirkendall	Maui	State Historic Preservation Division
Gaylord Kubota	Maui	Hawai'i Sugar Museum
Marvin Shim	Maui	Kula resident
Holly McEldowny	O'ahu	State Historic Preservation Division
Nathan Napokā	O'ahu	State Historic Preservation Division
Linda Howe	O'ahu	Sugar Company Public Relations (A&B)
Steve Holiday	Maui	Gen Manager Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company.
Randal Moore	Maui	Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company-mapping division
Elliot Krash	Maui	Kula Community Association
Meilani Abihar	Maui	Kamehameha Schools
Daryl Yagodich	O'ahu	Hawaiian Homes Planning Commission
Henry Rice	Maui	Ka'ono'ulu Ranch
M. J. Hardin	Maui	Author, Kula resident
Eric Nakashima	Maui	Kula Community Association
Hokulani Holt-Padilla	Maui	Kaho'olawe Island Reserve Commission
Kala Tau'a	Maui	Kula resident
Barbra Brandt-Fernandez	Maui	Tau'a's friend
Ki'ope Raymond	Maui	Hawaiian Language Teacher, Maui Community College

Camille Lyons
Sonny Manoa
Ed Uweko 'olani
Henry Silva
Tony Durso
Summer Erdman
Merton Kekivi

Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui

Halekalahi Ranch
Paniolo, Halekalahi Ranch
Paniolo, Halekalahi Ranch
Paniolo, Halekalahi Ranch
'Ulupalakua Ranch
'Ulupalakua Ranch
'Ulupalakua Ranch

Name
Dan Purdy
Kevin Kihara
George Ito
Charles Maxwell
Laurel Murphy
Silvia Hunt

Residence
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui
Maui

Title or Association
'Ulupalakua Ranch
Fong Store, Kula
Pa'ia Plantation Camp
Cultural Specialist
Author, historian
Former records keeper for Maui
Pineapple Co.

Manager, Maui Pineapple Co., Ltd.
Former employee Maui L. and P. Co.
Kealahua Plantation Camp
'Ulupalakua-Kula resident
District Manager, Forestry, Dept. of
Land and Natural Resources

Doug MacCluer
Frank Gouveia
Ethel Nagata
Nancy Purdy
Bob Hobby

APPENDIX B
Interview with Frank Gouveia

Interview with Frank Gouveia August 3, 2000, Hali'imaile, Maui
Conducted by Leann McGery of SCS, Inc.

Leann: ...I was just over with Sylvia [Hunt, former Records keep of Maui Land Pineapple Company] who lives on your street. I thought that Laura was going to arrive when I was talking to Sylvia. I'm hoping that this is going to start working...[referring to tape recorder]

I would like to ask you a few questions [formally]. Your name please.

Frank: Frank Gouveia and I'm 85 years old. We started working for ten cents an hour and worked for 46 years. I started as a water boy and worked my way up to the department head of transportation.

Leann: Ten cents an hour...was it six days a week?

Frank: Sometimes six sometimes seven, depending on the pineapples. No overtime.

Leann: So if you worked twelve hours a day you got the same?

Frank: Yes, the same thing.

Leann: Were you born here?

Frank: I was born in Kokomo and raised in Maui.

Leann: What about your family? Are they also here?

Frank: My mother and father came from Madeira, Portugal. When the plantation was looking for workers, they [looked for workers in] went to Portugal. They didn't plan what kind of people they needed to do the work. The people in Madeira did everything from clothing to all kinds of labor, just like here. My grand father, [was a] Gouveia, and I'm [a] Gouveia, rode the sailing boats and vessels and came to Maui. Then they started to work in the plantation.

Leann: Do you know what year that was?

Frank: In the 1880's. That's how the Portuguese came here mostly from there. Mostly working people. Madeira, where my parents came from, is just like West Maui mountain. Right around the island there is blue water. There is two places where you can go to the ocean. The rest is blue water. You take a basket of grapes and all that up to the road on the top of the mountain. I went there on a bus tour.

Appendix B Pg. 2

Leann: Oh, you went?

Frank: Yes, I went there. The old people never wanted me to go back. They never talked about Portugal.

Leann: Really?

Frank: Yes, once they got here nobody would go back. The only time we would go was when we retired. My wife and I went when I retired. I'm glad that we never looked behind. It took three months to get here and a lot of people died when they originally came here.

Leann: Very difficult. Did you find relatives? [when you went back to Madeira]

Frank: Yes, I did. They thought that they died on the way here. Then we talked about Portugal.

Frank: My father said, you don't have to know about Portugal. I'm glad you're in America.

Leann: Did they speak Portuguese to you?

Frank: I had a hard time because my grandmother was the last one to speak. We understood each other a little bit with English, etc. in between. They said they were poor and worked hard just like us.

Leann: How many brothers and sisters do you have?

Frank: I had sixteen. Five girls and eleven boys.

Leann: Where were you in that?

Frank: I was number eight. We were in a different group. The other group left when we moved to Hali'imaile, the rest all got married or something. We went to Hali'imaile in 1926 or so.

Leann: Where was your family before?

Frank: We lived right across the gym. When you came down, one of the big houses over there [referring to the gym in Hali'imaile]. The house on the hill, we moved into that house. In the meantime we were living in the Grove Ranch.

Leann: What was that, the Grove Ranch?

Appendix B Pg. 3

Frank: It was a big ranch for cattle. Harry Baldwin was the head of the Maui Agriculture of Pa'ia so he had Maui Pine and Sam Baldwin had Haleakala Ranch and Frank Baldwin had H. C. & S., Puunene. Then Harry broke away from Maui Pine and we broke away from the sugar but he was the head man yet and then his daughter married Walter Cameron. Walter Cameron was brought in by Sam Baldwin out from Haleakala. Haleakala pineapples were up there and we were down in this area. All the pineapple would be brought in from Pukalani. This is pineapple here.

Where are we now? Hali'imaile. This is pineapple here and Maui Pineapple Company came up. They combined and became one. Anything above Pukalani and Honolua is owned by the Cameron's.

Leann: What was the pineapple land before? What was it used for?

Frank: It was pastures for Haleakala Ranch and Grove Ranch and Honolua Ranch, and then pineapple came.

Leann: What about Pukalani?

Frank: It was just pasture land.

Leann: Where is Honolua Ranch? It's up in Kula. (Mr. Couvria is showing the map to the south of Pukalani).

Frank: The Rice's had a slaughter house and they had a corn [mill] and their headquarters was up in Kula. They had land up there where the government had _____. That was Rice's Ranch. Then pineapple began to take place over here. The Camerons own their own land and Haleakala is owned by the Camerons, too.

Leann: Oh yes, as well as Baldwins?

Frank: Yes. Maui Pine is also Camerons. I think they still own 51% of that and other historical places.

Leann: Oh yes, trails. Were you aware of some old trails that might have gone across the land that somebody told you, "You know what, before this..."

Frank: Yes, Hali'imaile Road. Right up here. This is Pukalani. This is all pineapple field. Right in here there was a trail that went to Sudeas place where the wharf was right down through Oma'opio Road. The wharf would be down here. Do you know who used the trail? The Chinese with their cargo and their donkeys and all that and would come to Kihei. Right here by the wharf.

Leann: And it [the trail] would go all the way down [to the coast]?

Frank: Yes, someplace in the canefield and all that.

Leann: Wow!

Frank: And there is a county road that goes down to it. Then they used to use the Puilehu Road and other roads to go to Kahului. There was one that came to Kihei.

Leann: How come they used that road instead of the one more towards 'Ulupekua? [referring to the Old Mākena Road].

Frank: This wharf takes you to Kaho'olawe or Lāna'i. The boat would stop here and Ma'alea.

Leann: And this is where you would load the sugar?

Frank: No, the sugar would be in Kahului.

Leann: So this would be cattle down there? What I was wondering is why they took that road (the Chinese) instead of the one by Haleakala Ranch but then it would not go to this wharf?

Frank: Some would go to Kahului and go to Lāna'i.

Leann: And even in your time when this road was still being used?

Frank: No. So that was the Chinese road. There were a lot of donkeys. We lived in Kahului when my dad was running the Pu'unanē Dairy. They unload, go to Kahului and load what they buy, that I remember.

Leann: How long did it take them? It would take them about three hours to go down and three hours to get back?

Frank: Yes, about that.

Leann: Where was the dairy?

Frank: Remember the dairy road? The airport road that goes to Lahaina and that, that's why its called the dairy road because it was right around here.

Leann: I see. What did they do for water in these pineapple fields? Did they have *aiwai* or just depended on the rain?

Frank: The rain. We never had ditch irrigation in those days and we had a lot of rain. Kona rains that took care of the dry lands. But today there's no rain so we had to go back to drip irrigation.

Leann: Yes, its been really bad the last couple of years too. What about the pipeline that came in 1905? The Kula pipeline in 1905--was that anywhere near the pineapple land?

Frank: Above. Above the pineapple lands.

Leann: Where did that take water to? The sugar?

Frank: The Kula guys. The forest over there. That's where we get some of our water from. We pick it up from Nahiko-Hana and goes to right above us. The ditch is right above us.

Leann: I see, I see. That would take water to the Kula farmers.

Frank: What they did, they always gave us bad time with water. All these people.

Leann: Still yet, huh?

Frank: But they're showing big improvement...

Leann: I had some questions written down here so the water was rain, ... pineapple was used for grazing and pasture. Did you have anything to do with any of the ranching activities at all?

Frank: No, we'd use some cane land and rotate, but not too much of that.

Leann: Sometimes cane, sometimes pasture... I'm wondering what things happened at different elevations like up here, you have pasture. What about Khei? What do they do down there?

Frank: They wait for the Kona rain--November, December, January, February. This would soak them and last for the whole year. They had nice *kenne*, a lot of beans, and it was all pasture land.

Leann: So it was all pasture land.

Frank: So today you only see stones. No grass.

Leann: Well, I'm wondering if there were any--when people wanted to get fish, what do they do, do they go down to Khei? Did they go down to Pa'ia?

Frank: People on this side, they go to Pa'ia or Kahului.

Leann: I know that the land was in cane and in ranching over 100 years so many of the stories are gone. They're lost.

Frank: They're lost.

Leann: I'm wondering if you recall anything besides the trail. That was very good information because I didn't know about that trail. Again, any areas that you recall had a special meaning, any caves, you don't even have to know [exactly] where they were--you may say, "I remember in this area there were some interesting places..."

Frank: Up in the gulches--the pineapple field up in the Homokea there was a big house and guys said they saw artifacts in there. But the water would end up in Kahului. They covered all these streams in Khei. When the gully up there comes down, it will be trouble.

Leann: There's going to be trouble. The water used to feed the fishponds long ago but not now. They did the same thing in Waikiki...[a brief discussion concerning Waikiki followed]

Frank: I remember Waikiki in 1940, when I was in the National Guard. We joined in 1940. When we went on maneuver in Waikiki, there were all swamps over there. These Honolulu boys would enter there and we couldn't get to them. We didn't know the streets. All the swampy areas I remember, today has buildfings.

Leann: I understand there were some military World War II activities over in this area somewhere. Do you know where that might be?

Frank: That was in Pu'unene.

Leann: Which is gonna be in this area [referring to map].

Frank: The army was right in this Pu'unene area too. They had a big airport over there. The navy moved their original airport over there. It is now the Kahului airport. The other people were stationed at Haiku.

Leann: So what were they doing? Maneuvers and war games?

Frank: They did go up this area--Khei and all that, and practice over there. And they did all that Training practice up in all in that area. Jungle in the Pacific.

Leann: Oh, really, all the way up to Kokomo?

Frank: They went to Hana, and stayed there for three months because we were too much from one area that's...

Tape stops and then picks up.

Frank: ...that is the right many gulches and plenty private lands. This is to deal with the plantations.

Leann: So the main thing you remember of course is this trail that the Chinese used all the way down to Kiheti by Suda Store.

Frank: Suda Store is an old landmark. That is where the wharf used to be. You haven't been to Kiheti lately?

Leann: I have been. I go there now and I don't-I don't like it.

Frank: All the big hotels down there, its terrible.

Leann: Terrible, I know.

Frank: The local people had the right of way and these haoles come and close it up.

Leann: Its really too bad because there was such good fishing areas and they're doing the same on the Big Island. They're doing the same in Kona too.

Frank: Kona and the Big Island has to start thinking for their own. You have these people around here run you, you're going to be nothing.

Leann: We're gonna loose all of it. Yes, I agree. I can't think of anything else [to ask] because, as I said, I'm aware that this has been so long in sugar cane and ranching.

Frank: They used to have a lot of villages scattered in this area.

Leann: You mean, the cane [plantation] camp villages?

Frank: Transportation was a hard thing so the villages Keahua, Kekania Camp, and they would have Keahua camp numbers-camp 1, camp 2, camp 3, etc.

Leann: I actually have a list of some of the [plantation] camps that were near this area. Are there people living now in Hail' imalle that used to live in some of the sugar camps?

Frank: I only know some of them-they might be grandchildren living but not the older

people.

Leann: I'm going to go tomorrow and see at Mrs. Nagata, who I guess was in Keohua [plantation camp]. She has a barbershop in Kahului but she was raised in Keohua camp where she lived for a long time.

Frank: Hipako was a big camp where Maui High used to be. It was a very big camp. Pe'a was a big camp too.

Leann: But the pineapple didn't have the camps like the sugar did, yeh?

Frank: We had a little camp in Ha'ikū and we had a little camp up in Kapalua and we started off in a gulch over here-Kaluani gulch. That's where the first ____ camp started.

Leann: In the gulch itself?

Frank: That's where the camp first started. It used to be bungalows.

Leann: Which gulch is that?

Frank: Kaluani. And then they consolidated everybody. We had pineapple and then they moved the whole thing.

Leann: Was this only pineapple people? Or pineapple and sugar people too?

Frank: No just pineapple. Local people stayed over there. Then after the war, sugar people put camps all over. Plantation got to do more modern things-weed killing, H-1, and all that. Kahului was all keawe trees so they made a village out of that and sold them for \$7,000 and today they are \$3,000 houses and they didn't want to go. They had a problem to move people away from camps.

Leann: Up here is nice and cool. I'd rather be here than Kahului.

Frank: We had a plantation sugar camp right next to us and that would be the thing that would be effecting the ____ line. Outstanding things is all out of our hands.

Leann: Do you know where Pu'uoweli is? Is that familiar to you at all?

Frank: No. Maybe they have a different name.

Leann: I don't know...They say the land form Pu'uoweli translated as "hill of fear". I looked at my [modern] map and I couldn't find it but ...

Frank: Kiholu [Pi'iholo?] is way up here by Makawao.

Leann: Kiholu, do you know what that means? Do you hear any stories about it?

Frank: No. These people from the mainland come here with the number of the streets and the name and all that and they find the place. People here say, turn right, turn left, etc.

Leann: It's because we live by landmarks. I know...

Frank: Yes. I have a daughter that works in the Ha'ikū Post Office. They say "...how long more are we going to get to Lahaina? You gotta go down the other way..." [back around through Kahului].

Leann: Oh, no!

Frank: Then you get some bad people that say you take this road and go right to Lahaina.

Leann: I guess they do...

