October 11, 1995

TO: Sam Callejo, Director
    Department of Accounting and General Services

SUBJECT: Final Environmental Impact Statement for Kapaa II Elementary School

With this memorandum, I accept the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Kapaa II Elementary School, Kapaa, the island of Kauai, as satisfactory fulfillment of the requirements of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes. The economic, social, and environmental impacts which will likely occur should this project be implemented are adequately described in the statement. The analysis and the comments made by reviewers provide useful information to policy makers and the public.

My acceptance of the statement is an affirmation of the adequacy of that statement under the applicable laws but does not constitute an endorsement of the proposed action.

I find that the mitigation measures proposed in the environmental impact statement will minimize the negative impacts of the project. Therefore, if this project is implemented, the Department of Accounting and General Services and/or its agents should perform these or alternatives and at least equally effective mitigation measures at the discretion of the permitting agencies. The mitigation measures identified in the environmental impact statement are listed in the attached document.
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SUMMARY
SUMMARY

1. Project Description

The State Department of Education (DOE) plans to construct a new elementary school in the Kawaihau District on Kauai. The new school is to be called the Kapaa II Elementary School. It will help alleviate the overcrowded conditions at the existing Kapaa Elementary School and its construction will result in two manageable elementary schools for the district. The new school will also help reduce the amount of people traveling on and off the existing elementary and intermediate/high school campuses in the mornings and afternoons. Both campuses of the existing elementary and intermediate/high schools happen to be next to each other.

This document gives the environmental impacts for five candidate school sites. Each of which is identified in the site selection study contained herein. Other candidate sites were also identified in the site selection process but they were eliminated because each had certain potentially adverse qualities.

2. Project Setting

The five candidate school sites are located either in or near to Kapaa town on the island of Kauai. The island is at the northwestern most end of the Hawaiian Islands Chain and is also the oldest of all the islands in the chain. The school service area is on the east side of the island with Kapaa Homesteads located to the west and the Wailua River to the south. The rural communities of Wailua, Kapaa, Kawaihau, Waipouli, and a few other nearby communities are in the service area.

3. Potential School Sites

Using the site selection criteria as established by the DOE, five candidate sites indicated as Candidate Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in this report were identified and evaluated. Each of the five sites were also assessed with regards to Environmental Impact Statement requirements.

4. Probable Impacts and Mitigative Measures

Short and long term impacts can be expected as a result of this project. Short term impacts are those associated with the construction activities and may affect noise levels, air quality, water quality, traffic, public health, public safety, flora, fauna, economic environment, and archaeological/historical items. Long term impacts are associated with the school operations and may also affect the flora, fauna, infrastructure, social environment, and traffic conditions surrounding the area. Mitigative measures such as state and county regulations addressing pollution of the environment, public health, and public safety will need to be adhered to by the contractor during construction of the new school. Once a school site is chosen,
detailed site specific impacts such as traffic, and mitigative measures should be determined and coordinated with the applicable government agencies.

The beneficial impacts of the project would be the temporary economic benefits from construction expenditures, employment opportunities during construction, the creation of needed jobs for the operation and maintenance of the school, and an overall reduction of the overcrowded conditions at the existing Kapaa Elementary School.

5. Proposed Action Alternatives

Prior to recommending the development of the new Kapaa II Elementary School, the DOE considered two other alternatives. The first was to remain "status quo" which, in reality, is impractical since the future enrollment growth in the area will substantially surpass the existing elementary school's capacity. The second alternative was to change the school service area for some of the students. It too was unacceptable because it was unfeasible to bus large amounts of children to neighboring schools that also did not have adequate facilities. Bussing students to another school to reduce the student enrollment at the existing Kapaa Elementary School may have been feasible had there been other elementary schools within a close proximity with adequate facilities.

6. The Relationship of Local Short Term Uses and the Enhancement of Long Term Productivity

The enhancement of long term productivity resulting from the proposed project is expected to outweigh the use of the environment. Although the construction activities for the proposed school will cause short term disruptions and nuisances to people living near to the project site, the new school is definitely needed and will provide a vital educational service and facility to the people in the Kapaa area.

7. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

The labor, utilities and materials needed for the development and operation of a new school will require the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of these resources.

8. Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls

The site selection and evaluation process considers the applicable plans, policies, and controls for the proposed Kapaa II Elementary School. Some of the plans and controls affecting the development of the new school are the State Land Use Map, the County General Plan, the County Zoning Ordinance, the County Constraint maps, and the Flood Insurance Rate Map. Discussions at the Kauai County Planning Department indicate the State Land Use and Zoning designations for Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 need to be changed to allow construction of the New Kapaa II Elementary School. Candidate Site 2 is already in an Urban designated area and, therefore, will not require changes to the State Land Use district boundary and the zoning designation. None of the five candidate sites need a General Plan change or a Shoreline Management Permit.
9. Unresolved Issues

The issues remaining unresolved depend on which candidate site is chosen to be the site for the proposed Kapaa II Elementary School. The following summarizes the unresolved issues for each of the five candidate sites and offers ways for their resolution and mitigation.

Archaeological/Historical Significance

The State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) of the Department of Land and Natural Resources has no research or past written documentation on any archaeological and/or historical worth for any of the five candidate sites. However, the SHPD feels there is a good possibility of candidate sites 3, 4, and 5 having some archaeologically and/or historically rich deposits since there were some deposits and burial grounds found on the makai side of the existing highway. The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. however, says if Candidate Site 3 falls entirely within the sugarcane growing area, it is unlikely that archaeological and/or historical sites are present.

SHPD says there's a good chance Candidate Site 1 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich if the school site doesn't encroach into any of the nearby valleys. Also, Candidate Site 2 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich since there is already an existing reservoir and an occupied dwelling on the site. To be sure, an archaeological inventory survey of the chosen site should be conducted to insure that no archaeological, historical or cultural resources of significance are impacted by the proposed new school development. Should any resources be found at the chosen site, mitigation and/or preservation plans will need to be prepared in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Division at the Department of Land and Natural Resources, the Kauai County Planning Department, and the Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission. The Kauai Island Burial Council will also be involved in the preparation of the mitigation and/or preservation plans if human burials are found.

Traffic

Detailed site specific issues regarding highway impacts and roadway mitigation measures, especially at key intersections along existing roadways and/or the existing Kuhio Highway, depend upon the site being chosen for the proposed school. Once a candidate site is selected, a Traffic Impact Analysis Report (TIAR) will be prepared. The work for the report will be during the design phase of the project and will include input from the State Department of Transportation.
Wastewater

While existing public sewer facilities are available to serve nearby areas, none of the candidate sites will receive service because all of them fall beyond the areas designated for sewer service by the County. It is quite possible that certain planned projects in the County’s designated sewer service areas with commitments for public sewers may fall out in future years and be canceled. Should that happen, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve either additional areas or other projects such as the new Kapaa II Elementary School. The reallocation process is not automatic but will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, it is assumed each candidate site will need to be served by an onsite wastewater treatment system. The wastewater treatment system must be designed to meet both the State Health Department and the Kauai County requirements.
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PREFACE

This document is prepared pursuant to Chapters 200 and 343 of Title 11, Administrative Rules, "Environmental Impact Statement Rule".

This is the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Site Selection Study for the new Kapaa II Elementary School. The site selection study was conducted to identify potential sites for the new school. The results of the study have been integrated to be a part of this document. Five candidate sites were identified and evaluated in the site selection study. Evaluation was in accordance with Environmental Impact Statement requirements.

Both the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Site Selection Study (DEIS/SSS) and the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN) have been completed. This document responded to comments received during the DEIS/SSS and EISPN consultation phases and incorporates both the comments received and the responses. The comments and responses for the DEIS/SSS and EISPN are given in Section XIV and Section XIII respectively of this document.

The original Candidate Sites 2 and 3 as discussed in the EISPN were eliminated because they were found to possibly contain wetlands. It is the Department of Accounting and General Services' policy to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible.

The original Candidate Sites 4 and 5 as discussed in the EISPN have since been redesignated as Candidate Sites 2 and 3 respectively and appears in the DEIS/SSS and the Final EIS/SSS as Candidate Sites 2 and 3.

Two new additional sites that were not a part of the EISPN were identified and added to the DEIS/SSS as Candidate Sites 4 and 5. These sites continue to remain as Candidate Sites 4 and 5 in the Final EIS/SSS.

From the time the EISPN process was completed, to the preparation of the DEIS/SSS, the island of Kauai experienced a major hurricane (Iniki) that impacted the island's environment severely. Hurricane Iniki stormed through Kauai on Friday, September 11, 1992 and destroyed many of the residential and commercial dwellings on the island. Power and communications on the island were knocked down and many people were left homeless. The Governor declared the island a national disaster area. Much of the island has since recovered from the damages. Evidence of the hurricane's impact on each of the five candidate sites over two years later is hardly noticeable.
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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Study Purpose

The State Department of Education (DOE) is planning a second elementary school in the Kapaa area on Kauai because the existing Kapaa Elementary School, in its already overcrowded condition, is faced with continued enrollment increases in its student body every year. The new school will be named the Kapaa II Elementary School. Kapaa will have two manageable elementary schools for the service area after completion of the new elementary school.

This study is part of the planning process for the new elementary school. It identifies and evaluates five candidate sites that may possibly be used for the new school and assesses the environmental impacts on each site in accordance with Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes and Chapter 200 of Title 11 - “Environmental Impact Statement Rules”, of the State’s Administrative Rules.

B. Current Conditions

The existing Kapaa Educational System presently serves three districts: Kawaihau District; a part of Lihue District; and a part of Hanalei District. The Feeder Organization’s present structure calls for four elementary schools feeding into a combined intermediate/high school while the proposed structure calls for the four elementary schools to be feeding separate intermediate and high schools. Both organizational structures are presented in Figure 1 on the next page.

The existing elementary school’s service area boundaries travel from the shoreline southeast of the Kuhio Highway/Kuamoo Road intersection to Kuamoo Road, along Kuamoo Road from the Kuhio Highway intersection to Kamalii Road on the west side, north along Kamalii Road to Oloiena Road, west along Oloiena Road to the Kamalii Ridge, then northwest along the ridge to the Makaleha Mountains before turning east along the Kapaa/Kealia boundary to continue east southeast back towards and along Kawaihau Road to Kuhio Highway, then towards the shoreline southeast of the Kuhio Highway/Kawaihau Road intersection and along the shoreline back to the beginning. The service area is shown in Figure 2.

The present elementary school’s room inventory includes 45 permanent classrooms and 26 portable classrooms for a total of 71 classrooms. When demolition of substandard facilities that need replacing is considered, the available classroom total becomes 43. Both totals are further affected by a DOE classroom adjustment which yields an adjusted existing total of 69 classrooms or 41 classrooms with consideration given to demolition and replacement.
KAPAA COMPLEX
FEEDER ORGANIZATION

EXISTING STRUCTURE

Hanalei Elementary
K-6

Kapaa Elementary
K-6
– Kapaa High and Intermediate
7-12

Kilauea Elementary
K-6

Kaumualii Elementary
K-6
– Kauai High and Intermediate
7-12

PROPOSED STRUCTURE

Hanalei Elementary
K-6

Kapaa Elementary
K-5
– Kapaa Intermediate – Kapaa High
6-8 (New) 9-12

Kapaa II Elementary
K-5 (New)

Kilauea Elementary
K-6

Kaumualii Elementary
K-5
– Kauai High and Intermediate
7-12
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Figure 1
The existing Kapaa Elementary and Intermediate/High School campuses adjoin each other. The schools share the same roads and support facilities. The campuses and facilities are located at the top of a hill where the average elevation is about 120 feet above sea level, more or less. Both campuses front Kawaihau Road and Mailihuna Road with the heavier usage being along Kawaihau Road. Each road is capable of handling two way traffic flows using one lane for each direction. The topography of the combined campuses is relatively flat with slopes ranging from mild to average and some banks separating the flatter areas.

C. Project Need

The existing Kapaa Elementary School is overcrowded. Its student enrollment from the kindergarten level through the sixth grade grew almost 50 percent from 1980 (1003 students) to 1989 (1498 students). The opening of the new Kaumualii Elementary School in September 1990 in Hanamauu only reduced the Kapaa Elementary School's student enrollment to 1435 students which is considered still too large for a desirable elementary school.

The large student enrollment stems from the constant growth of population and housing developments in the area. Beside housing developments, there is also much "in filling" of older properties in the Waialua Homesteads area that contribute students to the school system.

If the new Kapaa II Elementary School is not pursued, the projected student enrollment from the kindergarten through the fifth grade level at the existing Kapaa Elementary School will be around 1193 students for the year 1999. This reduced enrollment is the result of moving the sixth grade level to the new Kapaa Intermediate School in 1997.

The reduced enrollment however continues to exceed the guidelines used by the DOE for action to reduce student enrollment at elementary schools. Basically, the guideline says once an elementary school's enrollment exceeds 400 students, the DOE is to begin searching for ways to reduce the school's population. A possible way would be redistricting to redistribute the students to nearby schools. When all alternatives are considered and exhausted, the DOE would then consider opening a new school such as the Kapaa II Elementary School.

D. Proposed Project

The service area for the new Kapaa II Elementary School is shown in Figure 3.

The new elementary school will be located at another site from that of the existing elementary school. Candidate sites are discussed in Section III of this report. The new school will help relieve the overcrowded student enrollment conditions at the existing elementary school and also benefit the operations of the existing intermediate/high school in terms of reduced traffic activity in the area and reduced demand on the existing facilities on the combined campuses.
The proposed structure for the Kapaa Complex Feeder Organization is shown in Figure 1. It is similar to the existing feeder organization except the new Kapaa II Elementary School is added and the grades for the intermediate/high school are separated. It also shows the sixth grade level moving from the existing Kapaa Elementary School to the new Kapaa Intermediate School leaving both elementary schools with grade levels ranging from kindergarten to fifth grade.

The new elementary school is expected to have sixteen classrooms for grades K-2; twelve classrooms for grades 3-5; and two classrooms for special education. Three additional classrooms are also provided for classroom allowance and another three for peak allowance. There will be a total of thirty permanent and six portable classrooms. The new school will also have an administration building, library, food service, custodial service center, computer resource center, faculty center #1, faculty center #2, physical education play field (Boys & Girls), and paved play courts, all of which to be constructed at a later date. There will also be 43 marked parking stalls for the staff and 6 marked parking stalls for visitors. Additional parking will be provided as required by the Land Use Ordinances.

The past, present and future enrollment projections for the existing Kapaa Elementary School and the new Kapaa II Elementary School for the years 1990 to 2000 are given as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KES¹</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIES²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Future year with projected enrollment
¹ - Existing Kapaa Elementary School
² - New Kapaa II Elementary School

While the projected enrollment figures in the table above for the existing Kapaa Elementary School show a declining pattern occurring over the years, the enrollment totals continue to exceed the DOE’s guidelines for a desirable student enrollment for elementary schools. Hence the need remains for the new Kapaa II Elementary School.

E. Alternatives Considered

The DOE considered two other alternatives prior to recommending the construction of a new elementary school. They are:

1. Keeping the Status Quo: This alternative calls for not doing anything to the existing facilities. The alternative was rejected because the current Kapaa Elementary School is already experiencing overcrowding. Its campus is shared by the Kapaa Intermediate/High school. Its existing facilities cannot accommodate the present high student enrollment and it has no potential to
handle the continued increase in student enrollment that will occur in the upcoming years as a result of projected growth in the area.

2. **Change of School Service Area**: This alternative also is not feasible since some students will have to attend another elementary school that is either 7 miles away in Hanamaulu or more than 15 miles away at the Kilauea Elementary School. Bussing the students will be cost ineffective and impractical since both schools in Hanamaulu and in Kilauea do not have the needed facilities to help relieve the overcrowded conditions at the existing Kapaa Elementary School.

F. **School Development Requirements**

The proposed Kapaa II Elementary School will be developed in accordance with DOE Specifications and Standards. DOE has established the following requirements for the new school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School:</th>
<th>Elementary, Grades K-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Opening Date:</td>
<td>September 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage:</td>
<td>10-12 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Enrollment:</td>
<td>650 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Enrollment:</td>
<td>750 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Enrollment at School Opening:</td>
<td>345 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. PROJECT SETTING
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A. Regional Overview

Kauai is about 100 miles northwest of Oahu with a land area of about 549.4 square miles. It is commonly called the "Garden Island" because of its beautiful lush natural environment. Mount Waialeale, the wettest spot in the United States, is on Kauai with an average rainfall of 444 inches per year. In contrast, Poipu Beach on the island's southern coast averages only 35 inches of rainfall a year, more or less.

Tourism is the leading industry on the island. Other significant industries are agriculture and the military. Sugar is the major agriculture product. Kauai County includes the inhabited islands of Kauai and Niihau and the uninhabited islands of Lehua and Kaula. The county seat is in Lihue.

B. Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls

1. Hawaii State Plan:

The plan serves as a guide for future long range development of the State by identifying goals, policies and priorities. The proposed project is consistent with the following State objective and policy.

"Planning for the State's socio-cultural advancement with regards to education shall be directed towards achievement of the objective of the provision of a variety of educational opportunities to enable individuals to fulfill their needs, responsibilities, and aspirations. To achieve the education objective, it shall be the policy of this State to ensure the provision of adequate and accessible educational services and facilities that are designed to meet individual and community needs."

2. State Education Functional Plan:

The major purpose of the State Education Functional Plan is to help implement the Hawaii State Plan. This functional plan was prepared in compliance with Chapter 226, Hawaii Revised Statues by the State Department of Education. It advances priority directions for the Department of Education and improves the quality of public education in Hawaii.

The proposed project is consistent with the following State Policy, State Priority Guideline, Board of Education Concern and/or State Education Functional Plan Advisory Committees' concern regarding educational services and facilities:

"Ensure the provision of adequate and accessible educational services and facilities that are designed to meet individual and community needs."
3. State Land Use Districts:

According to Department of Education site selection criteria, a school site must not be located in a State Land Use Conservation District. None of the candidate sites fall within any Conservation District. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are in an Agricultural District. Candidate Site 2 is in an Urban District. See Figure 4.

4. County General Plan:

The County’s General Plan shows a mixture of land uses in the service area such as agriculture, urban mixed use, resort, urban residential, and public facilities. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are designated Urban Mixed Use while Candidate Site 2 is designated Urban Residential on the County General Plan. See Figure 5.

5. County Zoning:

Zoning in the service area is also a mixture of residential, open, special treatment, commercial, and industrial (R6, R4, O, ST-P, CG, IL, R10, and R20) zoning. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are zoned agricultural and Candidate Site 2 is zoned open. See Figures 6 and 6A.

6. Flood/Tsunami Hazard:

Flood Insurance Rate Map Panels 150002-130C, 135C, and 140C applies to the service area. Each candidate site was identified and its location shown on the respective flood map. All candidate sites are located in Zone X unshaded-areas which is determined to be outside the 500 year flood plain. See Figures 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 in Section III IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL SITES.

People at the public informational meeting commented that the parcel containing Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 have flooded before. They indicated the flood waters had risen to a level about even with the existing Kuhio Highway fronting the parcel. It was also noted at the meeting that the parcel’s ground along the highway was lower than the pavement of the highway which may explain in part the floods that occurred along the highway regardless of storm size.

7. Special Management Area:

None of the five candidate sites for the New Kapaa II Elementary School are in the Special Management Area. Hence the Special Management Area processing is not needed.
8. **Underground Injection Control:**

The Hawaii State Health Department’s Summary Of The Critical Wastewater Disposal Areas for Kauai establishes the following criteria,

1. The coastal area 1,000 feet from the shoreline or to the 100 foot elevation, whichever is greater, except for the coastal areas between Kekaha and Waimea where the inland boundary is at the 40 foot elevation, and the areas from Kalalau to Molokai where the inland boundary is the Hanalei District Boundary.
2. Within a 1,000 foot radius of all existing and projected drinking water sources
3. All lots less than one (1) acre in the inland areas except for:
   A. The Hanapepe-Koloa area, the area bounded by Port Allen Road to the Kaumualii Highway intersection, then east along Kaumualii Highway to where it meets the UIC Line near the Wahiawa Stream, then east along the UIC Line to Koloa Town where the UIC Line intersects the west boundary of the urban land use district, then south to where the zoning boundary meets the Private Cane Haul Road, then west along the Cane Haul Road to the east boundary of the agricultural zone near Kalaeo Gulch, then south to 1,000 feet from the shoreline and then west along 1,000 feet from the shoreline to Port Allen Road; and
   B. Below the UIC Line on the plateaus east and west of Anahola and Papaa Streams.
4. Waimea Canyon State Park and Kokee State Park bounded by the state park boundaries as delineated by the Indefinite Boundary.

The critical wastewater disposal areas map for Kauai (Figure 7) shows all five candidate sites in critical wastewater disposal areas. Unless connections to the County’s sewer line is allowed, the new school will need to have its own wastewater treatment system. A further discussion on sewers for the project is presented in the infrastructure portion of this section on page II-14.

The UIC rules prohibit sewage or industrial disposal wells in areas above the UIC line. No injection wells are allowed within one-quarter mile of any drinking water source. The land areas mauka of the UIC line are considered to contain underground sources of drinking water and these areas must be protected against any source of ground water contamination.

The use of injection wells (drywells) for the disposal of drainage runoff will also require a UIC permit authorizing its construction and operation.

9. **Agriculture Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii:**

According to the Agriculture Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii, Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are on land considered to be prime agriculture land which is further defined as land which has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields of crops economically when treated and managed according to modern farming methods. On the other hand, Candidate Site 2 is not on land considered to have any significance regarding agriculture. See Figure 8.
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10. **Site Constraint Map:**

Kauai County’s Site Constraint Map shows the project’s service area to contain soil, slope, drainage, flood, tsunami or shore constraints. Candidate Site 1 has no constraint. Candidate Site 2 has a shoreline constraint pertaining to the existing reservoir on the site. Candidate Site 3 has a potential soil constraint meaning the soil could be soft. A soils investigation is needed to determine the exact soil characteristics for the site.

Candidate Sites 4 and 5 have soil and tsunami constraints. Although, the Flood Insurance Rate Map shows the two sites to be outside of the flood zone, people at the public informational meeting did say the parcel containing Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 have flooded in the past. They indicated the flood waters rose to a level about even with the existing Kuhio Highway fronting the parcel.

A soils report is needed to determine the soil characteristics at Candidate Sites 4 and 5. The soils report will determine how soft the soil actually is and how it will affect the new school’s construction.

A soils investigation and report is also recommended for both Candidate Sites 1 and 2 even though no soils constraints are shown on the County’s Constraint Map. Essentially, a soils investigation and report is needed for the chosen site.

C. **Infrastructure**

1. **Water:**

The Kauai County Department of Water has jurisdiction over water distribution in the service area. Water throughout the service area is distributed through water mains ranging in size from 2” to 16”. The storage facilities serving the Wailua-Kapaa area are the Nonou, Makaleha, Ornellas, Stable, Kondo, and Puupilo Tanks. The source facilities are the Wailua Homestead Wells A and B, the Nonou Wells A, B, and C, the Moelepe Tunnel, the Makaleha tunnel, the Makaleha Well A, and the Akulikuli Tunnel. Figures 9, 10, and 10A show the existing water lines near the candidate sites.

Water availability for the new school will depend upon the adequacy of the source, storage, and transmission facilities existing at the time of development. The Department of Water indicates the existing storage facilities for the Wailua-Kapaa area are nearing their capacities and they cannot assure that adequate storage facilities will be available to service the new school at the time of actual development. The existing source facilities for the Wailua-Kapaa area are presently adequate for the candidate sites. Candidate Sites 1 and 2 will need to upgrade the transmission facilities.
For Candidate Site 1, the State will be asked to upgrade approximately 5,850 feet of existing 12 inch waterline to a new 16 inch waterline beginning at the Kawaihau and Kaapuni Roads (Ornelas Tank) intersection and traveling along Kaapuni Road to the County Stable Tank site. For Candidate Site 2, the State will be asked to replace approximately 4,000 feet of existing 6 inch waterline along Kuamoo Road with a new 8 inch waterline beginning at the Kuamoo and Kamalu Roads intersection and running southwest along Kuamoo Road to reconnect to the existing 6-inch waterline. The Department of Water indicates the existing water transmission facilities in Kuhio Highway are adequate and Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 will be permitted to use them. See Appendix F.

2. **Sewer:**

Existing sewer systems in the service area include the county's sewer lines, sewage treatment plants, and individual cesspools. There is a sewer trunk line in Kuhio Highway beginning at the lift station at the Haleiwa Road and Kuhio Highway intersection and ending at Mahelona Hospital.

While there are existing sewer facilities available to serve nearby areas, all of the candidate sites are beyond the County's designated sewer service areas. It is possible that certain planned projects in the designated sewer service areas that are already committed for service by the existing sewer facilities may fall out in future years and be canceled. Should that occur, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve additional areas or other projects such as the new Kapaa L Elementary School. The reallocation process is not automatic but will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, it is assumed each candidate site will need to be served by an onsite wastewater treatment system. The wastewater treatment system must be designed to meet State Health Department and Kauai County requirements.

3. **Drainage:**

The existing storm drainage facilities in the service area include a network of ditches, swales, and culverts. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are located on sugar cane fields that have irrigation ditches which could be a means of drainage provided drainage planning is first conducted with the Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd to ensure least disruption to their cane growing activities.

Candidate Site 2 has a reservoir at the bottom of the parcel which could be used for drainage. There are no other existing drainage structures or pipes that can serve any of the candidate sites. A UIC permit would be needed if drainage injection wells are used. Such a permit would authorize the construction and operation of the disposal wells.
4. **Electrical/Telephone:**

Electric power and services in the proposed school service area will be provided by the Kauai Electric Division of Citizens Utilities Company. They have said the existing transmission and distribution lines in the service area are adequate to serve any of the candidate sites. The existing distribution lines however, must be extended to the chosen site in order to provide service.

Telephone services in the proposed service area will be by GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company. Telephone service to each of the candidate sites will be by Service Connections as defined in their PUC Tariff No. 1, Section 2. A summary of the Service Connections tariff is given in GTE Hawaiian Telephone’s letter in Section XIV of this report.

GTE Hawaiian Telephone says Candidate Sites 1, 2, 4, and 5 are relatively close to their existing facilities and may not, depending on the individual telephone service routing, require Aid To Construction charges. Candidate Site 3 will need Aid To Construction charges if serviced from Kuhio Highway or, it will not need the Aid To Construction charges if serviced from the much closer Eggerking Road in Wailua House lots. Again, see GTE Hawaiian Telephone’s letter in Section XIV of this report for details.

D. **Service Area Environment**

1. **Existing Land Use:**

Existing land uses in the service area include residential, business, resort, and agriculture uses. There are also several churches, shopping centers, schools, subdivisions, cane lands, visitor resorts, and attractions in the area. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are presently used for agricultural purposes. Candidate Site 2 has an occupied house on the parcel and cattle grazing near the existing reservoir.

2. **Land Ownership**

Statistics for 1989 show private landowners owned almost 61.1% of the land on Kauai. The State of Hawaii was the second largest land owner with 37.9%. Private ownership impacts heavily on the candidate sites where four of the five sites are privately owned by The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. Only Candidate Site 2 is owned by the State of Hawaii.

3. **Climate:**

Kauai's climate is vastly affected by the shape of the topography. Winds are generally trade winds blowing from a northeasterly direction. These trade-winds provide the island with cool breezes. Occasionally, Kauai experiences Kona winds that blow from a southerly direction bringing with it a stale and humid
atmosphere. The average coastal temperature ranges from 71 degrees Fahrenheit during January and February to 79 degrees Fahrenheit between August and September. Mountainous and upper areas such as Kokee are generally cooler. The service area is located on the island’s windward side where it is normally cooler than the island’s leeward side.

4. **Flora and Fauna:**

The US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service does not anticipate significant adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources from the new school. They also say “the five candidate sites lack wetland areas and do not provide habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species.” The threatened Newell’s shearwaters which nest in the interior of Kauai may transit through the candidate sites periodically. Mitigative measures are discussed in Section V of this report to minimize impacts to the birds.

The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii indicates nine (9) records were processed in the service area that are classified as Listed Endangered (LE), Proposed Endangered (PE), or Category 2 under the Federal Status. However, the candidate sites do not appear to contain any of the proposed or listed endangered species. The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii’s database however, does not constitute a guarantee there is absolutely no endangered species on any of the candidate sites. See Appendix G for more detailed information and the reference map.

A study pertaining to flora and fauna, if necessary, can be included as part of the masterplan/design phase of the work for the new school. The study would be performed only on the candidate site chosen for the new school.

5. **Geology/Hydrology:**

Kauai is the oldest and fourth largest island in the Hawaiian Island chain. The island was formed by a hot spot in the Pacific Ocean on the Pacific plate.

The new elementary school’s service area is located in the Kapaa area on the eastern side of the island.

The median annual rainfall for the area is greater than 43”. The new service area is bounded by the Wailua River to the south, the Moikeha Canal on the north, the ocean on the east and the Nonou forest reserve on the west. Candidate Site 1 is on a hill; Candidate Site 2 is at the base of the Nounou forest reserve; and Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 are on a flat area between the base of the Nounou forest reserve and the Pacific Ocean. See Figure 11.
6. **Soils:**

Based on the US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the UH Agricultural Experiment Station, the soils in the service area are of the Kapaa-Pooku-Halii-Makapili association, Lihue-Puhi association, Rough mountainous land-Rough broken land-Rock outcrop association, and the Hanalei-Kolokolo-Pakala association. For generic descriptions and locations of each of the associations in the service area, see Figure 12.

The following gives the descriptions of the soils belonging to the various associations in the service area as derived from the Soil Survey of Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, State of Hawaii. See Figures 13 & 14.

**LhB, LhC, LhD:** (Lihue series) This soil type is good for topsoil and road fill. It is also favorable for highways except when slopes are near 40 percent. For irrigation, this soil's permeability is moderately rapid for slopes up to 40 percent. It has a high shear strength for slopes up to 40 percent for low building foundations. With regards to septic tank leach fields this type of soil has slight limitations on ground slopes ranging from 0 to 8 percent, and moderate limitations for slopes ranging from 8 to 15 percent. Ground slopes greater than 15 percent have severe limitations for septic tank leach fields.

**MTE:** (Mokuleia series) This soil type is considered to be a fair source for topsoil and it usually has a high water table. It is a poor soil source for road fill material. Its impact on agricultural drainage in low wet areas is low since it has a high water table. It needs drainage for irrigation purposes and has severe limitations when used for septic tank leach fields.

**HsE:** (Hanamauu series) While it is a good source for road fill, it is rated only fair for topsoil application due to its low fertility. Soil features affecting irrigation are favorable unless the slopes become steeper and approach 40 percent. This soil has slight limitations on septic tank leach fields when the ground slopes range from 0 to 8 percent and moderate limitations for ground slopes ranging from 8 to 15 percent. For ground slopes 15 percent or greater, this type of soil has severe limitations on septic tank leach fields.

The University of Hawaii Land Study Bureau’s map *Kauai Lands Classified By Physical Qualities For Urban Usage* shows the land category code and slope categories for the candidate sites. The map shows Candidate Sites 1, 2, and 3 having a soil character code “1” which characterizes non expanding, non-rocky, surface well-drained soil with a depth of over 10 feet and consolidated lava as underlying material. Candidate Sites 4 and 5 have soil character code “11” which characterizes expanding, non rocky, surface well-drained soil with a high water table. See Figure 15.
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A. Site Selection Methodology

The site selection process involves two procedures. The first is to choose and identify different sites in or near to the project's service area. Preference would be given to sites entirely in the service area. However, since many of the larger parcels in the service area are susceptible to floods, it became necessary to reach beyond the service area boundaries to obtain Candidate Site 1. Each candidate site is expected to conform to the Department of Accounting and General Services minimum school site selection criteria with modifications that may apply to the unique service area. Factors such as tsunami, flood hazard, landslide hazard, size, shape, location, and existing land development are a part of the site selection criteria. The proximity of the population in the service area is also a consideration to narrow the field of potential sites. To determine which site could be a candidate site, discussions and meetings were held with various agencies of the Federal, State and County governments and the public. Tax maps, State Land Use Plans, County General and Development Plans, Flood Insurance Rate Maps, Agricultural Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii (ALISH) maps and other pertinent material were gathered and reviewed.

The second procedure involves a detailed evaluation of each candidate site to determine their individual characteristics and physical properties. This "step two" evaluation considers DOE criteria and includes a description of the existing surroundings and conditions at each candidate site in terms of topography, environment, utilities, drainage, and other physical parameters. Site accessibility and cost factors are also evaluated for each candidate site. Based on this criteria, each site is impartially rated as being either "Excellent", "Good", or "Poor". The next section discusses each candidate site with respect to this "step two" evaluation.