Frank: All these young people that moved because of too much rain, they go there and they like it and they're building houses. They like that. They call it "valley", we called it "gulches".

Leann: There was a big Portuguese community here then. How big a community was it? Do you remember? Do you how old?

Frank: Yes, lots of standard houses. My cousin came here and moved to Pā'ia. Some of them stayed in Pā'ia and my grandfather worked for the sugar. So his house was close to the water where they start ditches to get water. My father live in _____ where we always went. And then we moved to Olinda when they opened Homestead land. That's when we went to Kahului about 1930 and then we came back up. Makawao was a big Portuguese town.

Leann: It wasn't just ranching?

Frank: Most ranches were small ranches I think they had a two year contract and after they finished that, where would they go? Up there. Like Madeira over there. H Coco was a big Portuguese camp, and Pu'unēnē had a lot of Portuguese, Waituku had the rich Portuguese. Big businessmen, and all the big guys. Those were the businessmen. Actually all businessmen, they went into merchants.

Leann: Did all of the Portuguese men come from Madeira?

Frank: Yes, several different islands--600 miles from Portugal. I have a sketch like this. But their on the same equator right?

Leann: So this was like home to them.

Frank: Yes, everything is the same. You walk down the street and you say, "Damn, I know this guy". I gotta know this guy, he look a Deceites, he looks like a Santos and could be. Then the old people wear white shirt and black pants. The ladies would wear dresses and the girls started to wear slacks. For the first time they dressed like that, and I had to talk to them.

Leann: Do you still speak Portuguese?

Frank: I can understand if they talk but sometimes you meet some tourist and they say they're Portuguese and they start talking to me. But they speak Portuguese on the mainland more than they do in Hawai'i. I can see why the people didn't want to tell us off--because the king over there at that time. What we have here is over there--coffee, poiatoes, tomatoes everything that we have here, came from there. I like to see these young Portuguese boys throw 'em back to them.

Leann: It's a different way of life. Is that a picture of your mother and father?

Frank: Yes, it is. This one is my wife's mother. This came from Portugal, my grandfather and grandmother. My grandmother outlived my grandfather. That's how they were dressed when they came from Portugal.

Leann: Oh my, that's wonderful.

Frank: All the Castros, not too many of them have a long life, but the Gouveias have long life. I have three brothers that died back home and they didn't reach 70. My father lived until 81, my aunty lived until 100 and 6 months, another aunty until 98. I had a sister that lived until 94.

Leann: [Is] the genetics--something genetic. Do they still live here? [referring to his brothers and sisters]

Frank: No, they're all gone. There's only four of us left, one sister and three brothers.

APPENDIX J

Botanical Screening Reconnaissance Study

Botanical Survey

Additional Botantial Surveys -- U2-A and U2-B Alignments

BOTANICAL SCREENING RECONNAISSANCE STUDY
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS

BOTANICAL SCREENING RECONNAISSANCE STUDY
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS

INTRODUCTION

On 28 December 1995, a helicopter flyover was made along the corridors of the alternative alignments for the Kihei-Upcountry Maui Highway project. Accompanying the botanical investigator were David Atkin and Deneitra Hutchinson, Parsons Brinckerhoff representatives working on the project. Windward Aviation, Inc., provided the helicopter service.

by

Winona P. Char

CHAR & ASSOCIATES
Botanical Consultants
Honolulu, Hawaii

The primary objectives of the aerial reconnaissance were to identify the general vegetation types along the alternative alignments and to search for sensitive areas which might harbor native plant communities, that is, lowland dry forests and shrublands. In general, these native plant communities tend to be associated with the stonier soils and the more rugged topographical features such as steep-sided gulches, large rocky outcroppings, and pu'us where grazing animals are less likely to visit. An important component of these lowland communities is williwili (*Erythrina sandwicensis*), an endemic member of the legume family. The distinct branching pattern and orange-yellow colored bark of the williwili is easily picked up from the air. Thus, most areas with native plant communities can be quickly identified by looking for this indicator species.

Prepared for: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

March 1996

Alternative alignments which support native plant-dominated communities are identified and the rationale for eliminating them is discussed. For the remaining alternatives, a comparative ranking is provided.

RESULTS

The plant names used in the following discussion are in accordance with the most recent treatment of the Hawaiian flora by Wagner et al. (1990).

Uncultivated Lands

Three broad bands of vegetation can be recognized on the uncultivated slopes of this portion of Haleakala, their distribution influenced primarily by rainfall, substrate type, and human activities.

From Pi'ilani Highway and upslope to about the 1,500-foot elevation contour, the vegetation consists of an open forest composed of kiawe trees (Prosopis pallida). Buffel grass (Cenchrus ciliaris) is the most abundant ground cover with the amount of grass cover varying with the season, i.e. rainy vs. dry. This vegetation type occurs where there is soil, although shallow and stony. Annual rainfall is about 15 to 20 inches in these areas.

Scattered through the kiawe forest are areas with 'a'a lava flows; these are mapped as "Very Stony Land" (rVS) on the soil maps (Foote et al. 1972). These very stony lands support large stands of williwili trees and other native species. Alternatives 6A and 6B cross over a portion of the large 'a'a flow around Pu'u o Kali. Two listed endangered species, the ko'oloa'ula (Abutilon menziesii) and ma'o hau hele (Hibiscus brackenridgei), and two candidate 2 endangered species, the 'awikiwiki (Canavalia pubescens) and koala (Acacia koa), are known from the dry forest on this 'a'a flow (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1994a, 1994b). Alternative 7 crosses a large flow also identified as "rVS" on the soil maps. A small portion of the flow was surveyed for the Maui Wailea 670 project (Char and Linney 1988), and plants of the 'awikiwiki as

well as maiapilo or the Hawaiian caper (Capparis sandwichiana), a candidate 2 species, were found. The occurrence of other listed and candidate endangered species on this flow are likely to be very high.

Above the 1,500-foot contour, the vegetation changes to an open scrub community composed of patches of lantana (Lantana camara) and panini cactus (Opuntia ficus-indica) with scattered kiawe trees. A mixture of various grass species and smaller, mostly weedy species fills in the matrix between the woody components (Char 1994).

At about the 2,000-foot elevation contour to just above the Kula Highway, the vegetation changes to kikuyu grass (Pennisetum clandestinum)-dominated pastures interspersed with large blocks of black wattle (Acacia mearnsii) forest. Smaller stands of various Eucalyptus species are also common. The soils in this area are deeper and rainfall increases to about 30 inches per year.

Cultivated Lands

Portions of Alternatives 1 to 4A and 4B as well as Alternative 8 will cross over actively cultivated sugar cane (Saccharum officinarum) and pineapple (Ananas comosus) fields. A few smaller vegetable and flower farms may also be within or close to these alignment corridors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Alternatives Recommended for Elimination

Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7 will cross over sensitive native lowland forests dominated by williwili trees. On Alternatives 6A and 6B, two listed and two candidate 2 endangered species are

known from the lava flow around Pu'u o Kali. Two candidate 2 species are known from a portion of the 'a'a flow along Alternative 7, and it is highly likely that this flow also harbors other endangered plants.

Besides the direct impact of the construction itself on these dry forests, there are a number of indirect impacts which include the increased chance of fires with more human activity in the area, pollution from petrochemical products, and an increased chance of invasion by weedy alien species. Many of these dry forests also provide habitat for native invertebrates, primarily insects, some of them candidate endangered species.

If Alternatives 6A, 6B, and 7 are considered, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as well as the State's Division of Forestry and Wildlife would require a review of the possible impacts and long-term mitigation measures, including a fire plan. A Section 7 Consultation and a biological assessment will be required if the project involves Federal funding. These requirements would increase the cost and time of completion for the proposed highway.

Comparative Ranking of Remaining Alternatives

From a botanical perspective, Alternatives 1 to 5 and 8 are the least likely to have a significant negative impact on the native botanical resources. These alignments cross over vegetation types dominated by introduced or alien species such as kiawe, buffel grass, black wattle, kikuyu grass, panini, etc., and actively cultivated agricultural lands. There are no 'a'a lava flows ("rVS") mapped along these alignments.

A comparative ranking among these alternatives, with justification, is presented below. The alternatives are arranged numerically with "1" being the most preferred and "5" the least preferred.

Rank	Alignment	Rationale
1	Alt. 1	Both Alternatives 1 and 2 cross kiawe forest with buffel grass along their lower sections. The remaining portions cross actively cultivated sugar cane fields. These fields do not support rare or endangered species and sensitive native plant communities. Portions of the kiawe forest appear to have been burned at one time.
1	Alt. 2	This alternative will remove the most cultivated lands. Because most of this corridor is cultivated or disturbed, it is very unlikely to support any rare or endangered species and sensitive native plant communities.
1	Alt. 8	This alternative crosses kiawe forest with buffel grass and disturbed and cultivated lands from Omaopio Road to Pukalani. Portions of the kiawe forest appear to have been burned at one time.
2	Alt. 3	Both 4B and 4A cross kiawe forest with buffel grass and open scrub which has long been used for grazing cattle and horses. Thus, there is little native vegetation left. Primarily in the larger, deeper gulches. A higher ranking is given 4B as it passes through some disturbed, weedy areas below the reservoir and portions of the kiawe forest along its lower corridor appear to have been burned at one time.
3	Alt. 4B	This alternative crosses kiawe forest and scrub vegetation as well as several fairly large and deep gulches. Near its Kuia Highway terminus, the alignment corridor is fairly narrow (there are more developed areas then is shown on topographic map). If rare plants or archaeological features are present, it may be difficult to avoid them.
4	Alt. 4A	
5	Alt. 5	

LITERATURE CITED

Char, W.P. 1994. Botanical Survey, DHHL Kula Residential Lot, Unit 1, Kula, Makawao District, Island of Maui. Prepared for Munekiyo & Arakawa, Inc. October 1994.

Char, W.P. and G.K. Linney. 1988. Botanical Survey, Maui Wailea 670 Project, Wailea, Makawao District, Island of Maui. Prepared for PBR Hawai'i. February 1988.

Foote, D.E., E.L. Hill, S. Nakamura, and F. Stephens. 1972. Soil survey of the islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, State of Hawaii. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994a. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants. 50 CFR 17.11 & 17.12. August 20, 1994.

_____. 1994b. Plants, Hawaiian Islands, Listed, proposed or candidate species under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, Updated: December 15, 1994. Unpublished list, Pacific Islands Office, Honolulu.

Wagner, W.L., D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer. 1990. Manual of the flowering plants of Hawai'i. 2 vols. University of Hawai'i Press and B.P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. B.P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 83.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	1
SURVEY METHODS	1
DESCRIPTION OF THE VEGETATION	3
Cultivated Lands	4
Kiawe/Buffelgrass Association	6
Kikuyu/Mixed Grass Pasture Land	8
Gulch Vegetation	9
THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	10
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
PLANT SPECIES LIST	14
LITERATURE CITED	25

BOTANICAL SURVEY
KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

by

Winona P. Char
CHAR & ASSOCIATES
Botanical Consultants
Honolulu, Hawaii

Prepared for: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

May 1997

Draft

SUMMARY

Field studies to assess the botanical resources found on the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway alternative termini and alignment segments were conducted in January and February 1997 by a team of three botanists. The termini and centerline for the alignment segments were staked and flagged prior to the botanical field studies. A corridor 200 feet wide, that is, 100 feet on each side of the centerline, was surveyed. Where the alignment segment crossed over a large gulch, then a corridor 500 feet wide was surveyed. Remnant populations of native plants are more likely to occur on steep, inaccessible areas such as gulch walls and rocky outcroppings away from agricultural disturbances and out of the reach of grazing animals.

Actively cultivated lands occur on the upper elevation portions of the alignments. Sugar cane fields and their associated network of canehaul roads and irrigation systems are found primarily on Segment A and the lower portion of Segment B. Pineapple fields are found along portions of Segments B, C, and D. A portion of Segment C crosses through the Kula Agricultural Park near Pulehu Road.

Uncultivated lands through which the alignments pass are covered primarily by a kiawe/buffelgrass association. Kiawe trees (*Prosopis pallida*), native to tropical America, and buffelgrass (*Cenchrus ciliaris*), native to Africa and tropical Asia, are the dominant components of this vegetation type. The kiawe/buffelgrass association occurs along all of Segments E and F, and along the greater length of Segments C and D. The remaining smaller sections of uncultivated lands support Kikuyu (*Pennisetum clandestinum*)/mixed grass pasture lands (Segments B and C), and gulch vegetation.

Gulch vegetation is found along all of the segments where they cross large, steep-walled gulches such as Waiahoa, Pulehu, and Kalialinui gulches. Most of the uncultivated lands are used for grazing cattle and horses.

One population of the endangered ko'oloa'ula (*Abutilon menziesii*), a member of the mallow or hibiscus family, is known from Kalialinui Gulch. Three small clusters of plants are found between 690 and 750 feet elevation. None of the plants occur on the alignment segments; Segment A crosses Kalialinui Gulch high above the ko'oloa'ula population at about the 840-foot contour.

Almost all of the vegetation on the proposed termini and alignment segments is composed of introduced or alien plant species. Introduced species are all those plants which were brought to the Hawaiian Islands by humans, intentionally or accidentally, after Western contact, i.e. Cook's discovery of the islands in 1778. A total of 173 plant species were recorded during the field studies. Of these, 153 (88%) are introduced species; 4 (2%) are originally of early Polynesian introduction; and 16 (10%) are native. Of the natives, 8 are indigenous, that is, they are native to the Hawaiian Islands and also elsewhere. Eight species are endemic, that is, they are native only to the Hawaiian Islands. The 8 endemic species are the kumu niu fern (*Doryopteris decipiens*), nehe (*Lipochaeta rockii*), *Sicyos hispidus*, *Wilwili* (*Erythrina sandwicensis*), *nana* (*Nama sandwicensis*), *pua kala* (*Argemone glauca*), *Panicum pellitum*, and *kakonakona* (*Panicum torridum*).

None of the plants found during the survey is a listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered species; nor is any plant a species of concern. There are no areas on or adjacent to the termini and alignment segments which support sensitive native plant-dominated communities.

None of the alternative termini and alignment segments are "more favorable" or "least favorable" from a botanical perspective. Use of any of the termini and alignment segments for the construction of the proposed highway is not expected to have a significant negative impact on the botanical resources. However, there is some concern for fires and soil erosion. Segments which cross the kiawe/buffelgrass association should have wide, gravel-lined shoulders. This vegetation type is especially fire-prone during the dry summer months. On the upper elevation portions of the proposed highway where it is wetter and the topography somewhat steeper, areas cleared of vegetation during construction should be revegetated as soon as possible to prevent soil loss.

Where landscaping is needed, it is recommended that native trees and shrubs be considered. These plants are already adapted to the local growing conditions and would require less water and soil amendments. Some native species which could be used include wili-wili (these occur naturally in some of the larger gulches along the alignment segments); naio (*Myoporum sandwicense*) -- a glossy, dark green shrub with fragrant white flowers; nehe -- a member of the daisy family (it occurs on Segment C); 'ilima (*Sida fallax*) -- a small shrub with bright orange flowers and used in landscaping; and 'akia (*Wikstroemia uva-ursi*) -- a low, mat-forming shrub and excellent ground cover already in use for landscaping. The Maui Native Plant Society and the Division of Forestry and Wildlife's Na Ala Hele program should be contacted for additional suggestions for planting as well as planting material.

BOTANICAL SURVEY KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY

INTRODUCTION


A four-lane highway which would link Kihei and Upcountry Maui is being proposed. Three termini are being studied for the proposed Upcountry portion and two termini are being considered for the Kihei portion. A total of six alternative alignments made up of six segments, Segments A through F, are being evaluated (Figure 1).

Field studies to assess the botanical resources found on the alternative termini and alignment segments of the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway were conducted by a team of three botanists. The field studies were made on 07 to 10 January, 10 to 14 February, and 26 February 1997. The primary objectives of the botanical studies were to:

- 1) provide a general description of the vegetation types found on the alternative termini and alignment segments;
- 2) inventory the flora;
- 3) search for threatened and endangered species as well as species of concern; and
- 4) identify areas of potential environmental problems or concerns and propose appropriate mitigation measures.

SURVEY METHODS

Prior to undertaking the field studies, a search was made of the pertinent literature to familiarize the principal investigator with other botanical studies conducted in the general area. Topographic maps as well as black and white aerial photographs with the alignments plotted on them were examined to determine



GRAPHIC SCALE: 0 2 km 4 km
0 1 mi 2 mi

Location of Alternative Termini and Alignment Segments
KIHEI-UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
Botanical Survey
FIGURE 1

vegetation cover patterns, terrain characteristics, access, boundaries, and reference points.

The termini and centerline for the alignment segments were staked and flagged prior to our field studies. The survey work was conducted in January and February 1997 during the wet (rainy) season. A corridor 200 feet wide, that is, 100 feet on each side of the centerline was surveyed. Where the alignment crossed a large gulch, a corridor 500 feet wide was surveyed. A walk-through survey method was used. Notes were made on plant associations and distribution, substrate types, drainage, exposure, disturbances, topography, etc. Plant identifications were made in the field; plants which could not be positively identified were collected later determination in the herbarium (University of Hawai'i, Manoa -- HAW), and for comparison with the taxonomic literature. The less disturbed, steeper gulch walls, rocky outcroppings, and uncultivated lands were more intensively surveyed than the cultivated areas as these portions of the alignments were more likely to harbor sensitive native plant communities and rare plants.

DESCRIPTION OF THE VEGETATION

Actively cultivated lands occur on the upper elevation portions of the alignments. Sugar cane fields are found primarily on Segment A and the lower portion of Segment B. Pineapple fields are found along portions of Segments B, C, and D. Part of Segment C crosses through the Kula Agricultural Park near Pulehu Road.

Uncultivated lands through which the alignments pass are covered largely by a kiawe/buffelgrass association; this vegetation type occurs along all of Segments E and F, and along the greater length of Segments C and D. The remaining smaller sections of uncultivated lands support Kikuyu/mixed grass pasture lands (Segments B and C), and gulch vegetation. Gulch vegetation is

found along all of the alignment segments where they cross large, steep-walled gulches. The majority of the uncultivated lands are used for grazing cattle and horses.

A more detailed description of the vegetation types is presented below. An inventory of all the plant species observed on the alternative termini and alignment segments during the field studies is found at the end of the report.

Cultivated Lands

Fields of sugar cane (Saccharum officinarum) along with their accompanying network of canehaul roads and irrigation systems cover the majority of the cultivated lands. Sugar cane fields are found along the entire length of Segment A and the lower portion of Segment B. The fields can be found in various stages of cultivation, ranging from bare recently harvested fields to open, low stands of young cane, 2 to 3 feet tall, to closed, very dense, mature stands of cane 12 to 15 feet tall. Sugar cane fields are found on soils of the Waiakoa-Keahua-Molokai association; these are deep to moderately deep, nearly level to moderately steep, well-drained soils that have a moderately fine textured subsoil. This soil association occurs on the low uplands of Maui (Foote et al. 1972).

Pineapple fields are found along portions of Segments B, C, and D on soils of the Waiakoa-Keahua-Molokai association. The rows of pineapple (Ananas comosus), following along the contour of the land, form a rather harsh, gray-green colored vegetation cover up to 3 feet tall. Like the sugar cane fields, the pineapple fields can also be found in different stages of cultivation.

A portion of Segment C crosses through Kula Agricultural Park

which supports small agricultural lots which produce a number of crops for the local market; these include green onions (Allium fistulosum), broccoli (Brassica oleracea var. botritis), banana (Musa X paradisiaca), Maui onions (Allium cepa), edible-podded pea (Pisum sativum var. macrocarpa), etc. Plant nurseries which offer potted ornamental as well as cut foliage and flowers are also found on the agricultural park. No inventory was made of the cultivated species on this portion of the study area.

The actively cultivated fields themselves tend to support only a few weedy species. The majority of the weedy plants associated with agricultural lands are found adjacent to the fields, that is, along the margins of the fields, along and on the dirt roads, on rock and debris piles, along irrigation ditches and reservoirs, and other areas which are only occasionally disturbed. These sites are sometimes treated with herbicides to control the weedy growth.

This weedy association of plants is composed primarily of grasses and annual, herbaceous species. The weedy assemblage of plants found in the sugar cane fields are similar to those found in the pineapple fields and the agricultural park. Frequently observed species include Guinea grass (Panicum maximum), swollen finger-grass (Chloris barbata), nutgrass (Cyperus rotundus), garden spurge (Chamaesyce hirta), smooth rattlepod (Crotalaria pallida), spiny amaranth (Amaranthus spinosus), buffel grass (Cenchrus ciliaris), and little bell (Ipomoea triloba). Along the irrigation ditches and reservoirs, a few species which prefer a wetter environment are found; these include honohono (Commelina diffusa), Leptochloa unineruia, primrose willow (Ludwigia octovalvis), California grass (Brachiaria mutica), and the ho'i'o fern (Diplazium esculentum).

Kiawe/Bufelgrass Association

This vegetation type is dominated by two introduced or alien plant species. Kiawe (Prosopis pallida), native to tropical America, was first introduced into the Hawaiian Islands in 1828 and now is the dominant component of the vegetation in low elevation, dry, disturbed sites on all of the main islands (Wagner et al. 1990). The seeds are very hard and pass through the digestive tract of livestock, and have thus been quickly and widely spread. Bufelgrass (Cenchrus ciliaris) is native to Africa and tropical Asia. It was first observed in 1932 on the island of Hawai'i. Today, it is common to abundant in dry areas in a wide variety of disturbed habitats.

The kiawe/bufelgrass association forms the major plant cover on the uncultivated lands. It covers all of Segments E and F, and major portions of Segments C and D. The soils generally belong to the Waiakoa-Keahua-Molokai association, but in many places contain the stonier variants of these soil types. For example, along the lower portions of Segments E and F, the substrate is Waiakoa extremely stony silty clay loam, 3 to 25% slopes, mapped as "WID2" on the soil maps (Foote et al. 1972). Thin soils over fragmental 'a'a belonging to the Keapuka-Makana association and the Kamaole-Oanapuka association are also found in the areas with this vegetation type.

Typically, the physiognomy is of an open canopy forest with dense grass cover filling in the matrix between the trees. Tree canopy cover is 30 to 60%, but tends to be somewhat denser in small gullies and low lying areas where runoff may accumulate during the rainy season. The trees vary in height from 12 to 40 feet tall, with most trees around 25 to 30 feet tall. In most places, bufelgrass forms dense, almost monodominant, clumping mats, 2 to

3 feet tall. On the stonier soils, bufel grass cover is reduced and patchy with a number of other, mostly annual, species common to abundant. These include peppergrass (Lepidium virginicum), burgrass (Tragus berteronianus), allseed (Polycarpon tetraphyllum), feather fingergrass (Chloris virgata), maile hohono (Ageratum conyzoides), wild zinnia (Zinnia peruviana), and pitted beardgrass (Bothriochloa pertusa).

There are a few minor variants of this vegetation type. Around water troughs and the larger, shadier kiawe trees where the cattle and horses tend to congregate and rest, peppergrass, Lepidium oblongum, cheeseweed (Malva parviflora), feather fingergrass, 'aheahea (Chenopodium murale), stinkgrass (Eragrostis cilianensis), and apple of Peru (Nicandra physalodes) are locally abundant. Along portions of Segments E and F, the kiawe trees become widely spaced and klu (Acacia farnesiana) shrubs, 3 to 6 feet tall, form large, open thickets.

Along the middle portion of Segment C, from where it crosses Waiakoa Gulch and upslope to the pineapple fields at about the 1,400-foot contour, panini cactus (Opuntia ficus-indica) is codominant with kiawe and bufelgrass. Panini forms dense prickly stands, 9 to 15 feet tall and 20 to 30 feet wide; the cactus cover is about 15 to 20%. The substrate is loose fragmental 'a'a and small boulders with a dense cover of bufelgrass. Surveying through this area is somewhat hazardous as the loose substrate can cause one to easily fall into a cactus patch. Large rock outcroppings in this area support a few native species such as 'ilima (Sida fallax) -- which is locally abundant, kumu-niu fern (Doryopteris decipiens), nehe (Lipochaeta rockii), Sicyos hispidus, and ilie'e (Plumbago zeylanica).

Along the lower portions of Segments E and F, where they join Pi'ilani Highway (K1 and K2 termini), there is evidence of past

fires. Burnt snags (standing dead) of kiawe trees are frequent and tree cover is more open, about 20 to 30% cover. In places, there are young saplings of kiawe, 1 to 4 feet tall, regenerating. Feather fingergrass forms extensive patches in the areas which have been recently burned.

Kikuyu/Mixed Grass Pasture Land

This vegetation type occupies only a small portion of the study site where it is found on the U2 terminus and along the upper portion of Segment B. Kikuyu grass (Pennisetum clandestinum), native to tropical Africa, is an excellent pasture grass which forms a thick, low, greenish-yellow colored mat. Other grasses which occur here in scattered patches or clumps include Rhodes grass (Chloris gayana), pitted beardgrass, Natal redtop (Melinis repens), Guinea grass, Bermuda grass (Cynodon dactylon), and buffelgrass. In places, Rhodes grass and pitted beardgrass may be locally abundant, that is, they form large, extensive patches.

This portion of the study site is at a higher elevation and is cooler and wetter. A number of species which prefer these cooler, moister conditions were found only in this vegetation type. These include fennel (Foeniculum vulgare), Childing pink (Petrohragia velutina), Spanish clover or ka'imī (Desmodium incanum), rat tail fescue (Vulpia myuros), and narrow-leaved plantain (Plantago lanceolata). Scattered here and there throughout the pasture land are small stands of trees and shrubs which include silk oak (Grevillea robusta), Christmas berry (Schinus terebinthifolius), jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), klu, black wattle (Acacia mearnsii), lantana (Lantana camara), and pepper tree (Schinus molle).

A variant of this vegetation type is found on Segment C, between the Kula Agricultural Park and the pineapple fields which begin at about the 2,000-foot contour. In this area, the pasture land contains scattered trees of kiawe and silk oak. Large patches of panini cactus are abundant. Glycine wightii, a climbing legume introduced as a fodder plant, is also abundant. Buffel grass and pitted beardgrass form extensive mats while Kikuyu grass is restricted to swale areas and small drainageways.

Gulch Vegetation

The alignment segments cross six major gulches: Kaliahinui, Puiehu, Kalaloo, Waiakoa, Kulanihako'i, and Waipu'ilani Gulches, as well as several, smaller unnamed gulches. Where Kaliahinui Gulch and Puiehu Gulch pass through the sugar cane fields, they are fenced and used for grazing.

The smaller, shallower gulches do not support a wide range of species and are dominated primarily by buffelgrass, Guinea grass, green panicgrass (Panicum maximum var. trichoglume), small thickets of koa haole shrubs (Leucaena leucocephala), and scattered kiawe trees.

Along the bottoms of the larger gulches and on the less steeply sloping gulch walls, scattered stands of kiawe, Chinaberry (Melia azedarach), and the native wiliwili (Erythrina sandwicensis) trees are found. Trees of Java plum (Syzygium cumini), kukui (Aleurites moluccana), silk oak (Grevillea robusta), and Chinese banyan (Ficus microcarpa) are also found in Kaliahinui Gulch, the largest gulch within the study area. Shrubs commonly found in these large gulches include koa haole, lantana, Christmas berry, and the native 'ilii'e (Plumbago zeylanica).

Ground cover is composed primarily of buffelgrass, Guinea grass, and green panicgrass. Because these large, deep gulches are shaded during part of the day and provide a moister habitat, they support a rich assortment of species. These include lion's ear (Leonotis nepetifolia), petty spurge (Euphorbia pepulus), castor bean (Ricinus communis), four-o'clock (Mirabilis jalapa), hairy abutilon (Abutilon grandifolium), Galinsoga parviflora, oriental hawkbeard (Youngia japonica), staggerweed (Stachys arvensis), Jimson weed (Datura stramonium), etc.

Scattered clumps of plants are found on the steep, almost perpendicular gulch walls. Large, succulent rosettes of sisal (Agave sisalana) and Mauritius hemp (Eurcraea foetida) are occasionally observed on many of the gulch walls. The native 'a'ali'i shrub (Dodonaea viscosa) is found on the walls of Kaliainui Gulch. Other native species which can be found on the steep gulch walls are 'ilie'e, 'ilima, kumu-niu fern, wiliwili, koali 'awa (Ipomoea indica), 'uhaloa (Waltheria indica), and popolo (Solanum americanum).

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

One small population of the endangered ko'oloa'ula shrub (Abutilon menziesii) is known from Kaliainui Gulch (Wagner et al. 1990; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1995).

The ko'oloa'ula is a member of the mallow or hibiscus family (Malvaceae). It is a much branched, rounded shrub up to 9 feet tall. The coarsely-toothed, heart-shaped leaves as well as the young branches are covered by a velvety, silvery, stellate pubescence. The pendent, solitary flowers are medium red to dark red (maroon) and about 0.8 inch across. The fruit is a hairy capsule, and five to eight-parted, usually with three seeds per cell. Extant populations of the ko'oloa'ula are known from

Lana'i (near Pu'u Mahanalu and north of Kaunapapa Road); Hawaii'i (Puako, South Kohala); O'ahu ('Ewa Plain); and Maui (Pu'u o Kali and Kaliainui Gulch).

The Kaliainui Gulch population is made up of three small clumps of plants at elevations between 690 to 750 feet on red soils. Segment A which crosses the nearest to the ko'oloa'ula population is found at the 840-foot contour, well above the endangered plants.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All of the vegetation types recognized on the alternative termini and alignment segments are dominated by introduced species. Sugar cane fields cover the majority of the cultivated lands, that is, all of Segment A, a small portion of Segment B, and the U1 terminus. Pineapple fields and the Kula Agricultural Park make up the remaining cultivated lands. Pineapple fields are found along Segments B, C, and D, and on the U3 terminus. The agricultural park is found on Segment C.