B. Minimum Site Criteria

The minimum site criteria is applied to the service area and to immediately adjacent areas to identify possible candidate sites. The criteria used are:

1. **Acreage:** 8 acres minimum and 12 acres maximum
2. **Shape:** Shape must not exceed a length to width ratio of 2.5 to 1.0
3. **Tsunami:** Site must not be in a tsunami inundation zone as established by a State authorized agency
4. **Flood:** Site must not be in a major flood plain if adequate drainage provisions cannot be provided at a reasonable cost.

5. **Landslide:** Site must not be in a known or potential landslide area.

6. **Traffic:** Site must not be in an area that is hazardous from the standpoint of pedestrian and traffic safety unless adequate safety provisions can be made.

7. **Timing:** Acquisition of the site must be early enough to allow adequate construction time to meet the DOE's scheduled school opening date.

8. **Location:** Site must be in or close to the ultimate service area.

9. **Displacement:** Site must be obtained without mass relocation of families.

10. **Historical:** Acquisition and development of the site must be such that no buildings or sites designated as historic and deserving of preservation by the Historic Buildings Task Force or the Bishop Museum will be destroyed.

**C. Potential Sites**

On the basis of the minimum site criteria, candidate sites were sought in or near the service area. Five candidate sites were identified at different locations as shown on Figure 20, page III-7. They are,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Site</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Figure No.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oloheia site</td>
<td>along Oloheia road</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>III-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nonou site</td>
<td>along Halelio Road</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>III-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wailua site</td>
<td>east of Wailua Hse Lots</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>III-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kuhio-S site</td>
<td>along Kuhio Highway</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>III-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kuhio-L site</td>
<td>along Kuhio Highway</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>III-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the candidate sites are not adjacent to any parks. They therefore, have been sized 12 acres to permit them to operate without relying on any park space. Exception for Candidate Site 2 that takes the configuration of the parcels it is located on, all other candidate sites have a rough configuration of 555 feet by 945 feet. These computations appear on page 12 of Appendix E. Eight other state owned sites and one privately owned site were also considered but not selected because their locations were either remote, in flood areas, in wetlands, or shaped irregular and awkwardly. Tax maps showing the nine rejected sites are contained in Appendix B. The candidate sites selected are:
1. Candidate Site 1: Olohepa Site

This 12 acre candidate site is located on a 183.281 acre parcel owned by The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. The parcel, identified as TMK: 4-3-03:01, is presently used for sugar cane cultivation. The candidate site is located along the central-northerly edge of the parcel as shown in Figure 21 on page III-8. It is the northernmost candidate site in the service area and is surrounded by communities in Wailua, Waipouli, and Kapaa making it the closest to the population area. The old Kauai County Development Plan had designated the site for a future high school site.

The parcel has a 20 year Agriculture Dedication that began July 1, 1974 meaning if The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. (The LPCo) uses this land for other than agriculture before July 1, 1994, then The LPCo will have to pay all the deferred taxes starting from the time the dedication began but not exceeding ten years. However, if the State initiates the conversion, then neither The LPCo nor the State will have to pay any of the deferred taxes. See Deferred Land Tax Section RP-1.6 item d(1) in Appendix D for details. The dedication will expire July 1, 1994.

The candidate site fronts a portion of the south side of Olohepa Road. The road is a winding two lane road with sharp turns and is the only access for the candidate site. There are no existing sidewalks, curbs and gutters. Sidewalk and other roadway improvements for safe pedestrian and traffic access will be needed. The candidate site itself is relatively flat with some rolling slopes.

Candidate Site 1 also happens to be on the same parcel that is being considered for use by the new Kapaa Intermediate School. The intermediate school will be using about 18 acres while the elementary school will be needing about 12 acres. Combining both schools at the same location is not possible since there is only a limited amount of usable land on the site before encountering severe slope banks. When the proposed intermediate school layout was superimposed over the existing features of the parcel with three sides of the new intermediate school aligned either against Olohepa Road or other steep slope areas, it revealed the remaining open space to be about 450 feet wide, more or less, before encountering other severe slope banks. The configuration of the remaining space is also odd and narrows as it approaches the severe slope areas. These findings show there is just not enough room at this site for both the new elementary school and the intermediate school. See Figure 21A on page III-9.

2. Candidate Site 2: Nonou Site

The candidate site is at the foothills of the Sleeping Giant. It consists of two parcels identified as: TMK: 4-1-09:17 & 18. Both parcels are owned by the State of Hawaii with parcel 17 having 12 acres of vacant land and parcel 18 having 15,600 square feet of land with 1,950 square feet of improvements on
it. Currently 11.796 acres of parcel 17 are leased to Kauai Sand and Gravel, Inc. under a general lease (GL) arrangement. The remaining 0.204 acre is vacant. Parcel 18 is being leased to the Waialua Young People's Club under a Revocable Permit. There is an existing water storage reservoir at the site's lower east side and a small drainage ditch along the site's north side that connects to the reservoir. The area near to the existing reservoir is being used for cattle grazing. See Figure 22 on page III-10.

This candidate site is the westernmost of all five candidate sites and furthest from the population area. It has frontages along Makani Road, Haledillo Road, and Kaulana Road and is a little more than a mile from Kuhio Highway. The fourth side of the site is bounded by existing residential homes. The site is mauka of a small residential community of which it is also a part.

3. Candidate Site 3: Waialua Site

This 12 acre candidate site is situated on a 288.90 acre parcel identified as TMK# 4-3-02:06 and located adjacent to the Waialua House Lots. It is owned by The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. The candidate site is situated on the northwestern part of the parcel where it is outside of the flood zone. It is about 2,230 feet from Kuhio Highway and will need an access road to get from Kuhio Highway to the site. The outstanding features of this candidate site include houses along the western side of the site and sugar cane fields on all the other sides. There is a cane haul road within a half mile away on the eastern and southern sides of the site. See Figure 23 on page III-11.

This parcel is presently a sugar cane field with a 20 year Agriculture Dedication on it. It would be expensive to acquire this site because of the Agriculture Dedication that began in 1979 and continues to 1999. If any part of the land is used for anything other than agriculture during this period, the owner will be required to pay all the deferred taxes for the land starting from the time when the Dedication began but not exceeding ten years. In this case however, there is an exception since the State will initiate the conversion change. The Deferred Land Tax Section RP-1.6 item d(1) (subpart of Appendix D) says "the deferred tax shall not be imposed when the conversion is initiated by any of the government agencies. The deferred tax shall not be imposed on an owner or lessee who did not petition for the reclassification, and the extended three years use value provisions may apply."

4. Candidate Site 4: Kuhio-S Site

This 12 acre candidate site is located on the same parcel as Candidate Site 3 but in a different location. This candidate site is on the southeastern part of the parcel where it is outside of the flood zone. The candidate site's short side is adjacent to Kuhio Highway and access to the site will be directly off of Kuhio Highway onto the short side of the site. The existing features bordering this site include Kuhio Highway on its south side and sugar cane fields on the
other three sides. There is also an existing cane haul road paralleling Kuhio Highway and crossing the candidate site. See Figure 24 on page III-12.

As in the case of Candidate Site 3, the parcel is presently used for sugar cane cultivation and has a 20 year Agriculture Dedication on it. It would normally be expensive to acquire this site because, the Dedication began in 1979 and expires in 1999. Until then, if any part of the land is used for anything other than agriculture, the owner will be required to pay all the deferred taxes for the land starting from the time when the Dedication began but not exceeding ten years. This case is an exception however, since the State will initiate the conversion change. The Deferred Land Tax Section RP-1.6 item d(1) (subpart of Appendix D) says the deferred tax shall not be imposed when the conversion is initiated by a government agency. The deferred tax shall not be imposed on an owner or lessee who did not petition for reclassification, and the extended three years use value provisions may apply.

The proposed Kapaʻa Bypass Road may impact on the final positioning of this candidate site. Presently, the proposed alignment of all three alternates appear to cross this site. Figure 18 on page II-28 gives a general idea of the impact each of the three alignments have on the candidate site. Construction for the Kapaʻa Bypass Road is not anticipated for at least another six years hence. The State Department of Transportation says they have not yet finalized any of the three alignments and are therefore reluctant to release plans showing details of the alignments. Also, none of the Environmental Impact Statement work for the Bypass Road has yet commenced. It is quite possible the Kapaʻa Bypass Road alignments may still be flexible enough to accommodate the candidate site’s location should the site be established before the road alignments become finalized.

5. Site 5: Kuhio-L Site

This 12 acre site is located on the same parcel as Candidate Sites 3 and 4 but in a different manner. It is also on the southeastern part of the parcel outside of the flood zone. However, the longer side of the site is next to Kuhio Highway rather than the short side. Access to the candidate site will also be directly off of Kuhio Highway but onto the long side of the site. The existing features surrounding this site include Kuhio Highway on its south side and sugar cane fields on the three remaining sides. The same cane haul road that crosses Candidate Site 4 also crosses this site. See Figure 25 on page III-13.

As in the case of Candidate Sites 3 and 4, the 20 year Agriculture Dedication that commenced in 1979 and ends in 1999 also affects this site. However, as in Candidate Sites 3 and 4, there is an exception since the State will initiate the conversion change. The Deferred Land Tax Section RP-1.6 item d(1) (subpart of Appendix D) says “the deferred tax shall not be imposed when the conversion is initiated by any of the government agencies. The deferred tax shall not be imposed on an owner or lessee who did not petition for the
reclassification, and the extended three years use value provisions may apply."

Candidate Site 5 is also affected by the alignments for the proposed Kapaa Bypass Road. Figure 18 on page II-28 gives a general idea of the impact each of the three alignments have on the candidate site. Since the Kapaa Bypass Road is not built, and it will be another six years before any construction for the Kapaa Bypass Road is anticipated, there may be a possibility that the Kapaa Bypass Road alignments may be flexible enough to accommodate the candidate site's location should the site be established before the road alignments become finalized.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel TMK#</th>
<th>Parcel Area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LPCo*</td>
<td>4-03-03:01</td>
<td>183.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>4-01-09:17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>12.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LPCo*</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
<td>288.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LPCo*</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
<td>288.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LPCo*</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
<td>288.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lihue Plantation Company
D. Rejected Sites

Nine candidate sites were considered but rejected. Five sites were rejected, because they did not meet certain minimum criteria as establish by the DOE. Each of the five sites are discussed briefly below. The remaining four sites not listed below but included as a part of Appendix B were either in flood zones, or their locations were remote from the service area.

1. Candidate Site 6: Kuhio Highway Site

The Kuhio Highway Site is identified as TMK: 4-6-14:26 and contains 21.496 acres. The site is owned by the State of Hawaii and is the furthest east of all the candidate sites placing it away from the population area. This site was eliminated from consideration after further investigation and a site visit because of its awkward shape and undesirable location. Salt spray in the air blowing in from the ocean is severe and will have a detrimental effect to the new school’s computers, metal structures, and facilities.

2. Candidate Site 7: Odd Site

The Odd Site is identified as TMK: 4-5-15:20 and contains 12.86 acres. This site is also owned by the State of Hawaii and has an odd configuration that surrounds a cemetery. Its location is in a low lying area prone to flooding and is obscured from the road by existing trees and houses.

3. Candidate Site 8: Moalepe Site

Candidate Site 8 is the furthest west of all the candidate sites making it also the furthest site from the population area. The site includes two parcels: TMK: 4-6-05:10 and TMK: 4-6-05:11 that are owned by the State of Hawaii. Parcel 10 contains 6.24 acres and parcel 11 contains 4.11 acres. Its remote location eliminated this site from further consideration.

4. Candidate Site 9: Ching Site

Candidate Site 9 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of the Department of Accounting and General Services to avoid using sites with wetlands if at all possible. Hence the site was dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as a potential site.

5. Candidate Site 10: Andrade Site

Candidate Site 10 may also contain wetlands. Therefore, like Candidate Site 9, it too was dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as a potential site.
IV. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
IV. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATE SITES

The DOE has set forth several standards for the evaluation of candidate sites. The standards are categorized as site characteristics, utilities, accessibility, and environment. Besides these standards, the candidate sites are also evaluated with respect to the community site criteria that considers government and community effects on each candidate site. On the basis of these combined standards, each candidate site is given a rating of excellent, good, or poor as summarized on pages IV-8 and IV-9 of this section. The details regarding the ratings with respect to each criteria for each of the candidate sites appear in Appendix C.

The following presents the standards and the approximated costs for land acquisition, onsite improvements, and offsite improvements for each of the candidate sites.

SCHOOL SITE CRITERIA

A. Site Characteristics

1. Size: (based on DOE requirements for elementary schools, the size is one acre per 100 students with a 6 acre minimum size. A minimum of ten acres would be required for a school/neighborhood park arrangement)

   a. Excellent: Site can be reduced more than 30% because an adjacent park will be used to meet a portion of the school's needs
   b. Good: Site meets but does not exceed the DOE minimum size requirements by more than 10%
   c. Poor: Site meets but exceeds the DOE minimum size requirements by more than 10%

2. Slope: (Slopes in excess of 15% are not usable.)

   a. Excellent: Major slope is between 1% and 3%
   b. Good: Major slope is between 3% and 10%
   c. Poor: Major slope is between 10% and 15%

3. Shape: (Generally, the shape should be rectangular. Length to width ratio of the site must not exceed 2.5:1.0. Higher length to width ratios severely restrict design flexibility of the complex and placement of facilities in their optimum arrangement.)

   a. Excellent: Length to width ratio 1.0:1.0 to 1.7:1.0
   b. Good: Length to width ratio 1.7:1.0 to 2.0:1.0
   c. Poor: Length to width ratio 2.0:1.0 to 2.5:1.0
4. Foundation: (UH Land Study Bureau Urban Land Classification Soil Character Code. The site must not be in a known or potential landslide area.)
   a. Excellent: Soil Character Code, I, II, VIII, and IX
   b. Good: Soil Character Code III, IV VI and VII
   c. Poor: Soil Character Code V with depth to consolidated material of 15 feet or less

5. Soils:
   a. Excellent: Site is composed of non-rocky soil with depth of over 10 ft, coral-rocky soil with depth of over 15 ft, or the soil type and depth listed in item (b) below with a major slope less than 3%
   b. Good: Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a 6 ft to 10 ft depth, coral-rocky soil with depth of 11 ft to 15 ft, or the soil type and depth listed in item (c) below with a major slope less than 3%
   c. Poor: Site is composed of (a) non-rocky soil with a 0 ft to 5-ft depth or (b) coral or rocky soil with a depth less than 11 ft or (c) marshy soil or (d) lava

6. Drainage: Site must not be in a major flood plain exposed to excessive storm water runoff if adequate drainage provisions, i.e., culverts, lined channels, etc., cannot be made at a reasonable cost
   a. Excellent: Site has adequate drainage facilities available to meet the ultimate school needs
   b. Good: Site will have adequate drainage facilities which are being developed to serve the interim and ultimate needs of the school
   c. Poor: Site has no drainage facility and may require development of a drainage system to specifically meet the school needs

7. Contours: (Alignment for ventilation and sun glare.)
   a. Excellent: Alignment of the contours fall within 22.5° of the east-west direction or the major slope of the site is 3% or less
   b. Good: Alignment of the contours fall within 22.5° of the north-south or northwest-southeast direction
   c. Poor: Alignment of the contours fall within 22.5° of the northeast-southwest direction

8. Aesthetic Value:
   a. Excellent: Site has some natural beauty in the form of trees, plants, brooks, rock formations, etc. which can be preserved and integrated into the school campus. Site is not crossed by overhead utility lines
b. Good: Site lacks most of the desirable natural beauty but still has the potential of becoming a beautiful campus through proper landscaping. Site is not crossed by overhead lines.
c. Poor: Site has no natural beauty whatsoever. Site is crossed by overhead lines.

B. Utilities

1. Water:
   a. Excellent: Site has adequate water pressure and capacity available to meet the ultimate school needs.
   b. Good: Existing water service is insufficient but adequate service is being developed which will meet interim and ultimate needs of the school.
   c. Poor: Site has inadequate water service and will require the development or extension of a water system to specifically meet the school's needs.

2. Sewer:
   a. Excellent: Site has adequate sewer lines available to meet the ultimate school needs.
   b. Good: Site will have adequate sewer service which is being developed to serve the interim and ultimate needs of the school.
   c. Poor: Site has no sewer service and will require construction of a septic tank or a sewage treatment plant to meet school needs.

3. Power and Communications:
   a. Excellent: Site has existing power and communications available to meet the ultimate school needs.
   b. Good: Site will have power and communications which are being developed to serve the interim and ultimate needs of the school.
   c. Poor: Site has insufficient power or communications available and will require improvement on these services to serve the school needs.

C. Accessibility

1. Pedestrian:
   a. Excellent: Site has pedestrian access from three sides.
   b. Good: Site has pedestrian access from two sides.
   c. Poor: Site has pedestrian access from only one side.
2. Automobile: The main access road to the school site should have at least a 56-foot wide right-of-way
   a. Excellent: Site has roadways along one short side and one long side
   b. Good: Site has roadways along one long side or two short sides
   c. Poor: Site has a roadway only along one short side

3. Bus Service:
   a. Excellent: Site is served by a major bus line running through the service area
   b. Good: A major bus line passes within reasonable (0.5 mile) distance of the site
   c. Poor: No bus service is available

4. Traffic:
   a. Excellent: The site is off a major roadway passing through the service area
   b. Good: Access to the site is via a through street capable of handling the heavy traffic at school opening and closing hours
   c. Poor: Access to the site is via a dead-end street

5. Safety: Site must not be located in a hazardous area from the standpoint of pedestrian and traffic safety unless adequate safety provisions can be made
   a. Excellent: Main access to the site is through an improved collector street free of blind corners, obstructions, and other hazards. Adequate and safe walkways to the site are available
   b. Good: Main access free of hazards and safe walkways to the site will be provided
   c. Poor: Access to the site is via a high speed, heavily traveled highway or a roadway with blind curves, obstructions, and other hazards. Walking to school is hazardous under existing roadway or traffic conditions

D. Environment

1. Highway Noise:
   Major Highway: A highway with posted speed limits of 35 mph or more
   Freeway: A controlled access highway with posted speed limits of 45 mph or more
   Truck Route: A roadway designated as such by the Department of Health
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The measured distance to be used in the application of the Highway Noise Criteria shall be the distance from the center of the traffic lane closest to the alternative site to the building setback line of the site.

a. Excellent: Site is more than 1,500 ft away from major highways, freeways and truck routes
b. Good: Site is 500 ft to 1,500 ft away from major highways, freeways and truck routes to keep the major vehicular noise to a level where normal conversation can be heard
c. Poor: Site is within 500 ft of a major highway, freeway or truck route

2. Aircraft Noise:

a. Excellent: Site is more than a mile away from the normal aircraft flight patterns into and out of airports and air bases
b. Good: Site is far enough away (0.5 to 1 mile) from the normal flight patterns to keep the noise level down to a level where normal conversation can be heard
c. Poor: Site is directly under (0 to 0.5 mile) the approach and takeoff pattern

3. Rainfall:

a. Excellent: Site has median annual rainfall less than 30 inches
b. Good: Site has median annual rainfall between 30 inches to 43 inches
c. Poor: Site has median annual rainfall greater than 43 inches

4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances:

a. Excellent: Site is free from noise, dust, odors, smoke, and other nuisances created by industrial or agricultural activities
b. Good: The noise, dust, odors, smoke, etc., nuisances from industrial or agricultural activities are at worst periodic but well within the limits of human toleration
c. Poor: The above mentioned nuisances cause considerable discomfort and hamper school activities

5. Attractive Nuisances:

a. Excellent: Site is more than 0.50 mile from commercial enterprises (bowling alleys, pool halls, stores, etc.) that attract students during school hours
b. Good: Site is reasonably far (0.25 to 0.50 mile) from distracting commercial centers
c. Poor: Site is within 0.25 mile of undesirable commercial enterprises
COMMUNITY SITE CRITERIA

A. Government

1. State Land Use District Map: Site must not be in a State Land Use Conservation District
   a. Excellent: Site is within an Urban District
   b. Good: Site is within a Rural District
   c. Poor: Site is in an Agricultural District

2. County General Plan:
   a. Excellent: Site is designated for school or institutional use on the Detail Land Use Map
   b. Good: Site is designated for residential, apartment, or park use
   c. Poor: Site is designated for commercial, hotel, industrial, agricultural, or open space use

3. County Zoning:
   a. Excellent: Site is zoned residential
   b. Good: Site is zoned agricultural
   c. Poor: Site is zoned hotel, business, industrial, or apartment

B. Community Effects

1. Displacement:
   a. Excellent: Site may be acquired without relocating any family, farm or business
   b. Good: Site may be acquired without relocating any farm or business or more than five families and living units
   c. Poor: Site cannot be acquired without the relocation of farms, businesses, or more than five families

2. Interference with Institutions:
   a. Excellent: Site is greater than 0.5 mile from hospitals, rest homes, and any other institutions which may be disturbed by large groups of students
   b. Good: Site is far enough away (0.25 to 0.5 mile) from any hospital, rest home, etc., so that any disturbance to the institution by the activities of the school will be minimal
   c. Poor: Site is adjacent to a hospital, rest home, or similar institution which may be disturbed by the activities of the school
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3. **Agricultural:** UH Land Study Bureau Agricultural Land Classification Productivity Rating.
   a. **Excellent:** Site is on land with very poor (E) productivity rating or a U designation
   b. **Good:** Site is on land with fair (C) to poor (D) productivity rating
   c. **Poor:** Site is on land with very good (A) to good (B) productivity rating

4. **Existing Use:** In changing the existing use of the site to school use, there should be minimum disruption to the existing living pattern of the community. The development must not destroy historic, cultural, or scenic buildings or sites.
   a. **Excellent:** Site is vacant and unused
   b. **Good:** Site is used for government agencies or institutions
   c. **Poor:** Site is used for agriculture, residences or private businesses

5. **Traffic:**
   a. **Excellent:** Site is located so that 3/4 of the morning work-bound traffic from the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic
   b. **Good:** Site is located so that 1/2 of the morning work-bound traffic from the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic
   c. **Poor:** Site is located so that less than 1/2 of the morning work-bound traffic from the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic

6. **Land Owners:**
   a. **Excellent:** Site owned by Federal, State or County government
   b. **Good:** Site owned by less than three individuals/business corporations
   c. **Poor:** Site owned by more than two individuals/business corporations

7. **Natural Beauty:**
   a. **Excellent:** Site is not an aesthetic asset to the community and will not interfere with scenic vistas when it is developed into a school
   b. **Good:** Site has little aesthetic value to the community or may partially obstruct scenic vistas when it is developed into a school
   c. **Poor:** Site is an aesthetic asset to the community or will obstruct scenic vistas when it is developed into a school

8. **Location:** Site must be in the ultimate service area.
   a. **Excellent:** Site is within reasonable walking distance (0.75 mile) of 75% of the students
   b. **Good:** Site is within walking distance of 50% of the students
   c. **Poor:** Site is within walking distance of less than 50% of the students
SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS

The following summarizes the evaluation for each candidate site based on school site criteria, community criteria, and cost considerations. The evaluation ratings and detailed explanations of cost considerations are given in Appendices C & E, respectively. It is emphasized that the intent of the Site Selection Study is not to recommend a single preferred site. It is a basis for discussing the relative advantages and disadvantages of each candidate site in an unbiased manner to facilitate a selection of a preferred site.

1. Summary of School Site Criteria Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Evaluation</th>
<th>OLOHENA SITE (1)</th>
<th>NONOU SITE (2)</th>
<th>WAILUA SITE (3)</th>
<th>KUHIO-S SITE (4)</th>
<th>KUHIO-L SITE (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contours</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Value</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power &amp; Comms</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Noise</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Noise</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind &amp; Ag Nuisances</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Nuisances</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT (E)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD (G)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Summary of Community Criteria Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Evaluation</th>
<th>OLOHENA SITE (1)</th>
<th>NONOU SITE (2)</th>
<th>WAILUA SITE (3)</th>
<th>KUHIO-S SITE (4)</th>
<th>KUHIO-L SITE (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLUDP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County General Plan</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Zoning</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference w/ Inst.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Owners</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Beauty</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS               | 2                | 3              | 1               | 1               | 1               |
| EXCELLENT (E)        | 5                | 7              | 7               | 7               | 7               |
| GOOD (G)             | 4                | 1              | 3               | 3               | 3               |

3. Grand Total of School Site Criteria and Community Criteria Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Site &amp; Community Criteria</th>
<th>OLOHENA SITE (1)</th>
<th>NONOU SITE (2)</th>
<th>WAILUA SITE (3)</th>
<th>KUHIO-S SITE (4)</th>
<th>KUHIO-L SITE (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT (E)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD (G)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR (P)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Community Concerns and Feelings

Representatives from the existing elementary and intermediate/high schools liked the aesthetics of Candidate Site 1. They felt access from three directions to Site 1 is very attractive (Wailua Homesteads, Kapahi, and Kapaa town).

They also spoke with some of the homeowners in the Wailua House Lots Subdivision and judging from their discussions, they interpreted the neighborhood did not want a school built near to the Wailua House Lots Subdivision (Candidate Site 3). Many of the Wailua House Lots Subdivision residents no longer have school age children. On the other hand, the school representatives indicated, "It is clear that the public wants a school built on the Olohena Site" (Candidate Site 1).
During the public informational meeting, members of the public brought up three concerns that need to be considered in the new elementary school’s masterplan and design phase of the work. They are,

1. Flooding with regards to Candidate Sites 4 and 5: Even though the sites were located outside of the flood zone as shown on the FIRM Map, they were still concerned with localized flooding that occurred in the past along the proposed locations of Candidate Sites 4 and 5. They said the flood waters had risen to levels about even with the top of the pavement in Kuhio Highway.

2. The adverse impact caused by the salt air: They felt the salt air would be damaging to the new school’s facilities. Such a concern needs to be addressed in the design phase of the work because the Kapaa area, being close to the shoreline, is exposed to some degree of salt in the air at one time or another depending upon weather and wind conditions.

3. The three proposed alignments for the Kapaa Bypass Road may impact on the final location of Candidate Sites 3, 4 and 5. They asked that the alignments be shown on the master plan should any of these candidate sites be chosen. Figure 18 on page II-28 was added to this report to give a general idea of the impacts each of the alignments will have on the candidate sites.

SITE COST CONSIDERATIONS

The following evaluates and compares the land acquisition and site costs for each candidate site.

Costs associated with the new construction work for the administration building, classroom buildings, cafeterium, physical education building, and other related plant facilities generally remain more or less uniform and could be applicable to any of the candidate sites. Such costs have therefore been omitted from the analysis since they don’t really impact substantially upon the cost differential between candidate sites regardless of which site is being compared.

1. Land Acquisition

Land acquisition costs account for land value, the value of improvements already existing on the land, and costs to relocate tenants and/or occupants using the land at the time of the acquisition. The 1993 assessed land and improvement valuations for each overall parcel on which a candidate site is situated was gotten from the County’s Tax Assessor’s Office. See Appendix H. The valuation amounts were then divided by the overall acreage of the respective parcel to arrive at a cost per acre value. It is this cost per acre value that was applied to the proposed 12 acre school site to establish an approximation of land cost for the respective candidate site. It is emphasized that the land value is only for comparing the five candidate sites on a common basis which, in this case, happens to be based on the assessed
valuation for tax purposes. This methodology is not intended to replace the formal appraisal process which will be performed once a site is chosen.

Since Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are presently under sugar cane cultivation, there may be a need to relocate and/or replace perceptible improvements in the forms of the existing cane haul road and irrigation systems. If such a relocation and/or replacement is necessary, then The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd should be compensated for such modifications. The exact extent of such modifications depends on the final siting of the new elementary school’s facilities. Hence the costs for such modifications remain uncertain and therefore could be considered to be a part of the contingency amounts shown in Appendix E for those candidate sites impacted. The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. should also be compensated for any crop damage resulting from the new elementary school’s construction unless the contractor exercises caution and avoids damaging the crops during construction.

The acquisition costs for Candidate Site 2 may need to provide for moving the cattle and relocating the people presently occupying the land. However, this may or may not be a significant cost factor since the site is State owned and the people are using it under a lease agreement with the State that may be revocable.

Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 all have a 20 year Agriculture Dedication. If Lihue Plantation Company uses any part of their parcel for anything other than agriculture, they would have to pay all the deferred taxes starting from the time the Dedication began (1974 for site 1 and 1979 for sites 3, 4, and 5) but for a period not to exceed ten years. However, if the State initiates the use conversion, there would be no deferred tax imposed on either the State or Lihue Plantation Company. See Appendix D for details regarding the Deferred Land Tax and Agricultural Land Dedication Assessment.

Costs for additional land to access a candidate site because it is removed from the nearest available government road or highway is included as a part of the land acquisition costs. Candidate Sites 1, 2, 4, and 5 need not consider this added cost since they already front directly to existing roads. Only Candidate Site 3 needs such a cost and, depending on which access route is adopted, the additional land cost for the access will vary.
2. Land Acquisition Costs

A. Derivation of Cost Per Acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Site</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Overall Area</th>
<th>Assessed Valuation</th>
<th>Cost/Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>175.181</td>
<td>$37,800.00</td>
<td>$215.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>12.358</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>287.900</td>
<td>$81,600.00</td>
<td>$283.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>287.900</td>
<td>$81,600.00</td>
<td>$283.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>287.900</td>
<td>$81,600.00</td>
<td>$283.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Determination of Land Cost for each Candidate Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Site</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Land Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>$2,589.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>12.358</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>$3,401.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>$3,401.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LPCo</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>$3,401.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Computing Additional Land Cost (Candidate Site 3 only)

Candidate Site 3 has no direct access to, nor frontage along, an existing road or highway. Hence a new access route is needed. Three access alternates are given below to obtain a range of costs for the access.

Alternate 1 (Access From Kuhio Highway)

Using a 56 feet wide right of way width, and traveling directly across the impacted parcel from the site to Kuhio Highway, the cost is approximated as:

- Approximate Length of Access Road = 2230' (measured on TMK map)
- Right of Way width = 56'
- Access Road Area = ((2230)(56))/43560 = (2.87 acres)
- Alternate 1 Cost = (2.87)($283.43) = $813.44
Alternative 2 (Access From Hale Place)

Based on a new access road being built from Hale Place directly to the site. The additional land cost using this alternate must also provide for the purchase of two private parcels between Hale Place and the candidate site to create the required corridor. The costs are approximated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
<th>Value of Existing Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1-08:49</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$82,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-08:50</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate 3 (Access From Eggerking Road)

Considers a new access being built from Eggerking Road directly to the site. The additional land cost under this alternate must provide for buying three private lots between Eggerking Road and the site to create the required corridor. The costs are approximated as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
<th>Value of Existing Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1-08:88</td>
<td>$150,600.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-08:13</td>
<td>$291,700.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-08:29</td>
<td>$396,200.00</td>
<td>$34,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The rights of ways for both Hale Place and Eggerking Road are less than 56ft. Hale Place's existing right of way width is only 30ft and it will ultimately be widened by the County to 40ft in the future. Eggerking Road's existing right of way width is only 40ft and it will ultimately be widened by the County to 44ft in the future. Both ultimate rights of ways for the two roads will continue to be less than the DOE required width of 56 feet for a right of way.

Existing homes along both sides of Hale Place and Eggerking Road will also be impacted by school traffic should either Alternate 2 or Alternate 3 be chosen.

The analysis adopts Alternate 1 for use in the cost comparisons. Alternates 2 and 3 routes are possible but they involve condemnation of adjoining properties and the displacement of owners to enable the existing ROW's to be widened. The land acquisition costs, displacement of people, and the construction of new road improvements make Alternates 2 and 3 uneconomical.

3. Onsite Development Costs: The costs used to analyze the onsite development work for the candidate sites were derived from actual bid amounts for two recently
completed projects. They are the Hanamaulu Elementary School on Kauai and Phase 1 of the Millilani Mauka Elementary School on Oahu.

The actual bid amounts for these two schools were analyzed, averaged, resolved to a per sqft basis for the area being cleared and grubbed. Then the bid amounts were projected from the time of the actual bid opening to the end of 1995 and further adjusted for location as needed. The resulting per sqft cost for onsite development amounted to approximately $8.57 per sqft. See Appendix E. In turn, this cost was then applied to the area being cleared and grubbed for each of the candidate sites. The costs for the various sites were summarized and tabulated along with other costs in the following Table A.