Uncultivated lands are covered largely by a kiawe/buffelgrass association. This vegetation type covers the greatest area throughout all of the study site. It is found on the K1 and K2 termini, on all of Segments E and F, and along the majority of Segments B and C. Kikuyu/mixed grass pasture land is found on the upper elevation sections of Segments B and C, and on the U2 terminus. Gulch vegetation is found where the segments cross several gulches, some of them large and steep-walled. Most of the uncultivated lands are used for grazing cattle and horses. The lower elevation portions of the kiawe/buffelgrass association also show evidence of past fires.

A total of 173 plant species were recorded during the field

studies. Of these, 153 (88%) are introduced species; 4 (2%) are originally of Polynesian introduction; and 16 (10%) are native. Of the natives, 8 are indigenous, that is, they are native to the Hawaiian Islands and also elsewhere. Eight species are endemic, that is, they are native only to the Hawaiian Islands. The 8 endemic species are the kumu-niu fern (*Doryopteris decipiens*), nehe (*Lipochaeta rockii*), *Sicyos hispidus*, wilwili (*Erythrina sandwicensis*), nama (*Nama sandwicensis*), pua kala (*Argemone glauca*), *Panicum pellitum*, and kakonakona (*Panicum torridum*).

None of the plants found during the survey is a listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered species; nor is any plant a species of concern (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1992, 1997a, 1997b). There are no areas on or adjacent to the termini and alignment segments which support native plant-dominated communities (Gagne' and Cuddihy 1990; Hawai'i Heritage Program 1994).

None of the alternative termini and alignment segments is "more favorable" or "least favorable" from a botanical perspective. Use of any of the termini and alignment segments for the construction of the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway is not expected to have a significant negative impact on the botanical resources. The vegetation on the alternative termini and alignment segments is dominated by introduced species and there are no rare plants on or adjacent to the proposed project. However, there is some concern for fires and soil erosion. Segments which cross the kiawe/buffelgrass association should be designed with wide, gravel-lined shoulders. This vegetation type is especially fire-prone during the dry summer months. On the upper elevation portions of the proposed highway where it is wetter and the topography somewhat steeper, areas cleared of vegetation during construction should be revegetated as soon as possible to prevent soil loss.

Where landscaping is needed, it is recommended that native trees

and shrubs be considered. These plants are already adapted to the local growing conditions and would require less water and soil amendments. Some native species which could be used include wilwili (these occur naturally in some of the larger gulches along the alignment segments); naio (*Myoporum sandwicense*) -- a glossy, dark green shrub with fragrant white flowers; nehe -- a shrubby member of the daisy family (it occurs on Segment C); 'ilima -- a small shrub with bright orange flowers and used in landscaping; and 'akia (*Wikstroemia uva-ursi*) -- a low, mat-forming shrub which is an excellent ground cover and already in use for landscaping. The Maui Native Plant Society and the State Division of Forestry and Wildlife's Na Ala Hele Program should also be contacted for additional suggestions for planting as well as planting material.

PLANT SPECIES LIST -- Kiheti/Upcountry Maui Highway

The following checklist is an inventory of all the plants observed on the alternative termini and alignment segments during the field studies. The plants are arranged alphabetically by families within each of three groups: Ferns, Dicots, and Monocots. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the Ferns are in accordance with Lamoureux (1988), while the flowering plants, Dicots and Monocots, follow Wagner *et al.* (1990).

For each species, the following information is provided:

1. Scientific name with author citation.
2. Common English and/or Hawaiian name(s), when known.
3. Biogeographic status. The following symbols are used:
 - E = endemic = native only to the Hawaiian Islands.
 - I = indigenous = native to the Hawaiian Islands and also elsewhere.
 - I? = questionably indigenous = data not clear if dispersal by natural or human-related mechanisms, but weight of evidence suggests probably indigenous.
 - P = Polynesian = plants originally of Polynesian introduction prior to Western contact, that is, Cook's discovery of the Hawaiian Islands in 1778.
 - P? = questionably Polynesian = may be a Polynesian introduction or possibly introduced in historical times (after 1778).
 - X = introduced or alien = all those plants brought to the Hawaiian Islands by humans, intentionally or accidentally, after Western contact.
 - X? = questionably introduced = date of introduction unclear or very early, may possibly be indigenous or of Polynesian introduction.
4. Presence (+) or absence (-) of a particular species within

each of four vegetation types recognized within the study area (see text for discussion):

- c = Cultivated Lands
- k = Kiawe/Bufelgrass Association
- m = Kikuyu/Mixed Grass Pasture Land
- s = Gulch Vegetation

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>
Foeniculum vulgare Mill.	fennel	X	-	-	+	-
ASCLEPIADACEAE (Milkweed family)						
Asclepias physocarpa (E. Mey.) Schlechter	balloon plant	X	+	-	-	+
ASTERACEAE (Daisy family)						
Ageratum conyzoides L.	maile hohono	X	+	+	+	+
Bidens alba var. radiata (Schultz-Bip.) Ballard ex Melchert	white-flowered bidens	X	+	-	-	+
Bidens cynapiifolia Kunth	West Indian beggar's tick	X	-	-	-	+
Bidens pilosa L.	Spanish needle, ki, ki nehe	X	+	+	+	+
Calyptocarpus vialis Less.	hierba del cabello	X	+	-	-	-
Centaurea melitensis L.	Napa thistle, yellow star thistle	X	-	+	-	+
Cirsium vulgare (Savi) Ten.	bull thistle	X	+	-	+	+
17 Conyza bonariensis (L.) Cronq.	hairy horseweed, ilioha	X	+	+	+	+
Conyza canadensis var. pusilla (Nutt.) Cronq.	horseweed, lani wela	X	+	-	-	-
Crassocephalum crepidioides (Benth.) S. Moore		X	+	+	+	+
Emilia fosbergii Nicolson	pualele, flora's paintbrush	X	+	+	+	+
Galinsoga parviflora Cav.		X	-	+	-	+
Gnaphalium purpureum L.	purple cudweed	X	+	+	+	+
Hypochoeris glabra L.	smooth cat's ear	X	-	+	+	+
Hypochoeris radicata L.	hairy cat's ear, gosmore	X	-	+	-	-
Lipochaeta rockii Sherff	nehe	E	-	+	-	-
Picris hieracioides L.	hawksbeard	X	-	-	-	+
Pluchea carolinensis (Jacq.) G. Don	pluchea, sourbush	X	-	+	+	-
Senecio madagascariensis Poir.		X	-	+	+	-
Sigesbeckia orientalis L.	small yellow crown-beard	X	-	-	+	+
Sonchus oleraceus L.	sowthistle, pualele	X	+	+	+	+
Synedrella nodiflora (L.) Gaertn.	nodeweed	X	-	-	-	+
Tridax procumbens L.	coat buttons	X	+	-	-	+
Verbesina encelioides (Cav.) Benth. & Hook.	golden crown-beard	X	+	+	+	+

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>
FERNS						
ADIANTACEAE (Maiden hair fern family)						
Adiantum raddianum Presl	maiden hair fern	X	-	-	-	+
ATHYRIACEAE (Athyrium family)						
Diplazium esculentum (Retz.) Sw.	ho'i'o	X	+	-	-	-
NEPHROLEPIDACEAE (Sword fern family)						
Nephrolepis multiflora (Roxb.) Jarrett ex Morton	'okupukupu, hairy sword fern	X	+	-	-	-
SINOPTERIDACEAE (Cliffbrake fern family)						
Doryopteris decipiens (Hook.) J. Sm.	kumu-niu, manawahua, 'iwa'iwa	E	-	+	-	+

16

FLOWERING PLANTS

DICOTS

AMARANTHACEAE (Amaranth family)						
Alternanthera pungens Kunth	khaki weed	X	+	-	-	-
Amaranthus lividus L.		X	+	-	-	-
Amaranthus spinosus L.	spiny amaranth, pakai kuku	X	+	+	+	+
Amaranthus viridus L.	slender amaranth, pakai	X	+	-	-	+
Amaranthus sp.		X	-	+	-	-
ANACARDIACEAE (Mango family)						
Mangifera indica L.	mango, manako	X	-	-	+	-
Schinus molle L.	pepper tree	X	-	-	+	-
Schinus terebinthifolius Raddi	Christmas berry	X	+	-	+	+
APIACEAE (Carrot family)						
Ciclospermum leptophyllum (Pers.) Sprague	fir-leaved celery	X	+	-	-	-

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type			
			c	k	m	g
CONVOLVULACEAE (Morning glory family)						
<i>Ipomoea cairica</i> (L.) Sweet	koali	X?	-	+	-	-
<i>Ipomoea indica</i> (J. Burm.) Merr.	koali 'awa	1	+	-	+	+
<i>Ipomoea obscura</i> (L.) Ker-Gawl.		X	+	-	-	-
<i>Ipomoea triloba</i> L.	little bell	X	+	+	-	-
<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> (L.) Urb.	hairy merremia, koali kua hulu	X?	+	+	-	+
CUCURBITACEAE (Gourd family)						
<i>Cucumis dipsaceus</i> Ehrenb. ex Spach	wild cucumber, hedgehog gourd	X	-	+	-	-
<i>Momordica charantia</i> L.	wild bittermelon	X	+	+	-	+
<i>Sicyos hispidus</i> Hillebr.		E	-	+	-	-
EUPHORBIACEAE (Spurge family)						
<i>Aleurites moluccana</i> (L.) Willd.	kukui, tutui	P	-	-	-	+
<i>Chamaesyce hirta</i> (L.) Millsp.	hairy spurge, garden spurge	X	+	+	-	+
<i>Chamaesyce hyssopifolia</i> (L.) Small		X	+	-	-	+
<i>Chamaesyce prostrata</i> (Aiton) Small	prostrate spurge	X	+	-	-	-
<i>Euphorbia heterophylla</i> L.	Mexican fireweed, kaliko	X	+	-	-	+
<i>Euphorbia peplus</i> L.	petty spurge	X	-	+	-	+
<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.	castor bean, koli	X	+	-	-	+
FABACEAE (Pea family)						
<i>Acacia farnesiana</i> (L.) Willd.	klu	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Acacia mearnsii</i> De Wild.	black wattle	X	-	-	+	-
<i>Canavalia cathartica</i> Thouars	mauna-loa	X	-	-	-	+
<i>Chamaecrista nictitans</i> (L.) Moench	partridge pea, lauki	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Crotalaria pallida</i> Aiton	smooth rattlebox, pikakani	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Desmodium incanum</i> DC	Spanish clover, ka'imi	X	-	-	+	-
<i>Desmodium tortuosum</i> (Sw.) DC	Florida beggarweed	X	+	-	-	+
<i>Erythrina sandwicensis</i> Degener	wiliwili	E	-	+	+	+
<i>Glycyne wightii</i> (Wight & Arnott) Verdc.		X	+	+	+	+
<i>Indigofera suffruticosa</i> Mill.	indigo, 'iniko	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Leucaena leucocephala</i> (Lam.) de Wit	koa haole	X	+	+	+	+

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type			
			c	k	m	g
Xanthium strumarium var. canadense (Mill.) Torr. & A. Gray						
<i>Youngia japonica</i> (L.) DC	cocklebur, kikania	X	-	+	+	+
<i>Zinnia peruviana</i> (L.) L.	oriental hawksbeard	X	-	+	+	+
	wild zinnia	X	+	+	-	+
BIGNONIACEAE (Bignonia family)						
<i>Jacaranda mimosifolia</i> D. Don	jacaranda	X	-	-	+	-
BORAGINACEAE (Heliotrope family)						
<i>Heliotropium amplexicaule</i> Vahl	heliotrope	X	+	-	-	+
BRASSICACEAE (Mustard family)						
<i>Brassica campestris</i> L.	field mustard	X	+	+	-	-
<i>Brassica nigra</i> (L.) W. Koch	black mustard, makeke	X	-	+	-	+
<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i> (L.) Medik.	shepard's purse	X	+	-	-	-
<i>Coronopus didymus</i> (L.) Sm.	swinecress	X	-	+	-	+
<i>Lepidium oblongum</i> Small		X	-	+	-	-
<i>Lepidium virginicum</i> L.	peppergrass	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i> L.	Jim Hill mustard, tumble mustard	X	+	+	+	+
<i>Sisymbrium officinale</i> (L.) Scop.	hedge mustard	X	-	+	-	-
CACTACEAE (Cactus family)						
<i>Opuntia ficus-indica</i> (L.) Mill.	panini	X	+	+	+	+
CARYOPHYLLACEAE (Pink family)						
<i>Petrorhagia velutina</i> (Guss.) P. Ball & Heyw.	Childing pink	X	-	-	+	-
<i>Polycarpon tetraphyllum</i> (L.) L.	allseed	X	-	+	-	+
<i>Silene gallica</i> L.	small-flowered catchfly	X	+	+	+	+
CHENOPODIACEAE (Goosefoot family)						
<i>Atriplex semibaccata</i> R. Br.	Australian saltbush	X	+	-	-	-
<i>Chenopodium carinatum</i> R. Br.	keeled goosefoot	X	-	+	-	-
<i>Chenopodium murale</i> L.	'aheahea	X	+	+	-	+
<i>Salsola kali</i> L.	Russian thistle, tumbleweed	X	+	-	-	-

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>B</u>
MYRTACEAE (Myrtle family) Syzygium cumini (L.) Skeels	Java plum	X	-	-	-	+
NYCTAGINACEAE (Four-o'clock family) Boerhavia coccinea Mill. Boerhavia repens L. Mirabilis jalapa L.	red-flowered boerhavia alena four-o'clock, naniahiahi	X I X	+	+	-	-
ONAGRACEAE (Evening primrose family) Ludwigia octovalvis (Jacq.) Raven	primrose willow, kamole	P?	+	-	-	-
OXALIDACEAE (Wood sorrel family) Oxalis corniculata L. Oxalis corymbosa DC	yellow wood sorrel, 'ihi 'ai pink wood sorrel, 'ihi pehu	P? X	+	+	+	+
21 PAPAVERACEAE (Poppy family) Argemone glauca (Nutt. ex Prain) Pope Argemone mexicana L.	pua kala, kala Mexican poppy	E X	-	-	+	-
PLANTAGINACEAE (Plantain family) Plantago lanceolata L.	narrow-leaved plantain	X	-	-	+	-
PLUMBAGINACEAE (Leadwort family) Plumbago zeylanica L.	'ilie'e, hilie'e	I	-	+	-	+
POLYGONACEAE (Buckwheat family) Rumex acetosella L.	sheep sorrel	X	+	-	-	+
PORTULACACEAE (Purslane family) Portulaca oleracea L. Portulaca pilosa L.	pigweed, 'akulikuli kula, 'ihi	X X	+	+	+	+
PRIMULACEAE (Primrose family) Anagallis arvensis L.	scarlet pimpernel	X	-	+	+	-

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>B</u>
Macroptilium lathyroides (L.) Urb. Medicago polymorpha L. Prosopis pallida (Humb. & Bonpl. ex Willd.) Kunch Vigna unguiculata ssp. sesquipedalis (L.) Verdc.	wild bean, cowpea bur clover kiawe yard-long bean	X X X X	+	+	-	+
GENTIANACEAE (Gentian family) Centaurium erythraea Raf.	bitter herb	X	-	+	-	-
GERANIACEAE (Geranium family) Erodium cicutarium (L.) L'Her.	alfilaria, pin clover	X	+	-	+	+
HYDROPHYLLACEAE (Waterleaf family) Nama sandwicensis A. Gray	nama	E	-	+	-	-
20 LAMIACEAE (Mint family) Leonotis nepetifolia (L.) R. Br. Stachys arvensis L.	lion's ear staggerweed	X X	-	-	-	+
MALVACEAE (Mallow family) Abutilon grandifolium (Willd.) Sweet Malva parviflora L. Malvastrum coromandelianum (L.) Garcke Sida fallax Walp. Sida rhombifolia L. Sida spinosa L.	hairy abutilon, ma'o cheeseweed false mallow 'ilima prickly sida	X X X I X X	+	+	+	+
MELIACEAE (Mahogany family) Cedrela sp. Melia azedarach L.	Chinaberry, pride of India	X X	-	-	+	-
MORACEAE (Mulberry family) Ficus microcarpa L. fil.	Chinese banyan	X	-	-	-	+

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	Vegetation type			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>B</u>
MONOCOTS						
AGAVACEAE (Agave family)						
Agave sisalana Perrine	sisal, malina	X	-	-	-	+
Furcraea foetida (L.) Haw.	Mauritius hemp	X	-	-	-	+
BROMELIACEAE (Pineapple family)						
Ananas comosus (Stickm.) Merr.	pineapple	X	+	-	-	-
COMMELINACEAE (Dayflower family)						
Commelina diffusa N.L. Burm.	honohono	X	+	+	+	+
CYPERACEAE (Sedge family)						
Cyperus rotundus L.	nutgrass, nut sedge	X	+	-	-	+
23 POACEAE (Grass family)						
Avena fatua L.	wild oat	X	-	-	-	+
Bothriochloa barbinodis (Lag.) Herter	fuzzy top	X	-	-	-	+
Bothriochloa pertusa (L.) A. Camus	pitted beardgrass	X	+	+	+	+
Brachiaria mutica (Forssk.) Stapf	California grass	X	-	-	-	+
Brachiaria subquadripata (Trin.) Hitchc.		X	-	-	+	-
Cenchrus ciliaris L.	buffelgrass	X	+	+	+	+
Chloris barbata (L.) Sw.	swollen fingergrass, mau'ulei	X	+	-	+	-
Chloris gayana Kunth	Rhodes grass	X	+	-	+	-
Chloris virgata Sw.	feather fingergrass	X	+	+	-	+
Cynodon dactylon (L.) Pers.	Bermuda grass, manienie	X	+	-	+	-
Digitaria fuscescens (K. Presl) Henr.	creeping kukaepua'a	X	-	-	-	+
Digitaria insularis (L.) Mez ex Ekman	sourgrass	X	+	+	+	+
Digitaria setigera Roth	kukaepua'a, itchy crabgrass	I?	-	-	-	+
Digitaria violascens Link	kukaepua'a-uka	X	-	-	+	+
Digitaria sp.	crabgrass	X	-	+	-	-
Eleusine indica (L.) Gaertn.	wiregrass, goosegrass	X	+	-	+	+

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	Vegetation type			
			<u>c</u>	<u>k</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>B</u>
PROTEACEAE (Protea family)						
Grevillea robusta A. Cunn. ex R. Br.	silk oak, 'oka kalika	X	-	+	+	+
SAPINDACEAE (Soapberry family)						
Dodonaea viscosa Jacq.	'a'ali'i	I	-	-	-	+
Indet. sp.		X	-	-	+	-
SCROPHULARIACEAE (Figwort family)						
Antirrhinum orontium L.	lesser snapdragon	X	-	+	+	-
SOLANACEAE (Nightshade family)						
Datura stramonium L.	Jimson weed, la'au hano	X	-	+	-	+
Lycopersicon pimpinellifolium (Jusl.) Mill.	currant tomato, 'ohi'a ma ka nahele	X	+	-	-	+
Nicandra physalodes (L.) Gaertn.	apple of Peru	X	+	+	-	+
22 Nicotiana glauca R.C. Graham	tree tobacco	X	-	-	-	+
Physalis peruviana L.	poha	X	-	-	+	-
Solanum americanum Mill.	popolo	I?	+	+	-	+
Solanum linnaeanum Hepper & P. Jaeger	apple of Sodom, popolo kikania	X	-	-	+	-
STERCULIACEAE (Cacao family)						
Waltheria indica L.	'uhaloa, hi'aloa, kanakalou	I?	+	+	-	+
TILIACEAE (Linden family)						
Triumfetta semitriloba Jacq.	Sacramento bur bush	X	-	-	+	-
VERBENACEAE (Verbena family)						
Lantana camara L.	lantana, lakana	X	-	+	+	+
Verbena litoralis Kunth	weed verbena, owi, oi	X	+	-	+	-
ZYGOPHYLLACEAE (Caltrop family)						
Tribulus terrestris L.	puncture vine	X	+	-	-	-

LITERATURE CITED

- Foote, D.E., E.L. Hill, S. Nakamura, and F. Stephens. 1972. Soil survey of the islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, State of Hawaii. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Washington, D.C.
- Gagne', W.C. and L.N. Cuddihy. 1990. Vegetation. In: W.L. Wagner et al., Manual of the flowering plants of Hawaii'i. 2 vols. University of Hawaii'i Press and B.P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu.
- Hawai'i Heritage Program, The Nature Conservancy of Hawai'i. 1994. Summary listing of Hawaiian natural communities. February 1994.
- Lanoureux, C.H. 1988. Checklist of Hawaiian pteridophytes, "Kupukupu O Hawai'i Ne'i". Lyon Arboretum, University of Hawai'i, Manoa. October 1988.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Determination of endangered or threatened status for 15 plants from the island of Maui, HI. Final rule. Federal Register 57(95): 20772-20788. May 15, 1992.
- _____. 1995. Lana'i plant cluster recovery plan: Abutilon eremitopetalum, Abutilon menziesii, Cyanea macrostegia var. Gibsonii, Cyrtandra munroi, Gahnia lanaiensis, Phyllostegia glabra var. lanaiensis, Santalum freycinetianum var. lanaiense, Tetramolopium remyi, and Viola lanaiensis. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. September 1995.
- _____. 1997a. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Proposed endangered status for 10 plant taxa from Maui Nui,

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type				
			IC	K	M	B	
Eragrostis cilianensis (All.) Link	stinkgrass	X	
Eragrostis pilosa (L.) P. Beauv.		X	
Eragrostis tenella (L.) P. Beauv. ex Roem. & Schult.	lovegrass	X	
Eragrostis sp.		X	
Leptochloa uninervia (K. Presl) Hitchc. & Chase		X	
Melinis repens (Willd.) Zizka	Natal redtop, Natal grass	X	++	++	++	++	
Panicum maximum Jacq.	Guinea grass	X	++	++	++	++	
Panicum maximum var. trichoglume Eyles ex Robyns		X	++	++	++	++	
Panicum pellicum Trin.	green panicgrass	X	+	+	+	+	
Panicum torridum Gaud.		X	+	+	+	+	
Paspalum scrobiculatum L.	kakonakona	F	+	+	+	+	
Pennisetum clandestinum Chiov.	ricegrass, mau'u laiki	l?	+	+	+	+	
Saccharum officinarum L.	Kikuyu grass	X	+	+	+	+	
Setaria verticillata (L.) P. Beauv.	sugar cane, ko	X	+	+	+	+	
Tragus berteronianus Schult.	bristly foxtail	X	+	+	+	+	
Vulpia myuros (L.) C.C. Gmelin	burgrass, goatgrass	X	+	+	+	+	
	rat tail fescue	X	+	+	+	+	

Hawaii. Proposed rule. Federal Register 62(94): 26757-26770.
May 15, 1997.

_____. 1997b. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service species list,
plants. Pacific Islands Ecoregion Office, Honolulu, HI.
May 18, 1997.

Wagner, W.L., D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer. 1990. Manual of the
flowering plants of Hawai'i. 2 vols. University of Hawai'i
Press and B.P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. B.P. Bishop
Museum Special Publication 83.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BOTANICAL SURVEY
KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ADDITIONAL STUDIES -- U2-A ALIGNMENT

BOTANICAL SURVEY
KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ADDITIONAL STUDIES -- U2-A ALIGNMENT

INTRODUCTION

A botanical survey report was prepared for the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway in May 1997 (Char 1997). Since then, the plans for the U-2 terminus have been modified and two alternate alignments, U2-A and U2-B, are now being considered.

by

A discussion of the botanical resources found on the Alternative U2-A alignment is presented in this report. Field studies for the U2-A alignment were conducted on September 13 to 14, 1997 by a team of three botanists. The centerline of the alignment was staked and flagged prior to our field studies. The survey methods outlined in the earlier study (Char 1997) were used.

Winona P. Char
CHAR & ASSOCIATES
Botanical Consultants
Honolulu, Hawaii

DESCRIPTION OF THE VEGETATION

In the discussion below, the vegetation along the U2-A alignment is described from mauka to makai, that is, from the U2-A terminus to where it terminates near Pulehu Gulch. Locations are referenced to the centerline station numbers.

Prepared for: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

October 1997

The alignment crosses two vegetation types which were not encountered during the earlier study; these are abandoned pineapple fields and Christmas berry/mixed shrubland. They are described in more detail in the report. A list of the plants observed during the field studies is presented at the end of the report.

Vegetation Along the Alignment

From its terminus at the existing signalized intersection of Haleakala Highway, Pukalani Bypass, and Kula Highway to about station 307, the alignment crosses abandoned pineapple fields. Scattered remnant patches of pineapple (Ananas comosus) are found in overgrown fields now covered with dense clumps of Rhodes grass (Chloris gayana) and other weedy species. Young trees of jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), 10 to 12 ft. tall, and Christmas berry (Schinus terebinthifolius) shrubs, 10 to 15 ft. tall, are scattered widely throughout the overgrown fields. In the areas which support remnant patches of pineapple, there are also tangled mats of wild bittermelon (Momordica charantia) and white passion flower (Passiflora subpeltata) vines, prickly clumps of bull thistle (Cirsium vulgare), wild fennel (Foeniculum vulgare), and sourgrass (Digitaria insularis).

From station 307 to station 314, the alignment crosses through Christmas berry/mixed shrubland. Christmas berry shrubs form large, rounded thickets up to 20 ft. tall and 25 to 30 ft. wide. Filling in the matrix between the Christmas berry shrubs is a varied mixture of grasses such as Rhodes grass, Kikuyu grass (Pennisetum clandestinum), pitted beardgrass (Bothriochloa pertusa), and smaller herbaceous species which include Spanish clover or ka'imi (Desmodium incanum), Sida rhombifolia, 'ilima (Sida fallax), spiny amaranth (Amaranthus spinosus), etc. In many places, dense patches of mixed shrubs are common to abundant; shrubs found here include lantana (Lantana camara), indigo (Indigofera suffruticosa), castor bean (Ricinus communis), and hairy abutilon (Abutilon grandifolium). Portions of the Christmas berry/mixed shrubland were used for pineapple cultivation at one time as there are remnants of black plastic sheeting as well as dried out, dead pineapple plants.

From about station 314 to station 317, the U2-A alignment crosses Ha'akakai/Kaluapalani Gulch, and Gulch vegetation. Stands of Chinaberry (Melia azedarach) and the native williwilli (Erythrina sandwicensis), 30 to 50 ft. tall, are found in the gulch. Also common are plantings of large trees of various Eucalyptus species up to 70 and 80 ft. tall. Ground cover is primarily Guinea grass (Panicum maximum), pitted beardgrass, and buffelgrass (Cenchrus ciliaris). As in the earlier study (Char 1997), this gulch as well as the other gulches along the alignments support only intermittent streams along their bottoms. The dry stream beds have been eroded down to the solid bedrock in most places, or are strewn with large boulders.

From station 317 to 333, the alignment crosses Kikuyu/mixed grass pasture land. A detailed description of this vegetation type is given in the earlier report.

Gulch vegetation is again encountered where the alignment crosses Kalialinui Gulch between stations 334 and 341. From station 341, the alignment then crosses cultivated lands consisting of pineapple fields and also gulch vegetation where a few shallow gulches cross the pineapple fields. At about station 365 and on to Pulehu Gulch (station 386), the U2-A alignment passes through recently planted sugar cane fields.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings along the proposed U2-A alignment are similar to the earlier botanical study (Char 1997). All of the vegetation types found along the U2-A alignment are dominated by introduced species. The few native species are more or less found in or adjacent to the gulches. Native plants found during this field survey are the kumu-niu fern (Doryopteris decipiens), koali 'awa (Ipomoea indica), pa'u o Hi'iaka (Jacquemontia ovalifolia), williwilli, 'ilima, pua

kala (*Argemone blauca*), 'a'ali'i (*Dodonaea viscosa*), and 'uhaloa (*Waltheria indica*). All except the pa'u o Hi'iaka were found during the earlier survey.

As in the earlier study, none of the plants found along the proposed U2-A alignment is a listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered species; nor is any plant a species of concern (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1997). Again, no wetlands were found where the intermittent streams run along the bottom of the gulches. These areas are not dominated by wetland indicator species (Reed 1988), and the soils along the alignment are not listed as hydric soils (Soil Conservation Service 1990).

The construction of the highway along the U2-A alignment should not have a significant negative impact on the botanical resources. However, it is recommended that areas cleared of vegetation be revegetated as soon as possible to prevent soil loss and discharge of sediments into the intermittent streams (during the rainy season). Again, it is recommended that native plants be used whenever possible for landscaping.

PLANT SPECIES LIST -- U2-A Alignment

The following is a list of all the plants observed along the U2-A alignment of the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway. The plants are arranged alphabetically within each of three groups. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the Ferns follow Lamoureux (1988), while the flowering plants, Dicots and Monocots, are in accordance with Wagner et al. (1990).