The onsite development costs include the following work,

**Clearing:** Clearing and grubbing costs vary from site to site depending on the kind of vegetation being removed and the amount of material being cleared and grubbed. Since Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are presently used for sugar cane cultivation, it can be presumed the costs for these sites will not differ significantly. The clearing and grubbing costs for Candidate Site 2 however, can be expected to be considerably more since the site contains improvements. All the sites are relatively near to the County’s existing solid waste disposal facility on Apapoo Road. Debris disposal from the work should not be a problem.

**Grading:** Grading costs depend on the slope conditions and land characteristics at each site. The grading costs for Candidate Site 2 can be expected to be considerably more because the site features include rolling hills with some steep grades. On the other hand, Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 have relatively flat slopes and the grading work is anticipated to be almost same between them.

**Water:** Onsite water distribution costs will be relatively same for all sites since each site has access to, and will be using the public water system that is available as compared to the need for drilling a new water well and/or constructing new storage facilities. The costs would provide for, but not be limited to, service lines, valving, reaction blocks, along with excavation and backfilling for the placement of the lines.

**Wastewater:** While there are existing sewer facilities presently available to serve nearby areas, all of the candidate sites are beyond the County’s designated sewer service areas. The possibility exists that certain planned projects in the designated sewer service areas that are already committed for service by the existing sewer facilities may fall out in future years and be canceled. At that time, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve additional areas or other projects such as the proposed Kapaa II Elementary School. The reallocation process will not be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Site</td>
<td>Olohe Site</td>
<td>Nonou Site</td>
<td>Wailua Site</td>
<td>Kuhio-S Site</td>
<td>Kuhio-L Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise Known As</td>
<td>4-03-03:01</td>
<td>4-01-00:17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
<td>4-03-02:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Key</td>
<td>LPCa</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>LPCa</td>
<td>LPCa</td>
<td>LPCa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned By*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Desired (Acres)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,358</td>
<td>14,866</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Land Acquisition Cost**       |            |            |            |            |            |
| For 12 acre site              |            |            |            |            |            |
| For access drive to site      |            |            |            |            |            |
| Onsite infrastructure         |            |            |            |            |            |
| (includes clear, grub, grade, parking areas, concrete walks, fire lane, water system, sewer system, drain system, exterior electric, fencing, landscaping, etc) | $2,590.00 | none | $3,410.00 | $3,410.00 | $3,410.00 |
| Demolition & removal of extg house |            |            |            |            |            |
| $4,478,000.00                  | $4,630,000.00 | $4,478,000.00 | $4,478,000.00 | $4,478,000.00 | $4,478,000.00 |
| Septic System & Disposal Field |            |            |            |            |            |
| Septic Tank & Installation    | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 |
| Disposal Field Construction   | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 |
| Access Driveway               |            |            |            |            |            |
| $4,200.00                     | $8,000.00  | $23,600.00 | none       | none       | none       |
| $936,000.00                   | $520,000.00 | $289,800.00 | none       | none       | none       |
| $529,968.00                   | $476,894.00 | $78,260.00  | $293,782.00 | $454,920.00 |
| $306,750.00                   | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 |
| $117,700.00                   | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 | $117,700.00 |
| $306,750.00                   | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 | $306,750.00 |
| $4,554,630.00                 |            |            |            |            |            |

| Offsite Infrastructure        |            |            |            |            |            |
| Citizen’s Electric Costs      | $4,200.00  | $8,000.00  | $23,600.00 | none       | none       |
| Dept of Water Supply Costs    |            |            |            |            |            |
| (DWS line upgrade or new installation) | $936,000.00 | $520,000.00 | $289,800.00 | none       | none       |
| Full Frontage Improvements    | $529,968.00 | $476,894.00 | $78,260.00  | $293,782.00 | $454,920.00 |
| (includes clear, grub, grade, guardrails, curb, gutter, sidewalk, pavement, wheelchair and driveway ramp, street trees, etc) |            |            |            |            |            |
| Frontage Length (feet)        | 1170       | 1000       | 130        | 555        | 945        |
| Cost per lin ft of frontage improvements | $452.98  | $476.89  | n/a        | $457.26    | $481.40    |
| Total Estimated Costs         | $6,375,208.00 | $6,084,444.00 | $6,853,065.00 | $5,158,642.00 | $6,360,780.00 |

*LPCa denotes Lihue Plantation Company, State denotes State of Hawaii
**Land Acquisition costs based on Agriculture zoned land. Acquisition costs after rezoning will be subject to increases.
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automatic but will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, it is assumed each candidate site will need to be served by an on-site wastewater treatment system. Designs for the wastewater treatment system must meet the State Health Department and Kauai County requirements.

The onsite costs for wastewater collection, handling, and effluent disposal will be almost same for all sites because each needs to construct the collection lines, treatment facility, leach field and/or seepage pit with piping for effluent disposal inclusive of excavation & backfill for placement of the improvements.

**Drainage:** Onsite costs for the drain system should be almost similar. Each site already has some means of conveying and handling runoff. Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 may possibly use existing irrigation ditches in the area to convey runoff away from the sites while Candidate Site 2 has an existing reservoir to use as a detention basin for the runoff. The costs will allow for construction of the necessary collection lines, manholes, inlets, and drywells, along with the excavation and backfill work for the placement of the improvements.

**Power & Communications:** Power and communications costs are estimated to be same for all sites because each site will use services provided by the Kauai Electric Division of Citizens Utilities and GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company.

**Onsite Parking:** Onsite costs for new parking areas and access drives provide for the preparation of the subgrade, compaction, base course material, asphaltic concrete pavement material, concrete curbs, concrete gutters where applicable, striping for parking stalls, and pavement markers where needed. While the final layout will differ between sites, this analysis presumes the differences will not be major and therefore, costs for this category of work are held to be uniform.

**Access Drives:** Candidate Site 1 fronts Oloheha Road; Candidate Site 2 fronts Haleiilo Road; and Candidate Sites 4 and 5 front Kuhio Highway. The new parking areas for these sites will connect directly to each respective street. No access drives will be needed for them.

Candidate Site 3 however, is away from existing roads and will need an access drive to connect its new parking areas to the existing road(s). There are three possible access drive alignments. However, two of the existing roads to which the access drive can connect, Hale Place and Eggerking Road, are substandard in width and are separated from the candidate site by existing residential homes. Connecting the new parking areas to these two roads will require upgrading the existing substandard conditions. Acquisition of additional properties from neighboring parcels, possible displacement of some residents along the existing roads to widen the existing rights of way, and then constructing the new improvements deems these routes unfeasible. A more reasonable route for the access drive would be to connect directly to the existing Kuhio Highway approximately 2230 ft away. This route will be through a sugar cane field on
the same parcel as the candidate site. The access drive costs under this basis is shown on Table A. Detailed costs are shown on Table C-3 in Appendix E.

4. Offsite Development Costs

Intersection Improvements: This work allows for the connection of the new access drives to the existing road pavements, concrete curbs and sidewalks, wheelchair ramps, a pedestrian crosswalk, and traffic signals. The new concrete curbs and sidewalks would be along the entire frontage of the new candidate site. See Appendix E. If a lesser frontage is considered rather than that shown, the cost per linear feet of frontage improvements shown in Table A can be used to determine the reduced frontage improvement costs. Costs for this work are given in Table A. Detailed breakdown costs are also given in Tables C-1, C-2, C-4, and C-5 for Candidate Sites 1, 2, 4, and 5 respectively in Appendix E.

Water: The County’s Department of Water Supply (DWS) indicates the existing source facilities for off-site water is adequate. They however, cannot assure adequate storage facilities will be available at the time of the actual development. Additionally, the DWS says the existing water transmission facilities are not adequate for handling the proposed domestic and fire flows for the new school (See Appendix F). The following are the upgrade needs as per the DWS for each of the candidate sites along with the estimated costs for the work.

Candidate Site 1: Upgrade approximately 5,850 ft of existing 12" waterline to a new 16" waterline beginning at the intersection of Kawaihau and Kaapuni Roads (Ornellas Tank) along Kaapuni Road to the County’s Stable Tank Site.

Approximate $ = 5,850ft x $ 160.00 = $ 936,000.00

Candidate Site 2: Replace approximately 4,000' of existing 6" waterline along Kuumoo Road with a new 8" waterline, beginning at the intersection of Kuumoo and Kamalu Roads then running southwest along Kuumoo Road and reconnecting back to the same existing 6" waterline.

Approximate $ = 4,000ft x $ 130.00 = $ 520,000.00

Candidate Site 3: DWS says the existing water transmission facilities in Kuhio Highway are adequate. Based on 2,230ft of new 8 inch waterline being installed with the new access road work.

Approximate $ = 2,230ft x $ 130.00 = $ 289,900.00

Candidate Site 4: DWS says the existing transmission facilities along Kuhio Highway are adequate.
**Candidate Site 5:** DWS says the existing transmission facilities along Kuhio Highway are adequate.

**Wastewater:** Offsite wastewater facilities development is not expected since each candidate site is assumed to have its own onsite wastewater treatment system as discussed earlier.

**Power & Communications:** Kauai Electric Division of Citizens Utilities has reviewed each of the candidate sites and have determined the cost to bring electric power to each candidate site to be,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Site</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telephone service in the service area is provided by GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company. Telephone service to each of the five candidate sites will be provided by Service Connections as defined in their PUC Tariff No. 1 Section 2. A summary of the Service Connections tariff is given in GTE Hawaiian Tel's letter in Section XIV of this document.

According to GTE Hawaiian Tel, Candidate Sites 1, 2, 4, and 5 are relatively close to existing GTE Hawaiian Tel facilities and may not, depending on the individual telephone service routing, require Aid To Construction charges. Candidate Site 3, if serviced from Kuhio Highway, will require Aid To Construction charges. If the service is from the much closer Eggerking Road in the Wailua House lots Subdivision, Aid To Construction charges may not be needed depending upon the service routing. See GTE Hawaiian Tel’s letter in Section XIV for additional details.
V. PROBABLE IMPACTS
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V. PROBABLE IMPACTS AND MITIGATIVE MEASURES

A. Short Term Impacts

The development of the new elementary school will create certain short-term impacts that would affect each of the candidate sites or the lands near them. Such impacts are generally associated with activities such as the site grading, utility installation, construction of infrastructure improvements, and project landscaping.

Short-term impacts for the five candidate sites will vary depending upon its location and the land use types near to each of them. For instance, the impact of disruption and noise from the construction activities will be greater for Candidate Site 2 than for Candidate Site 1 because Candidate Site 2 happens to be in a residential neighborhood whereas Candidate Site 1 is in a sugar cane field away from people.

The following describes the anticipated construction noise, air quality, construction wastes, water quality, public health and safety, flora and fauna, economic, traffic, and archaeological/historical impacts that are associated with construction work.

1. Construction Noise:

Noise levels will increase during construction and the areas most sensitive to these noise increases will be the residential areas near Candidate Sites 2 and 3. Candidate Site 2 is the most sensitive of all the five sites being surrounded by existing residential homes on all four sides. The existing road widths between Candidate Site 2 and the adjacent residential homes are also narrow.

Construction noise generated on Candidate Site 3 will affect the existing homes in the Wailua House Lots Subdivision on the site’s west side. The noise impact on the other remaining sides of Candidate Site 3 will be minimal because those sides abut sugar cane fields. Candidate Site 1’s construction noise impact is also anticipated to be minimal since it too is in a sugar cane field away from residential homes and businesses.

Construction noise created on Candidate Sites 4 and 5 will only affect people traveling along Kuhio Highway and possibly the businesses across the highway. Such noise will be from heavy equipment used to excavate and move soils, vehicles and equipment used for delivery and moving construction materials, heavy construction equipment, and other worker generated activities normally found on construction sites.

To keep construction noise impacts to a minimum, the contractor will be expected to comply with all applicable regulations including Title 11 of the Department of Health Administrative Rules, Chapters 42 and 43. The contractor will also be responsible for the proper maintenance of the
construction equipment on the project and his work should be limited to daylight hours only.

2. **Air Quality:**

Air quality will decrease during construction - especially during grading work when dust and dirt particles become airborne. To mitigate this impact, the contractor will be required to implement measures to minimize airborne particles. The contractor must also comply with the State Department of Health’s Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 59 and 60 along with other applicable Kauai County Rules and Ordinances. Adherence to the approved erosion control plans and the use of dust control methods such as water sprinkling will also help to reduce adverse air quality caused by the construction work.

The contractor will be expected to take proper care of, and maintain the construction equipment during the course of the work to keep adverse impacts on the air quality from the construction equipment emissions to a minimum.

3. **Construction Wastes:**

Depending on the candidate site chosen, the type and quantity of construction wastes will vary. The contractor will not be allowed to accumulate construction wastes on the site to the point where it becomes overbearing and thus impact on surrounding areas and environment. The contractor will be expected to maintain a clean work site and dispose the accumulation of construction wastes properly and on a timely basis. Proper measures shall be used to minimize any impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods and environment - especially when transporting the construction wastes for disposal.

4. **Water Quality:**

Construction of the new elementary school should not adversely affect water quality in the area.

The only site that has a surface body of water - the existing reservoir - that could become affected is Candidate Site 2. Except for watering cattle, this reservoir is not used as a drinking water source nor for recreational activities.

The contractor will need to implement the appropriate erosion controls such as interceptor ditches, sediment ponds, and/or silt traps during construction. The erosion control practices used shall be in accordance with State and County erosion control standards to minimize adverse water quality impacts. The contractor will also be expected to comply with Title 11, Department of Health Administrative Rules, Chapters 54 and 55. The contractor shall also be responsible for preventing chemicals, soils, and debris from entering the reservoir during the landscaping and construction work.
5. **Public Health and Safety:**

The contractor will be expected to implement the necessary measures to assure public health and safety throughout all phases of the construction work. The construction areas are to be secured by adequate safety signs and other safety devices and/or measures as required by the State and County regulations during all non-working hours (nights, weekends, and holidays).

6. **Flora and Fauna:**

The United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service does not anticipate any significant adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources. Their response letter had stated, “the five candidate sites lack wetland areas and do not provide habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species.”

The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii has no record of any known rare or endangered species of flora or fauna on any of the five candidate sites. They however, did record 9 cases of sensitive flora and fauna in the overall school service area. See Appendix G for more information and locations.

7. **Economic:**

The short term economic impact from the construction work for the new school includes expansion of job opportunities to local construction personnel. Local material suppliers and retail businesses in the project area will also benefit from the increased construction activities.

8. **Traffic:**

Trucks, heavy equipment and other construction-related vehicles will be using existing roads to haul away and import materials during the construction period. Local traffic along these roads may occasionally encounter minor delays. These delays should be of short duration and consist primarily of vehicles that ingress and egress to and from the project site. The contractor will be responsible for providing the necessary traffic controls and precautions to maintain traffic flow and safety on the roads next to and in the vicinity of the work site. Traffic impacts will be primarily along Olohalena Road for Candidate Site 1; Haleililo Road for Candidate Site 2, and Kuhio Highway for Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5.

9. **Archaeological/Historical:**

The State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) of the Department of Land and Natural Resources has no research or past written documentation on any archaeological and/or historical worth for any of the five candidate sites. However, the SHPD feels there is a good possibility of candidate sites 3, 4, and 5 having some archaeologically and/or historically rich deposits since there were some deposits and burial grounds found on the makai side of the existing
highway. The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. however, says if Candidate Site 3 falls entirely within the sugarcane growing area, it is unlikely that archaeological and/or historical sites are present.

SHPD says there's a good chance Candidate Site 1 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich if the school site doesn't encroach into any of the nearby valleys. Also, Candidate Site 2 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich since there is already an existing reservoir and an occupied dwelling on the site. To be sure, an archaeological inventory survey of the chosen site should be conducted to insure that no archaeological, historical or cultural resources of significance are impacted by the proposed new school development. Should any resources be found at the chosen site, mitigation and/or preservation plans will need to be prepared in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Division at the Department of Land and Natural Resources, the Kauai County Planning Department, and the Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission. The Kauai Island Burial Council will also be involved in the preparation of the mitigation and/or preservation plans if human burials are found.

B. Long Term Impacts

1. Flora and Fauna:

The United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service does not anticipate significant adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources that may result from construction of the new school. They've already stated, "the five candidate sites lack wetland areas and do not provide habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species."

The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii has also indicated no rare or endangered species of flora and/or fauna are known to exist at any of the candidate sites. Vegetation loss because of necessary clearing and grubbing of the project site will be effectively mitigated with new landscape plantings for the new school campus. The impact on any existing fauna is anticipated to be minimal and unavoidable. Landscaping associated with the new school should provide an adequate nesting and feeding environment for the birds that are commonly found in the area. The displacement of mammals such as mice and rats are not regarded as an adverse impact.

The native Hawaiian seabird, Newell's Shearwater, listed as "threatened" under the Federal Endangered Species Act, is known to nest in the interior mountains above the Wailua area. Shearwaters leaving their nests at night can become disoriented and confused by urban lights and may become exhausted or fly into unseen objects such as utility wires, trees, buildings and automobiles. The new school's lighting facilities can be designed and located to minimize attraction and confusion impacts on the Newell's Shearwater. Avoidance of situations where light glare projects upward or laterally, particularly during the critical fallout period of October and November, will help reduce adverse impacts on
this unique species. New lighting fixtures should be shielded and aimed downward to reduce potential “fallout” (exhaustion and/or collision with structures brought on by attraction to and disorientation from bright lights) of Newell’s Shearwaters during the spring and summer nesting season.

2. Social:

The New Kapaa II Elementary School will provide for vital educational needs to the ever rising and up-coming communities between the Moikeha Canal and the Wailua River. The new school is needed to help relieve the existing Kapaa Elementary School - which also happens to be the only existing elementary school in the Kapaa area. Since the population in the Kapaa area is growing rapidly, a second elementary school is needed to help serve the public.

The new school’s facilities can be designed to minimize the impacts of noise on nearby residences from the new school’s activities. Building orientation and location, fences, walls, and landscape plantings can help achieve this objective.

3. Public Health and Safety:

All five candidate sites are generally free from flood, tsunami, erosion and landslide hazards. The new school’s design however, should consider the possible flooding impact as pointed out by the people attending the public informational meeting. Layout and design of the new school’s structures should also consider the impact of tropical storm and/or hurricane force winds so that people using the new school as a shelter in the future will be safe from the potentially destructive hazards of floods and strong winds.

Oloheha Road fronting Candidate Site 1 has blind curves and fast flowing traffic. Fast traffic flow however, can be controlled with the proper traffic control measures and devices. Candidate Site 2 is not expected to have high speed traffic in the area since Haleiwi Road is not a major highway. It currently travels through an older residential area. Candidate Site 3 is next to the Wailua House Lots Subdivision which is an older urbanized residential area where traffic speeds are already controlled. Exhaust fumes from cane haulers using the existing cane haul road nearby may impact Candidate Site 3. Candidate Sites 4 and 5 are adjacent to Kuhio Highway where high traffic speeds are common and will impact on the children’s safety. A well planned traffic control system using sufficient sight distance and the proper traffic control devices can help mitigate this condition. The final layout and design of the selected school site must also consider the proposed Kapaa Bypass Road, since its alignment may significantly impact on the final layout and suitability of the new school site.

All the candidate sites are near existing cane fields where dust, smoke, noise and exhaust fumes generated by sugar cane planting, growing, and harvesting operations will impact the new school. Once a school site is selected, the location and orientation of the school facilities will need to consider these
impacts. Fences, walls, and landscape plantings may be used to mitigate the noise impacts. To mitigate cane operation impacts, it is anticipated that both the State and The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. can work together amicably to schedule certain cane activities to occur during times when school is not in session.

Besides addressing the final location and orientation of the new school’s facilities to avoid or minimize adverse impacts as discussed previously, Candidate Site 1 must also consider the proximity of the new facilities from nearby high voltage electric lines. Students, teachers and others using the new school should be protected from its electromagnetic radiation field. This concern must be resolved if Candidate Site 1 is chosen.

4. Displacement:

Candidate Sites 1, 3, 4, and 5 are presently under sugar cane cultivation. There may be a need to relocate and/or replace certain perceptible improvements such as portions of the existing cane haul road and/or irrigation systems. If this need exists, then The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd should be compensated accordingly. They should also be compensated for crop damages that may be sustained from the new school’s construction work. To minimize disruption to the sugar cane growing activities, the State should work closely with The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd. through all phases of the new school’s development.

There is an occupied residential dwelling on Candidate Site 2. The people living in that dwelling may need to be displaced.

There will also be a need to displace people if a new access drive is built at the end of the existing dead-end street for access to Candidate Site 3. Several houses will also need to be moved elsewhere or demolished since the road extension will be over and across private lots at the end of the dead-end street. Widening of the existing dead-end streets will also be an additional impact on the residents living along the access road alignment. Displacement impact for Candidate Site 3 can be mitigated if a new access road is constructed to connect the site directly to Kuhio Highway.

5. Infrastructure:

Evaluations of the various infrastructure systems such as the drainage, water, sewer, power, and communications systems have been conducted for each of the five candidate sites.

Appendix E in the back of this report presents detailed information concerning the various costs for the onsite and offsite construction work. Detailed information pertaining to water and power for each of the candidate sites are given in Appendix F.
It is to be noted that the demand on the infrastructure systems as given in this report are based on present available data and may differ when a final site is chosen and the existing detailed conditions such as soil type, population count, and exact school size can be firmed.

It is anticipated the new elementary school will need a maximum water daily demand of about 279,000 gallons per day (gpd) and a required fire flow of 2,000 gallons per minute (gpm) for a duration of 2 hours. The water system should also be able to deliver a peak hour flow of about 558,000 gpd without fire flow.

These amounts are based on a 12 acre school site having a population of 750 students and 30 staff persons resulting in a total school population of 780 people. Using an average daily demand of 2,500 gallons per acre plus 20 gallons per person, the average daily demand is about 186,000 gpd. Multiplying the average daily demand by a factor of 1.5, the maximum daily demand is determined as indicated above. Multiplying the average daily demand by a factor of 3, the peak hour flow is determined as indicated above. The water consumption demands and demand factors are derived from the Water System Standards, State of Hawaii, dated 1985, Volume 1.

Kauai County Department of Water has jurisdiction over the water service in the school service area. The existing source facilities for the Wailua-Kapaa area are adequate for these candidate sites. The existing storage facilities for the Wailua-Kapaa area however, are nearing capacity and the Department of Water cannot assure that adequate storage facilities will be available to service the proposed school at the actual time of its development. Additionally, the existing transmission facilities are not adequate for handling the proposed domestic and fire flows for Candidate Sites 1 and 2. The Department of Water says the existing transmission facilities along Kuhio highway are adequate for Candidate Sites 4 and 5. Candidate Site 3 however, is about 2,230 feet away from Kuhio highway. As a result, construction of a new waterline to serve Candidate Site 3 is needed. Section IV of this document gives the details on the impacted transmission facilities.

Electric power and services in the proposed school service area will be by the Kauai Electric Division of Citizens Utilities Company. They say the existing transmission lines and the distribution lines are adequate to serve all the candidate sites. But, the existing distribution lines must be extended to the exact location for each of the candidate sites in order to provide service.

Telephone services in the proposed service area is provided by GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company. Telephone service to each of the five candidate sites will be provided according to the Service Connections as defined in their PUC Tariff No. 1, Section 2. A summary of the Service Connections tariff is given in GTE Hawaiian Tel’s letter in Section XIV of this document.
Page 6 of Appendix E estimates the new school will produce a wastewater flow of about 19,200 gpd. There are existing sewer facilities available to serve the nearby areas but all of the candidate sites happen to be beyond the County's designated sewer service areas. This means there are no public sewers available to service any of the candidate sites. It is possible however, that certain planned projects in the designated sewer service areas that already have commitments for service by the existing public facilities may fall out in future years and/or be canceled. At that time, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve additional areas or other projects such as the proposed Kapaa II Elementary School. The reallocation process is not automatic and will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, it is assumed each candidate site will need to be served by an on-site wastewater treatment system. The system must be designed to meet the State Health Department and Kauai County requirements.

C. Beneficial Impacts

The new Kapaa II Elementary School will relieve the overcrowding conditions at the existing Kapaa Elementary School and also create two manageable elementary schools in the Kapaa area. Other beneficial impacts include the temporary economic benefits from the construction expenditures and employment opportunities as related to the construction of the new school. Permanent employment opportunities such as teaching, school administration and other related school positions needed for the operation and maintenance of the school will be available once the school opens.
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS
The University of Hawaii Land Study Bureau classifies the candidate sites for intensive agriculture as,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Site</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Moderate suited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Uns suited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Well suited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Well suited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Well suited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The map showing the Generalized Classification of Lands According to Suitability for Intensive Agriculture appears as Figure 16.

7. Wetlands:

The Wetlands and Wetland Vegetation of Hawaii Publication by Margaret Elliott and Erin Marie Hall shows a wetland in the service area. It is the Kapaa Marsh located west of Kapaa town. The wetland is almost a mile long and is bisected by a cane road off of Highway 581. See Figure 17.

The vegetative cover at the marsh is dominated by the Brachiaria mutica with some Commelina diffusa and scattered amounts of Sagittaria sagittaeolia. Hibiscus tiliaceus, eugenia cumini and Schinus terebinthifolius border the marsh. Beyond its borders are sugar cane fields. Two areas of the marsh show signs of active land use. One is on the north side that is currently used for cattle grazing. The other is on the south central side where grazing also occurs. Ducks and indigenous black-crowned night heron were sighted in the marsh area. See Table 1 for a listing of the species found in the Kapaa Marsh.

The closest site to the Kapaa marsh is Candidate Site 1 which is about 0.25 miles away at an elevation about 80 feet higher than the marsh. The other candidate sites are about 2.25 miles away. According to the US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, “the five candidate sites lack wetland areas and do not provide habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species.”

8. Archaeological/Historical Sites:

The State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) records at the Department of Land and Natural Resources show no research or past written documentation on any of the candidate sites regarding archaeological and/or historical worth. They say Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 may have good possibilities of being archaeologically and/or historically rich since deposits and burial grounds were found on the makai side of the highway. However, The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd, says if Candidate Site 3 falls entirely within the sugarcane growing area, it is unlikely that archaeological/historical sites are present. SHPD says Candidate Site 1 has a good chance of not being archaeologically and/or historically rich provided it doesn’t encroach into any of the nearby valleys.
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Figure 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY NAME</th>
<th>SPECIES NAME</th>
<th>Cover</th>
<th>Abundance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILICINAE</td>
<td>Ceratopterys silicifera</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOCOTYLEDONAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALISMATACEAE</td>
<td>Sagittaria sagittifolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMELINACEAE</td>
<td>Commandaria diffusa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYPERACEAE</td>
<td>*Cyperus alternifolius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Cyperus brevifolius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Cyperus difformis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Cyperus laevigatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Fimbristylis dichotoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Scirpus validus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMINEAE</td>
<td>Brachiaria mutica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coix lacryma-jobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echinochloa colona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Echinochloa crusgalli</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paspalum conjugatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paspalum urvillei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICOTYLEDONAE</td>
<td>Schinus terebinthifolius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGUMINOSAE</td>
<td>Cassia alata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALVACEAE</td>
<td>Hibiscus tiliaceus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRTACEAE</td>
<td>Eugenia cumini</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONAGRAEACE</td>
<td>Ludwigia octovalvis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Obligate species
* Faculative species
1 = <5% cover; 2 = 5-25%; 3 = 26-50%; 4 = 51-75%; 5 = 76-100%
R = Rare; O = Occasional; F = Frequent; A = Abundant; V = Very abundant
Candidate Site 2 may also not be archaeologically and/or historically rich since there is already an existing reservoir and an occupied dwelling on it.

9. Scenic Characteristics:

The Sleeping Giant is a popular scenic site with the locals and tourists. It, along with the lush vegetation, establishes the backdrop setting for the west side of the service area. The Pacific Ocean with waves breaking over the reef sets the scenery along the east side of the service area.

10. Topography:

Most of the topography in the service area is relatively flat with surrounding hills. Except for the mountainous slope conditions in the Nonou forest reserve, most of the slopes at the candidate sites are generally between 1% and 6%, more or less, with the exception of Candidate Site 2 which contains an existing reservoir and has slopes ranging from about 5% to 18%, more or less.

11. Highways and Streets:

Kuhio Highway has a 60 feet wide right of way and is the only major highway in the service area. The State Department of Transportation has indicated there will be a Kapaa Bypass Road that runs through Kapaa. They have three alternate alignments for the Bypass Road, each of which is subject to change. The alignments are shown in Figure 18. Their rights of ways will be 120 feet wide. Projected construction start date will be about 6 years hence.

Other local streets to the candidate sites vary in right of way widths. Most are two (2) lane streets with one lane in each direction. The Kauai County Planning Department records show the streets near the candidate sites to have the following existing and future rights of ways (ROW). Streets shown with an asterisk (*) denotes streets already used by school busses.

### ACCESS STREET TO SITE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Road Name</th>
<th>Existing ROW</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oloheha Road*</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>60 ft (major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Streets in near proximity to Oloheha Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehua Street*</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulu Street*</td>
<td>36 ft</td>
<td>56 ft (collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukui Street*</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>56 ft (collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauwila Street</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaapuni Road</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>56 ft (collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apopo Road*</td>
<td>32 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malu Road*</td>
<td>32 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENTATIVE ALIGNMENTS FOR THE KAPAA BYPASS

Note: The alignments shown are very preliminary and are subject to change. No EIS for the project has commenced.
Olohe Road fronts Candidate Site 1. The other streets connect to Olohe Road. Lehua, Kukui, and Kauwila Streets connect to Kuhio Highway. Although Lehua and Kukui Streets are classified as a minor and collector street respectively, the Kauai County Planning Department says the County will not reduce the existing 60 ft wide right of way for either street.

**ACCESS STREETS TO SITE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Road Name</th>
<th>Existing ROW</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haleiilo Road*</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>56 ft (collector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makani Road*</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaulana Road*</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These streets all front Candidate Site 2. Haleiilo Road also connects to Kuhio Highway.

**CANDIDATE SITE 3 WILL NEED A NEW ACCESS STREET TO CONNECT THE SCHOOL SITE TO KUHIO HIGHWAY**

Streets close to Candidate Site 3 but with no direct access to the site. Private residential lots are situated between them and Candidate Site 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Road Name</th>
<th>Existing ROW</th>
<th>Road Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eggerking Street</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>44 ft (minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale Place</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>40 ft (dead end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeke Place</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>40 ft (dead end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laokea Place</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>40 ft (dead end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miulana Place</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
<td>40 ft (dead end)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Haleiilo Road connects the above streets to Kuhio Highway.