For each species, the following information is provided:

1. Scientific name with author citation.
2. Common English and/or Hawaiian name(s), when known.
3. Biogeographic status. The following symbols are used:
 - E = endemic = native only to the Hawaiian Islands.
 - I = indigenous = native to the Hawaiian Islands and also elsewhere.
 - I? = questionably indigenous = data not clear if dispersal by natural or human-related mechanisms, but weight of evidence suggests probably indigenous.
 - P = Polynesian = plants originally of Polynesian introduction prior to Western contact, i.e. Cook's discovery of the Hawaiian Islands in 1778.
 - P? = questionably Polynesian = may be a Polynesian introduction or possibly introduced in historical times (after 1778).
 - X = introduced or alien = all those plants brought to the Hawaiian Islands by humans, intentionally or accidentally, after Western contact.
 - X? = questionably introduced = date of introduction unclear or very early, may possibly be indigenous or of Polynesian introduction.
4. Presence (+) or absence (-) of a particular species within each of five vegetation types recognized along the alignment (see text for discussion):

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>				
			<u>c</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>s</u>
FERNS							
ADIANTACEAE (Maiden hair fern family)							
Adiantum hispidulum Sw.	Australian maiden hair	X	-	-	+	-	-
NEPHROLEPIDACEAE (Sword fern family)							
Nephrolepis multiflora (Roxb.) Jarrett ex Morton	'okupukupu, hairy sword fern	X	-	-	-	+	-
SINOPTERIDACEAE (Cliffbrake fern family)							
Doryopteris decipiens (Hook.) J. Sm.	kumu-niu, manawahua, 'iwa'iwa	E	-	-	+	-	-
FLOWERING PLANTS							
DICOTS							
ACANTHACEAE (Acanthus family)							
Thunbergia fragrans Roxb.	fragrant thunbergia	X	+	-	-	-	-
AMARANTHACEAE (Amaranth family)							
Amaranthus spinosus L.	spiny amaranth, pakai kuku	X	+	+	-	-	+
Amaranthus viridus L.	slender amaranth, pakai	X	+	-	-	-	-
ANACARDIACEAE (Mango family)							
Schinus molle L.	pepper tree	X	-	+	-	-	-
Schinus terebinthifolius Raddi	Christmas berry	X	-	+	+	+	+
APIACEAE (Carrot family)							
Foeniculum vulgare Mill.	fennel	X	-	-	-	+	-

c = Cultivated Lands
m = Kikuyu/Mixed Grass Pasture Land
g = Gulch Vegetation
a = Abandoned Pineapple Fields
s = Christmas berry/Mixed Shrubland

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type				
			c	m	g	a	s
CUCURBITACEAE (Gourd family)							
<i>Cucumis dipsaceus</i> Ehrenb. ex Spach	wild cucumber, hedgehog gourd	X	-	-	-	-	+
<i>Momordica charantia</i> L.	wild bittermelon	X	+	-	-	+	-
EUPHORBIACEAE (Spurge family)							
<i>Chamaesyce hirta</i> (L.) Millsp.	hairy spurge, garden spurge	X	+	-	-	-	-
<i>Chamaesyce hyssopifolia</i> (L.) Small		X	+	-	-	-	-
<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.	castor bean, koli	X	+	+	+	+	+
FABACEAE (Pea family)							
<i>Acacia farnesiana</i> (L.) Willd.	klu	X	-	+	-	-	-
<i>Chamaecrista nictitans</i> (L.) Moench	partridge pea, lauki	X	+	+	-	-	+
<i>Crotalaria incana</i> L.	fuzzy rattlepod, kukae hoki	X	+	-	-	-	-
<i>Crotalaria pallida</i> Aiton	smooth rattlepod, pikakani	X	-	-	-	-	+
<i>Desmodium incanum</i> DC	Spanish clover, ka'imi	X	-	+	-	-	+
<i>Desmodium sandwicense</i> E. Mey.	Spanish clover, chili clover, puu pilipili	X	-	-	-	+	+
<i>Desmodium tortuosum</i> (Sw.) DC	Florida beggarweed	X	+	-	-	-	-
<i>Desmodium</i> sp.		X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Erythrina sandwicensis</i> Degener	wiliwili	E	-	+	+	-	+
<i>Glycine wightii</i> (Wight & Arnott) Verdc.		X	-	-	+	-	-
<i>Indigofera spicata</i> Forssk.	creeping indigo	X	-	+	-	-	-
<i>Indigofera suffruticosa</i> Mill.	indigo, 'iniko	X	+	+	-	+	+
<i>Leucaena leucocephala</i> (Lam.) de Wit	koa haole	X	+	+	+	-	+
<i>Macroptilium lathyroides</i> (L.) Urb.	wild bean, cowpea	X	+	+	-	+	-
<i>Prosopis pallida</i> (Humb. & Bonpl. ex Willd.) Kunth	kiawe	X	+	-	-	-	-
LAURACEAE (Laurel family)							
<i>Cinnamomum camphora</i> (L.) J. Presl	camphor tree	X	-	-	+	+	-

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type				
			c	m	g	a	s
ASCLEPIADACEAE (Milkweed family)							
<i>Asclepias physocarpa</i> (E. Mey.) Schlechter	balloon plant	X	-	-	-	+	-
ASTERACEAE (Sunflower family)							
<i>Bidens pilosa</i> L.	Spanish needle, ki, ki nehe	X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Cirsium vulgare</i> (Savi) Ten.	bull thistle	X	-	+	-	+	-
<i>Conyza bonariensis</i> (L.) Cronq.	hairy horseweed, ilioha	X	+	+	-	+	+
<i>Crassocephalum crepidioides</i> (Benth.) S. Moore		X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Hypochoeris radicata</i> L.	hairy cat's ear, gosmore	X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Lactuca serriola</i> L.	wild lettuce	X	+	-	-	-	-
<i>Senecio madagascariensis</i> Poiret		X	-	-	-	-	+
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> L.	sow thistle, pualele	X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Verbesina encelioides</i> (Cav.) Benth. & Hook.		X	-	-	-	+	-
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i> var. <i>canadense</i> (Mill.) Torr. & A. Gray	golden crown-beard	X	+	-	-	-	+
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i> var. <i>canadense</i> (Mill.) Torr. & A. Gray	cocklebur, kikania	X	-	-	+	-	-
BIGNONIACEAE (Bignonia family)							
<i>Jacaranda mimosifolia</i> D. Don	jacaranda	X	-	-	-	+	+
BRASSICACEAE (Mustard family)							
<i>Lepidium oblongum</i> Small		X	-	+	-	-	-
<i>Sisymbrium altissimum</i> L.	Jim Hill mustard, tumble mustard	X	-	+	-	-	+
CACTACEAE (Cactus family)							
<i>Opuntia ficus-indica</i> (L.) Mill.	panini	X	+	-	+	-	+
CONVOLVULACEAE (Morning glory family)							
<i>Ipomoea indica</i> (J. Burm.) Merr.	koali 'awa	I	+	+	-	+	-
<i>Jacquemontia ovalifolia</i> ssp. <i>sandwicensis</i> (A. Gray) K. Robertson		E	-	+	-	-	-
<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> (L.) Urb.	pa'u o Hi'iaka, hairy merremia, koali kua hulu	X?	+	-	-	-	-

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type				
			c	m	g	a	s
PHYTOLACCACEAE (Pokeweed family) Phytolacca octandra L.	southern pokeberry	X	-	-	-	+	-
PLANTAGINACEAE (Plantain family) Plantago lanceolata L.	narrow-leaved plantain	X	-	+	-	-	-
PORTULACACEAE (Purslane family) Portulaca oleracea L.	pigweed, 'akulikuli kula, 'ihi	X	-	+	-	-	-
PROTEACEAE (Protea family) Grevillea robusta A. Cunn. ex R. Br.	silk oak, 'oka kalika	X	-	+	-	+	+
SAPINDACEAE (Soapberry family) Dodonaea viscosa Jacq.	'a'ali'i	I	-	+	+	-	-
11 SOLANACEAE (Nightshade family) Capsicum frutescens L. Nicandra physalodes (L.) Gaertn. Nicotiana glauca R.C. Graham Solanum linneanum Hepper & P. Jaeger	chili pepper, nioi	X	-	-	-	+	-
	apple of Peru	X	+	-	-	-	-
	tree tobacco	X	+	-	-	-	+
	apple of Sodom, popolo kikania	X	-	+	-	-	-
	blue potato vine	X	-	-	+	-	-
SOLANUM seaforthianum Andr.							
STERCULIACEAE (Cacao family) Waltheria indica L.	'uhaloa, hi'aloa, kanakaloa	I?	+	-	-	-	+
TILIACEAE (Linden family) Triumfetta semitriloba Jacq.	Sacramento bur bush	X	-	-	+	-	-
TROPAEOLACEAE (Nasturtium family) Tropaeolum majus L.	nasturtium, pohe haole	X	-	-	-	+	-

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type				
			c	m	g	a	s
MALVACEAE (Mallow family) Abutilon grandifolium (Willd.) Sweet	hairy abutilon, ma'o	X	+	+	-	+	+
Malvastrum coromandelianum (L.) Garcke	false mallow	X	-	-	-	-	+
Sida fallax Walp.	'ilima	I	+	+	-	-	+
Sida rhombifolia L.		X	-	+	-	-	+
MELIACEAE (Mahogany family) Melia azedarach L.	Chinaberry, pride of India, 'inia	X	-	-	+	-	+
MORACEAE (Mulberry family) Ficus microcarpa L. fil.	Chinese banyan	X	-	-	+	-	-
10 MYRTACEAE (Myrtle family) Eucalyptus spp.	eucalyptus, gum tree	X	-	+	-	-	+
NYCTAGINACEAE (Four-o'clock family) Mirabilis jalapa L.	four-o'clock, naniahihi	X	-	-	+	-	-
OLEACEAE (Olive family) Olea europaea ssp. africana (Mill.) P. Green	olive, 'oliwa	X	-	+	-	-	+
OXALIDACEAE (Wood sorrel family) Oxalis corniculata L.	yellow wood sorrel, 'ihi 'ai	P?	-	+	-	-	-
PAPAVERACEAE (Poppy family) Argemone glauca (Nutt. ex Prain) Pope	pua kala, kala	E	-	+	-	+	-
PASSIFLORACEAE (Passion flower family) Passiflora subpeltata Ort.	white passion flower	X	-	-	-	+	-

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>				
			<u>c</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>s</u>
Pennisetum clandestinum Chiov.	kikuyu grass	X	-	+	-	-	+
Saccharum officinarum L.	sugar cane, ko	P	+	-	-	-	-

13

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>				
			<u>c</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>s</u>
VERBENACEAE (Verbena family)							
Lantana camara L.	lantana, lakana	X	-	+	+	+	+
Verbena littoralis Kunth	weed verbena, owi, oi	X	+	-	-	+	-
MONOCOTS							
AGAVACEAE (Sisal family)							
Agave sisalana Perrine	sisal, malina	X	-	-	+	-	-
Furcraea foetida (L.) Haw.	Mauritius hemp	X	-	+	+	-	-
BROMELIACEAE (Pineapple family)							
Ananas comosus (Stickm.) Merr.	pineapple	X	+	-	-	+	-
CYPERACEAE (Sedge family)							
Cyperus rotundus L.	nutgrass, nut sedge	X	+	-	-	-	-
LILIACEAE (Lily family)							
Asparagus setaceus (Kunth) Jessop		X	-	-	-	+	-
POACEAE (Grass family)							
Avena fatua L.	wild oat	X	-	+	-	-	-
Bothriochloa pertusa (L.) A. Camus	pitted beardgrass	X	-	+	+	-	+
Bromus mollis L.	soft chess	X	-	+	-	-	-
Bromus rigidus Roch	ripgut grass	X	-	-	+	-	-
Bromus willdenowii Kunth	rescue grass	X	-	-	-	+	-
Cenchrus ciliaris L.	buffel grass	X	+	+	+	-	-
Chloris barbata (L.) Sw.	swollen fingergrass,	X	+	-	-	-	-
Chloris gayana Kunth	mau'ulei	X	+	-	-	-	-
Cynodon dactylon (L.) Pers.	Rhodes grass	X	-	+	-	+	+
Digitaria insularis (L.) Mez ex Ekman	Bermuda grass, manienie	X	+	+	-	-	-
Melinis repens (Willd.) Zizka	sourgrass	X	+	-	-	+	-
Panicum maximum Jacq.	Natal redtop, Natal grass	X	+	-	-	+	+
Paspalum dilatatum Poir	Guinea grass	X	+	+	+	+	+
	Dallis grass	X	-	-	-	+	-

LITERATURE CITED

Char, W.P. 1997. Botanical survey, Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway. Prepared for Parsons Brinckerhoff. May 1997.

Lamoureux, C.H. 1988. Checklist of Hawaiian pteridophytes, "Kupukupu O Hawai'i Ne'i". Lyon Arboretum, University of Hawai'i, Manoa. October 1988.

Reed, P.B., Jr. 1988. National list of plant species that occur in wetlands: Hawaii (Region H). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 88(26.13).

Soil Conservation Service. 1990. Hydric soil map unit list, Island of Maui. May 1990.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service species list, plants. Pacific Islands Ecoregion Office, Honolulu, HI. September 25, 1997.

Wagner, W.L., D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer. 1990. Manual of the flowering plants of Hawai'i. 2 vols. University of Hawai'i Press and B.P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. B.P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 83.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BOTANICAL SURVEY
KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ADDITIONAL STUDIES -- U2-B ALIGNMENT

BOTANICAL SURVEY
KIHEI/UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGHWAY
ADDITIONAL STUDIES -- U2-B ALIGNMENT

by

Winona P. Char
CHAR & ASSOCIATES
Botanical Consultants
Honolulu, Hawaii

INTRODUCTION

An earlier botanical survey report (Char 1997a) which covered all of the then proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway alignments and termini was prepared in May 1997. Since that time, the plans for the U-2 terminus and alignment segment have been modified and two alternate alignments, U2-A and U2-B, are now being proposed. The U2-A terminus is found at the intersection of Haleakala Highway, Pukalani Bypass, and Kula Highway, by the existing traffic signal. The U2-B terminus is located on the Kula Highway, across from the Kula 200 Subdivision and south of the Ha'akakai Gulch bridge.

Field studies to assess the botanical resources along the U2-B alignment were conducted on September 14 to 15, 1997 by a team of three botanists. The centerline of the alignment was staked and flagged prior to the field studies. The survey methods outlined in the earlier study (Char 1997a) were followed.

DESCRIPTION OF THE VEGETATION

In the discussion which follows, the vegetation found along the U2-B alignment is described from mauka to makai, that is from the U2-B terminus at Kula Highway to where it adjoins the U2-A alignment at station U2-B 500. Locations are referenced to the centerline station numbers.

The alignment crosses over three vegetation types: Kikuyu/mixed grass pasture land, gulch vegetation, and cultivated lands (pine-

Prepared for: PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

October 1997

apple fields). A short description is provided for each of these vegetation types; a more detailed discussion is found in the earlier botanical survey report (Char 1997a). A list of all the plant species found along the U2-B alignment is presented at the end of the report.

Vegetation Along the U2-B Alignment

From its terminus at Kula Highway (station 550) and downslope to about station 521, the U2-B alignment crosses Kikuyu/mixed grass Pasture land. Along this alignment, Kikuyu (Pennisetum clandestinum), Rhodes grass (Chloris gayana), and pitted beardgrass (Bothriochloa pertusa) are the most abundant grass components. In some places, spiny amaranth (Amaranthus spinosus) plants are locally abundant. Trees and shrubs which include various Eucalyptus species, China-berry (Melia azedarach), Christmas berry (Schinus terebinthifolius), Jacaranda (Jacaranda mimosifolia), pepper tree (Schinus molle), etc., occur as scattered individuals or small stands. Where the alignment passes near a cinder pit (Pu'u O'Wei), there is a grove of Eucalyptus and other tree species as well as scattered thickets of koa haoie shrubs (Leucaena leucocephala).

From station 521 to station 519, the alignment crosses Kaliainui Gulch and gulch vegetation. The gulch supports tall stands of Chinaberry and wiliwili (Erythrina sandwicensis) trees. Koa haoie shrubs are common and Guinea grass (Panicum maximum) forms dense clumps between the woody components. Rocky outcrops are frequent along the steep gulch walls. The gulch bottom supports an intermittent stream which is composed of shallow, dry soil and large boulders. For the greater part of the time, the streams are dry with flowing water present only during periods of very heavy rainfall. The cattle which graze in the gulch use the dry streambed as part of their network of cattle paths.

From station 519 and on to where the U2-B alignment joins the U2-A alignment, the U2-B alignment crosses recently planted pine-apple fields or cultivated lands and a few shallow gulches with gulch vegetation.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The vegetation types found along the U2-B alignment are dominated by introduced species such as Kikuyu grass, koa haoie, Chinaberry, Christmas berry, etc. The few native plants are usually found associated with the gulch areas. All of the native plants can be found in similar habitats throughout the Hawaiian Islands. None of the plants inventoried during the field studies is a listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered species; nor is any plant considered a species of concern (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1997). Similar findings were recorded from the earlier botanical study (Char 1997a) and also from the most recent study for the U2-A alignment (Char 1997b). No wetlands or wetland vegetation occur along the alignment.

Given the findings above, the proposed U2-B alignment should not have a significant negative impact on the botanical resources. As in the previous studies, it is recommended that areas cleared of vegetation be revegetated as soon as possible to prevent soil erosion. Native plants such as the wiliwili are recommended for landscaping wherever possible.

PLANT SPECIES LIST -- U2-B Alignment

The following is a list of all the plants observed along the U2-B alignment of the proposed Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway. The plants are arranged alphabetically by families within each of three groups. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the Ferns follow Lamoureux (1988), while the flowering plants, Dicots and Monocots, are in accordance with Wagner et al. (1990).

For each species, the following information is provided:

1. Scientific name with author citation.
2. Common English and/or Hawaiian name(s), when known.
3. Biogeographic status. The following symbols are used:

E = endemic = native only to the Hawaiian Islands.

I = indigenous = native to the Hawaiian Islands and also elsewhere.

I? = questionably indigenous = data not clear if dispersal by natural or human-related mechanisms, but weight of evidence suggests probably indigenous.

P? = questionably Polynesian = may be a Polynesian introduction prior to Western contact, i.e. Cook's discovery of the Hawaiian Islands in 1778, or possibly introduced very early after Western contact.

X = introduced or alien = all those plants brought to the Hawaiian Islands by humans, intentionally or accidentally, after Western contact.

4. Presence (+) or absence (-) of a particular species within each of three vegetation types recognized along the alignment (see text for discussion):

c = Cultivated Lands

m = Kikuyu/Mixed Grass Pasture Land

B = Gulch Vegetation

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type		
			c	m	B
FERNS					
ADIANTACEAE (Maiden hair fern family)					
Adiantum hispidulum Sw.	Australian maiden hair	X	-	-	+
SINOPTERIDACEAE (Cliffbrake fern family)					
Doryopteris decipiens (Hook.) J. Sm.	kumu-niu, manawahua, 'iwa'iwa	E	-	-	+
FLOWERING PLANTS					
DICOTS					
AMARANTHACEAE (Amaranth family)					
Amaranthus spinosus L.	spiny amaranth, pakai kuku	X	+	+	-
Amaranthus viridus L.	slender amaranth, pakai	X	+	-	-
ANACARDIACEAE (Mango family)					
Schinus molle L.	pepper tree	X	-	+	-
Schinus terebinthifolius Raddi	Christmas berry	X	-	+	+
ASCLEPIADACEAE (Milkweed family)					
Asclepias curassavica L.	butterfly weed, laulele	X	-	+	-
Asclepias physocarpa (E. Mey.) Schlechter	balloon plant	X	-	+	-
ASTERACEAE (Daisy Family)					
Cirsium vulgare (Savi) Ten.	bull thistle	X	-	+	-
Conyza bonariensis (L.) Cronq.	hairy horseweed, ilioha	X	-	+	+
Emilia fosbergii Nicolson	pualele	X	-	+	+
Heterotheca grandiflora Nutt.	telegraph plant	X	-	+	+
Lactuca serriola L.	wild lettuce	X	-	+	+
Senecio madagascariensis Poiret		X	-	+	+
Sonchus oleraceus L.	sow thistle, pualele	X	-	+	+

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type		
			c	m	g
GENTIANACEAE (Gentian family) Centaurium erythraea Raf.	bitter herb	X	-	+	-
MALVACEAE (Mallow family) Abutilon grandifolium (Willd.) Sweet	hairy abutilon, ma'o	X	-	+	+
Malvastrum coromandelianum (L.) Garcke	false mallow	X	-	+	+
Sida fallax Walp.	'ilima	I	+	+	+
Sida rhombifolia L.		X	-	+	-
MELIACEAE (Mahogany family) Melia azedarach L.	Chinaberry, pride of India, 'inia	X	-	+	+
MORACEAE (Mulberry family) Ficus microcarpa L. fill.	Chinese banyan	X	-	-	+
MYRTACEAE (Myrtle family) Eucalyptus spp.	eucalyptus, gum tree	X	-	+	+
Psidium guajava L.	guava, kuawa	X	-	+	-
NYCTAGINACEAE (Four-o'clock family) Mirabilis jalapa L.	four-o'clock, naniahiahi	X	-	-	+
OLEACEAE (Olive family) Olea europaea ssp. africana (Mill.) P. Green	olive, 'oliwa	X	-	+	-
OXALIDACEAE (Wood sorrel family) Oxalis corniculata L.	yellow wood sorrel, 'ihi 'ai	P?	-	+	-
PAPAVERACEAE (Poppy family) Argemone glauca (Nutt. ex Prain) Pope	pua kala, kala	E	-	+	-

Scientific name	Common name	Status	Vegetation type		
			c	m	g
BIGNONIACEAE (Bignonia family) Jacaranda mimosifolia D. Don	jacaranda	X	-	+	-
BRASSICACEAE (Mustard family) Lepidium oblongum Small	Jim Hill mustard, tumble mustard	X	-	+	-
Sisymbrium altissimum L.		X	-	+	-
CACTACEAE (Cactus family) Opuntia ficus-indica (L.) Mill.	panini	X	+	+	+
CONVOLVULACEAE (Morning glory family) Ipomoea indica (J. Burm.) Merr.	koali 'awa	I	+	-	-
CUCURBITACEAE (Gourd family) Momordica charantia L.	wild bittermelon	X	+	+	+
EUPHORBIACEAE (Spurge family) Ricinus communis L.	castor bean, koli	X	-	-	+
FABACEAE (Pea family) Acacia farnesiana (L.) Willd.	klu	X	-	+	-
Acacia mearnsii De Wild.	black wattle	X	-	+	-
Chamaecrista nictitans (L.) Moench	partridge pea, lauki	X	+	+	-
Crotalaria pallida Aiton	smooth rattlebox, pikakani	X	-	+	-
Desmodium incanum DC	Spanish clover, ka'imi	X	-	+	-
Desmodium triflorum (L.) DC	three-flowered beggarweed	X	-	+	-
Erythrina sandwicensis Degener	wiliwili	E	-	+	+
Indigofera suffruticosa Mill.	indigo, 'iniko	X	+	+	+
Leucaena leucocephala (Lam.) de Wit	koa haole	X	+	+	+
Macroptilium lathyroides (L.) Urb.	wild bean, cowpea	X	+	+	-
Prosopis pallida (Humb. & Bonpl. ex Willd.) Kuntz	kiawe	X	+	-	-

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>		
			<u>c</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>
MONOCOTS					
BROMELIACEAE (Pineapple family)					
Ananas comosus (Stickm.) Merr.	pineapple	X	+	-	-
CYPERACEAE (Sedge family)					
Cyperus rotundus L.	nutgrass, nut sedge	X	+	-	-
POACEAE (Grass family)					
Boehriochloa pertusa (L.) A. Camus	pitted beardgrass	X	-	+	+
Bromus willdenowii Kunth	rescue grass	X	-	+	-
Cenchrus ciliaris L.	buffelgrass	X	+	+	+
Chloris barbata (L.) Sw.	swollen fingergrass, mau'u-lei	X	-	+	-
Chloris gayana Kunth	Rhodes grass	X	-	+	-
Cynodon dactylon (L.) Pers.	Bermuda grass, manienie	X	+	+	-
Digitaria insularis (L.) Mez ex Ekman	sourgrass	X	+	+	+
Melinis repens (Willd.) Zizka	Natal redtop, Natal grass	X	+	+	+
Panicum maximum Jacq.	Guinea grass	X	+	+	+
Pennisetum clandestinum Chiov.	Kikuyu grass	X	-	+	-
Sporobolus africanus (Poir.) Robyns & Tournay	African dropseed, smutgrass	X	-	+	-

<u>Scientific name</u>	<u>Common name</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Vegetation type</u>		
			<u>c</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>g</u>
PLANTAGINACEAE (Plantain family)					
Plantago lanceolata L.	narrow-leaved plantain	X	-	+	-
PORTULACACEAE (Purslane family)					
Portulaca oleracea L.	pigweed, 'akulikuli kula, 'ihi	X	-	+	-
PROTEACEAE (Protea family)					
Grevillea robusta A. Cunn. ex R. Br.	silk oak, 'oka-kalika	X	-	+	+
RUTACEAE (Citrus family)					
Murraya paniculata (L.) Jack	mock orange	X	-	+	-
SAPINDACEAE (Soapberry family)					
Dodonaea viscosa Jacq.	'a'ali'i	I	-	+	+
SOLANACEAE (Nightshade family)					
Nicandra physalodes (L.) Gaertn.	apple of Peru	X	+	-	+
Nicotiana glauca R.C. Graham	tree tobacco	X	+	+	-
Solanum linnaeanum Hepper & P. Jaeger	apple of Sodom, popolo kikania	X	-	+	-
STERCULIACEAE (Cacao family)					
Waltheria indica L.	'uhaloa, hi'aloa, kanakaloa	I?	+	-	+
VERBENACEAE (Verbena family)					
Lantana camara L.	lantana, lakana	X	-	+	+
Stachytarpheta dichotoma (Ruiz & Pav.) Vahl	owi, oi	X	-	+	-
Verbena litoralis Kunth	weed verbena, owi, oi	X	+	+	-

LITERATURE CITED

Char, W.P. 1997a. Botanical survey, Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway. Prepared for Parsons Brinckerhoff. May 1997.

_____. 1997b. Botanical survey, Kihei/Upcountry Maui Highway, Additional studies -- U2-A Alignment. Prepared for Parsons Brinckerhoff. October 1997.

Lamoureux, C.H. 1988. Checklist of Hawaiian pteridophytes, "Kupukupu O Hawai'i Ne'i". Lyon Arboretum, University of Hawai'i, Manoa. October 1988.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service species list, plants. Pacific Islands Ecoregion Office, Honolulu, HI. September 25, 1997.

Wagner, W.L., D.R. Herbst, and S.H. Sohmer. 1990. Manual of the flowering plants of Hawai'i. 2 vols. University of Hawai'i Press and B.P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu. B.P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 83.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX K

EDR - Environmental Atlas



e data resources, inc.

EDR-Environmental Atlas™

EDR - Area/Corridor Study
Kihel - Upcountry Project
Maui, HI

September 30, 1997

Inquiry number 198604.1s

**The Source
For Environmental
Risk Management
Data**

3530 Post Road
Southport, Connecticut 06490


Nationwide Customer Service

Telephone: 1-800-352-0050
Fax: 1-800-231-6802
Internet: www.edrnet.com

Section 1

Overview and Key Map

Focus Map 4




EDR - Area/Corridor Study
Kihei - Upcountry Project



- Legend
- Road
 - Road Right-of-Way
 - Center Line
 - Right-of-Way
 - Boundary
 - Subdivided Area
 - Park
 - Park Lane
 - Proposed
 - Proposed
 - Park Lane
 - Land Use
 - Proposed
 - Right-of-Way




Focus Map 5




EDR - Area/Corridor Study
Kihei - Upcountry Project



- Legend
- Road
 - Road Right-of-Way
 - Center Line
 - Right-of-Way
 - Boundary
 - Subdivided Area
 - Park
 - Park Lane
 - Proposed
 - Proposed
 - Park Lane
 - Land Use
 - Proposed
 - Right-of-Way



Focus Map 18



EDR - Area/Corridor Study
Kihei - Upcountry Project




Project No. 143-0700

- Legend
- Road
 - Road Right-of-Way
 - General Lane
 - Roadway
 - Elevation
 - Roadway
 - Right-of-Way
 - Road Boundary
 - 100' Flood Zone
 - Proposed Lane
 - Improved Lane
 - Lane
 - Limited Lane
 - Proposed Right-of-Way



Focus Map 19




EDR - Area/Corridor Study
Kihei - Upcountry Project



Project No. 143-0700

- Legend
- Road
 - Road Right-of-Way
 - General Lane
 - Roadway
 - Elevation
 - Roadway
 - Right-of-Way
 - Road Boundary
 - 100' Flood Zone
 - Proposed Lane
 - Improved Lane
 - Lane
 - Limited Lane
 - Proposed Right-of-Way



DETAILED ORPHAN LISTING

Site	Database(s)	EDR ID Number EPA ID Number
<p> KIHEI SPS #7 (KAMAOLE PARK #1) S KIHEI RD KIHEI, HI 96753 UST: Facility ID: 9-500218 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use Installed: 05-May-78 Substance: Diesel Owner: COUNTY OF MAUI 200 S. HIGH STREET Waiuku, HI 96793 </p>	UST	U003155087 N/A
<p> KIHEI SPS#8 (HALE HUI KAI CONDO) S KIHEI RD KIHEI, HI 96753 UST: Facility ID: 9-500219 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use Installed: 05-May-74 Substance: Diesel Owner: COUNTY OF MAUI 200 S. HIGH STREET Waiuku, HI 96793 </p>	UST	U003155088 N/A
<p> ULUPALAKUA RANCH STORE HIGHWAY 37 KULA, HI 96790 UST: Facility ID: 9-500425 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use Installed: 01-Jan-64 Substance: Gasoline Owner: ULUPALAKUA RANCH INC. P.O. BOX 901 Kula, HI 96790 </p>	UST	U001236673 N/A
<p> ULUPALAKUA RANCH STORE HIGHWAY 37 KULA, HI 96790 UST: Facility ID: 9-500425 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use Installed: 01-Jan-64 Substance: Gasoline Owner: ULUPALAKUA RANCH INC. P.O. BOX 901 Kula, HI 96790 </p>	UST	U001236685 N/A
<p> KULA CENTRAL OFFICE KULA HWY KULA, HI 96790 UST: Facility ID: 9-500547 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use Installed: 07-May-72 Substance: Diesel Owner: GTE HAWAIIAN TELEPHONE CO INC 1177 BISHOP ST Honolulu, HI 96813 </p>	UST LUST	U001236685 N/A

ORPHAN SUMMARY

City	EDR ID	Site Name	Site Address	Le	Database(s)	Facility ID
KIHEI	U003155087	KIHEI SPS #7 (KAMAOLE PARK #1)	S KIHEI RD	96753	UST	9-500218
KIHEI	U003155088	KIHEI SPS#8 (HALE HUI KAI CONDO)	S KIHEI RD	96753	UST	9-500219
KULA	U001236673	ULUPALAKUA RANCH STORE	HIGHWAY 37	96790	UST	9-500425
KULA	U001236685	KULA CENTRAL OFFICE	KULA HWY	96790	UST, LUST	9-500547
MAKAWAO	U001234783	CROSSROADS SERVICE	MAKAWAO AVE	96768	UST	9-501605

DETAILED ORPHAN LISTING

Site: _____ Database(s): _____ EDR ID Number: _____
 EPA ID Number: _____

KULA CENTRAL OFFICE (Continued) U001236685

UST
 Facility ID: 9-500547
 Alternate Event ID: 940157
 Facility Status: Site Cleanup Completed
 Facility Status Date: 12/28/1994

CROSSROADS SERVICE UST U001236783
 MAKAWAO AVE N/A
 MAKAWAO, HI 96768

UST
 Facility ID: 9-501605
 Tank Status: Temporarily Out of Use
 Installed: 01-May-66
 Substance: Other
 Owner: RICHARD F. TAM SING
 P. O. BOX 1199
 Makawao HI 96768

Tank ID: 1
 Tank Capacity: 1200
 Date Closed: Not reported

Facility ID: 9-501605
 Tank Status: Temporarily Out of Use
 Installed: Not reported
 Substance: Other
 Owner: RICHARD F. TAM SING
 P. O. BOX 1199
 Makawao HI 96768

Tank ID: 2
 Tank Capacity: 1200
 Date Closed: Not reported

Facility ID: 9-502765
 Tank Status: Permanently Out of Use
 Installed: Not reported
 Substance: Not Listed
 Owner: COUNTY OF MAUI
 FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU / 21 KIHIPOPO ST
 Waialeale, HI 96793

Tank ID: R-1
 Tank Capacity: Not reported
 Date Closed: 01-Jun-93

*Thank you for your business.
 Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050
 with any questions or comments.*

Disclaimer

This Report contains information obtained from a variety of public sources and EDR makes no representation or warranty regarding the accuracy, reliability, quality, or completeness of said information or the information contained in this report. The customer shall assume full responsibility for the use of this report. No warranty of merchantability or of fitness for a particular purpose, expressed or implied, shall apply and EDR specifically disclaims the making of such warranties. In no event shall EDR be liable to anyone for special, incidental, consequential or exemplary damages.