Candidate Sites 4 and 5 will have their access directly off of Kuhio Highway. These two sites and possibly Candidate Site 3 will be impacted by the future Kapaa Bypass Road. Their final locations must be coordinated with the State Department of Transportation.
E. Socioeconomic Characteristics

1. Population taken from the Hawai‘i Data Disc (Published 1993):

1990 Census for Kapaa

URBAN AND RURAL RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>8,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban population</td>
<td>8,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of total population</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 3 years and over enrolled in school</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preprimary school</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or high school</td>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in private school</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 25 years and over</td>
<td>4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates degree</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESIDENCE IN 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 5 years and over</td>
<td>7,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in same house</td>
<td>3,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in different house in U.S.</td>
<td>3,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same State</td>
<td>2,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different county</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different State</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived abroad</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISABILITY OF CIVILIAN NON INSTITUTIONALIZED PERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 16 to 64 years</td>
<td>4,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a mobility or self-care limitation</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a mobility limitation</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a self-care limitation</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a work disability</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevented from working ................................................. 146
Persons 65 years and over............................................. 801
With a mobility or self-care limitation.............................. 186
With a self-care limitation............................................ 144

2. Income taken from the Hawai’i Data Disc (Published 1993):

1990 Census for Kapaa

INCOME IN 1989
Households ........................................................................ 2,541
Less than $5,000 .............................................................. 125
$5,000 to $9,999.............................................................. 167
$10,000 to $14,999 ......................................................... 175
$15,000 to $24,999 ......................................................... 491
$25,000 to $34,999 ......................................................... 466
$35,000 to $49,999 ......................................................... 488
$50,000 to $74,999 ......................................................... 454
$75,000 to $99,999 ......................................................... 116
$100,000 to $149,999 ...................................................... 43
$150,000 or more ......................................................... 16
Median household income (dollars) .................................... 32,439

Families ............................................................................ 1,912
Less than $5,000 .............................................................. 82
$5,000 to $9,999............................................................. 64
$10,000 to $14,999 ......................................................... 110
$15,000 to $24,999 ......................................................... 349
$25,000 to $34,999 ......................................................... 410
$35,000 to $49,999 ......................................................... 396
$50,000 to $74,999 ......................................................... 387
$75,000 to $99,999 ......................................................... 61
$100,000 to $149,999 ...................................................... 37
$150,000 or more ......................................................... 16
Median family income (dollars) ........................................ 33,891

Non family households .................................................. 629
Less than $5,000 .............................................................. 62
$5,000 to $9,999............................................................. 94
$10,000 to $14,999 ......................................................... 88
$15,000 to $24,999 ......................................................... 146
$25,000 to $34,999 ......................................................... 71
$35,000 to $49,999 ......................................................... 99
$50,000 to $74,999 ......................................................... 38
$75,000 to $99,999 ......................................................... 31
$100,000 to $149,999 ...................................................... 0
$150,000 or more ......................................................... 0
Median non family household income (dollars) 17,350

Per capita income (dollars) ............................................... 12,118
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### INCOME TYPE IN 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>2,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With wage and salary income</td>
<td>2,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean wage and salary income (dollars)</td>
<td>33,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With nonfarm self-employment income</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean nonfarm self-employment income (dollars)</td>
<td>20,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With farm self-employment income</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean farm self-employment income (dollars)</td>
<td>4,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Social Security income</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Social Security income (dollars)</td>
<td>6,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With public assistance income</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean public assistance income (dollars)</td>
<td>5,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With retirement income</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean retirement income (dollars)</td>
<td>8,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POVERTY STATUS IN 1989

- All persons for whom poverty status is determined: 7,990
- Below poverty level: 766

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 18 years and over</td>
<td>5,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 65 years and over</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related children under 18 years</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related children under 5 years</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related children 5 to 17 years</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated individuals</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>1,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female householder families</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 18 years</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With related children under 5 years</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent below poverty level:

- All persons: 9.8
- Persons 18 years and over: 8.3
- Persons 65 years and over: 9.9
- Related children under 18 years: 12.7
Related children under 5 years ........................................ 11.5
Related children 5 to 17 years ........................................ 13.2
Unrelated individuals .................................................. 18.4

All families .................................................................... 9.2
With related children under 18 years ............................. 11.5
With related children under 5 years ............................... 14.1

Female householder families ........................................... 37.9
With related children under 18 years ............................. 43.3
With related children under 5 years ............................... 54.0

3. Housing taken from the Hawaii Data Disc (Published 1993):

1990 Census of Population and Housing for Kapaa

TOTAL HOUSING UNITS .................................................. 2,736

YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT
1989 to March 1990 ...................................................... 197
1985 to 1988 .................................................................. 502
1980 to 1984 ................................................................. 327
1970 to 1979 ................................................................. 617
1960 to 1969 ................................................................. 324
1950 to 1959 ................................................................. 322
1940 to 1949 ................................................................. 162
1939 or earlier ............................................................... 285

BEDROOMS
No bedroom ................................................................... 146
1 bedroom ................................................................. 1,364
2 bedrooms ............................................................... 1,703
3 bedrooms ............................................................... 1,288
4 bedrooms ............................................................... 1,185
5 or more bedrooms .................................................... 40

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
Lacking complete plumbing facilities ............................ 34
Lacking complete kitchen facilities .............................. 62
Condominium housing units ........................................... 76

SOURCE OF WATER
Public system or private company ................................. 2,722
Individual drilled well ................................................... 0
Individual dug well ....................................................... 0
Some other source ......................................................... 14

SEWAGE DISPOSAL
Public sewer .............................................................. 294
Septic tank or cesspool ................................................. 2,403
Other means ............................................................... 39
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Occupied housing units ........................................... 2,552

HOUSE HEATING FUEL
Utility gas ......................................................... 34
Bottled, tank, or LP gas .......................... 208
Electricity ................................................. 610
Fuel oil, kerosene, etc .................................. 10
Coal or coke .......................................................... 0
Wood ................................................................. 12
Solar energy .................................................... 87
Other fuel .......................................................... 0
No fuel used ....................................................... 1,591

YEAR HOUSEHOLDER MOVED INTO UNIT
1989 to March 1990 .............................................. 570
1985 to 1988 ..................................................... 843
1980 to 1984 ..................................................... 409
1970 to 1979 ..................................................... 304
1960 to 1969 ..................................................... 149
1959 or earlier ................................................... 277

TELEPHONE
No telephone in unit .............................................. 93

VEHICLES AVAILABLE
Occupied housing units .................................. 2,552
None ........................................................................ 196
1 ................................................................. 669
2 ........................................................................ 1,083
3 or more .......................................................... 604

MORTGAGE STATUS AND SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS
Specified owner-occupied housing units .............. 1,325
With a mortgage .................................................. 811
Less than $300 ................................................... 16
$300 to $499 .................................................... 142
$500 to $699 .................................................... 121
$700 to $999 .................................................... 271
$1,000 to $1,499 ............................................. 178
$1,500 to $1,999 ............................................. 54
$2,000 or more .................................................. 29
Median (dollars) ............................................... 820
Not mortgaged ..................................................... 514
Less than $100 ................................................... 33
$100 to $199 .................................................... 373
$200 to $299 .................................................... 77
$300 to $399 .................................................... 22
$400 or more .................................................... 9
Median (dollars) ............................................... 147
SELECTED MONTHLY OWNER COSTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1989

Specified owner-occupied housing units ........................................... 1,325
  Less than 20 percent ................................................................. 731
  20 to 24 percent ........................................................................... 182
  25 to 29 percent ........................................................................... 54
  30 to 34 percent ........................................................................... 106
  35 percent or more ........................................................................ 252
  Not computed .................................................................................. 0

GROSS RENT
Specified renter-occupied housing units ........................................... 1,072
  Less than $200 .............................................................................. 66
  $200 to $299 ................................................................................. 49
  $300 to $499 ................................................................................. 168
  $500 to $749 ................................................................................. 327
  $750 to $999 ................................................................................. 259
  $1,000 or more ............................................................................. 110
  No cash rent ................................................................................. 93
  Median (dollars) ............................................................................ 671

GROSS RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1989
Specified renter-occupied housing units ........................................... 1,072
  Less than 20 percent ........................................................................ 268
  20 to 24 percent ............................................................................ 148
  25 to 29 percent ............................................................................ 125
  30 to 34 percent ............................................................................ 57
  35 percent or more ........................................................................ 375
  Not computed .................................................................................. 99

4. Labor Force taken from the Hawaii Data Disc (Published 1993):

1990 Census for Kapaa

LABOR FORCE STATUS
Persons 16 years and over ................................................................. 5,847
  In labor force ................................................................................ 4,135
  Percent in labor force .................................................................. 70.7
  Civilian labor force ...................................................................... 4,135
  Employed ....................................................................................... 3,924
  Percent unemployed ...................................................................... 5.1
  Armed Forces ............................................................................... 1,712
  Not in labor force ........................................................................ 1,712

Males 16 years and over ................................................................. 2,935
  In labor force ................................................................................ 2,199
  Percent in labor force .................................................................. 74.9
  Civilian labor force ...................................................................... 2,199
  Employed ....................................................................................... 2,081
  Unemployed ............................................................................... 118
Percent unemployed ........................................... 5.4
Armed Forces ...................................................... 0
Not in labor force .................................................. 736

Females 16 years and over ..................................... 2,912
  In labor force .................................................. 1,936
  Percent in labor force ...................................... 66.5
  Civilian labor force ......................................... 1,936
  Employed ....................................................... 1,843
  Unemployed .................................................... 1.93
  Percent unemployed ......................................... 4.8
  Armed Forces ................................................... 0
  Not in labor force ............................................. 976

Females 16 years and over ..................................... 2,912
  With own children under 6 years ........................... 626
    Percent in labor force ..................................... 69.0
    With own children 6 to 17 years only .................... 516
      Percent in labor force .................................... 82.8

Own children under 6 years in families and subfamilies .... 839
  All parents present in household in labor force ........ 576

Own children 6 to 17 years in families and subfamilies .... 1,586
  All parents present in household in labor force .......... 1,223

Persons 16 to 19 years ......................................... 428
  Not enrolled in school and not high school graduate .... 34
  Employed or in Armed Forces ................................ 31
  Unemployed .................................................... 39
  Not in labor force ............................................ 8

COMMUTING TO WORK
  Workers 16 years and over .................................. 3,861
    Percent drove alone ....................................... 76.6
    Percent in carpools ....................................... 16.8
    Percent using public transportation ...................... 0.4
    Percent using other means ................................ 0.7
    Percent walked or worked at home ......................... 5.8
    Mean travel time to work (minutes) ....................... 22.2

OCCUPATION
  Employed persons 16 years and over ......................... 3,924
    Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations .... 357
    Professional specialty occupations ........................ 359
    Technicians and related support occupations ............. 56
    Sales occupations .......................................... 551
    Administrative support occupations, including clerical .... 452
    Private household occupations ............................ 0
    Protective service occupations ............................ 56
    Service occupations, except protective and household .... 880
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Farming, forestry, and fishing occupations................................. 241
Precision production, craft, and repair occupations ..................536
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors ....................... 50
Transportation and material moving occupations ....................190
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers ...............186

INDUSTRY
Employed person 16 years and over................................. 3,924
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries ................................... 295
Mining ........................................................................... 0
Construction ..................................................................... 440
Manufacturing, non durable goods .....................................88
Manufacturing, durable goods ..........................................37
Transportation ................................................................... 185
Communications and other public utilities ......................... 32
Wholesale trade .................................................................. 78
Retail trade ....................................................................... 927
Finance, insurance, and real estate ....................................159
Business and repair services .............................................146
Personal services ............................................................. 702
Entertainment, and recreation services ............................... 47
Health services ................................................................... 194
Educational services .........................................................206
Other professional and related services ............................. 199
Public administration .......................................................189

CLASS OF WORKER
Employed persons 16 years and over ................................. 3,924
Private wage and salary workers ....................................... 3,057
Government workers .........................................................494
Local government workers ................................................. 140
State government workers .................................................318
Federal government workers ............................................. 36
Self-employed workers .....................................................366
Unpaid family workers ..................................................... 7

5. Public Services:

Samuel Mahelona Hospital is located just below Kapaa High School. Its wastewater treatment facility presently serves the existing Kapaa Elementary, Intermediate and High Schools. The average flows handled by the plant are around 60,000 gpd when the schools are out and 110,000 gpd when the schools are in session. The existing facility is a secondary treatment facility and uses an aerated oxidation pond for disposal of the effluent.

There are shopping centers, parks, beaches, a post office, a fire station, and a public library in the service area.
The County’s solid waste disposal facility is across an existing vacant State parcel on Apopo Road. There is an existing cemetery on Kanaele Road which connects to Apopo Road.

Kauai Bus, called the Iniki Express, is a public bus system. It stops throughout the service area to pick up and drop off passengers. Table 2 shows the scheduled times and the locations of the bus stops along the bus route.

There are six school buses that travel throughout the service area picking up elementary, intermediate and/or high school students who attend the existing Kapaa Elementary and Kapaa Intermediate/High Schools. Each bus has a capacity of 72 elementary students based on three students per seat. The actual capacity for the elementary and intermediate/high school students is 66 and 48 students respectively. Since the buses pick up a mix of elementary and intermediate/high school students, the capacity ranges from 48 to 66 students per bus. Roberts Hawaii operates the school buses in the service area. The first bus starts at 6:45 am and the other five buses start at 7:15 am. They arrive at the schools at about 7:45 am. These school buses and their routes change from year to year depending upon demand in the area. The Department of Accounting and General Services Central Services evaluate the areas for bus needs every year after the school year starts. DOE requires students who live within a one mile radius from the school to use other means of transportation to and from the school instead of the school bus. The school bus routes and bus stops are shown in Figure 19.

F. Summary

The table below summarizes the existing characteristics of the five candidate sites and not areas adjacent to the sites. Previous sections already discussed the areas near the sites and in the service area. This table presents only a brief synopsis of the sites’ existing features. Details are in previously discussed sections above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>State Land Use Map</th>
<th>County General Plan</th>
<th>County Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Urban Mixed Use</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Prin. 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:30</td>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:30</td>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>21:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>22:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>24:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>20:00</td>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>24:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Passengers should be at stop at time shown for preceding stop.**

*Transfer point to legal feeder bus,

Tables listed are approximate. Actual times may vary, depending on traffic conditions.

For information, call: 241-6410
### Candidate Site's Summary Table (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Flood Map</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Critical Wastewater Disposal Areas</th>
<th>Agriculture Lands of Importance to the State of Hawaii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zone X - unshaded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes with one acre lot exception</td>
<td>Prime Agricultural Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zone X - unshaded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes with one acre lot exception</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zone X - unshaded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes with one acre lot exception</td>
<td>Prime Agricultural Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zone X - unshaded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes with one acre lot exception</td>
<td>Prime Agricultural Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zone X - unshaded</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes with one acre lot exception</td>
<td>Prime Agricultural Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>Electrical/Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Irrigation ditches</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Irrigation ditches</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Irrigation ditches</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Irrigation ditches</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Land Ownership</th>
<th>Foundation and Soils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>The Lihue Plantation Company</td>
<td>Soil Character Code I and Non-rocky soil with a depth over 10', Class B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Cattle-grazing</td>
<td>State of Hawaii leased to Kauai Sand and Gravel and Wailua Young People's Club</td>
<td>Soil Character Code I and Non-rocky soil with a depth over 10', Class D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>The Lihue Plantation Company</td>
<td>Soil Character Code I and Non-rocky soil with a depth over 10', Class A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>The Lihue Plantation Company</td>
<td>Soil Character Code III and Non-rocky soil with a depth over 10', Class A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sugar Cane</td>
<td>The Lihue Plantation Company</td>
<td>Soil Character Code III and Non-rocky soil with a depth over 10', Class A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Archaeological/Historical Sites</th>
<th>Topography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-     Unlikely-Not Guaranteed</td>
<td>Flat slopes - 3% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Unlikely-Not Guaranteed</td>
<td>Adverse slopes - 10% to 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Likely-Not Guaranteed</td>
<td>Flat slopes - 3% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Likely-Not Guaranteed</td>
<td>Flat slopes - 3% to 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Likely-Not Guaranteed</td>
<td>Flat slopes - 3% to 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

A. No Action

If status quo is maintained, the existing Kapaa Elementary School would continue to enroll students from grades K through 6. The student enrollment is projected to be 1,198 students in the year 1999 for grades K through 5. The sixth grade would have already moved to the new intermediate school by the year 1999 and therefore, would not be a part of the enrollment for the elementary school. The anticipated growth at the existing Kapaa Elementary School just cannot be accommodated on the existing school campus which also happens to be shared by the existing Kapaa Intermediate and High Schools.

The secondary schools too are experiencing a large student enrollment growth with a projected enrollment of 1,951 students in the year 1995.

In view of these demands and limitations, the "No Action" alternative is an impractical solution which only becomes worse as future enrollment growth increases at both the elementary and the secondary schools.

B. Change of School Service Area

Changing the school service area will result in some students having to attend another school in the Kauai District. Other elementary schools on that side of the island is the Kaumualii Elementary School in Hanamaulu which is approximately 7 miles away to the south or the Kilauea Elementary School which is over 15 miles away to the north. Kaumualii Elementary School in Hanamaulu opened in September 1990. Its enrollment for 1994 was 877 students. This enrollment is expected to grow to 935 students by the year 1995. The school has no excess capacity which would provide relief to the overcrowded Kapaa Elementary School. Kilauea Elementary School is too distant from the Kapaa area and has too limited a capacity to be considered for a change of school service area.

Proposed housing developments in the area will also continue to create additional classroom needs.

Therefore this alternative is also not acceptable.
VII. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY
VII. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT & THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Building the proposed project includes local short-term uses of man's environment during the construction phase of the work. Construction activities associated with the new Kapaa II Elementary School will create disruptions and nuisances in the vicinity of the project site. These disruptions and nuisances are considered to be minor and temporary in nature as compared to the long-term benefits of providing essential educational opportunities to the community. This includes benefits that are associated with employment of personnel for the operation and maintenance of the new school's facilities. Temporary economic benefits are also realized from the construction spending and construction related employment opportunities.

The new Kapaa II Elementary School will create a long-term commitment of the land at the selected site for school use. This will preclude other uses to that same land such as agriculture, recreation, open space, residential, or commercial. The foreclosure of other land use options however, is not considered to be a significant adverse impact since the school site is comprised of a relatively small land area and the new elementary school is clearly needed to provide educational opportunities to the public in the community.
VIII. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES
VIII. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Implementing the proposed action will involve irreversible and irretrievable land resources that will be committed to school use. This action will preclude any other land use options for the selected site. If the new school’s facilities were to be discontinued in the future, then the land could possibly be committed to other uses at that time.

Fuel, labor, funding and materials needed for the construction of the new school will be irretrievably committed to school use.

Labor, materials, public facilities, energy, utilities, and community service resources will be required for the operation and maintenance of the new Kapaa II Elementary School. These items will also be irretrievably committed to school use.
IX. PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED
IX. PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

A temporary increase in dust, noise and traffic congestion can be expected during the construction of the new school. This is a minor, short term inconvenience and can be minimized with the use of dust abatement techniques and by limiting the hours of the construction activity.

Once the new school is opened, daily morning and afternoon traffic can be expected to increase in the vicinity of the school, especially when school starts and closes. The demand on public facilities and community services are expected to increase along with the periodic noise levels because of school activities.

These impacts can be minimized through provision of improvements to roads, water systems, sewer systems, and drainage facilities if necessary. The new school facilities can be designed and located to minimize conflicts with the surrounding community and agricultural activities. Walls, fences and landscape plantings can be incorporated into the design and construction plans to help screen and buffer school access ways, buildings and play areas.

These relatively minor adverse impacts that are associated with the new project is far outweighed by the benefit of providing an educational opportunity to current and future students in the community.

Student population and enrollment in the area will always increase continuously and many impacts mentioned already will occur regardless of the new school site’s location. Many of these impacts, especially with regards to utility services, already affect the existing elementary school’s location and will continue to affect the existing campuses as the existing elementary school continues to handle elementary students in the community.
X. LIST OF NECESSARY APPROVALS
## X. LIST OF NECESSARY APPROVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit/Approval</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Land Use Designation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>npr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Change</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Management</td>
<td>npr</td>
<td>npr</td>
<td>npr</td>
<td>npr</td>
<td>npr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Drawings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Drawings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing &amp; HVAC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Lighting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Connection</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic System</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with State DOH**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with State DOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with County agencies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Grading</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sidewalks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Driveways</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1......Special permit needed for the site to be used for school purposes*
2......Use and Class IV permits needed for the site to be used for school purposes*
npr......no permit required for the site to be used for school purposes*
nr......General Plan change is not required since a school is determined as a specific use on the site*
X......construction plans and document reviews and approvals needed.

* Source of information: Kauai County Planning Department
  ** for sewage treatment system, effluent disposal, NPDES process, etc.

---
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XI. SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES
XI. SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Unresolved issues depend upon which candidate site is chosen for the new school site. The following paragraphs describe the unresolved issues and offers means for their resolution and mitigation.

A. Archaeological/Historical Significance

The State Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Land and Natural Resources has no research or past written documentation on any archaeological and/or historical worth for any of the five candidate sites.

The Lihue Plantation Company, Ltd, says that it is unlikely for Candidate Site 3 to have any archaeological/historical sites given the condition that it is entirely within the sugarcane growing area. However, according to the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD), there is a good possibility of Candidate Sites 3, 4, and 5 having some archaeologically and/or historically rich deposits since there were some deposits and burial grounds found on the makai side of the existing Kuhio Highway. The SHPD also feels there is a good chance Candidate Site 1 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich if the school site doesn’t encroach into any of the nearby valleys.

Candidate Site 2 may not be archaeologically and/or historically rich since there is already an existing reservoir on the site as well as an occupied dwelling.

To be sure however, an archaeological inventory survey of the chosen site should be conducted to insure that no archaeological, historical or cultural resources of significance are impacted by the new school development. Should any resources be found at the selected site, mitigation and/or preservation plans will need to be prepared in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Division at the Department of Land and Natural Resources, the Kauai County Planning Department, and the Kauai Historic Preservation Review Commission. The Kauai Island Burial Council must also be involved in the preparation of the mitigation and/or preservation plans if human burials are found.

B. Traffic

In order to properly address detailed site specific issues regarding highway impacts and roadway mitigation measures, especially at key intersections along Kuhio Highway or at other roads, a Traffic Impact Analysis Report will be prepared after a site is chosen. The report will need to consider future developments such as the State Department of Transportation’s new Kapaa
Bypass Road when analyzing the detailed site specific impacts for the chosen site. The report is to be prepared during the design phase of the project and is to be in accordance with State Department of Transportation requirements.

C. Wastewater

While there is an existing sewer trunk line in Kuhio Highway beginning at the lift station at the Haleiwa Road and Kuhio Highway intersection and ending at Mahelona Hospital, the Kauai County Department of Public Works has indicated that none of the five candidate sites are in the designated sewer service area of the existing Wailua Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The capacity of the treatment plant has already been allocated for use by the different areas adjacent to the existing sewer lines. This includes the Kapaa sewer lines recently constructed. There is a possibility that the system capacity could be reallocated in the future and be made available if projects for which the capacity has been already allocated are canceled or, the capacity is reallocated through negotiations between State and County agencies. If the public sewer system capacity cannot be reallocated, all five sites will require an onsite wastewater treatment system. The design and plans for an onsite wastewater treatment system along with the disposal fields must meet Department of Health and Kauai County requirements. The estimated infrastructure costs for each of the five sites include monies for an onsite wastewater treatment system since the reallocation of the existing sewer system’s capacity continues to remain uncertain.
XII. AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCUMENT
XII. AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE DOCUMENT

A. Federal Agencies
   Department of the Army - Planning Division
   Department of the Army - U.S. Corps of Engineers
   Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service
   Department of the Interior - Fish and Wildlife Service
   Department of the Interior - U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division
   Department of the Navy

B. State Agencies
   Department of Agriculture
   Department of Accounting & General Services - Honolulu
   Department of Budget and Finance - Housing Finance & Development Corporation
   Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism
   Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism - Energy Division
   Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism - Land Use Commission
   Department of Defense
   Department of Education
   Department of Health
   Department of Health - Clean Water Branch
   Department of Land & Natural Resources - Historic Sites
   Department of Land & Natural Resources - Land Management Division
   Department of Land & Natural Resources - Water Resources Management Division
   Department of Transportation
   Office of Environmental Quality Control
   Office of State Planning
   University of Hawaii at Manoa, Environmental Center

C. County of Kauai
   Department of Finance
   Department of Health
   Department of Planning
   Department of Public Works
   Department of Transportation
   Department of Water Supply

D. Utilities
   Citizens Utilities - Kauai Electric Division
   GTE Hawaiian Telephone

E. Other
   Kapaa Elementary School, PTSA
   The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii
   The Lihue Plantation Company, LTD.
   Public attendance at the public informational meeting-Dec 15, 1994 at Kapaa, Kauai
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XIII. SITE SELECTION REPORT AND EIS CONSULTATION PHASE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
XIII. SITE SELECTION REPORT AND EIS CONSULTATION
PHASE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The following list indicates the agencies, organizations, and individuals who were sent a copy of the New Kapaa II Elementary School Site Selection Study and EIS Preparation Notice. A total of eight comment letters were received; two of them were no comment/no objection letters. The comment letters and responses are included in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL AGENCIES</th>
<th>PROVIDED COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE AGENCIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Environmental Quality Control</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Environmental Center</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAUAI COUNTY AGENCIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kauai Community College</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai Electric Company</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Telephone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapaa Elementary School PTSA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Kaumualii Elementary School PTSA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sierra Club, Hawaii Chapter</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of the Land</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amfac JMB Hawaii, Inc.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Lehua Fernandes Salling</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable James Aki</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Peter Apo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Ezra Kanoho</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No comment/no objection letters
with a base flood elevation of 7 feet above mean sea level); Zone X—shaded (areas inundated by the 300-year flood); and Zone X—unshaded (areas determined to be outside the 200-year flood plain).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Klaus Schmeug, P.E.
Director of Engineering

Enclosure
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS
Mr. Kusuk Cheung
Director of Engineering
Department of the Army
US Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Building 250
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Cheung:

Subject: Kapaa II Elementary School
Site Selection Study and Environmental Impact Statement
DAGS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for your August 11, 1992 comments on the subject project. We are providing the following responses to your comments:

1. Your comments note that wetlands may be present at Sites 2 and 3 and that a wetlands determination/delineation should be performed. Since these are only two out of a total of five potential sites for the new Kapaa II Elementary School, it would be premature to perform the study at this time. Based on the study, it is unlikely that either Site 2 or 3 will be selected for the school. Furthermore, it is the policy of the Department of Accounting and General Services to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the criteria that wetlands be avoided as possible sites will be added to the evaluation criteria and Sites 2 and 3 will be assigned a rating of poor in this category. The possible presence of wetlands at Sites 2 and 3 will also be included in the body of the report.

Since Sites 2 and 3 are already included in the Site Selection Study, they will continue to be rated. However, they will not be considered acceptable due to the possible presence of wetlands.

2. The flood designation for Site 2 will be corrected in the draft EIS to include Zone A1. Also, Zone X will be revised to reflect Zone X (shaded) and Zone Z (unshaded) rather than as previously shown and described on the EIS Preparation Notice.

Thank you for your input on this project. If there are any questions on this matter, please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ishida of the Planning Branch at 986-4657.

Very truly yours,

Gordon Matsumura
State Public Works Engineer
JN 30 1982

Mr. Klok Cheung
Director of Engineering
Department of the Army
Hawaii Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii, 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Cheung:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Site Selection Study and EIS
DACS Job No. 14-16-4337

Thank you for participating in the consultation phase for the subject project. Please note that Sites 2 and 3 have been removed from the site selection process. During the Consultation Phase, it was determined that Sites 2 and 3 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of the Department of Accounting and General Services to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the two sites have been dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as potential sites in the draft EIS.

This response will be appended to the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUDA
State Public Works Engineer
MEMO TO: Mr. Gordon Matsumoto, Public Works Engineer
        Public Works Division, EWS

FROM: Alfred K. Suga, Assistant Superintendent
       Office of Business Services

SUBJECT: Kapaa II Elementary School
        EIS Consultation Phase

We have reviewed the subject Site Selection Report and EIS
Preparation Notice for Kapaa II Elementary School and have
no consent to make at this time. We request that the
consultant proceed to preparation of the draft
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and finalize the
document for public input.

Should there be any questions, please call the Facilities
Branch at 737-4743.

ATTACHMENT

CC: C. Tonouchi
    S. Anita

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
The Honorable Russell S. Noguchi  
September 2, 1992  
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The Honorable Russell S. Noguchi  
September 2, 1992  
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Regardlss of the site selected, the proposed school shall meet the minimum requirements of Department of Health (DOH) Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-11, "Sanitation", and Chapter 1-1A, Food Service and Food Establishment Sanitation Code.

Any site selected may be either inlets which will be dispersed to the surrounding area. The property is utilized. In accordance with DOH Adminstrative rules, Chapter 11-20, "Vector Control", the applicant shall eradicate the rodents prior to clearing the site.

Effective soil erosion and fumigate dust control measures shall be implemented by the applicant during all phases of development.

Graded material shall be disposed of at a solid waste disposal facility that is permitted by the DOH. Open burning of the material is prohibited.

Water service shall be provided by the County of Kauai. In this situation, the Department of Water shall be responsible for the review and approval of the plans to modify the existing water system.

Underground Injection Control (UIC) -

A. In Section 11-23.1, information on UIC is missing. Land areas marked the UIC line are considered to contain underground sources of drinking water. These areas should be protected against all sources of groundwater contamination.

B. If the project plans to use drainage injection wells (drywells), it will be necessary to obtain a UIC permit to authorize the construction and operation of these wells.

C. The UIC rule prohibits sewage or industrial disposal wells in areas above the UIC line.

D. Injection wells cannot be used within one-quarter mile of any drinking water source.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Stuart Yamada (Drinking Water) and Mr. Charles Hee (Underground Injection Control) of the Safe Drinking Water Branch at 386-4558, or Mr. Clyde Takata of Kauai District Health Office at 341-3323.

c) Waste Water Branch  
Safe Drinking Water Branch  
Kauai District Health Office
Honorable John Levin
Director
Department of Health
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Dr. Levin:

Subject: New Kapa'a II Elementary School
EIS Preparation Notices and Site Selection Study
DAGS Job No. 14-16-4937

Thank you for reviewing the above document and submitting the comments contained in your September 2, 1992 letter. The following is a discussion of the comments contained in your letter:

1. Although the sites are located in near proximity to existing or proposed sewer lines, the Kauai County Department of Public Works has indicated that the sites are not within the designated service area of the existing Vailua Wastewater Treatment Plant and that existing and proposed system capacity has not been allocated for a new school. However, there is a possibility that system capacity could become available if those projects for which capacity has been allocated are canceled or capacity is reallocated through negotiations between State and County agencies.

The Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS) will make every effort to obtain the necessary approvals to connect to the public sewer system. If the County determines that system capacity cannot be made available for school use, any site selected would require an on-site wastewater treatment facility.

2. Once a site is selected, the precise location and orientation of the school facilities will be designed to avoid or minimize the impact of dust, noise and exhaust fumes generated by vehicular traffic. Landscaping, walls and fencing can be incorporated into the school design to help screen the school facilities from the impacts of vehicular traffic. Further discussions on the impacts will be included in the draft EIS.

3. As noted above, the precise location and orientation of the school site can be modified to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The school facilities will be located and designed to minimize the impacts of noise from school activities on nearby residences. Fencing, walls and landscaping can be used to help achieve this objective if required. Further discussions on the impacts will be included in the draft EIS.

4. As discussed above, the school facilities will be located and designed to minimize conflicts with nearby sugar cane cultivation. In addition, it is anticipated that many sugar cane operations which could disrupt school functions can be scheduled during times when school is not in session. Further discussions on the impacts will be included in the draft EIS.

5. If Site 1 or Site 2 is selected, the precise location of the 12-acre school site and the school facilities within the site will be located a sufficient distance from the high voltage electrical lines so that students, teachers and others at the school are not impacted by electromagnetic radiation. The precise distance from the high voltage electrical lines and orientation of the facilities will be determined in consultation with the Department of Health (DOH). Placement of lines underground in the vicinity of school buildings and play areas may be considered.

The above considerations will be included in the EIS.

6. Substantial drainage improvements may be required to mitigate the adverse impact of stormwater flows if Site 3 is selected for the school loca-
tion. If Site 3 is selected, the drainage system can be designed to intercept stormwater runoff which may enter the site from the solid waste facility and convey it via underground culvert or fenced channel.

A rating of Poor for Site 2 and 3 will be assigned in the category of Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances due to the potential for periodic nuisances from the nearby solid waste transfer site. Mitigation measures include landscaping, fencing, appropriate building and play area siting, and design. Further discussion of these impacts will be included in the draft EIS.

7-10. Regardless of the site selected, all appropriate DOH requirements will be adhered to (including those regarding sanitation and food services, vector control, control of soil erosion and dust during construction, and disposal of grubbed material). It is understood that these requirements are applicable to all developments and DOH and DOH have consistently insured that they are incorporated into construction and operation plans under their administration.

11. The Kauai County Department of Water has been made aware of the proposed school and construction plans will be submitted to them for review and approval during the design phase. This will be noted in the draft EIS.

12. As required, underground injection control (UIC) rules will be complied with in the proposed project. Information and the accompanying map pertaining to UIC will be included in the draft EIS.

Many factors must be considered in selecting an appropriate location for any new school. Please be assured that protecting the health and safety of the new Kepa II Elementary School students, faculty and staff, and the surrounding community remains one the priorities of DOH and DOH.

Please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ichikawa of the Public Works Division at 566-0487 if you have any questions or additional concerns.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. TATSUMI
State Comptroller
JN 18 1983

Honorable John Levin
Director
Department of Health
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Dr. Levin:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Site Selection Study and EIS
DGSE Job No. 14-15-4837

Thank you for participating in the consultation phase for the subject project. Please note that Sites 2 and 3 have been removed from the site selection process. During the consultation phase, it was determined that Sites 2 and 3 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of DGSE to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the two sites have been dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as potential sites in the draft EIS.

This response will be appended to the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. TAKUSHI
State Comptroller
TO: Ruskell B. Wayka, Controller
   Department of Accounting and General Services
FROM: Rex D. Johnson, Director
   Department of Transportation
SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE
 AND SITE SELECTION STUDY, KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,
   KAPAA, KAUAI, T奴: 4-01-93; 4-05-93; 4-01-93
VAR: PARCELS

Thank you for your letter of July 7, 1993, requesting our review
of the subject proposed project.

A Traffic Impact Analysis Report (TIAA) should be submitted for
our review when the school site is selected. The TIAA should
include a discussion of the highway impacts and propose roadway
mitigation measures, especially at the key intersections along
Kuhio Highway.

Honorable Rex Johnson
Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Johnson:

SUBJECT: Kapaan II Elementary School
Site Selection Study and
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your July 21, 1993 comments on the subject
project. A Traffic Impact Analysis Report (TIAA) is in accor-
dance with Department of Transportation requirements will be
prepared during the design phase of the work after the
selection of a candidate site. Your comments and this
response will be appended to the Draft Environmental Impact
Statement.

Please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ishioka of the
Public Works Division at 368-8487 if you have any questions or
additional comments.

Very truly yours,

Robert P. Takushi
State Controller
Honorable Rex Johnson  
Director  
Department of Transportation  
State of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii  

Dear Mr. Johnson:  

Subject: New Kapaa, HI Elementary School  
Site Selection Study and EIS  
DACS Job No. 14-16-4377  

Thank you for participating in the consultation phase for the subject project. Please note that Sites 2 and 3 have been removed from the site selection process. During the Consultation Phase, it was determined that Sites 2 and 3 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of DACS to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the two sites have been dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as potential sites in the draft EIS.

This response will be appended to the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

ROBERT F. TAKUSHI  
State Comptroller
August 3, 1992

Department of Accounting and General Services
1151 Punchbowl Street
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Re: Kapaa II Elementary School
EIS Consultation Phase

We would like to provide the following comments and recommendations relative to the above referenced matter:

1. There should be a detailed analysis of the land classification soils types and characteristics utilizing the Land Study Bureau, AILSH, and Soil Survey reports, as they apply to each site.

2. There should be a detailed description of the permits required (both State and/or County), the standards for the issuance of such permits, the timeframes for the issuance and/or consideration of such permits, and the review agency or commission that will consider such permits, for each of the potential sites considered.

Further, will subdivision be necessary in order to create the school boundary? If so, such subdivision should be made to conform to County standards?

3. There should be a detailed description of the roadways fronting each of the potential sites considered (i.e., width of pavement, width of right of way, etc.), along with a description and cost estimate of the necessary improvements to make access and safety more towards County standards. Such necessary improvements could include pavement widening, shoulder widening, turning lanes, signalization, sidewalks, etc.

4. State Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division, must provide their comments and criteria for each of the potential sites.

5. In the Site Characteristics (Appendix C - Candidate Site Evaluations and Results), the drainage characteristics of a site should be detailed in this section, rather than in the Utilities section. A drainage analysis needs to be provided if any site is located within a drainageway, and cost estimates reflected to provide such improvement.

Additionally, cost estimates should be reflected for each site when infrastructure improvements are necessary, such as the cost of a sewage treatment plant, water line improvements, etc.

6. In Section IV, Evaluation of Candidate Sites, Community Site Criteria, Government, there should be a fifth consideration added, namely: "5. Site Constraints." The County's Constraint maps must be utilized and applied to each site in order to determine the existence of either soil, slope, drainage, flood, tsunami or shore constraints.

Should there be constraints existing on a property considered for development, there are detailed requirements of the County's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 164, as amended, that must be satisfied, in conjunction with #2 above.

7. Were any neighborhood boards, community organizations or environmental organizations consulted when such site characteristics such as "Aesthetic Value", "Safety", "Traffic", "Natural Beauty", etc., were established or considered?

8. The information contained within the Flora/Fauna section must be submitted by a professional in that field of expertise, and there should be a detailed report for each of the candidate sites.
9. For those sites located within the flood fringe zone, if land filling is necessary, an engineer's estimate on the amount of fill, the location of such fill material, etc. should also be reflected. Will such land filling meet State or County standards? This matter should be coordinated with the Kauai County Public Works Department.

10. Access to the sites should be examined in detail with the County Public Works Department and State Highways Division. Their input on the condition of the roadways and traffic patterns are very valuable to the planning aspect.

11. We also recommend the Kauai DADS office be consulted regarding school bus routes. This element should be vital in site selection in terms of transporting students.

12. Because of the limited amount of park space in the Kauai County (which has been one of the faster growing districts on Kauai), we recommend that contact be made with our Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation Division to discuss the feasibility of joint uses of park space within the school grounds. Maintenance, types of development, etc. should be examined if such joint use is agreed upon.

Should you have any questions, please contact Michael Laurea of my staff at 245-3910.

[Signature]
Planning Director
rich. Their comments are already contained in the Archaeological/Historical Sites section. The Archaeological Inventory Survey will be performed after a candidate site is selected.

5. Drainage characteristics for each site will be moved from the Utilities section to the Site Characteristics section of the report and be further discussed in the draft EIS. The cost estimates for the new school's infrastructure which includes drainage will also be in the draft EIS.

6. Site constraints will be analyzed and included in the draft EIS.

7. A public informational meeting where the community will have a chance for input on any of the candidate sites is being planned by the Department of Education (DOE). The public will also have a second opportunity to comment on the contents in the draft EIS when the Office of Environmental Quality Control publishes the draft document.

8. The draft EIS will be available to various government, environmental, and public agencies as well as professionals with differing backgrounds who will have the opportunity to concur, disagree and/or add to any part of the report which includes the Flora/Fauna section. The University of Hawai'i Environmental Center will be one of the many reviewing agencies reviewing copies of the draft EIS.

9. For sites within the flood fringe zone, land filling will likely be needed. The site grading concept for the candidate sites will be coordinated with, and meet Kauai County Department of Public Works standards. Fill quantities for sites needing fill material will be estimated and included in the draft EIS.

10. Access roads to the proposed school sites will be examined in detail with the Kauai County Department of Public Works and State Department of Transportation, Highways Division during the preparation of the draft EIS. They will also be receiving copies of the draft EIS, and their comments and responses to their comments will be incorporated into the final EIS.

11. The Department of Accounting and General Services, Kauai District Office will be consulted regarding school bus routes during the preparation of the draft EIS.

12. Contact with the Kauai County Department of Public Works, Parks and Recreation Division to discuss the feasibility of joint use of park space with the new school will be accomplished during the preparation of the draft EIS.

Thank you for your input on this project. If there are any questions on this matter, please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ichikawa of the Planning Branch at 388-0487.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUZAKA
State Public Works Engineer

Sf:jk
Mr. Jeffrey R. Lacey  
Planning Director  
Planning Department  
County of Kauai  
4280 Rice Street  
Libby, Kauai, Hawaii 96766

Dear Mr. Lacey:

Subject: New Ewa II Elementary School  
Site Selection Study and EIS  
DACS Job No. 14-18-4837

Thank you for participating in the consultation phase for the subject project. Please note that Sites 2 and 3 have been removed from the site selection process. During the Consultation Phase, it was determined that Sites 2 and 3 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of the Department of Accounting and General Services to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the two sites have been dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as potential sites in the draft EIS.

This response will be appended to the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

GORDON MATSUOKA  
State Public Works Engineer

RM: JK
Dept. of Accounting & General Services
July 20, 1992
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increase in traffic and its consequences such as noise, dust and vehicle emissions.

We are also concerned with sites selected which can only be reached by one narrow roadway. We believe that alternate routes should be developed or made available for motorists and pedestrians to reach a site.

The development of the site with imperforate surfacing will increase storm water flowages. We are concerned especially with sites 4 and 5 where increased storm water flowages may impact existing residential units.

2. WASTEWATER DISPOSAL

The paragraph on sewer on page II-9 is not accurate. It is not an established fact that upon completion of the main sewer line in Epaau Town, the proposed school sites can connect to the system. In fact, none of the five proposed sites are within the designated sewer area of the existing Wailua Wastewater Treatment Plant. The capacity of the treatment plant is projected to be utilized by the area adjacent to the existing sewer line, including the Epaau line presently under construction.

The evaluation of the candidate sites, Appendix C, more accurately portrays the situation as all sites are rated "poor" for sewers: the five sites have no sewer service and would require the construction of a sewage treatment facility. Unless a specific exception is made to allow any of the sites to connect to the County's system, such shall be the case.

Site 2 is adjacent to USA's low income housing project, which has received approval to connect to the public sewer system, although outside of the current service area of the treatment plant. It is improbable that approval will be given by the Department of Health to construct another treatment plant when the existing is to be abandoned primarily due to its ineffectiveness.

The first paragraph on page V-7 mentions the possibility of the State working with USA to construct a transmission line. The construction plans for that proposed transmission system is presently being reviewed by this Department.

We are unable to locate in the report any projections of wastewater quantity.
Thank you for the opportunity to offer our comments.

Very truly yours,

ED RENAUD
Deputy County Engineer

Mr. Ed Renaud
Deputy County Engineer
Department of Public Works
County of Maui
3211 Umi Street
Lahaina, Hawaii 96766

Dear Mr. Renaud:

Subject: New Kapa'a Elementary School Site Selection Study and Environmental Impact Statement
DAS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for your July 20, 1992 comments on the subject project. The following responses to your comments are provided:

1. Vehicle and Pedestrian Access

The study recognizes that most of the sites use County roadways that have poor roadway geometrics with the potential for vehicle and pedestrian access and safety problems which may require improvements, and dedication and/or purchase or condemnation of additional rights-of-way. Problems with these roadways are recognized in the Evaluation of Candidate Sites section of the Site Selection Study under Roadways and under Accessibility. The improvements anticipated will be explored further in the draft EIS. Specific details regarding County road improvements will be developed in consultation with your department once a final school site is selected.

The use of County roads for access to school Sites 1, 2, 4 and 5 will generate more passenger and bus traffic onto existing residential streets. The resulting increase in traffic noise, dust and vehicle emissions could represent a nuisance to residents. However, these impacts would only be experienced primarily on weekdays during the school year at the opening and closing hours of the school day. Site 3
would gain primary access off of Oloaha Road and should not result in increased traffic on existing residential streets.

It is suggested that alternate routes be developed for those sites which can only be reached by one main roadway. Potential secondary access roads for the sites will be explored further in the draft EIS. The decision regarding alternative access routes will be made during the project design phase after a final site is selected.

2. Drainage

Drainage of storm water flow will be designed to minimize the impact on adjacent residential units. Once a final site is selected, the details of necessary drainage improvements will be developed in consultation with your department.

3. Wastewater Disposal

The paragraph on sewers on Page 11-9 will be corrected and it will be noted that none of the sites are within the designated sewer service area. Any sewer capacity has been allocated for a new elementary school and that connection to the County system at Site 1, 2 or 3 would require negotiations between the State and County. It is noted that if system capacity cannot be allocated, any site would require an on-site wastewater treatment facility. The plans for an on-site wastewater treatment system will need to be reviewed by the Department of Health requirements and would require their approval. The projections of wastewater quantities will be included as a part of the draft EIS.

Thank you for your input on this project. If there are any questions on this matter, please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ichikawa of the Planning Branch at 586-4687.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

[Signature]

[Date]
July 29, 1992

Mr. Russell Nagata
DAGS State Controller
State of Hawaii
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, HI 96810

Re: Kapaa II Elementary School, Site Selection Report and EIS Preparation Notice, Kapaa, Kauai

We have no objections to the Site Selection Report and EIS Preparation Notice for the subject project.

[Signature]
Raymond N. Salo
Manager and Chief Engineer
EDM
August 21, 1992

Mr. Russel S. Nagata, State Controller
Mr. Mark Yamabe, Project Coordinator, Public Works Division
Department of Accounting and General Services
1351 Punchbowl Street
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Subject: Kapaa II Elementary School and New Kapaa Intermediate School, EIS Consultation Phase/ Site Selection Studies

Dear Mr. Nagata and Mr. Yamabe,

The Kapaa Elementary School PTSA board has reviewed both the elementary school’s and middle school’s Preparation Notice of the Environmental Impact Statement and Site Selection Study.

Representatives of the existing intermediate/high school and elementary school met at three of the properties here have been sited for both schools. These two reports were analyzed and compared. It is a great concern that disagreement over locations for the two schools could delay the selection process. Representatives were in agreement that there should be no delay in moving forward on the projects, and any conflicts should be addressed openly and expeditiously.

The elementary school group is aware that the high school group favors the Oloheana Road site (Site 1/Kapaa II Elementary, Site 2/New Kapaa Intermediate), and that the Kealia site (Site 4/New Kapaa Intermediate; not sited for Kapaa II Elementary) would be their second choice. It is also understood that because the service area for the intermediate school presently extends to the northshore there is some sentiment that the Kealia site would be the most feasible location with regards to eliminating traffic from the north into and through Kapaa, thus reducing the busing time of the northshore students. As the majority of students would then need to be bussed out of the Wallua and Kapaa areas it was questioned whether the bussing time factor for those students would outweigh the time differential for the northshore students between the Kealia and the Oloheana site.

Also, it was felt that the aesthetics of the Oloheana site outweighed the Kealia site with regards to the bussing time factor for the northshore students.

Representatives from both groups feel that access from three directions to the Oloheana site is very attractive (Wallua Homesteads, Kapahi, and Kapaa town).

Both groups reviewed the cost considerations (page 49, New Kapaa Intermediate School report) and the Kapaa Intermediate and High School Ad Hoc Committee felt the Kealia site probably would be more costly to develop than the present report states, thus making it of equal or greater cost than the Oloheana site. Keith Companies confirmed that additional costs are a possibility, but this is true for for any of the sites.

Site 3 for Kapaa II Elementary School/ Site 3 for New Kapaa Intermediate School has not been supported by anyone. The facts that the land is situated in a low area that recently flooded, the air circulation is poor, the temperature of the area is generally higher in the lowland, the immediate neighborhood includes a cemetery and a refuse transfer station, and that the cost considerations detailed are nearly 3.5-millions dollars more than any of the other properties sited in the intermediate school study (page 49) cause this opinion.

The Libue Plantations land in Wallua Houselots (Site 5/Kapaa II Elementary School; Site 6/New Kapaa Intermediate) has not been supported by anyone. It was felt that bussing the northshore students through the entire stretch of Kapaa-Wallua traffic was not feasible. Traffic considerations were of the greatest concern with the sentiment that a "bottleneck" situation would be created at the entrance to the Wallua Houselots subdivision. It was also felt that the location does not provide an optimum climate as the area is typically hotter with little air movement and circulations. The Wallua Houselots Homeowner Association was contacted, but a written final opinion was not gained in the short period of time allowed for comments. In speaking with some homeowners in that area it was interpreted that the neighborhood does not want a school built there, many of the residents no longer have school age children.

This opinion holds for Site 4 in the Wallua Houselots (Kapaa II Elementary School), also. Additionally, the size of this property does not allow for future expansion possibilities (park, community resource center).

The representatives from Kapaa Elementary School felt that of the five sites studied, Site 1, was the only viable choice. No site was felt to be acceptable as a
second choice. With this thought in mind, the elementary group felt that the intermediate school should then be developed on the Kealia site. It was questioned why the Kealia site was not considered for the elementary school and if it was because of the proposed service area, then could the service area be reconsidered to accommodate an elementary school in that area. Consideration of the development of Anahola lands raised questions as to whether this site would then accommodate the growth. Thoughts were raised that eventually a school in Anahola should be built to address the growth of the Hawaiian Homestead community.

In consideration of the public input given in November for the intermediate school site selection study (pages 15-171), climate and aesthetics are of a priority. Though the representatives of Libue Plantation Company prefer the Kealia site to be developed as sugar cane operations have ceased, it is likely that sugar cane operations will cease within the decade on the Lehua site, and housing development might occur. It is believed that a school should enhance a community, not hinder it; that a developer should participate in the true development of a community which must include an educational facility and parks as well as safe vehicle and foot access. In view of the current needs to alleviate the overcrowded situation at the existing Kapaa complex, the Department of Education has been encouraged to move as quickly as possible to expedite construction of the school; land acquisition could delay that process with Libue Plantation holding ownership to the sites. This should not be allowed. It is clear that the public wants a school built on the Lehua site. The public encourages pursuit of acquiring a portion of the acreage for educational facilities which could include an agricultural and recreational park utilized by all of the community.

The study for the elementary school addresses wetlands (pages 17-17) and the Kapaa Marsh. It is not clear whether this marsh (Anahola Quadrangle) is situated in or near any of the proposed sites. A clarification would be appreciated as access to such a natural resource could be educationally beneficial.

Though the community realizes that the Department of Education will make this final decision, our organization believes that the communities' concerns should be weighed, and that cost factors should not be the only consideration.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

If you need clarification of any statements made in this commentary, I can be reached at my home, 822-3771, or a message can be left at Kapaa Elementary School, 823-4141.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Stark-Wickman, Co-Chair, Facilities in Education Action Task Force

cc: Clifton Bailey, Principal, Kapaa Elementary School
Wayne Watanabe, Principal, Kapaa Intermediate and High School
Evonne Shimaki, Kapaa Intermediate and High School Ad Hoc Committee
Warren Mizunuma, Business Specialist, Kauai District, Department of Education
Shirley Akina, District Superintendent, Kauai District, Department of Education
The Kealohi Companies - Hawaii
Stanley Yim & Associates
Nancy Bux, President, Kauai District PTSA
Billie Swain, President, Hanalei School PTSA
Chipper Wickman, President, Hanalei School PTSA
Ms. Cynthia Stark-Wickman  
Co-Chair, Facilities in Education  
Action Task Force  
Kapaa Elementary School PTA  
4886 Kauai Road  
Kapaa, Hawaii 96746  

Dear Ms. Stark-Wickman:  

Subject: Kapaa II Elementary School  
Site Selection and Environmental Impact Statement  
DNGS Job No. 14-16-607  

Thank you for your August 21, 1992 comment on the subject project. Several concerns which you expressed were previously addressed in our October 7, 1992 letter to you regarding the new intermediate school. This reply will respond primarily to concerns for the new elementary school, which were not answered in our previous letter. Your letter brought up several questions to which we provide the following responses:

1. **KAPAA SITE AND THE PROPOSED SERVICE AREA:** The Kapaa site is outside of the service area for the new school and therefore was not considered for the elementary school. Reconsidering the service area, established by the Department of Education (DOE) is undesirable because it would entail additional difficulties such as:

   A. The school site would need to be increased.

   B. The number of students to be bussed would increase.

   C. The increased service area would extend north of the location of the present elementary school, resulting in service areas which are awkward.

   D. The Kapaa site would be farther away from the population center of the proposed service area increasing the difficulty of access.

2. **WETLANDS:** Clarification was requested as to whether the Kapaa Marsh is located on or near the proposed sites. The marsh is not located on any of the proposed school sites and is approximately two and a half miles from the nearest proposed site (Site 1). For your information, it is the policy of the Department of Education and the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS) to avoid the use of wetlands. This avoids negative impacts upon sensitive wetland environments.

3. **SELECTION OF THE SITE:** The selection of the site will be made until the completion of the environmental review process and acceptance of the final EIS. We would like to assure you that the concerns and opinions of the PTA, including the preference for Site 1, expressed in your letter will be incorporated by the DOE into the final decision making process.

Thank you for your assistance on this project. If there are any questions on this matter, please have your staff contact Mr. Stanley Ishikawa or Mr. Brian Major of the Planning Branch at 586-0497 or 586-9495.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

State Public Works Engineer

RWH/yr
MS. CYNTHIA STARK-WICKMAN  
Co-Chairperson  
Facilities in Education  
Action Task Force  
Kapaa Elementary School P.T.S.A.  
4900 Kanaloha Road  
Kapaa, Kauai, Hawaii 96746

Dear Ms. Stark-Wickman:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School  
Site Selection Study and EIS  
DMGS Job No. 16-15-4437

Thank you for participating in the consultation phase for the subject project. Please note that Sites 2 and 3 have been removed from the site selection process. During the Consultation Phase, it was determined that Sites 2 and 3 may contain wetlands. It is the policy of the Department of Accounting and General Services to avoid the use of wetlands if at all possible. Therefore, the two sites have been dropped from further consideration and will not be considered as potential sites in the draft EIS.

This response will be appended to the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

GORDON HATZUKA  
State Public Works Engineer

RM: Jk
XIV. SITE SELECTION REPORT AND EIS REVIEW
PHASE COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
XIV. SITE SELECTION REPORT AND EIS REVIEW PHASE
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The following list indicates the agencies, organizations, and individuals who were sent a copy of the New Kapaa II Elementary School Site Selection Study and Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A total of seventeen comment letters were received; seven of them were no comment/no objection letters. The comment letters and responses are included in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL AGENCIES</th>
<th>PROVIDED COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey - Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE AGENCIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Accounting and General Services</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Budget and Finance -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Finance and Development Corporation</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) - Energy Division</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) - Land Use Commission</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Environmental Quality Control</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of State Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Environmental Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KAUAI COUNTY AGENCIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS**

- Amfac JMB Hawaii, Inc.................................No
- Citizens Utilities, Kauai Electric Division ..........Yes
- GTE Hawaiian Telephone.................................Yes
- Kapaa Elementary School PTSA .........................No
- King Kaumualii Elementary School PTSA ...............No
- Life of the Land .......................................No
- The Garden Island Newspaper (Kauai) ...................No
- The Honorable Ezra Kanoho ...............................No
- The Honorable James Aki ................................No
- The Honorable Lehua Fernandes Salling ...............No
- The Honorable Peter Apo ................................No
- The Lihue Plantation Company, LTD .................Yes
- The Sierra Club, Hawaii Chapter .....................No

**LIBRARIES**

- Hilo Regional Library .....................................No
- Kahului Regional Library ...............................No
- Kaimuki Regional Library .................................No
- Kaneohe Regional Library .................................No
- Kapaa Public Library ......................................No
- Kauai Community College Library ......................No
- Kauai Regional Library ....................................No
- Legislative Reference Bureau ................................No
- Pearl City Regional Library ...............................No
- State Main Library ........................................No
- University of Hawaii, Hamilton Library ................No

*No comment/no objection letters*
State of Hawaii  
Office of Environmental Quality Control  
220 South King Street, 4th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Sir/Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the New Kapaa II Elementary School, Kauai, Kauai (TEK 4-3-3; 1, 4-3-2; 6, and 4-1-09; 17 and 18). We do not have any additional comments to offer beyond those offered in our previous letter dated August 13, 1992.

Sincerely,

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

Copies Furnished:

Mr. Ralph Morita  
Department of Accounting and General Services  
1115 Punchbowl Street, Room 430  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Jason Yim  
Stanley Yim & Associates  
2850 Pan Street, Suite 200  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Ray H. Jyo  
Director of Engineering  
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
Department of the Army  
Fort Shafter, HI 96850-5440

July 7, 1994

Mr. Ray H. Jyo  
Director of Engineering  
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu  
Department of the Army  
Fort Shafter, HI 96850-5440

Dear Mr. Jyo:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School  
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study  
DMSS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your July 7, 1994 letter indicating that the Department of the Army does not have any additional comments to offer on the draft EIS along with this response letter will be included in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

Gordon Natsuno  
State Public Works Engineer

GC:5k  
c: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

State of Hawaii
Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Subj: NEW KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DRAFT EIS AND SITE SELECTION STUDY

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Kapaa II Elementary School Site Selection Study.

The Navy has no comments to offer at this time and appreciates the opportunity to participate in your review process.

The Navy's point of contact is Mr. Stanford Yuen at 474-0439.

Sincerely,

STANFORD B.C. YUEN, P.E.
Facilities and Environment

Copy to:
Stanley Yim & Associates
2850 Pau Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96815

Mr. Stanford B. C. Yuen
Facilities and Environment
Department of the Navy
Naval Base Pearl Harbor
P. O. Box 110
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96840

Dear Mr. Yuen:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your June 24, 1994 letter indicating that the Navy has no comments to offer on the draft EIS along with this response letter will be included in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

GCM: jk
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Islands Ecoregion
300 Ala Moana Blvd, Room 6307
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

In Reply Refer To: AAP

Governor, State of Hawaii
d/O Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Site Selection Study for the New Kapaa II Elementary School, Kapaa, Kauai, Hawaii

Dear Governor Waihee:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the above-referenced project for the proposed elementary school in Kapaa, Kauai, Hawaii. Construction of an additional school will alleviate the overcrowded conditions at the existing Kapaa Elementary School. Five candidate sites were considered for the proposed public facility, and site descriptions and evaluation criteria were provided for each candidate site. The Service offers the following comments for your consideration.

The Service does not anticipate significant adverse impacts to fish and wildlife resources that may result from implementation of the proposed action. The five candidate sites lack wetland areas and do not provide habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species. Although threatened Newell’s shearwaters (Puffinus newelli), which rest in the interior of Kauai, may transit through the candidate sites, the DEIS cites measures to minimize impact to the birds. Additionally, the Service recommends that any lighting fixtures associated with the public facility be shielded and aimed downward to minimize potential "fallout" (excessive and/or collision with structures brought on by attraction to and disorientation from bright lights) of Newell’s shearwaters during the spring and summer nesting season. Lastly, all five candidate sites lie outside the 500-year floodplain hazard areas. Based on the available information, the Service has no objections to the proposed public facility.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
Field Supervisor
Ecological Services

cc: Dept. of Accounting and General Services, Hawaii
Stanley Yim & Associates, Hawaii

[Stamp: RECEIVED
AUG 6 1984
I.T. INEL 84-44856, INC]
SEP 29 1994

Mr. Brooks Harper
Field Supervisor, Ecological Services
Pacific Islands Ecoregion
Fish and Wildlife Service
U. S. Department of the Interior
P. O. Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Harper:

Subject: New Kapua Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study
DUNS Job No. 14-16-4817

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your comments and recommendations are acknowledged and will be addressed accordingly in the final EIS.

This response letter and your August 4, 1994 letter will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

GC:jk
cc: Stanley Yin & Associates, Inc.

RECEIVED
OCT 01 1994
STANLEY YIN & ASSOC, INC.
Governor, State of Hawaii

June 29, 1994

Dear Governor Valenti:

Subject: New Kapiolani Elementary School, Draft Environmental Impact
Statement (DEIS) and Site Selection Study, Honolulu, Hawaii

The staff of the U.S. Geological Survey, Water Resources Division, Honolulu, Hawaii, has reviewed the subject DEIS and we do not have any comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for allowing us to review this document. We are returning the DEIS to your office for your future use.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William Meyer
District Chief

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Ralph Murata
Department of Accounting and General Services
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 430
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Jason Yin
Stanley Yin and Associates
2550 Pau Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

[Signature]

RECEIVED
JUL 1 1994

[Stamp: Stanley Yin & Associates, Inc.]
TO: The Honorable John Waihee  
Governor, State of Hawaii  
c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control

FROM: Joseph K. Conant  
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Draft EIS for the New Kapaa II Elementary School

We have reviewed the subject EIS and have no comments to offer. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

cc: OEQC  
DADS  
Stanley Yim & Associates

Mr. Joseph K. Conant  
Executive Director  
Housing Finance and Development Corporation  
State of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Conant:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School  
Draft EIS AND Site Selection Study  
DADS Job No. 14-16-04877

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your July 22, 1994 letter indicating that the Housing Finance and Development Corporation has no comment on the draft EIS along with this response letter will be included in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

GORDON HAYASHIKA  
State Public Works Engineer

GC:1k  
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
June 23, 1994

The Honorable John Waihee
Governor, State of Hawaii
c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
299 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Governor Waihee:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

Island of Kauai, District of Lihue
Tax Map Key Numbers: 4-03-01:01; 4-01-09:17; 4-03-02:06

We wish to inform you that we have no comments regarding the Draft EIS (DEIS) and Site Selection Study (SSS) for the subject project. We are forwarding the report to you.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Maurice H. Kaya
Energy Program Administrator

[Signature]

cc: DEIS-Mr. Ralph Murata
Stanley Yim & Associates-Mr. Jason Yim

June 23, 1994

The Honorable John Waihee
Governor, State of Hawaii
c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
299 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Governor Waihee:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

Island of Kauai, District of Lihue
Tax Map Key Numbers: 4-03-01:01; 4-01-09:17; 4-03-02:06

We wish to inform you that we have no comments regarding the Draft EIS (DEIS) and Site Selection Study (SSS) for the subject project. We are forwarding the report to you.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed project.

Sincerely,

Maurice H. Kaya
Energy Program Administrator

[Signature]

cc: DEIS-Mr. Ralph Murata
Stanley Yim & Associates-Mr. Jason Yim

July 9, 1994

Mr. Maurice H. Kaya
Energy Program Administrator
Energy Division
Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Kaya:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

DEIS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your June 23, 1994 letter indicating that the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism, Energy Division has no comments to offer on the draft EIS along with this response letter will be included in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 584-0487.

Very truly yours,

Gordon N. Suzuki
State Public Works Engineer

GC:jk
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
June 29, 1994

Mr. Brian J.J. Choy
Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, Fourth Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Choy:

The Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism is pleased to submit the enclosed comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Study and Site Selection Study for the New Kapaa II Elementary School.

The comments were provided by the Land Use Commission. Questions regarding these comments may be directed to Esther Ueda, LUC Executive Officer, at 537-3220.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Muif Hahnemann

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Ralph Morita
    Mr. Jason Yim

June 27, 1994

SUBJECT: Director's Referral No. 94:216-S
Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) and Site Selection Study (SSS) for the New Kapaa II Elementary School

We have reviewed the subject DEIS and SSS for the subject Kapaa II Elementary School, and have the following comments:

1) We confirm that candidate sites 1 through 5 are located within the respective State Land Use Districts as summarized on page II-39.

2) In Appendix K of the DEIS, there are two maps entitled "State Land Use Map." We note that these maps are not the State Land Use District maps. We suggest that the final EIS include a map showing all five candidate sites in relation to the State Land Use Districts.

We have no other comments to offer at this time.

EUS: 85th
Honorable Mufi Hannemann  
Director  
Department of Business,  
Economic Development, and Tourism 
State of Hawaii  
Honolulu, Hawaii  

Dear Mr. Hannemann:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School  
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study  
DAGS Job No. 14-10-4837

Thank you for your June 29, 1994 letter forwarding comments from the State Land Use Commission on the subject project. The comments are noted and will be addressed in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Public Works Division at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

Robert P. Takushi 
State Comptroller

---

RECEIVED  
JUL 2 A 1994  
STANLEY YIN & ASSOC., INC.
TO: Governor, State of Hawaii
c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control

FROM: Roy C. Price, Sr.
Vice Director of Civil Defense

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS); NEW KAPA'A II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SITE SELECTION FOR FIVE CANDIDATE SITES

State Civil Defense (SCD) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the DEIS and Site Selection for five candidate sites by the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS), for the New Kapa‘a II Elementary School, Kauai District, Kauai, Hawaii, WNK 6-03-05:01, 6-03-05:17 and 18, 6-03-02:06.

SCD does not have specific comments specifically directed at the DEIS and the Site Selection for the five candidate sites. All proposed sites are covered by existing flood warning devices (see attached).

Section II, PROJECT SETTING, page II-1, subparagraph II.B., Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls; page II-2, subparagraph II.B.9., Floodplains, page II-13, subparagraph II.D.8., Service Area Environment; and page II-14, subparagraph II.D.9., Geology/Hydrology, briefly discuss the hazards associated with flooding, tsunamis and annual rainfall, respectively.

However, Section II, PROJECT SETTING, page II-13, subparagraph II.D., Service Area Environment, and page II-21, subparagraph II.D.15., Topography, describe the elevation as ranging from "relatively flat with surrounding hills," with slopes ranging from 1-6 percent, "except for the mountainous slope conditions in the Hanalei Forest reserve" and the existing reservoir in Candidate Site 2 which "has slopes ranging from about 5% to 10%, more or less." Each candidate site should be evaluated for the impact of the triple threat of tropical storm/hurricane force winds which could cause flash floods as a result of torrential rains and coastal flooding from tropical storm/hurricane force driven waves and terrain/geographic amplification of the tropical storm/hurricane force winds.

Structures within the selected project site should be designed and constructed to resist the potentially destructive hazards of floods and winds as listed above.

Our SCD planners and technicians are available to discuss this further if there is a requirement. Please have your staff call Mr. Mel Nishikawa of my staff at 734-2191.

Attach.
cc: Mr. Ralph Hurts, DAGS

✓ Mr. Jason Yim
Stanley Yim & Associates

Governor, State of Hawaii
October 25, 1994
Page 2
Mr. Roy C. Price, Sr.
Vice Director of Civil Defense
Department of Defense
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Price:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study
DMGS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Please note that a public informational meeting will be held by the Department of Education for this project on the island of Kauai sometime in the future. It is at this meeting that the public will provide input concerning all of the school sites and the various items as contained in the draft EIS. Additional concerns or suggestions the public may have will also be discussed at this meeting. An item of discussion will be on flooding and whether anyone in the public is aware of any flooding that occurs at any of the sites during heavy rains or large storms.