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 00

EPA Waste Codes Addendum

Code **Description**

Section 4
EPA Waste Code
Addendum

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

To maintain currency of the following federal and state databases, EDR contacts the appropriate governmental agency on a monthly or quarterly basis, as required.

Elapsed ASTM days: Provides confirmation that the EDR report meets or exceeds the 90-day updating requirement of the ASTM standard.

FEDERAL ASTM RECORDS:

CERCLIS: Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
Source: EPA/RTIS
Telephone: 703-413-0223
CERCLIS: CERCLIS contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the USEPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons, pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). CERCLIS contains sites which are either proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites which are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

Date of Government Version: 04/30/97
Date Made Active at EDR: 06/30/97
Database Release Frequency: Monthly
Date of Data Arrival at EDR: 05/19/97
Elapsed ASTM days: 42
Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/22/97

ERIS: Emergency Response Notification System

Source: EPA/RTIS
Telephone: 202-260-2342
ERIS: Emergency Response Notification System. ERIS records and stores information on reported releases of oil and hazardous substances.

Date of Government Version: 03/01/97
Date Made Active at EDR: 06/24/97
Database Release Frequency: Quarterly
Date of Data Arrival at EDR: 04/10/97
Elapsed ASTM days: 75
Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/26/97

IPL: National Priority List

Source: EPA
Telephone: 703-603-8852
IPL: National Priorities List (Superfund). The IPL is a subset of CERCLIS and identifies over 1,200 sites for priority cleanup under the Superfund Program. IPL sites may encompass relatively large areas. As such, EDR provides polygon coverage for over 1,000 IPL site boundaries produced by EPA's Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC).

Date of Government Version: 04/01/97
Date Made Active at EDR: 05/29/97
Database Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
Date of Data Arrival at EDR: 04/21/97
Elapsed ASTM days: 38
Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/01/97

RCRIS: Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System

Source: EPA/RTIS
Telephone: 800-424-9346
RCRIS: Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System. RCRIS includes selective information on sites which generate, transport, store, treat and/or dispose of hazardous waste as defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

Date of Government Version: 04/01/97
Date Made Active at EDR: 06/30/97
Database Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
Date of Data Arrival at EDR: 04/23/97
Elapsed ASTM days: 66
Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/04/97

CORRACTS: Corrective Action Report

Source: EPA
Telephone: 800-424-9346
CORRACTS: CORRACTS identifies hazardous waste handlers with RCRA corrective action activity.
Date of Government Version: 12/01/96
Date Made Active at EDR: 03/03/97
Database Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
Date of Data Arrival at EDR: 12/03/96
Elapsed ASTM days: 63
Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/07/97

Section 5

Databases Searched and Update Dates

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

FEDERAL NON-ASTM RECORDS:

BRS: Biennial Reporting System
 Source: EPA
 Telephone: 800-424-8346
 BRS: The Biennial Reporting System is a national system administered by the EPA that collects data on the generation and management of hazardous waste. BRS captures detailed data from two groups: Large Quantity Generators (LQG) and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities
 Date of Government Version: 12/31/93
 Database Release Frequency: Biennially
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/04/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/22/97

CONSENT: Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees
 Source: EPA Regional Offices
 Telephone: Varies
 Major legal settlements that establish responsibility and standards for cleanup at NPL (Superfund) sites. Released periodically by United States District Courts after settlement by parties to litigation matters.
 Date of Government Version: Varies
 Database Release Frequency: Varies
 Date of Last EDR Contact: Varies
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: N/A

FINDS: Facility Index System
 Source: EPA/RTIS
 Telephone: 703-908-2493
 FINDS: Facility Index System. FINDS contains both facility information and "pointers" to other sources that contain more detail. EDR includes the following FINDS databases in this report: PCS (Permit Compliance System), AIRS (Airborne Emission Reporting System), DOCKET (Enforcement Docket used to manage and track information on civil judicial enforcement cases for all environmental statutes), FURS (Federal Underground Injection Control), C-DOCKET (Criminal Docket System used to track criminal enforcement actions for all environmental statutes), FFIS (Federal Facilities Information System), STATE (State Environmental Laws and Statutes) and PADS (PCB Activity Data System).
 Date of Government Version: 09/30/95
 Database Release Frequency: Quarterly
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/22/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/04/97

HMIRS: Hazardous Materials Information Reporting System
 Source: U.S. Department of Transportation
 Telephone: 202-366-4326
 HMIRS: Hazardous Materials Incident Report System. HMIRS contains hazardous material spill incidents reported to DOT.
 Date of Government Version: 12/31/95
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/28/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/27/97

MLTS: Material Licensing Tracking System
 Source: Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Telephone: 301-415-7189
 MLTS is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of approximately 8,100 sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements. To maintain currency, EDR contacts the Agency on a quarterly basis.
 Date of Government Version: 01/15/97
 Database Release Frequency: Quarterly
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/14/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 10/13/97

NPL LIENS: Federal Superfund Liens
 Source: EPA
 Telephone: 205-564-4267
 NPL LIENS: Federal Superfund Liens. Under the authority granted the USEPA by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, the USEPA has the authority to file liens against real property in order to recover remedial action expenditures or when the property owner receives notification of potential liability. USEPA completes a listing of filed notices of Superfund Liens.
 Date of Government Version: 10/15/91
 Database Release Frequency: No Update Planned
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 06/25/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/24/97

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

PADS: PCB Activity Database System
 Source: EPA
 Telephone: 202-260-3936
 PADS: PCB Activity Database. PADS identifies generators, transporters, commercial storers and/or brokers and distributors of PCB's who are required to notify the EPA of such activities.
 Date of Government Version: 01/27/97
 Database Release Frequency: Semi-Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 08/19/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 11/17/97

RAATS: RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System
 Source: EPA
 Telephone: 202-564-4104
 RAATS: RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System. RAATS contains records based on enforcement actions issued under RCRA pertaining to major violators and includes administrative and civil actions brought by the EPA. For administration actions after September 30, 1995, data entry in the RAATS database was discontinued. EPA will retain a copy of the database for historical records. It was necessary to terminate RAATS because a decrease in agency resources made it impossible to continue to update the information contained in the database.
 Date of Government Version: 04/17/95
 Database Release Frequency: No Update Planned
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/01/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/97

ROD: Records Of Decision
 Source: RTIS
 Telephone: 703-416-0223
 Record of Decision. ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid in the cleanup.
 Date of Government Version: 03/31/95
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 09/03/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 12/01/97

TRIS: Toxic Chemical Release Inventory System
 Source: EPA/RTIS
 Telephone: 202-260-1531
 TRIS: Toxic Release Inventory System. TRIS identifies facilities which release toxic chemicals to the air, water and land in reportable quantities under SARA Title III Section 313.
 Date of Government Version: 12/31/92
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/02/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/29/97

TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act
 Source: EPA/RTIS
 Telephone: 202-260-1444
 TSCA: Toxic Substances Control Act. TSCA identifies manufacturers and importers of chemical substances included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory list. It includes data on the production volume of these substances by plant site. USEPA has no current plan to update and/or re-issue this database.
 Date of Government Version: 01/31/95
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 06/16/97
 Date of Next Scheduled EDR Contact: 09/15/97

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

STATE OF HAWAII ASTM RECORDS:

LUST: Active Leaking Underground Storage Tank Log Listing
 Source: Department of Health
 Telephone: 808-586-4228
LUST: Leaking Underground Storage Tank Incident Reports LUST records contain an inventory of reported leaking underground storage tank incidents. Not all states maintain these records, and the information stored varies by state.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/96
 Date Made Active at EDR: 04/21/97
 Database Release Frequency: Quarterly
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/07/97

SHWS: CERCLUS

Source: Department of Health
 Telephone: 703-603-8904

SHWS: State Hazardous Waste Sites. State hazardous waste site records are the states' equivalent to CERCLUS. These sites may or may not already be listed on the federal CERCLUS list. Priority sites planned for cleanup using state funds (state equivalent of Superfund) are identified along with sites where cleanup will be paid for by potentially responsible parties. Available information varies by state.

Date of Government Version: 04/30/97
 Date Made Active at EDR: 06/08/97
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/07/97

SWFLF: Permitted Landfills in the State of Hawaii

Source: Department of Health
 Telephone: 808-586-4245

SWFLF: Solid Waste Facilities/Landfill Sites. SWFLF type records typically contain an inventory of solid waste disposal facilities or landfills in a particular state. Depending on the state, these may be active or inactive facilities or open dumps that failed to meet RCRA Subtitle D Section 4004 criteria for solid waste landfills or disposal sites.

Date of Government Version: 04/18/97
 Date Made Active at EDR: 06/06/97
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 06/30/97

UST: Listing of Underground Storage Tanks

Source: Department of Health
 Telephone: 808-586-4228

UST: Registered Underground Storage Tanks. USTs are regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and must be registered with the state department responsible for administering the UST program. Available information varies by state program.

Date of Government Version: 12/31/96
 Date Made Active at EDR: 04/29/97
 Database Release Frequency: Annually
 Date of Last EDR Contact: 07/07/97

Historical and Other Database(s)

Depending on the geographic area covered by this report, the data provided in these specialty databases may or may not be complete. For example, the existence of wetlands information data in a specific report does not mean that all wetlands in the area covered by the report are included. Moreover, the absence of any reported wetlands information does not necessarily mean that wetlands do not exist in the area covered by the report.

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Former Manufactured Gas (Coal Gas) Sites: The existence and location of Coal Gas sites is provided exclusively to EDR by Real Property Scan, Inc. Copyright 1993 Real Property Scan, Inc. For a technical description of the types of hazards which may be found at such sites, contact your EDR customer service representative.

Disclaimer Provided by Real Property Scan, Inc.

The information contained in this report has predominantly been obtained from publicly available sources produced by entities other than Real Property Scan. While reasonable steps have been taken to assure the accuracy of this report, Real Property Scan does not guarantee the accuracy of this report. Any liability on the part of Real Property Scan is strictly limited to a refund of the amount paid. No claim is made for the actual existence of toxins at any site. This report does not constitute a legal opinion.

DELISTED NPL: Deleted NPL Sites

Source: EPA
 Telephone: 703-603-8769

DELISTED NPL: The National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP) establishes the criteria that the EPA uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425 (e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

IFRAP: No Further Remedial Action Planned

Source: EPA/MTIS
 Telephone: 703-413-0223

IFRAP: As of February 1993, CERCLUS sites designated "No Further Remedial Action Planned" (IFRAP) have been removed from CERCLUS. IFRAP sites may be sites where, following an initial investigation, no contamination was found, contamination was removed quickly, or the need for the site to be placed on the NPL or the contamination was not serious enough to require Federal Superfund action or NPL consideration. EPA has removed approximately 25,000 IFRAP sites to an undated banner to the re-evaluation of these properties and has archived them as historical records so EPA does not need to repeat the investigations in the future. This policy change is part of the EPA's Brownfields Redevelopment Program to help cities, states, private investors and affected citizens to promote economic redevelopment of unproductive urban sites.

FRDS: Federal Reporting Data System

Source: EPA/Office of Drinking Water
 Telephone: 202-260-2805

FRDS: Provides information regarding public water supplies and their compliance with monitoring requirements, maximum contaminant levels (MCLs), and other requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1986.

Area Radon Information: The National Radon Database has been developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and is a compilation of the EPA State Radon Survey and the National Residential Radon Survey. The study covers the years 1986 - 1992. Where necessary data has been supplemented by information collected at private sources such as universities and research institutions.

Oil/Gas Pipelines/Electrical Transmission Lines: This data was obtained by EDR from the USGS in 1994. It is related to by USGS as GeoData Digital Line Graphs from 1:100,000 Scale Maps. It was extracted from the transportation category including some oil, but primarily gas pipeline and electrical transmission lines.

Sensitive Receptors: There are individuals deemed sensitive receptors due to their fragile immune systems and special sensitivity to environmental changes. These sensitive receptors typically include the elderly, the sick, and children. While the location of all sensitive receptors cannot be determined, EDR indicates those buildings and facilities - schools, daycares, hospitals, medical centers, and nursing homes - where individuals who are sensitive receptors are likely to be located.

USGS Water Wells: In November 1971 the United States Geological Survey (USGS) implemented a national water resource information tracking system. This database contains descriptive information on sites where the USGS collects or has collected data on surface water and/or groundwater. The groundwater data includes information on more than 900,000 wells, springs, and other sources of groundwater.

Flood Zone Data: This data, available in select counties across the country, was obtained by EDR in 1992 from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Data depicts 100-year and 500-year flood zones as defined by FEMA.

GOVERNMENT RECORDS SEARCHED / DATA CURRENCY TRACKING

Epicenters: World earthquake epicenters, Richter 5 or greater
Source: Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Water Dams: National Inventory of Dams
Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency
Telephone: 202-646-2801
WATER DAMS: National computer database of more than 74,000 dams maintained by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Thank you for your business.
Please contact EDR at 1-800-352-0050
with any questions or comments.

Disclaimer

This Report contains information obtained from a variety of public sources and EDR makes no representation or warranty regarding the accuracy, reliability, quality, or completeness of said information or the information contained in this report. The customer shall assume full responsibility for the use of this report. No warranty of merchantability or of fitness for a particular purpose, expressed or implied, shall apply and EDR specifically disclaims the making of such warranties. In no event shall EDR be liable to anyone for special, incidental, consequential or exemplary damages.