The draft EIS will also be modified to indicate the layout of the school and the new structures should be designed and constructed to resist the potentially destructive hazards of flood, tropical storm/hurricane force winds. This response letter is your October 25, 1994 comment letter will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 885-0487.

Very truly yours,

Gordon Matuguza
State Public Works Engineer

CC: DOE
Stanley Yin & Associates.
July 12, 1994

Honorable Herman Aliszawa
Superintendent
Department of Education
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Dr. Aliszawa:

Subject: New Kapas II Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

We have reviewed the subject environmental impact statement and site selection study and have no comment on the draft.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

Herman M. Aliszawa, Ph.D.
Superintendent

[Signature]

cc: A. Ujita, OBS
S. Akiha, NRO
K. Rihita, DGNSS
J. Yim, Stanley Yim & Assoc.

RECEIVED
Jul 12 1994

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
P.O. BOX 208495
HI 96820

Robert P. Takushi
Controller

LETTER NO. (P) 17814

AUG 1 2 1994

An AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
Mr. Ralph Morita  
Department of Accounting and General Services  
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 430  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Morita:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

After a careful review of the subject project, we request the following corrections:

1. Figures 13 and 14 lack titles; please add them to the figures for the final EIS.

2. The Table of Contents entries for Figures 13 and 14 do not reference Candidate site numbers; correct them. OK

3. On page 14-8 the reader is referred to Appendix C for a full treatment of cost considerations, but no costs appear in this appendix. Please correct your reference. App. H

4. You say print your document on both sides of the pages if you wish to reduce volume. (did not)

If you have any questions, please call Ms. Nancy Heinrich at 586-4185.

Sincerely,

BRUCE E. ANDERSON, Ph.D.
Interim Director

cc: Stanley Yim & Associates (Attn: Jason Yim)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bruce Anderson, Interim Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Statement and Site Selection Study for Kapaa II Elementary School, Kauai.

We have reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Site Selection Study for the Kapaa II Elementary School and have the following comments.

There are two Coastal Zone Management (CZM) concerns with the sites identified in the EIS. One deals with the historic significance of most of the sites, the other with the potential for water quality degradation.

A statutory CZM policy is to "support state goals for protection, restoration, interpretation, and display of historic resources." Another is to "maximize information retention through preservation of remains and artifacts or salvage operations." These apply to four of the five sites considered for the school. The archaeological significance of the locations should be considered in the selection of a site.

With regard to site number 2, a relevant CZM policy is to "promote water quantity and quality 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." While the EIS considered the short term effects on the reservoir, there is no discussion about the long term effects. The increased run off from the paved surface could increase the sediment flow into the reservoir. The study also indicates that the sites receive more than 43 inches of rain a year. Because of poor drainage, the reservoir is the main drainage basin. Therefore, if the site is seriously considered, effective mitigation measures to control sediment run off should be developed and discussed in the EIS.

We also have several other concerns.

1. Section IV Evaluation—An evaluation should not be considered before all support studies have been done. The Draft EIS does not include studies on flora and fauna, traffic, and archaeology. These omissions are major flaws of the document. An evaluation of various characteristics of the five potential school sites should not be done until these studies are completed. There is a potential that if any endangered species are found on any of the sites that may lead to that site's elimination from consideration for the school. We note that the information from the Nature Conservancy is not complete, and should not take the place of actual surveys. Similarly, if any major archaeological sites are found on any site, that portion of the site may need to be preserved. That would reduce the usability and land area of the site. A traffic survey would be completed to determine what roadway improvements are needed for each of the sites. The cost of developing each of the site's infrastructure needs to be included in the evaluation and subsequent decision of the final school site.

2. Table, page II-41—The table should clarify whether water of sewer services could be made available to the proposed sites, and how it would be available, i.e., if the County wastewater treatment plant would have sufficient capacity or if there is a possibility of expansion of the existing plant to accommodate the school. Water supply should be treated the same. Also, the quantities should be indicated, for example, how much water and sewer capacity would be required for a school.

3. The draft EIS indicates that a sewage treatment plant could be built on the school site to dispose of wastewater. The document should indicate how the effluent would be disposed of, how much area the plant would require, and the cost of the plant. This factor should be considered in the evaluation section.

The Honorable Bruce Anderson
Page 2
August 23, 1994
4. Some of the figures do not have titles, and all of the proposed sites are not indicated on the figures.

5. The site location map should be located at the beginning of the document.

6. The maps showing the State Land Use Districts should be located in the same chapter as the zoning and general plan maps. That section would be clearer if the information for the State Land Use Districts were in a separate paragraph with a section heading, "State Land Use Districts."

Thank you for allowing us to comment. If you have any questions, please contact us at 587-2882.

Harold Masumoto
Director

cc: Department of Accounting and General Services
Stanley Yim and Associates

Ms. Roma Wong
Director
Office of State Planning
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Ms. Wong:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study
DAGS Job No. 14-16-4837

DAGS acknowledges and thanks your department for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your department's comments have been noted and the following responses are provided for your information:

1. Historic, Flora, Fauna and Traffic:

   Your position that evaluation of the various sites should not be considered until the archaeological, traffic, and flora and fauna studies have been prepared and completed for each of the five sites is acknowledged. The overall cost to prepare each of the studies for each of the sites is very costly. Hence, it has been DAGS' policy to perform these studies once a site is chosen. The studies and reports would then be prepared as part of the master plan/design phase of the work.

   Not having these individual studies prepared for each of the candidate sites does not mean there was no attempt to research the potential impacts on the archaeological significance, the traffic, and the flora and fauna at all. DAGS' Historic Preservation Division searched their files for archaeological and/or historic significance that each may contain. Kauai County agencies and the State Department of Transportation were contacted. Existing street right-of-ways, land uses and other major developments in the area of the candidate sites were researched regarding possible traffic impacts. The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the project to determine if wetlands and rare,
threatened or endangered species would be impacted. The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii searched their database for past significant sightings near the candidate sites. All discussions were developed with input and recommendations from the various government and private agencies that deal in these specific areas.

2. Water Quality Degradation (concerning Candidate Site 2):

Your concern about water quality degradation is appreciated. During the master plan/design stage of the project, different government agencies will be reviewing the design of the school's proposed drainage facilities and proposed landscaping plans. The plans would include appropriate mitigative measures that will address sediment runoff and the effects on the existing reservoir on the site.

3. Other Concerns:

a. Item 1 - See response above.

b. Item 2 - The table on Page II-41 of the report is a summary table and not intended to duplicate details already presented earlier in the report. On Page II-39, immediately preceding the summary table, it was indicated that "This table is only shown for a brief synopsis of the sites' existing features. Please refer to the related items in the previous sections for details." With regards to sewer services, the report will be modified to reflect that while there are existing sewer facilities presently available to serve nearby areas, all of the candidate sites happen to be beyond the County's designated sewer service areas. The possibility exists that certain planned projects in the designated sewer service areas may fall out in future years and be canceled. At that time, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve additional areas or other projects such as the proposed Kapaa II Elementary School. The reallocation process will not be automatic but will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, it is assumed each candidate site will need to be served by an on-site wastewater treatment system. Section C1 of the Project Setting entitled "Sewer" will be expanded to include a discussion of the on-site wastewater treatment system. Computation for water needs based on the new school's population will also be added to the Appendix.

c. Item 3 - The on-site wastewater system cost is already shown on Page IV-15 of the report. Appendix E of the report already shows the capacity and size of the on-site wastewater system. Should an on-site wastewater system be used, the effluent would be disposed of through a leach field and/or seepage pit.

d. Item 4 - All figures in the report will be titled and all sites if not already shown, will be shown on the applicable figures.

e. Item 5 - The site location maps are located in the chapter entitled "Identification of Potential Sites" because it is in this chapter that the sites are identified and discussed.

f. Item 6 - The State Land Use District maps will be moved to the same chapter as the zoning and general plan maps and the paragraph on State Land Use District maps will include the heading "State Land Use Districts."

This response letter and the August 23, 1994 letter from your department will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

CC:jk
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
The archaeological and historical significance of the proposed action is identified as an unresolved issue. The current requirements for an EIS in Section 200.11.17(c)(27), Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) provides that a draft EIS shall contain historic perspective necessary for evaluation and review of the environmental impact. While there has been no research or past written documentation on the archaeological and historical worth of any of the five candidate sites, we find that the cursory discussion in the EIS on how potential archaeological damage would be mitigated is unsupportable and inadequate. Neither does the applicant provide any overriding reason as to why this issue remains unresolved in the EIS. On page V-4, it is suggested that if archaeological or historical resources are found on the selected site, plans will be made to mitigate and/or preserve these resources. There is no mention, however, of what they would do if significant historical or archaeological resources are found which may warrant site preservation. Our reviewers suggest that archaeological and historical studies of the area should be done in the EIS preparation stage instead of in the action implementation stage.

Technical Comments

1. On page II-4, the statement that "breezes in the service area are mostly sea breezes during the day" is unsupported. There is no landsea breeze in this area. What is the authority for such description?

2. Some of the maps in the draft EIS are poorly produced. Figure 13 and Figure 14 are illegible. The source of Figure 15 needs to be given in the document.

3. Kaupa Marsh is located west of Kapua town (II-21). The proximity of each school site to the marsh should be taken into consideration for proposals of insect control.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft EIS, and we hope our comments are helpful in preparation of the final document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Environmental Coordinator

[Title and Signature]
Department of Accounting and General Services
Stanley Yim and Associates, Inc.
Roger Fujisaka
Marshall Block
Paul Ekem
Maria Sweaney
Hulin Dong

Govt
August 8, 1994
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Governor

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
Environmental Center
A Unit of Water Resources Research Center
Crawford 301 - 2500 Campus Road - Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96822
Telephone: (808) 956-7361 - Facsimile: (808) 956-3886

August 8, 1994

RECEIVED
AUG 9 1994

Dear Governor:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Kaupa II Elementary School on the Island of Kaua‘i discusses the procedures for selecting potential sites and their potential impacts on the environment.

The Office of Environmental Quality Control has reviewed this document with the assistance of Marshall Block, Assistant County Council; Paul Ekem, Entergy/Water Resources Research Center; Maria Sweaney, Anthropology; and Hulin Dong of the Environmental Center.

General Comments

In general, the draft EIS inadequately identifies potential environmental impacts that may accrue at each of the five sites under consideration. The mitigation measures prescribed in the document are far from convincing. It appears that all five sites have serious deficiencies that are difficult if not impossible to mitigate. With the exception of site 2, all other sites are on prime agricultural land. The engagement of these sites for the proposed action will render it irreversible. In addition, all five sites are in critical agricultural land and involve the necessary disposal areas (II-3-6), and none of the five sites is served by the existing sewer facilities in the proposed service area. We also believe that the alternative sites are reaching their carrying capacities. If the proposed school needs to be held, we believe that these criteria are met. If the draft EIS is selected (II-3-9), the site will be selected for the natural resource constraint to be further addressed in the document. Furthermore, sites 3 and 2 also face water constraints. The State will also be asked to upgrade the water transmission facilities if Site 3 or 2 is selected. The state action will also compound the existing traffic problem in Kapaa.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution
Dear Dr. Harrison:

Subject: New Kapaʻa II Elementary School Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your response comments were received well beyond the deadline for comments. The Office of Environmental Quality Control tells us that responses to late comments are not legally required. However, as a matter of courtesy, we offer the following:

General Comments:

1. Aside from fault finding and the negativism in your first paragraph, it seems you have only paraphrased the problems and concerns in the draft EIS. The report's purpose is not to convince anyone of anything but to present facts about the various candidate sites to enable a site to be chosen for the new school location. Your incessant accusations, measures being far from convincing, etc. do not contain nor reference any specifics to enable a proper response to be made. The Kapaʻa area, in general, does have many problems. First, unless agricultural land is used, there are no sites of the size needed that are readily available. Second, the few sites with ample acreage along the coastal areas are either in flood zones or are already developed. Three, while there may be a problem with connecting to the county's sewer system, the use of an on-site wastewater system is possible. There may or may not be a problem with effluent disposal but this concern can only be addressed during the project design. Four, while traffic may be a problem, the project's design would prepare a traffic impact analysis report for the chosen site and also provide mitigating measures to address any impacts. The combined elementary and intermediate/high school at its present location already creates a major traffic problem that can only improve when the enrollment at the present elementary school is relieved by a second elementary school at another site. It appears, based on the arguments in the first paragraph of your letter, no new school should be built because there will be no sites available in the service area.

2. With regards to paragraph two of your letter, the report's material is based on input and recommendations from the DLNR's Historic Preservation Division. They recommended an archaeological survey of the chosen site be conducted to ensure no archaeological, historical or cultural resources of significance are impacted by the new school's development. Furthermore, it has always been DAS's policy to perform such a survey after a site is chosen. Additionally, the landowners also say if the site is entirely within the sugarcane growing area, it is unlikely that archaeological/historical sites are present. The only reason this was identified as an unresolved issue in the report is because an archaeological inventory survey may be needed to ensure no resources will be impacted and that an archaeological survey may be done after a site is chosen (as required by DLNR's Historic Preservation Division). Furthermore, if an archaeological survey on the chosen site should indicate "in situ" preservation is required, then selection of the site would be reconsidered.

Response to Technical Comments:

1. The reference to breezes in the service area does not appear on Page II-4 as stated in your letter. No particular authority was cited for the description. However, the residents, living and working in the area did reference the breezes as such on some occasions. The phrase "land/sea breezes" will be deleted.
2. These maps are reproduced as best as possible. Because they are hard to read, the soil descriptions belonging to the various associations in the school service area have also been described in the report. The information is from the Soil Survey of Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai and Lanai, State of Hawaii. Figure 15's source will be added to the final EIS.

3. Figure 17 graphically shows the Kapa Marsh and Site 1 on the map. The other sites are off the map. The closest site is about 0.25 mile away and at an elevation about 80 feet higher than the marsh. The other sites are much further (about 2.25 miles) away. The likelihood of insects from the marsh affecting them is small, if any.

This response letter and your August 8, 1994 letter will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chung of the Planning Branch at 586-0487.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

GC;JK
CC: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
Honorable John Waihee, Governor
July 20, 1994
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While we have no other comments, we thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

County Engineer

RF

Re: MWS

Stanley Yiu & Associates

[Signature]

cc: DAGS

Stanley Yiu & Associates

Honorble John Waihee
Governor, State of Hawaii

c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
210 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Governor Waihee:

RE: NEW KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DRAFT EIS AND SITE SELECTION STUDY

KAEHAI, KAUAII

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the New Kapaa II Elementary School and offer the following comments which are related to wastewater:

a. Item 9, Unresolved Issues of SUMMARY: The mention of the alternative of reallocation of County wastewater treatment plant capacity and connection to the County's system is not consistent with the narrative portion of the report. On page IV-14 it states that no public sewer are available for any of the candidate sites and on page IV-11 it states that offsite facilities are not anticipated. Item 5, page V-6 also indicates that each candidate site will need to have its own onsite wastewater treatment system as is indicated in the evaluation of sites in APPENDIX C.

b. We are unable to readily determine from the Draft EIS, the projected wastewater volumes to be generated by the project.

c. Table A on page IV-15 indicates that the onsite wastewater treatment system will be septic tanks. Are septic tanks approvable by the State Department of Health for this size of project?
Mr. Eldon Franklin  
County Engineer  
Department of Public Works  
County of Maui  
3021 Umi Street  
Lilue, Hawaii  96766  

Dear Mr. Franklin:  

Subject: New Kapa'a II Elementary  
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study  
DADS Job No. 14-16-4837  

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. The following are our responses to your comments:

1. The unresolved issues of the summary correctly express the situation as presented. The report will be modified to reflect that while there are existing sewer facilities presently available to serve nearby areas, all of the candidate sites happen to be beyond the designated sewer service areas. The possibility exists that certain planned projects in the designated sewer service areas are already committed for service by the existing sewer facilities may fall out in the future and be canceled. At that time, the committed capacities for those canceled projects could be reallocated to serve additional areas or other projects such as the proposed Kapa'a II Elementary School. The reallocation process will not be automatic but will require negotiations between the State and County agencies. Until such discussions occur, each of the candidate sites will need to be served by on-site wastewater treatment systems.

2. Appendix E, Page 6 of the report is a table giving the sizes and estimating the cost for the septic tank and disposal field for the project. A part of this same table already includes the computations for the anticipated or projected wastewater volumes to be generated by the project.

3. The Department of Health does not object to using septic tanks for school sites. They have indicated in a recent discussion that septic tanks are acceptable for use as on-site wastewater treatment systems for this size and type of project.

This response letter along with your July 20, 1994 comment letter will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-0497.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATSUDA  
State Public Works Engineer

GC:jk  
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
July 7, 1994

Governor, State of Hawaii

c/o Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Draft EIS and Site Selection Study - Kapaa II Elementary School, TKH: 4-2-3:01, 4-1-09:17:18, 4-3-02:06, Kauai Hawaii

We have no objections to the draft EIS provided the applicant is made aware that any actual development of the proposed areas will be dependent on the adequacy of the existing source, storage and transmission facilities existing at that time.

If you have any questions, please call Gregg Fujikawa at 245-6986.

Huri T. Nielsen
Manager and Chief Engineer

Subj: Draft EIS and Site Selection Study - Kapaa II Elementary School

AUG 9 1994

Mr. Huri T. Nielsen
Manager and Chief Engineer
Department of Water
County of Kauai
P.O. Box 1706
Lihue, Hawaii 96766-5706

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

Subject: Draft EIS and Site Selection Study - Kapaa II Elementary School

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Your July 7, 1994 letter indicating that the Department of Water does not have any objections to the draft EIS provided the applicant is made aware that any actual development of the proposed areas will be dependent on the adequacy of the existing source, storage and transmission facilities existing at that time along with this response letter will be included in the final EIS.

If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 586-6467.

Very truly yours,

Gordon Matsubara
State Public Works Engineer

CC: STANLEY YIN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
July 1, 1994

In reply refer to:
File #21-6-46298

Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
2850 Pau Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96819

Attention: Mr. Jason Yim

SUBJECT: NEW KAPAII ELementary School DRAFT EIS AND SITE SELECTION STUDY

Dear Mr. Yim:

We have completed our review of the recently submitted study for the above mentioned project. We have no further comments except for the following clarification:

Page II-13 indicates the transmission lines will require upgrading to serve sites 1, 2, and 3. Please note that the transmission lines, as well as the distribution lines, are adequate to serve these sites. However, the existing distribution lines must be extended to the exact site location in order to provide service. This is true for all 5 sites.

Should you have any questions, please call me at 246-4167.

Very truly yours,

PATTY FINLAY
Customer Engineer

cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
Beyond the call
August 1, 1994

Mr. Ralph Morita
Department of Accounting and General Services
1151 Punchbowl St., Room 430
Honolulu, HI 96813

Subject: NEW KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
DRAFT EIS AND SITE SELECTION STUDY

Dear Mr. Morita:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS. Telephone service to each of the five potential sites will be provided by Service Connections as defined in our P.U.C. Tariff No. 1 Section 2. A summary of the Service Connections tariff is given below:

1. AERIAL CONNECTIONS. GTE Hawaiian Tel will, at its expense, provide up to 320 feet of service connection facility in addition to the cable between the last service pole on private property and the building served. The applicant will be required to bear the installed cost of any service connection facility in excess of 320 feet.

2. UNDERGROUND CONNECTIONS. The applicant or customer at his expense shall perform all staking and backfill, furnish, install and maintain on his property the required underground conduit system (conduit, pull boxes, etc.) satisfactory to GTE Hawaiian Tel. GTE Hawaiian Tel will furnish, install and maintain in accordance with its construction standards and its expense up to 500 feet of underground wiring on the applicant's or customer's property. The applicant or customer will be required to bear the installed cost of any wiring required in excess of 500 feet.

Sites 1, 2, 4, and 5 are relatively close to existing GTE Hawaiian Tel facilities and may not, depending on the individual telephone service routing, require Aid To Construction charges. Site 3 (west of Wai'anae House Lelo) is served from the much closer Ewa Beach Commercial which may not require Aid To Construction charges depending on the service routing.

We ask that you provide us a copy of your final EIS when it is available and that we are notified as soon as a site is selected so we may begin service provisioning planning to that location. Should you have any questions, please call me at 241-5051 or James Sone at 241-5052.

Sincerely,

Gary K. Heu
Operations Supervisor
GTE Engineering-Kauai

cc: T. Nakaokama
N. Ahi

John Magee

STATE OF HAWAI'I
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
P. O. BOX 400, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96804

SEP 29 1994

Mr. Gary K. Heu
Operations Supervisor
GTE Engineering-Kauai
GTE Hawaiian Telephone
4444 Rice Street
Lihue, Hawaii 96766

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study

DRSS Jol. No. 14-15-4877

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for subject project. We acknowledge your August 1, 1994 letter which:

1. Summarizes the Service Connections tariff.
2. Indicates the proximity of the existing GTE Hawaiian Telephone facilities to the candidate sites.
3. Requests a copy of the final EIS.
4. Asks for GTE Hawaiian Telephone to be notified once a site is selected so that GTE Hawaiian Telephone may begin service provisioning planning to that location.

This response letter and your August 1, 1994 letter will be included in the final EIS.

Very truly yours,
GORDON MATSUOKA
State Public Works Engineer

cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.

RECEIVED
OCT 3 1994

STANLEY YIM & ASSOC., INC.
Governor, State of Hawaii  
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September 16, 1994

1. Preface section, fourth paragraph, last sentence. 
   Add the word "area" after "national disaster."

2. Page 1 - 6, Table 1. 
   Are some of the data accurate or are they all projected as the title suggests? 
   Also, is the classroom inventory projected as the title says or current as described in the table?

   Drainage planning must be conducted with LPCo if irrigation ditches as a means of drainage are being considered so as to ensure least disruption to the cane growing activities.

   All references to "Olohena Street" should be corrected to "Olohena Road."

5. Page II - 41, third from bottom. 
   Site 3 appears to be entirely within the sugarcane growing area. If this is so it is unlikely that archaeological/historical sites are present.

   Candidate sites 4 and 5 do have negative improvements in the form of a cane haul road and irrigation systems which would need to be addressed (relocation and/or replacement). LPCo should also be compensated for any crop damage.

7. Page IV - 12, 2. Land Acquisition Costs. 
   Value of the land should be derived through a formal appraisal process instead of assessed valuation for tax purposes.

8. Page IV - 15, Table A 
   Same comment as for 7 above.

9. Page IV - 16, third paragraph 
   Olohena Road instead of Olohena Street.

    Same comments as for 5 above.

    Same comments as for 6 above.

    Same comments as for 5 above.

    The State Department of Transportation's plans to build a new Kapaa bypass highway would have a significant impact on the planning and perhaps suitability of Candidate Sites 3, 4 and 5, depending on the route selected.

14. At a general comment; if any of the LPCo site is ultimately selected, we ask that the DOE and developer work closely with LPCo to ensure least possible disruption to the sugarcane growing activities.
Governor, State of Hawaii
Page 3
September 16, 1994

Please feel free to call the undersigned at 245-4947 should there by any questions.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Michael H. Furuwaka
Vice President

cc: Office of Environmental Quality Control
    Department of Accounting and General Services
    Stanley Tim and Associates

Mr. Michael H. Furuwaka
Vice President
The Libue Plantation Company, Ltd.
2970 Kele Street
Libue, Hawaii 96786-1803

Dear Mr. Furuwaka:

Subject: New Kapaa II Elementary School
Draft EIS and Site Selection Study
DAGS Job No. 14-16-4837

Thank you for participating in the review and comment phase for the subject project. Our responses to your September 16, 1994 comments are as follows:

1. The word "area" will be added after "national disaster."

2. The enrollment figures have been revised to include actual and projected enrollment numbers. The classroom inventory has been revised to reflect an current status of the classroom inventory. The final EIS will reflect the revised numbers and will indicate which numbers are actual versus projected.

3. The final EIS will state that if irrigation ditches are to be used as a means of drainage, planning must be conducted with the Libue Plantation Company to ensure least disruption to the cane growing activities.

4. Oloheha Street will be revised to Oloheha Road.

5. Your comment that archaeological/historical sites are unlikely at Site 3 is acknowledged and will be included in the final EIS.

6. The final EIS will indicate that Candidate Sites 4 and 5 do have perceptible improvements in the forms of a cane haul road and irrigation systems which would need to be relocated and/or replaced and that Libue Plantation Company may need to be compensated for any crop damage.
7. The land value in the draft EIS is only for comparing the five candidate sites on a common basis which, in this case, is based on the assessed valuation for tax purposes. It is not intended to replace the formal appraisal process which will be performed once a site is chosen. This will be added to the final EIS.

8. See response for Item 7.


10. See response for Item 5.


12. See response for Item 5.

13. Comment acknowledged.

14. Comments acknowledged.

This response letter and your September 16, 1994 letter will be included in the final EIS. If you have any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Gary Chong of the Planning Branch at 866-9467.

Very truly yours,

GORDON MATUSUKA
State Public Works Engineer

GC:jK
cc: Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
XV. APPENDICES
APPENDIX A - STATE LAND INVENTORY
Identification of Encumbrances

VACX: Land is vacant pending disposition or board action. Land is vacant but a permit may be pending, or in the process for approval to build on that land.

VAC: Land is vacant. Anyone can apply for a permit to use the land.

GEO: Government Executive Order. The government has set the land aside for government use such as schools, etc.

GL: General Lease. The land is leased to a tenant (more than likely on a long term basis).

RP: Revocable Permit. The land is leased on a month to month basis and the lease can be revoked at any time. Example would be a concession stand usage, etc.

HWYR: Land that has been set aside for highway use.

Types of State Land Use Zoning Districts

UD Urban District
CD Conservation District
AD Agricultural District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX MAP SS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NAME OF USER</th>
<th>LAND AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>PAGE CITY DRAINAGE ESWY</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>GEORGE CHRISTIAN A</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>GEORGE CHRISTIAN A</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>ESTATE TO MAIT CIV LUP004202</td>
<td>1.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>HAPPO RIVER &amp; FAX</td>
<td>10.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>STATE-HI DLMN LWMAS RIV PK</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>STATE-HI DLMN LWMAS RIV PK</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>REHABILITATION UNLIMITED</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>COCONUT GROVE DRAINAGE DIT</td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>STATE-HI DLMN LWMAS RIVER</td>
<td>3.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>STATE-HI DLMN LWMAS RIV PK</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>NURSING HOME</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>WASHINGTON ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>STATE-HI DDM DR PHQY</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>WASHINGTON ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>PUBLIC UTILITY</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>VACX</td>
<td>RIVER LAND WILUS, KANHAWI</td>
<td>3.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>INNR</td>
<td>MILI REMETT VRUER KANHAW</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11-00-00-000-000</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>FERNANDO, GEORGE E</td>
<td>9.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX MAP KEY</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>ST COUNTY ON PLN DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>PROOFS 6006 STATE OF HAWAII FOREST RESER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A001-010-0000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>KAPA FOREST OWNERS ASSOCIATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-0000-0000-0000</td>
<td>Vac</td>
<td>VAC</td>
<td>VAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Land Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>County Code</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAC</td>
<td>VAC</td>
<td>VAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B - OTHER PARCELS CONSIDERED IN THIS REPORT BUT NOT SELECTED
APPENDIX C - CANDIDATE SITE EVALUATIONS AND RESULTS
APPENDIX C

CANDIDATE SITE EVALUATIONS AND RESULTS

Site evaluation results for each of the five candidate sites relative to school site criteria and community criteria are given in this appendix. Section IV of this document describes each of the criteria in detail.

Site Characteristics Items 2, 4, and 5 refers to the Kauai Lands Classified By Physical Qualities For Urban Usage Map which is shown as Figure 15.

Community Effects Item 3 refers to the land classification according to suitability for Intensive Agriculture which is shown as Figure 16.

Sewer service for the new school is evaluated based on present conditions which means the new school would need an onsite sewage treatment facility.
CANDIDATE SITE 1: OLOHENA SITE

School Site Criteria

A. Site Characteristics

1. Size........................................................................... Excellent
   Parcel has 183.281 usable acres. A 12.0 acre school site can be located in an area with slopes ranging from 0 to 12 percent.

2. Slope........................................................................... Good
   Majority of slopes range from 3 to 10 percent.

3. Shape........................................................................... Excellent
   Any shape can be accommodated on the larger 183.281 acre parcel.

4. Foundation.................................................................... Excellent
   Soil character code for site is "I".

5. Soil............................................................................. Excellent
   Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a depth of over 10 feet.

6. Drainage...................................................................... Poor
   Site has no existing drainage improvements.

7. Contours...................................................................... Good
   Contour alignment falls within 22.5° of the north-south direction.

8. Aesthetic Value............................................................. Good
   Site can be beautified. Although parcel has overhead lines crossing it at the far East side, the new school site can be situated at a location away from the overhead lines.

B. Utilities

1. Water.......................................................................... Poor
   Water capacity is adequate but transmission line needs upgrading to handle fireflows.

2. Sewer.......................................................................... Poor
   Site has no public sewer service and will need construction of an onsite sewage treatment and disposal system.

3. Power and Communications........................................ Good
   Existing power and communications available to serve school's needs.

C. Accessibility

1. Pedestrian.................................................................... Poor
   Site has no improved pedestrian access.

2. Automobile.................................................................. Good
   Long side of site will front Oloheha Road.

3. Bus Service.................................................................... Good
   School bus passes within reasonable distance of site.

4. Traffic.......................................................................... Good
   Oloheha Road is a through road capable of handling school traffic.

5. Safety.......................................................................... Poor
   Existing road has blind curves, high traffic speed, and hazardous conditions for pedestrians.
D. Environment

1. Highway Noise .......................................................... Poor
   Olohe Road is also a truck route.

2. Aircraft Noise .......................................................... Excellent
   Closest airport is in Lihue over 8 miles away.

3. Rainfall ................................................................. Poor
   Median annual rainfall is greater than 43".

4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances ................................ Poor
   Parcel is an existing sugar cane field which may contribute to
   considerable nuisances and discomfort during harvesting.

5. Attractive Nuisances .................................................. Excellent
   Nearest commercial center (stores) is more than a half mile away.

Community Site Criteria

A. Government

1. State Land Use District Map ....................................... Poor
   Parcel designated Agricultural.

2. County General Plan .................................................. Good
   Parcel designated as Urban Mixed Use.

3. County Zoning .......................................................... Good
   Parcel zoned Agricultural.

B. Community Effects

1. Displacement .......................................................... Good
   Site contains sugar cane crop, irrigation ditches, and a cane haul
   road.

2. Interference with Institutions ..................................... Excellent
   Site is more than a half mile away from hospital and any rest homes.

3. Agricultural ............................................................. Poor
   Site is moderately suited for intensive agriculture. Site rated Class B.

4. Existing Use ............................................................. Poor
   Site is being used for sugar cane cultivation.

5. Traffic ................................................................. Good
   Site is situated such that about half of the morning work-bound traffic
   from the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic.

6. Land Owners ........................................................... Good
   Site is owned by The Lihue Plantation Company Limited.

7. Natural Beauty .......................................................... Excellent
   Site is not an aesthetic asset to the community.

8. Location ................................................................. Poor
   Site is within walking distance of less than 50% of the students.
CANDIDATE SITE 2: NONOU SITE

School Site Criteria

A. Site Characteristics

1. Size................................................. Good
   Site has about 12 acres and includes an existing reservoir and earth
   banks resulting in less than 12 acres being usable for the school.
   Earth banks may be made usable with proper landscaping and
   grading.

2. Slope............................................... Poor
   Majority of slopes range from 10 to 15 percent.

3. Shape............................................... Good
   Parcel's shape approximates square.

4. Foundation......................................... Excellent
   Site soil character code is "1".

5. Soil ................................................. Excellent
   Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a depth over 10 feet.

6. Drainage........................................... Poor
   Site has no drainage facility.

7. Contours.......................................... Poor
   Alignment falls within 22.6° of the northeast-southwest direction.

8. Aesthetic Value.................................... Good
   Site has reservoir and rolling hills that can be a part of the campus
   with proper grading and landscaping.

B. Utilities

1. Water ................................................ Poor
   Water capacity adequate to meet school's needs but transmission line
   needs upgrading to handle fireflows.

2. Sewer ............................................ Poor
   No public sewers, onsite sewage treatment & disposal system
   needed.

3. Power and Communications.................... Good
   Existing power and communications nearby to meet school's needs.

C. Accessibility

1. Pedestrian......................................... Excellent
   Pedestrian access available from all four sides.

2. Automobile ....................................... Excellent
   Site is bounded by Haleiwa Road on two sides and Kaulana Road and
   Makani Road on the other sides.

3. Bus Service....................................... Excellent
   School bus passes within reasonable distance of the site. There is an
   existing school bus stop on the east side of the site.

4. Traffic .......................................... Good
   Access to site is via a through street capable of handling heavy
   traffic. There are existing roads on all four sides of the site.

Appendix C
5. Safety ................................................................. Good
   No existing blind curves or traffic hazards but Halelilio Road bordering
   about half of the site is narrow.

D. Environment  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Highway Noise ............................................................................. Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is in a residential community. It is more than 1500 feet from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuhio Highway and any truck routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aircraft Noise ........................................................................... Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihue Airport is more than 8 miles away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rainfall ....................................................................................... Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median annual rainfall is greater than 43&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances ........................................... Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agricultural activities nearby.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attractive Nuisances ..................................................................... Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores and commercial centers are more than a half mile away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Site Criteria

A. Government  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Land Use District Map ................................................................ Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is designated Urban.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. County General Plan ........................................................................... Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is designated Urban Residential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. County Zoning .................................................................................. Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is zoned Open.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Community Effects  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Displacement ..................................................................................... Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has one residential structure on it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interference with Institutions ................................................................ Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is greater than half mile away from any hospital or rest home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agricultural ...................................................................................... Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is unsuited for intensive agriculture. It is rated Class &quot;D&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Existing Use ...................................................................................... Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Except for cattle grazing, Parcel 18 is leased under a revocable permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Parcel 17 is vacant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Traffic ............................................................................................. Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than half of the morning work-bound traffic from the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area coincides with the school-bound traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Land Owners ...................................................................................... Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is owned by the State of Hawaii.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Natural Beauty .................................................................................. Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is not an aesthetic asset to the community but is close to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base of the Sleeping Giant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location ........................................................................................... Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is within walking distance for 50% of the students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANDIDATE SITE 3: WAILUA SITE

School Site Criteria

A. Site Characteristics

1. Size................................................................................................. Excellent
   Parcel size is 288.90 acres on which a 12 acre site can be fitted.

2. Slope............................................................................................... Good
   Majority of slopes range from 3 to 10 percent.

3. Shape............................................................................................... Excellent
   Site is shaped rectangular.

4. Foundation...................................................................................... Excellent
   Site’s soil character code is "I".

5. Soil ................................................................................................. Excellent
   Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a depth over 10 feet.

6. Drainage ......................................................................................... Poor
   Site has no drainage facility.

7. Contours......................................................................................... Good
   Contour alignment falls within 22.5° of the north-south direction.

8. Aesthetic Value .............................................................................. Good
   Site can be beautified with proper landscaping.

B. Utilities

1. Water ............................................................................................... Poor
   Water capacity is adequate to meet the school’s needs but transmission line needs extension from Kuhio Highway to site.

2. Sewer .............................................................................................. Poor
   No public sewers, onsite sewage treatment & disposal system needed.

3. Power and Communications ......................................................... Poor
   Site is far away from existing power and communications.

C. Accessibility

1. Pedestrian ...................................................................................... Poor
   No existing pedestrian access. Nearest access is across private lots.

2. Automobile .................................................................................... Poor
   No existing automobile access.

3. Bus Service ................................................................................... Good
   Nearest school bus service is along Haleiwa Road which is near to site.

4. Traffic ............................................................................................. Poor
   Site access via a dead end street and across private lots. Otherwise construction of lengthy access to Kuhio Highway necessary.

5. Safety ............................................................................................ Good
   Major access with no hazards and sidewalks can be provided to site.
D. Environment

1. Highway Noise ................................................................. Good
   Site is 500 ft to 1,500 ft away from a major road and a truck route.

2. Aircraft Noise ................................................................. Excellent
   Site is more than 8 miles away from Lihue Airport.

3. Rainfall ............................................................................ Poor
   Site has a median annual rainfall greater than 43".

4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances .................................. Good
   Nuisance would be from trucks traveling periodically on the Cane Haul
   Road but should be within human toleration.

5. Attractive Nuisances .......................................................... Excellent
   Site is more than half mile from commercial enterprises such as
   stores.

Community Site Criteria

A. Government

1. State Land Use District Map .............................................. Poor
   Site is designated as Agricultural.

2. County General Plan .......................................................... Good
   Site is designated Urban Mixed Use.

3. County Zoning .................................................................... Good
   Site is zoned Agricultural.

B. Community Effects

1. Displacement ................................................................. Good
   Site contains sugar cane, irrigation ditches, and a cane haul road.

2. Interference with Institutions ........................................... Excellent
   Site is more than a half mile from the hospital and any major
   institutions that may be affected by the school's activities.

3. Agricultural ......................................................................... Poor
   Site is well suited for intensive agriculture and has a Class A rating.

4. Existing Use ......................................................................... Poor
   Site is being used for agriculture - sugar cane cultivation.

5. Traffic ................................................................................. Good
   Site is located such that half of the morning work bound traffic from
   the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic.

6. Land Owners ...................................................................... Good
   Site is owned by The Lihue Plantation Company Limited.

7. Natural Beauty .................................................................... Good
   The site has no aesthetic value to the community but may obstruct
   scenic views for some houses nearby looking toward the ocean.

8. Location ................................................................................ Good
   Site is within waking distance for about 50% of the students.
CANDIDATE SITE 4: KUHIO-S SITE

School Site Criteria

A. Site Characteristics
   1. Size................................................................. Excellent
      Parcel size is 288.90 acres on which a 12 acre site can be located.
   2. Slope................................................................. Good
      Majority of slopes range from 3 to 10 percent.
   3. Shape................................................................. Excellent
      Site has a rectangular shape with short side fronting Kuhio Highway.
   4. Foundation.......................................................... Excellent
      Site’s soil character code is “1”.
   5. Soil................................................................. Excellent
      Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a depth over 10 feet.
   6. Drainage............................................................. Poor
      Site has no drainage facilities.
   7. Contours............................................................. Good
      Contour alignment falls within 22.5° of the north-south direction.
   8. Aesthetic Value.................................................... Good
      Site can be beautified with proper landscaping.

B. Utilities
   1. Water................................................................. Excellent
      Water capacity and transmission facilities in Kuhio Highway are adequate to meet the school’s needs.
   2. Sewer.................................................................... Poor
      No public sewers, onsite sewage treatment & disposal system needed.
   3. Power and Communications........................................ Excellent
      Existing power and communications available in Kuhio Highway to meet the school’s needs.

C. Accessibility
   1. Pedestrian.......................................................... Poor
      Site has no existing pedestrian access.
   2. Automobile.......................................................... Poor
      Site has no existing automobile access.
   3. Bus Service......................................................... Good
      School bus service passes on Kuhio Highway.
   4. Traffic.................................................................... Poor
      Access to the site is off of Kuhio Highway.
   5. Safety.................................................................... Good
      Hazard free access with sidewalks can be easily provided for the site.
D. Environment

1. Highway Noise ................................................................. Poor
   Site is within 500 ft of Kuhio Highway.

2. Aircraft Noise ............................................................... Excellent
   Site is more than 8 miles away from Lihue Airport.

3. Rainfall ........................................................................ Poor
   Median annual rainfall is greater than 43".

4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances................................. Good
   Nuisances would be from trucks traveling periodically along the Cane
   Haul Road but should be within human toleration.

5. Attractive Nuisances......................................................... Poor
   Site is within 0.25 mile from commercial enterprises such as stores.

Community Site Criteria

A. Government

1. State Land Use District Map ............................................. Poor
   Site is designated Agricultural.

2. County General Plan....................................................... Good
   Site is designated Urban Mixed Use.

3. County Zoning.................................................................. Good
   Site is zoned Agricultural.

B. Community Effects

1. Displacement ................................................................. Good
   Site contains sugar cane, irrigation ditches, and a cane haul road.

2. Interference with Institutions ......................................... Excellent
   Site is greater than half mile from the hospital, and any major
   institutions that may be affected from the school's activities.

3. Agricultural ..................................................................... Poor
   Site is well suited for intensive agriculture and has a Class A rating.

4. Existing Use .................................................................... Poor
   Site is used for agriculture - sugar cane cultivation.

5. Traffic ............................................................................... Good
   Site is located such that half of the morning work bound traffic from
   the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic.

6. Land Owners................................................................. Good
   Site is owned by The Lihue Plantation Company Limited.

7. Natural Beauty ............................................................. Good
   Site has no aesthetic value to the community.

8. Location .......................................................................... Good
   Site is within waking distance for about 50% of the students.
CANDIDATE SITE 5: KUHIO-L SITE

School Site Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Site Characteristics</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Size: Parcel size is 288.80 acres on which a 12 acre site can be located.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Slope: Majority of slopes range from 3 to 10 percent.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shape: Site has a rectangular shape with long side fronting Kuhio Highway.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foundation: Site’s soil character code is “1”.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Soil: Site is composed of non-rocky soil with a depth over 10 feet.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Drainage: Site has no drainage facilities.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contours: Contour alignment falls within 22.5° of the north-south direction.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aesthetic Value: Site can be beautified with proper landscaping.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Utilities</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Water: Water capacity and transmission facilities in Kuhio Highway are adequate to meet the school’s needs.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sewer: No public sewers, onsite sewage treatment &amp; disposal system needed.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Power and Communications: Existing power and communications available in Kuhio Highway to meet the school’s needs.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Accessibility</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pedestrian: Site has no existing pedestrian access.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Automobile: Site has no existing automobile access.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bus Service: School bus service passes on Kuhio Highway.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Traffic: Access to the site is off of Kuhio Highway.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Safety: Hazard free access with sidewalks can be easily provided for the site.</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Environment

1. Highway Noise. Site is within 500 ft of Kuhio Highway.
   Rating: Poor

2. Aircraft Noise. Site is more than 8 miles away from Lihue Airport.
   Rating: Excellent

3. Rainfall. Median annual rainfall is greater than 43".
   Rating: Poor

4. Industrial and Agricultural Nuisances. Nuisances would be from trucks traveling periodically along the Cane Haul Road but it should be within human tolerance.
   Rating: Good

5. Attractive Nuisances. Site is within 0.25 mile from commercial enterprises such as stores.
   Rating: Poor

Community Site Criteria

A. Government

1. State Land Use District Map. Site is designated Agricultural.
   Rating: Poor

2. County General Plan. Site is designated Urban Mixed Use.
   Rating: Good

3. County Zoning. Site is zoned Agricultural.
   Rating: Good

B. Community Effects

1. Displacement. Site contains sugar cane, irrigation ditches, and a cane haul road.
   Rating: Good

2. Interference with Institutions. Site is greater than half mile from the hospital, and any major institutions that may be affected from the school's activities.
   Rating: Excellent

3. Agricultural. Site is well suited for intensive agriculture and has a Class A rating.
   Rating: Poor

4. Existing Use. Site is used for agriculture - sugar cane cultivation.
   Rating: Poor

5. Traffic. Site is located such that half of the morning work bound traffic from the service area coincides with the school-bound traffic.
   Rating: Good

   Rating: Good

7. Natural Beauty. Site has no aesthetic value to the community.
   Rating: Good

8. Location. Site is within waking distance for about 50% of the students.
   Rating: Good
APPENDIX D - DEFERRED LAND TAX & AGRICULTURAL LAND DEDICATION ASSESSMENT
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
COUNTY OF KAUAI
REAL PROPERTY TAXATION

DEFERRED LAND TAX

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR
OF FINANCE RELATING TO THE ASSESSMENT
OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND THE IMPOSITION
OF THE DEFERRED TAX UNDER
SECTION 58-8.1(A) OF THE KAUAII COUNTY CODE 1987

SECTION RP-1.1. Purpose of rules. These rules and
regulations are intended to implement the provision of Section
58-8.1(A), Kauai County Code 1987, as amended, herein referred to
as "KCC 1987", relating to the assessment of land classified and
used for agriculture and to the imposition of the deferred or
rollback tax upon the conversion of such agricultural lands.

The purpose of this ordinance (to be consistent with Act 190,
S.L. 1973) is to encourage the owners of lands, which are situated
within the agricultural district, suitable for agriculture, to put
that land to agricultural use on a sustained basis, and to
discourage (by tax recapture) the conversion of such lands or the
reduction or subdivision of agricultural land parcels to less than
reasonable economic size. Such lands classified and used for
agriculture shall be assessed at their use in agriculture without
regard to market value or neighboring land values.

SECTION RP-1.2 Definitions. (a) As used in these rules and
regulations:

(1) The term "agricultural use" shall mean lands actually put
to agricultural use adhering to acceptable standards to
produce crops, or specific livestock, including ranching use. Actually put to agricultural use shall be deemed to
be when crops are actually cultivated, and farm
management efforts such as weeding and pruning control,
pastures, including housing, fencing and water facilities
for livestock and pasture of animals are clearly evident. It neither includes nor applies to areas used
primarily as yard space, setback, or open landscape
associated with the fair agricultural use planted with fruit and
ornamental trees, flowers and vegetables primarily for
house use.

(2) The term "agricultural use value" shall mean the value
for assessment purposes determined by the director for
lands being put to any agricultural use.

(3) The term "conversion" shall mean (i) the government-
approved subdivision of agricultural land into parcels of
five (5) acres or less or (ii) a land use district conversion from
agricultural to an urban or rural district where such change is initiated by other than a
governmental agency.

(4) The term "deferred" tax shall mean that recaptured tax
imposed by Section RP-1.4 upon the owner of agricultural
lands assessed according to its agricultural use when the
land is changed in its use designation to an urban or
rural use district by any property owner, or lessee or
when such lands are subdivided into parcels of five (5)
acres or less.

(5) The term "director" shall mean the County Director of
Finance or designate.

(6) The term "fair agricultural lease rent" shall mean the
lease rental determined by the director as the reasonable
lease rent paid in the open market for comparable
agricultural land leased for agricultural use.

(7) The term "fulfills all of the requirements of the
dedication" shall mean that the owner, or successor to
the owner if such be the case shall have complied with
all of the terms, conditions or restrictions of the
dedication for the minimum period of dedication.

(8) The term "homestead" shall mean that portion of the land
which is used for residential purposes, including the
land upon which the house is located, together with all
accessory buildings and the land designated to be the
yard space.

(9) The term "land use district" shall mean the urban, rural,
conservation and agricultural districts classified and
established by the Land Use Commission of the State of
Hawaii pursuant to Chapter 205 of the Hawaii Revised
Statutes.

(10) The term "rate of capitalization" shall mean the annual
percentage rate applied to the fair agricultural lease
rent, or annual net income imputed to land, for the
purpose of determining the value of the land.

(11) The term "tax year" shall mean the period commencing from
July 1 of a calendar year and ending on June 30 of the
following calendar year.

(12) The term "unsuitable or unsuitable for any agricultural
use" shall mean either: (i) comprised of land which is
(13) The term "native forest land" shall mean a minimum area of one acre of land either stocked with trees at a crown density of at least 10 per cent or covered with shrubs to a crown density of at least 50 per cent. At least 50 per cent of the preceding stock of trees or shrubs must be of species designated by the Division of Forestry and Wildlife of the Department of Land and Natural Resources of the State of Hawai’i as native to Hawai’i.

(b) Use of Gender and Number. Words importing the singular number shall extend to and include the plural; words importing the plural shall extend to and include the singular; and words importing the male or female gender shall extend to and include the female and the male as the case may be.

SECTION RP-1.3. Lands subject to the deferred tax. (a) Agricultural lands shall be subject to the deferred tax when:

(1) The land parcel is located within the agricultural district as established by the Land Use Commission of the State of Hawai’i; and

(2) The land is actually put to an agriculture use; and

(3) The land has been assessed by the director according to its value in the agricultural use; and

(4) The land has not been dedicated under the provisions of Section 5A-9-1, KCC 1987.

(b) The real property taxes upon the portion of a land parcel subject to deferred tax under this section that is unusable or unsuitable for any agricultural use, whether dedicated or not, shall be treated as a deferred tax.

SECTION RP-1.4 Assessment of lands subject to the deferred tax. (e) Where lands are in the agricultural district and used for agricultural purposes, the director shall:

(1) Classify the land in its agricultural use, and determine the assessed value of the land in its agricultural use.

(2) Classify the land according to its highest and best use and determine the assessed value of the land according to such highest and best use.

(3) Record the assessed value of the land (1) in its highest and best use and (II) in its agricultural use on the appropriate records.

(d) For portions of land parcels subject to deferred tax under this section which are unusable or unsuitable for any agricultural use, the director shall:

(1) Classify and determine the assessed value of the land according to its highest and best use.

(2) Record the assessed value so determined on the appropriate records accessible to the public.

(3) Make no current property tax assessments until conversion has occurred or the land is put to any use.

(c) When lands with the agricultural district are not put to any agricultural use, including any portion of the land being used as a homestead, such lands shall be assessed at their highest and best use based upon comparable value of similar lands being put to similar uses as reflected in the market.

(d) When the land is reclassified, the director shall:

(1) Note the date of reclassification on appropriate records. The effective date of reclassification is the date of the decision and order by the Land Use Commission.

(2) Send an "Amended Notice of Assessment" to the owner when the agricultural use is discontinued or three years from the date of reclassification, whichever is sooner.

(3) Where the agricultural use continues, the land shall continue to be assessed at its agricultural use for a period of three years or until development of the land to its urban or rural use is initiated, whichever should first occur.

SECTION RP-1.5 Valuation considerations. (e) The agriculture use value of lands classified and used for agriculture shall be based upon the special considerations as provided in Section 5A-8.1(e)(1), KCC 1987.

Whenever such data are unavailable or are inadequate for the director to determine the agricultural use value, the director shall make his determination based upon the fair agricultural lease rent of comparable land, which may be in other agricultural use, as income imputed to land and capitalized into value.

(b) The income approach to value shall be used, as far as possible, to determine agricultural use values.
The director shall impose the deferred taxes upon the owner of agricultural lands when a conversion occurs in the following situations:

1. Upon subdivision of the land into parcels of five acres or less.
2. When the land is reclassified from agricultural to an urban or rural district, where the owner or lessor has petitioned for the land use district reclassification.
3. Deferred taxes shall be rolled back to the date the land was deemed to be taxed as agricultural lands, but in no event shall the roll-back period exceed ten years.
4. Deferred taxes shall be due and payable:
   1. Where a conversion results from the subdivision of land into parcels of 5 acres or less, each parcel resulting from the subdivision shall be separately and independently assessed a prorata share of the deferred tax and shall be subject to the prorated deferred tax. The effective date of the subdivision is the date the subdivision is given final approval as provided in Section 9, KCC 1987. The deferred tax shall be due and payable within sixty (60) days following the effective date of the subdivision.
   2. Where the conversion results from a land use district reclassification, the amount of deferred tax shall be computed at the end of the tax year or at the end of the third tax year following the reclassification provided the conditions of the extension are met. The deferred tax shall be due and payable within thirty (30) days following the mailing of the notice.
   3. All deferred taxes shall be subject to a penalty of ten percent (10%) per annum from the date they would have been due without the deferral.
   4. Whenever the deferred taxes are imposed, the director shall determine the amount of special deferred tax assessment to the owner.

The deferred tax shall not be imposed when the conversion is initiated by any government agencies. The deferred tax shall not be imposed on an owner or lessor who did not petition for the reclassification, and the extended three years use value provisions may apply.

Where a conversion results from a land use district reclassification, the deferred tax shall be set aside provided the owner continued the agricultural use and dedication the land for the purposes specified and fulfills all the requirements of land dedication. (Petitions to dedicate must be filed on or before the statutory deadline of the third tax year following the reclassification.)

A. If the petition to dedicate is approved and all the requirements for dedication are met, the deferred tax shall be set aside and the land shall be subject to the provisions of dedication as provided in Section 5A-9.1, KCC 1987.

B. If the petition to dedicate is disapproved, the deferred tax shall be imposed at the end of the tax year as provided in Section RP-1.6 of these regulations.

Lien. All taxes and penalties due and owing as deferred taxes shall attach to the land as a paramount lien pursuant to Section 5A-9.1, KCC 1987.

Appeals. The owner shall have thirty (30) days from the mailing of the amended notice of assessment to appeal the assessment of the deferred tax. Appeals shall be governed by the appropriate sections of Chapter 5A, KCC 1987, and may be taken to the board of review or to the tax appeal court without appealing to the board of review.

The Procedural Rules for the Implementation of Section 5A-9.1(8), KCC 1987, relating to the Assessment of Agricultural Lands and the Imposition of the Deferred Tax, were adopted as amended following a public hearing after public notice was given.
CERTIFICATION

I, Dorothy R. Behart, Deputy Director of Finance, Department of Finance, County of Kauai, do hereby certify:

1. That the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Rules of the Department of Finance on matters relating to the Assessment of Agricultural Lands and the Imposition of the Deferred Tax, as amended to provide for the deferment of taxes on native forests, under Section 54-8-1.4(4), Kauai County Code 1987.

2. That a public hearing on the amendments providing for the deferment of taxes on native forests was held at the Conference Room of the County Building Annex II, Building B, located at 4280A Rice Street, Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii on December 11, 1991.

3. That notice of public hearing on the foregoing Rules, amendments, was published in the Garden Island newspaper on November 6, 1991.

4. That said Rules were adopted as amended by the Department of Finance on December 12, 1991 and shall become effective ten (10) days after filing with the Office of the County Clerk, County of Kauai, State of Hawaii.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Dorothy R. Behart
Deputy Director of Finance

DATE: 12/19/91

KAREN NAKAHARE
County Attorney

DATE: 12-21-91

MICHAEL VEITH
Director of Finance

DATE: 12-21-91

JAMES A. YOKIHARA
Mayor, County of Kauai

DATE: 12-21-91

CERTIFICATION OF THE COUNTY CLERK:

I certify that on December 30, 1991, I have accepted for filing from the Department of Finance the Rules on the Assessment of Agricultural Lands and the Imposition of the Deferred Tax, as amended on December 12, 1991.

[Signature]

James V. Al Hip
County Clerk, County of Kauai
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
COUNTY OF WAILuku
REAL PROPERTY TAXATION
AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATION ASSESSMENT
RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE DIRECTOR OF
FINANCE RELATING TO ASSESSMENT OF
LANDS FOR AGRICULTURAL USE
UNDER SECTION 56-8.2-1 KANSAS CODE 1977

SECTION 56-2.1 PURPOSE OF RULES. These rules and
regulations are intended to implement the provisions
of chapter 56-8A, K.S.A. 1977 Supp., hereby referred to
as "K.A. 1977," relating to the assessment of land for
ranching or other agricultural uses.

SECTION 56-2.2 DEFINITIONS. (a) As used in these
rules and regulations:

(1) A term "agricultural," "agriculture," "farm," or "farmland" district means the respective land
district designated by the Land the Commission
of the State of Kansas pursuant to Chapter 205,
Kansas Revised Statutes.

(2) The term "agricultural use shall mean lands
actually used for agricultural use or under
reasonable expectations to produce agricultural
products for sale or livestock including raising
vines.

(3) The term "crop" shall mean the annual production
of a specific agricultural crop or crops such as
sugar cane, corn, soybeans, wheat, grain or
alfalfa, pastures, hay, alfalfa, or mixed or
other like farming crops which are ready to be
used or consumed within the season of the
growing season.

(4) The term "acreage" shall mean the land area
approved as dedicated lands by the director.

(5) The term "Director" shall mean the director of
finance or the director or their designee.

(6) The term "ranching" or "ranch" or "ranching
use shall mean the actual use of the land for
purposes of raising livestock such as cattle, dairy, sheep, hogs, and
other livestock.

(7) The term "specific livestock" shall mean the
actual production of livestock under confirmed
housing or controlled conditions to include, for
example, sales, shipping, marketable services and
sale for operations, livestock raising or breeding
within an urban district.

(8) The term "tax year" shall mean the period
commencing on July 1 of a calendar year and
ending on June 30 of the following calendar year.

(9) A "violation" means the failure by the owner or
any person by any operator to use the land for the
agricultural purposes for a period of more than
ninety days of the calendar year, unless the owner
or operator has obtained a permit from the
Director for the use of the land for purposes other than the agricultural use
for any period of time in excess of 120 days in the case of nonagricultural use
or 500 days in the case of nonagricultural use
or exterior to those conditions or the directive.

(10) Use of gender and number. Words importing the
plural number shall be construed to include the
singular number, and words importing the
singular number shall be construed to include the
plural number as the case may be.

SECTION 56-2.3 PETITIONS TO DEDICATE. (a) The
dedication of lands, within any
land use districts as designated by the State Land Use
Commission, shall be made by petition to the director of finance or the director of the
following:

(1) The petitions for dedication shall be submitted on

...
a form prescribed by the director. Petitions shall be submitted at the office of the director.

(b) Each petition for dedication shall state:

(1) The name of the owner of the land to be dedicated, and the address of the owner.

(2) The specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(3) If the petitioner is a lessee, the name of the lessee.

(4) A statement of the future use of the land to be dedicated and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(5) The name of any additional persons or organizations that will be affected by the dedication.

(6) Any other information that may be required by the director.

(c) Petitions shall be submitted for changes in:

(1) The use of the land as stated in the dedication.

(2) The manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(3) The name of the owner of the land.

(4) Any other information that may be required by the director.

(d) The director shall assign an appropriate number to each petition.

SECTION 8-2.4 SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEDICATION WITHIN THE URBAN DISTRICT. (a) Dedication of urban lands for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least three years.

(2) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least five years.

(3) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least seven years.

(4) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least ten years.

(b) Petitions for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(2) The petition shall state the name of the owner of the land.

(3) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(4) The petition shall state any additional persons or organizations that will be affected by the dedication.

(5) The petition shall state any other information that may be required by the director.

(c) Petitions shall be submitted for changes in:

(1) The use of the land as stated in the dedication.

(2) The manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(3) The name of the owner of the land.

(4) Any other information that may be required by the director.

(d) The director shall assign an appropriate number to each petition.

SECTION 8-2.5 SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEDICATION WITHIN THE URBAN DISTRICT. (a) Dedication of urban lands for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least three years.

(2) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least five years.

(3) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least seven years.

(4) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least ten years.

(b) Petitions for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(2) The petition shall state the name of the owner of the land.

(3) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(4) The petition shall state any additional persons or organizations that will be affected by the dedication.

(5) The petition shall state any other information that may be required by the director.

(c) Petitions shall be submitted for changes in:

(1) The use of the land as stated in the dedication.

(2) The manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(3) The name of the owner of the land.

(4) Any other information that may be required by the director.

(d) The director shall assign an appropriate number to each petition.

SECTION 8-2.6 SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DEDICATION WITHIN THE URBAN DISTRICT. (a) Dedication of urban lands for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least three years.

(2) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least five years.

(3) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least seven years.

(4) The land must have been substantially and continuously used for the cultivation of crops for at least ten years.

(b) Petitions for the cultivation of crops shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(2) The petition shall state the name of the owner of the land.

(3) The petition shall state the specific use to which the land is to be dedicated, and the manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(4) The petition shall state any additional persons or organizations that will be affected by the dedication.

(5) The petition shall state any other information that may be required by the director.

(c) Petitions shall be submitted for changes in:

(1) The use of the land as stated in the dedication.

(2) The manner in which the dedication will be accomplished.

(3) The name of the owner of the land.

(4) Any other information that may be required by the director.

(d) The director shall assign an appropriate number to each petition.
been met.

(6) The director's determination of economic feasibility shall be based upon the following findings:

(1) The owner must have obtained a general series tax license for the purpose of engaging in business in the production of crops or specific livestock.

(2) The annual gross income derived from the production of crops or specific livestock, at the time of the application, shall be 20,000 for periods which are one acre or less and 3000 per acre for periods which are more than one acre.

(3) The director has determined to his satisfaction that the land has been substantially and continuously used for the production of crops or specific livestock for a minimum period of two years immediately prior to the filing of the certificate of ownership. The director shall furnish proof of such substantial and continuous use as required by subsection 90-2.36(1) of these rules and regulations.

SECTION 90-2.5 PETITION OF PARTY. (a) The petitioner shall, by November 15 of each year, make the following findings with respect to petitions filed by September 1 of said year:

(1) Whether the petitioned land is actually put to the agricultural, specific livestock or ranching use at the time of certification.

(2) The productivity ratings of the land for these uses to which it is best suited.

(3) The adequacy of the facilities and area of the unit for the petitioned use and the present use of the surrounding lands.

(4) Whether the petitioned use is permissible under the county zoning district or ordinance.

(5) Whether the use is in conflict with the general plan of the county and the overall development plan of the state.

SECTION 90-2.6 APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF THE PETITION. (a) For lands in the original district, the director shall approve the petition if the requirements of section 90-2.6 are met and the findings of fact, including the economic feasibility of the petitioned use, are supportive of the owner.

(b) For lands in other use districts, the director shall approve the petition if the findings are supportive of the owner.

(c) The director shall disapprove the petition if any of the findings are not favorable to the owner or if he determines good cause exists for such disapproval.

(d) Notice of the approval or disapproval of the petition shall be sent to the petitioner. If the petition is disapproved, the notice shall state the reasons for such disapproval.

(e) The director shall notify the petitioner of approval or disapproval of the petition no later than December 15. Upon approval, the dedication shall become effective January 1 of the following year. But the assessment roll will be determined on the assessment date January 1. The petition number and the effective date of the dedication are to be noted on appropriate records accessible to the public.

(f) Upon approval, the director shall prepare and file in the name of the petitioner and the county the notice of dedication. The notice shall be recorded in the office of the county clerk of the county where the dedication is located following the approval of dedication. A copy of the approved document shall be returned to the petitioner.

SECTION 90-2.7 EFFECTS OF DEDICATION AND REPEALABLE RESTRICTIONS UPON USE. (a) Each approved dedication shall constitute a forfeiture in the part of the owner of any right to change the use of the land to a use other than an agricultural or ranching use for a minimum period of ten years following dedication, as provided hereafter. The period shall be automatically renewable indefinitely subject to proper cancellation by the owner or release by the director.

(b) The dedication shall bind and enure to each subsequent owner unless properly cancelled by the owner or released by the director.

(c) Where dedicated land has been subdivided, each parcel shall be independently subject to the restrictions of the original dedication. The owner shall notify any subdivision holding the dedication of the terms of the approval and subdivision map on the registered file.

(d) The owner of a subdivided parcel may, independently of any other owner, petition for a change in use in accordance with or to give the notice of cancellation.

(e) Any action taken by the owner of a subdivided parcel shall not have any effect on the owner of the land from which he has purchased the submerged land.

(f) A change in the dedications or restrictions, whether by petition, shall be made by petition and shall be subject to the required findings of fact and approval in the same manner as the initial petition for dedication.
(2) Upon approval of such petition, the land shall be assessed at such value as the assessing authority may set, and if the property is dedicated and the property is assessed at a value higher than that of the non-dedicated land, the property shall be deemed to have been sold for the purposes of dedication.

(3) The owner shall then be entitled to sell the property at any time after the approval of the petition and shall be entitled to the same rights and duties as in the case of a contract.

(4) The owner shall have the right to sell the property at any time after the approval of the petition and shall be entitled to the same rights and duties as in the case of a contract.

(5) The owner shall have the right to sell the property at any time after the approval of the petition and shall be entitled to the same rights and duties as in the case of a contract.

(6) This section shall be deemed to have been amended and shall have the same effect as in the case of a contract.

SECTION 66-2.9 RESTRICTIVE AGREEMENTS, VIOLATION, AND PENALTY

(a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

SECTION 66-2.10 TOLL TANGLED LANDS

(a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(c) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(d) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(e) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(f) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

SECTION 66-2.11 TOLL TANGLED LANDS

(a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(c) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(d) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(e) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(f) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(g) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(h) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(i) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(j) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(k) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(l) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(m) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(n) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(o) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(p) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(q) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(r) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(s) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(t) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(u) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(v) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(w) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(x) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(y) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.

(z) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, and by imprisonment for not less than 60 days nor more than 1 year.
A change in land use district classification upon a petition by the owner shall not be deemed to constitute an agreement for the county's determination of ad valorem tax assessment and shall not be deemed to be subject to the terms and conditions of the dedication.

SECTION 8D-1.10 CANCELLATION OF TAX ASSESSMENT PROVIDED, THAT THE LAND SHALL CONSTITUTE a subject to the terms and conditions of the dedication.

(1) The owner shall, if it desires to cancel the dedication, notify the director of such cancellation in writing, accompanied by a copy of the notice of the change of land use classification.

(2) All cancellations shall become effective July 1 of the following tax year from the date of effective period as set forth in this chapter.

(3) Upon expiration of the maximum period of dedication, the owner may cancel or withdraw the dedication without being subject to restrictions or penalties by presenting the property cancellation notice in the following situations:

(1) For a ten-year dedication, the owner shall submit the cancellation notice after the ninth year and annually thereafter;

(2) For a twenty-year dedication, the notice shall be submitted after the nineteenth year and annually thereafter as provided herein:

(3) Each such notice hereunder shall be submitted on or before December 31 to become effective on July 1 of the following tax year from the date of effective period as set forth in this chapter.

SECTION 8D-1.11 CANCELLATION AND RELEASE OF DEDICATION. Upon cancellation or release of the dedication, the owner shall immediately return the dedication to the original condition as of the date of recordation. All owners of the property shall pay all taxes for the period of the dedication.

SECTION 8D-1.12 APPEALS. (a) The owner may appeal any determination as in the case of any appeal from an assessment. Appeals shall be governed by the procedures set forth in the Florida Statutes, Florida Constitution, and any other applicable local laws.

(b) The provisions of this section shall be subject to the provisions of Part II of the Uniform Property Tax Law of the State of Florida, as the same may be amended from time to time.
CERTIFICATION

1. Elmay Moreha, Deputy Director of Finance,
   Department of Finance, County of Kauai, do hereby certify:

   1. That the foregoing is a true and correct copy
      of the Amended Rules of the Department of Finance
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   Director of Finance, County of Kauai
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APPENDIX E - MISCELLANEOUS COST DERIVATIONS
DERIVATION AND SUMMARY OF ONSITE COST/SQFT BASED ON ACTUAL BIDS RECEIVED.

Methodology: The construction bids analyzed gave only overall lump sum values. None had any itemization of costs for the various work items. It was necessary to extrapolate a factor from the consultants' estimates to establish that portion of the overall bid that might be attributed to onsite infrastructure work. The factor was then applied against the lump sum bids received to approximate that portion of the bid for onsite site infrastructure work. This approximated amount was further divided by the onsite project area for clearing and grubbing to yield the cost per sqft for onsite work. The resulting figures were then adjusted for inflation from the time of bid opening to the end of 1995 at an inflationary rate of 5.0% per annum. Finally, depending upon locale, the figures were again adjusted reflect Kauai cost conditions.

Two schools were used to establish the onsite infrastructure costs. One school was the Hanamaulu Elementary School which is located on Kauai and the other was the Millili Mauka Elementary School on Oahu.

Results: The adjusted cost per square foot for onsite improvements, based on the Hanamaulu Elementary School's construction bids (there were only two bids received), was $4.52/sqft, more or less. The adjusted cost per square foot for onsite improvements using the Millili Mauka Elementary School's construction bids (which amounted to nine bids received) was $7.72/sqft, more or less.

Since the bid openings for both schools were at different times, the Hanamaulu cost had to be adjusted to the bid date for the Millili Mauka cost at an inflationary rate of 5% per annum. The Millili Mauka Cost then had to be increased 20% to reflect Kauai locale. Both costs having been adjusted for both time difference and locale, could now be averaged using the weighted average approach. The resulting figure was then adjusted from the Millili Mauka bid opening date which essentially is the end of 1991 to the end of 1995 for use in this report.

For this report, we recommend using $8.57/sqft in estimating the onsite improvements to the end of 1994. For a 12 acre site, the onsite infrastructure costs would be in the neighborhood of $4,478,000 dollars.
### RESOLVING $/sqft BETWEEN THE HANAMALU & MILILANI MAUKA BIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>$/sqft</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanamalu Elementary School</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>adopted for use based on bids received on 22Jun89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>adjustment to end of 1991 (30 months at 5% per annum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>$/sqft for onsite work based on Hanamalu Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as of end of 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mililani Mauka Elementary School</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>$/sqft for onsite work based on Mililani Mauka Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School (includes adjustment for relocation to Kauai) as of end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of 1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the weighted average approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanamalu Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>amount of bids received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mililani Mauka Elementary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>amount of bids received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>weighted value for the Hanamalu $/sqft (18% of total bids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>weighted value for the Mililani Mauka $/sqft (82% of total bids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>sum of the weighted values (100% of total bids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to end of 1995 from end of 1991</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$8.57 Adopt this $/sqft for use in determining onsite costs

Estimating the onsite improvement costs

For a 12 acre site, the onsite costs is estimated to be: $4,477,809.60

For this report, use $4,478,000.00
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offsite Costs (estimated 13Mar89)</th>
<th>Determination of Onsite Sitework Factor</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sidewalk, curb, gutter, planter</td>
<td>$74,880.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water system</td>
<td>$48,530.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer system</td>
<td>$18,570.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$141,980.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall estimated construction cost</td>
<td>$8,303,848.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Costs (Estimated 13Mar89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demolition/removal</td>
<td>$32,100.00</td>
<td>(w/electrical &amp; landscaping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear, grub, grade</td>
<td>$173,750.00</td>
<td>as computed on 27Feb89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking, walkway, fencing, firelane</td>
<td>$338,645.00</td>
<td>(see figures at left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water system</td>
<td>$124,555.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer system</td>
<td>$84,770.00</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage system</td>
<td>$140,890.00</td>
<td>$4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retention pond</td>
<td>$12,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer assessment fee</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$932,410.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Offsite and Onsite</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,074,390.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% contingency</td>
<td>$107,439.00</td>
<td>$4.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,181,829.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded</td>
<td><strong>$1,182,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai Builders Ltd</td>
<td>$6,438,000.00</td>
<td>overall bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$89,000.00</td>
<td>estimated sitework portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$86,577.00</td>
<td>$3.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,357,577.00</strong></td>
<td>estimated $/sqft for sitework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Electrical</td>
<td>$150,474.00</td>
<td>$4.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total for Offsite and Onsite</td>
<td>$1,508,051.00</td>
<td>$0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Offsite Costs</td>
<td>($141,980.00)</td>
<td>$4.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total for Onsite Costs</td>
<td><strong>$1,366,071.00</strong></td>
<td>$4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For continuation, see next column

Appendix E, Page 3
## DETERMINATION OF ONSITE COST PER SQFT BASED ON ACTUAL BIDS FOR:

**Mililani Mauka Elementary School**

### Offsite Costs (none)

### Onsite Costs (Estimated 15Nov91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demolition/removal</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear, grub, grade</td>
<td>$536,484.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking, sidewalk, retaining wall,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chainlink fence, firelane, curbs, gutters,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheelchair ramp, driveway</td>
<td>$523,185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water system</td>
<td>$198,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer system</td>
<td>$75,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage system</td>
<td>$388,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playcourt</td>
<td>$33,616.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash enclosure</td>
<td>$14,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal for onsite only</td>
<td>$1,761,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% contingency</td>
<td>$176,197.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer connection charge</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Onsite</td>
<td>$1,978,172.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Determination of Onsite Sitework Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>(sqft)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>392040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall estimated construction cost** $12,006,238.00

Referenced to Consultant's estimate of costs for project as computed on 15Nov91 (see figures at left)

**Onsite sitework** (w/electrical & landscaping)

**Ratio of Onsite Sitework to Overall Construction Cost** 26.13%

Adopt for application to bid amounts to obtain $/sqft for estimated onsite costs

### Determination of Costs/sqft for Onsite Costs based on actual bids received on 19Dec91 appears on next page

**Rounded** $1,978,173

**General Conditions** $232,000

**Landscape** $384,100

**Exterior Electrical** $487,200

**Entrance Shelter** $51,200

**Flagpole** $4,000

**Overall Total for Onsite** $3,136,673

The estimated onsite cost/sqft computes to:

- 7.72 w/ playcourt, trash enclosure, entrance shelter and flagpole or,
- 8.00 overall inclusive of all items shown

NOTE: This page calculates the ratio of Onsite Sitework to the Overall Construction Cost. The ratio is then applied to the next page to obtain the estimated cost/sqft for onsite infrastructure costs.

For continuation, see next column
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## ANALYSIS OF #/SQFT FOR ONSITE WORK BASED ON ACTUAL BIDS (Cont'd)

**FOR MILILANI MAUKA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear &amp; Grub Area</th>
<th>acres</th>
<th>sqft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>392040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A = 9.0 acres</th>
<th>Total estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Date of estimate = 11/15/91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,006,238.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$3,136,673.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>(See also Previous page)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #1 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,379,480.00</td>
<td>2,711,676.60</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,421,298.44</td>
<td>$6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #2 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,268,000.00</td>
<td>2,462,576.51</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,462,576.51</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #3 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,991,000.00</td>
<td>2,610,184.80</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,347,490.12</td>
<td>$6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #4 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,985,484.00</td>
<td>2,347,490.12</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,462,576.51</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #5 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,426,000.00</td>
<td>2,462,576.51</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,462,576.51</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #6 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,390,000.00</td>
<td>2,453,171.38</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,453,171.38</td>
<td>$6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #7 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,499,997.00</td>
<td>2,481,908.50</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,481,908.50</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #8 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,422,000.00</td>
<td>2,722,785.11</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,722,785.11</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall estimated construction cost</th>
<th>Bid #9 opnd 12/19/91</th>
<th>Ratio x overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,526,551.00</td>
<td>2,488,845.82</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework w/ exterior electrical</td>
<td>$2,488,845.82</td>
<td>$6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of sitework to overall</td>
<td>26.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per sqft for sitework</td>
<td>$6.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Avg cost per sqft                   | $6.4336               |
| 20% adjustment factor to relocate to Kauai | $1.2867               |
|                                    | $7.7203               |

ADAPT FOR USE
BASED ON MILILANI MAUKA BIDS (to end OF 1991)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATING SEPTIC TANK &amp; DISPOSAL FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provisions for staff at one/25 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterial for Estimating Flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for schools w/gyms, cafeteria or showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers at schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For student population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Dept of Health rules, for flows over 800 gals/day, sizing is based on (1000 + (0-800)/1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each 8ft diameter by 24ft long horizontal reinforced concrete septic tank provides with a 16 inch air gap provides for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of tanks required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic Tank Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost for 3 8ft diameter x 24ft long horizontal reinforced concrete septic tanks FOB Young Brothers Pier at Navwilliwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add for labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for materials and labor to install</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this report, use:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leach Field Sizing &amp; Estimate of Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basing the computations on canefield type of soils, the permeability could range from 30 min/per inch to 40 min/inch infiltration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 40 minutes/inch, and using the equation 5/it)**0.5, the application rate in gals/day/sqft is permeability (minutes/inch infiltration rate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using this application rate, and the 24,250 gals/day flow, the leach field area is estimated to be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such a field is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 102ft by 300ft. The cost to excavate such an area to an estimated depth of 6ft, replace w/filter gravel &amp; leach piping and backfill, and using $45/cu yd for the excavation would be about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this report, use:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C-1
OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE (Candidate Site 1)
(Excludes costs received from agencies & utility companies)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Clearing, grubbing, grassing, and appurtenant work in place &amp; complete. Lump Sum</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Unclassified grading in place complete. Lump Sum</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1075 LinFt</td>
<td>Installation of guard rails along sidewalk area for public safety, in place &amp; complete. Per LinFt</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1075 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete curbs, in place &amp; complete. Per LinFt</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1170 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete gutters, in place &amp; complete. Per LinFt</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>895 SqYd</td>
<td>4&quot; thick concrete sidewalk, in place &amp; complete. Per SqYd</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>220 CuYd</td>
<td>6&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete. Per CuYd</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Wheel chair ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete. Each</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Driveway ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete. Each</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2380 SqYd</td>
<td>2.5&quot; thick Asphalitic Concrete pavement, in place &amp; complete. Per SqYd</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$53,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>530 CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Base Course, in place &amp; complete. Per CuYd</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$93,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1190 CuYd</td>
<td>18&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete. Per CuYd</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$59,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>40 Each</td>
<td>Street Trees, in place &amp; complete. Each</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Pavement markers &amp; striping Lump Sum</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE*** $441,640.00
Plus 20% Contingencies for Miscellaneous $88,328.00

**ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE*** $529,968.00

*Excludes the offsite costs received from the Department of Water Supply and Citizen's Electric. These costs appear as separate line items in the Summary Table in this report.
TABLE C-2
OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE (Candidate Site 2)
(Excludes costs received from agencies & utility companies)*
Based on construction of 500 feet of frontage improvements along Haleiwa Road and a second 500 feet of frontage improvements along Makani Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Clearing, grubbing, grassing, and appurtenant work in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$16,070.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Unclassified grading in place complete.</td>
<td>$116,670.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 810</td>
<td>LinFt</td>
<td>Installation of guard rails along sidewalk area for public safety, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$20,250.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 810</td>
<td>LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete curbs, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$22,680.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1000</td>
<td>LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete gutters, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 675</td>
<td>SqYd</td>
<td>4&quot; thick concrete sidewalk, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$30,375.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 190</td>
<td>CuYd</td>
<td>6&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$8,550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 4</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>Concrete Wheel chair ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 4</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>Concrete Driveway ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 2040</td>
<td>SqYd</td>
<td>2.5&quot; thick Asphaltic Concrete pavement, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 455</td>
<td>CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Base Course, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$45,900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 1020</td>
<td>CuYd</td>
<td>18&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$36,400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 40</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>Street Trees, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Pavement markers &amp; striping</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE*** $397,495.00
Plus 20% Contingencies for Miscellaneous $79,499.00

**ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE*** $476,994.00

*Excludes the offsite costs received from the Department of Water Supply and Citizen's Electric. These costs appear as separate line items in the Summary Table in this report.
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# TABLE C-3
**ACCESS DRIVEWAY (Candidate Site 3)**  
(Excludes costs received from agencies & utility companies)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Clearing, grubbing, grassing, and appurtenant work in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Unclassified grading in place complete.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4460 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete curbs, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$124,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4460 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete gutters, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$98,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3717 SqYd</td>
<td>4&quot; thick concrete sidewalk, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per SqYd</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$167,265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>826 CuYd</td>
<td>6&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8920 SqYd</td>
<td>2.5&quot; thick Asphalitic Concrete pavement, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per SqYd</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1983 CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Base Course, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$158,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4460 CuYd</td>
<td>18&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$223,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>90 Each</td>
<td>Street Trees, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Pave ment markers &amp; striping</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE**  
Plus 20% Contingencies for Miscellaneous  
$1,295,525.00  
$259,105.00

**ESTIMATED ACCESS DRIVEWAY COSTS**  
$1,554,630.00

Plus:

12. Lump Sum  
    Improvements within Kukui Highway to connect with new access drive to hwy.  
    Lump Sum  
    $78,260.00

*Excludes the offsite costs received from the Department of Water Supply and Citizen's Electric. These costs appear as separate line items in the Summary Table in this report.
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## TABLE C-4
OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE (Candidate Site 4)
(Excludes costs received from agencies & utility companies)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Cleaning, grubbing, grassing, and appurtenant work in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$7,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Unclassified grading in place complete.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>460 LinFt</td>
<td>Installation of guard rails along sidewalk area for public safety, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td>$11,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>460 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete curbs, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td>$12,880.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>555 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete gutters, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td>$12,210.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>383 SqYd</td>
<td>4&quot; thick concrete sidewalk, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per SqYd</td>
<td>$17,235.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>103 CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td>$4,635.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Wheel chair ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Driveway ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1150 SqYd</td>
<td>2.5&quot; thick Asphalitic Concrete pavement, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>260 CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Base Course, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$25,875.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>575 CuYd</td>
<td>18&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$28,750.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>20 Each</td>
<td>Street Trees, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE**
$211,485.00

Plus 20% Contingencies for Miscellaneous
$42,297.00

**ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE**
$253,782.00

*Excludes the offsite costs received from the Department of Water Supply and Citizen's Electric. These costs appear as separate line items in the Summary Table in this report.
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**TABLE C-5**

OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE (Candidate Site 5)

(Excludes costs received from agencies & utility companies)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Clearing, grubbing, grassing, and appurtenant work in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Unclassified grading in place complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$110,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>850 LinFt</td>
<td>Installation of guard rails along sidewalk area for public safety, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$21,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>850 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete curbs, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$23,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>945 LinFt</td>
<td>New concrete gutters, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$20,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per LinFt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>710 SqYd</td>
<td>4&quot; thick concrete sidewalk, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$31,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per SqYd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>175 CuYd</td>
<td>6&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$7,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Wheel chair ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2 Each</td>
<td>Concrete Driveway ramps &amp; aprons, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1930 SqYd</td>
<td>2.5&quot; thick Asphalitic Concrete pavement, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$43,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per SqYd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>430 CuYd</td>
<td>8&quot; thick Base Course, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$34,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>965 CuYd</td>
<td>18&quot; thick Select Borrow subbase, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$48,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per CuYd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>36 Each</td>
<td>Street Trees, in place &amp; complete.</td>
<td>$175.00</td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>Pavement markers &amp; striping</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE***  
$379,100.00

Plus 20% Contingencies for Miscellaneous  
$75,820.00

**ESTIMATED OFFSITE INFRASTRUCTURE***  
$454,920.00

*Excludes the offsite costs received from the Department of Water Supply and Citizen's Electric. These costs appear as separate line items in the Summary Table in this report.
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COMPUTATION OF LOT CONFIGURATION
FOR PROPOSED KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Based on a 12 acre size parcel, and using an ideal 1.7:1.0 ratio, the lot configuration is computed as follows,

Length = 1.7(w) where "w" is the proposed lot width

and area is: 1.7(w) x w = 12 acres x 43,560 sf/acre = 522,720 sf

thereby yielding a width value of 554.51 ft and a length value of 942.67 ft

For purposes of this report,

Adopt: 555 ft x 945 ft which yields an area of 12.040 acres.
APPENDIX F - INFRASTRUCTURE: WATER AND POWER REQUIREMENTS
March 27, 1992

Mr. Stanley Yim
Mr. Jason Yim
STANLEY YIM & ASSOCIATES, INC.
770 Kapiolani Blvd., Suite 703
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Water System Requirements for Five(5) Proposed Sites, for a New Kapaa II Elementary School

We have reviewed your February 27, 1992 verbal inquiry requesting water availability for the five(5) proposed school sites and our comments are as follows:

Any actual development of the proposed areas will be dependent on the adequacy of the source, storage and transmission facilities existing at that time. At the present time, the existing source facilities for the Wailua-Kapa'a area are adequate for the five(5) proposed sites. The existing storage facilities for the Wailua-Kapa'a area are nearing capacity and the Department of Water cannot assure that adequate storage facilities will be available to service the proposed development at the time of actual development.

Transmission facility requirements for the proposed five(5) sites are shown below.

Site No. 1: The existing transmission facilities are not adequate to handle the proposed domestic and fire flow requirements for the proposed development. The developer will be required to upgrade approximately 5,850 feet of 12-inch waterline to a 16-inch, beginning at the intersection of Kawaihau and Kaspuni Roads (Ornellas Tank) running approximately 5,850 feet along Kaspuni Road to the County Stable Tank Site.

Site No. 2: The existing transmission facilities are not adequate to handle the proposed domestic and fire flow requirements for the proposed development. The developer will be required to upgrade approximately 5,850 feet of 12-inch waterline to a 16-inch beginning at the intersection of Kawaihau and Kaspuni Roads (Ornellas Tank) running approximately 5,850 feet along Kaspuni Road (Stable Tank).

Also, the developer will be required to upgrade the existing 6-inch waterline to a 8-inch waterline along Malu Road, beginning at the existing 16-inch waterline at the intersection of Obohena and Malu Roads continuing on Malu Road and then on to the proposed development.
April 28, 1992

Mr. Stanley Yin & Mr. Jason Yin
STANLEY YIN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
770 Kapilani Blvd., Suite 703
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Water System Requirements for Additional Proposed Site for a New Kapaa II Elementary School, Site No. 5, TDR: 4-J-376 Pot., Wallua Houselots, Wallua, Kauai

We have reviewed your April 9, 1992 inquiry requesting water availability for Site No. 5, TDR: 4-J-376 and our comments are as follows:

Any actual development of the proposed areas will be dependent on the adequacy of the source, storage and transmission facilities existing at that time. At the present time, the existing source facilities for the Wallua/Kapaa area are adequate for the proposed Site No. 5. The existing storage facilities for the Wallua/Kapaa area are nearing capacity and the Department of Water cannot assure adequate storage facilities will be available to service the proposed development at the time of actual development. The existing transmission facilities are adequate along Kuhio Highway.

If you have further questions, please call Edward Döi at 245-6986.

[Signature]
Raymond M. Sato
Manager and Chief Engineer
EDIRN
August 17, 1993

In reply refer to:
File #K-20

Subject: KAUAI ELECTRIC EASEMENT LOCATIONS

Dear Mr. Yim:

In reference to your inquiry concerning the location of easements for our facilities near the proposed sites for the Kapa'a II Elementary School.

For the sites #4 and #5 near Wallus, our facilities are located in the road ROW, therefore we do not have an easement for them.

For site #1 near Kapa'a on Olohe'a Road, we have transmission and primary distribution lines located in the road ROW. The transmission line does leave the road ROW on Olohe'a Road near the tennis courts and proceeds along to the same haul road and makes a 90° turn to our Kapa'a Switchyard next to the Wailua Drainage Canal near Kuhio Highway (see enclosed maps).

These are our main facilities in the indicated locations. If you need any further information you can contact me at 246-2369.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
GILBERT MACKIE
Systems Engineer

Enclosures
March 18, 1992

In reply refer to:
File #2-6-40208

Stanley Yin & Associates, Inc.
March 18, 1992

3. A partial payment received of $420.00 which will be credited
   toward the advance necessary for this project. This
   partial payment is nonassignable and is applicable only
   to the present project by your organization. In the
   event the project is canceled, changed materially after
   we begin our final engineering, or taken over by another
   entity prior to completion, no refund of this partial
   payment will be made.

We can begin material procurement and schedule construction on this
project as soon as you:

1. Enter into a formal line extension agreement with Kauai
   Electric.

2. Provide the remainder of the advance developed during our
   engineering phase.

3. Provide the necessary Grant of Easement documents. The
   easements are to be perpetual and legally recorded. To
   expedite the installation, we will accept a notarized
   Right-of-Entry (for TM #4-3-010) in lieu of an
   easement with the understanding that you will provide, at
   no cost to us, the required easements within the time
   specified in the Right-of-Entry.

Enclosed find a copy of our standard Right-of-Entry
document for your reference.

Enclosed are our Tariffs, Rules 2-C and 13, as filed with the
Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii. Rule 2-C
requires your careful study of our requirements and makes it your
responsibility to provide adequate protection for your equipment.

Rule 13 explains our advance and refund requirements. The maximum
amount of refund will in no case exceed the advance or the
estimated 60-month revenue from our new customers, whichever
is least in accordance with the Rule. No refund will be made until
all aspects of this agreement have been fulfilled.

If this proposal meets with your approval, please indicate your
acceptance by executing and returning this original letter to our
office accompanied by your payment.
Mr. Robert Romero is the individual assigned to your project and the Supervising Engineer is Ms. Patty Finlay, both of whom can be reached at our Engineering office at 335-6231 or 335-6294, respectively, should you have any further questions on this matter.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

DOUG T. TUNISLEY
Vice President
Kauai Electric Division

Enclosures: Detail Map for Site #1
Rules 2-C and 13
Sample Right-of-Entry Document

ACCEPTED AND AGREED TO:

By

Date

March 18, 1992

In reply refer to:
File #2-4-403RR

Stanley Yin & Associates, Inc.
2850 Pau Street, Suite 210
Honolulu, HI 96819

Attention: Mr. Jason Yin

SUBJECT: OVERHEAD ESTIMATE FOR "BUDGET PURPOSES ONLY" FOR
NAN JAPAA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, SITE #8

Dear Mr. Yin:

We have developed "For Budget Purposes Only" our cost to provide service to the subject project at $8,000. From this, an amount will be deducted in accordance with our Tariff, Rule 11. The actual amount of the deduction will be developed when and if we proceed to develop firm costs.

The estimate stated herein is an estimate only and any reliance on said figure is at your own risk. We cannot and do not guarantee that the firm cost of the project will be as estimated. Please contact GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company Incorporated for their costs.

We can begin final engineering and provide you with a firm cost for this project after the following have been provided by you:

1. Name of person, title, and firm who has the legal authority to sign any necessary documents.
2. The connected load, estimated demand and estimated kWh for this project.

3. A partial payment received of $800 which will be credited toward the advance necessary for this project. This partial payment is nonassignable and is applicable only to the present project by your organization. In the event the project is canceled, changed materially after we begin our final engineering, or taken over by another entity prior to completion, no refund of this partial payment will be made.

We can begin material procurement and schedule construction on this project as soon as you:

1. Enter into a formal line extension agreement with Kauai Electric.
2. Provide the remainder of the advance developed during our engineering phase.
3. Provide the necessary Grant of Easement documents. The easements are to be perpetual and legally recorded. To expedite the installation, we will accept a notarized Right-of-Entry (for TN #4-1-0917) in lieu of an easement with the understanding that you will provide, at no cost to us, the required easements within the time specified in the Right-of-Entry.

Enclosed find a copy of our standard Right-of-Entry document for your reference.

Enclosed are our Tariffs, Rules 2-C and 13, as filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii. Rule 2-C requires your careful study of our requirements and makes it your responsibility to provide adequate protection for your equipment from conditions that can occur in a utility system such as, but not limited to, single phasing, low and high voltage, and transients that may affect sensitive electronic equipment.

Rule 13 explains our advance and refund requirements. The maximum amount of refund will in no case exceed the advance or the estimated 60-month revenue from our new customers, whichever is least in accordance with the Rule. No refund will be made until all aspects of this agreement have been fulfilled.

If this proposal meets with your approval, please indicate your acceptance by executing and returning this original letter to our office accompanied by your payment.
Mr. Robert Romano is the individual assigned to your project and the Supervising Engineer is Ms. Patty Finkley, both of whom can be reached at our Engineering office at 335-4231 or 335-6264, respectively, should you have any further questions on this matter.

Very truly yours,

BOYD T. TOOMESLEY
Vice President
Kauai Electric Division

BT:do

Enclosures: Detail Map for Site #4
Rules 2-2 and 13
Sample Right-of-Entry Document

ACCEPTED AND AGREED TO:

By ____________________________

Date ___________________________
Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.  
April 14, 1992  

In reply refer to:  
File #92-6-402HR  

3. A partial payment received of $2,360 which will be credited toward the advance necessary for this project. This partial payment is non-assessable and is applicable only to the present project by your organization. In the event the project is canceled, changed materially after we begin final engineering, or taken over by another entity prior to completion, no refund of this partial payment will be made. 

We can begin material procurement and schedule construction on this project as soon as you:

1. Enter into a formal line extension agreement with Kauai Electric. 
2. Provide the remainder of the advance developed during our engineering phase. 
3. Provide the necessary Grant of Easement documents. The easements are to be perpetual and legally recorded. To expedite the installation, we will accept a notarized Right-of-Entry (for TNK #4-3-52:06) in lieu of an easement with the understanding that you will provide, at no cost to us, the required easement within the time specified in the Right-of-Entry. 

Enclosed find a copy of our standard Right-of-Entry document for your reference. 

Enclosed are our Tariffs, Rules 2-C and 13, as filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Hawaii. Rule 2-C merits your careful study of our requirements and makes it your responsibility to provide adequate protection for your equipment from conditions that can occur in a utility system such as, but not limited to, single phasing, low and high voltage, and transients that may affect sensitive electronic equipment.

Rule 13 explains our advance and refund requirements. The maximum amount of refund will in no case exceed the advance or the estimated 6-month revenue from our new customers, whichever is least in accordance with the Rule. No refund will be made until all aspects of this agreement have been fulfilled. 

If this proposal meets with your approval, please indicate your acceptance by executing and returning this original letter to our office accompanied by your payment.
Mr. Robert Rosaro is the individual assigned to your project and the Supervising Engineer is Ms. Patty Finlay, both of whom can be reached at our Engineering office at 334-6231 or 335-6234, respectively, should you have any further questions on this matter.

Very truly yours,

BOYD T. TOWNSLEY
Vice President
Kauai Electric Division

BTT: do

Enclosures: Detail Map for New Site #5
Rules 2-2 and 13
Sample Right-of-Entry Document

ACCEPTED AND AGREED TO:

By ____________________________

Date ____________________________
RULE NO. 2 (CONTINUED)

C. MOTOR AND EQUIPMENT PROTECTION

Customer's motors and other equipment should conform with the following requirements:

1. Motors that cannot be subjected to full rated voltage on starting with safety to the customer's and the Company's equipment, or that drive machinery of such a nature that the machinery or the product it handles will not permit the motor to resume normal speed upon the restoration of normal supply voltage, should be equipped with devices that will disconnect them from the line upon failure of supply voltage and that will prevent the automatic reconnection of the motors upon restoration of normal supply voltage.

2. All motors, single or three phase, should be equipped with thermal relays, fuses, or other automatic over-current interrupting devices to disconnect completely such motors from the line as a protection against damage due to over-heating. It is recommended that such protection devices be installed in each conductor connected to three-phase motors to protect against over-heating due to open phase or low voltage conditions.

3. Reverse phase relays are recommended on all poly-phase installations where a reversal of rotation might cause damage to the equipment.

4. Any other equipment, apparatus or device that would be subject to damage from low or high voltage should be equipped with similar devices.
acknowledged, the Grantor does hereby grant to the Grantee, its respective successors and assigns, a right-of-entry and easement subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The right-of-entry shall be an area over and across that certain property situate, lying and being at _____ District, County of Kauai, State of Hawaii, affecting ______ (DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY WITH TAX MAP KEY NUMBER STATED)

the said area being as is shown in red on the map attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "A".

2. The right-of-entry shall be used by the Grantee for the purpose of building, constructing, repairing, maintaining and operating pole and wire lines, and/or underground lines and related appliances and equipment, and to use such wires, lines, conduits and other appliances and equipment as may be necessary for the transmission and distribution of electricity and for communications and control circuits.

3. The Grantor will, at Grantor's cost, without undue delay, prepare, execute and record a formal Grant of Perpetual Easement whereonsoever required by the Grantee.

4. The Grantee shall hold the Grantor harmless for any claims for damages of any kind, occasioned in whole or in part by the Grantee's actions or omissions arising out of their exercise of this right-of-entry.

5. This right-of-entry shall be binding upon the Grantor, its heirs, successors and assigns.
6. The grantor warrants and covenants with the grantee that grantor is the fee simple owner of the property upon which the right-of-entry is located, has full right to convey said right-of-entry and will warrant and defend the right-of-entry granted herein against all adverse claims.

7. This right-of-entry shall continue until the effective date of the above-mentioned formal Grant of Perpetual Easement and shall automatically terminate upon the effective date of said easement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands as of the ___ day of __________, 19__.

GRANTOR:

By Its

(NAME MUST BE PRINTED OR TYPED UNDER SIGNATURE LINE)

By Its

GRANTEE:

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

By

BOYD T. TONNESLEY
Its Vice President
Kauai Electric Division

STATE OF HAWAII   }
COUNTY OF KAUAI   }

On this ____ day of __________, 19__, before me appeared BOYD T. TONNESLEY, to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did say that he is the Vice President, Kauai Electric Division of Citizens Utilities Company, a Delaware corporation, and that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the corporate seal of said corporation, and that said instrument was signed and sealed in behalf of said corporation by authority of its Board of Directors, and BOYD T. TONNESLEY acknowledged said instrument to be the free act and deed of said corporation.

_________________________
Notary Public
State of Hawaii
My Commission Expires: ___
STATE OF HAWAI'I  
COUNTY OF KAUAI  

On this _____ day of __________, 19 ____ before me personally appeared ______________________ to me known to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and severally acknowledged that _______ executed the same as _______ free act and deed.

Notary Public  
State of Hawaii  
My Commission Expires: ______

-----------

STATE OF HAWAI'I  
COUNTY OF KAUAI  

On this _____ day of __________, 19 ____ before me personally appeared ______________________ to me known to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and severally acknowledged that _______ executed the same as _______ free act and deed.

Notary Public  
State of Hawaii  
My Commission Expires: ______
STATE OF HAWAII
COUNTY OF KA'UAI

On this ______ day of ____________, 19____,
before me personally appeared ____________________________,
to me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did depose
and say that _______ is the ____________________________
of ____________________________,
a Hawaii corporation; that said corporation has no corporate
seal available; and said ____________________________
acknowledges said instrument to be the free act and deed of
said corporation.

Notary Public, Fifth Judicial Circuit
State of Hawaii
My commission expires: __________

STATE OF HAWAII
COUNTY OF KA'UAI

On this ______ day of ____________, 19____,
before me appeared ____________________________, to
me personally known, who, being by me duly sworn, did say
that _______ is a general partner of ____________________________

a partnership registered in the State of Hawaii, and that the
foregoing instrument was executed in the name and on behalf of
______________________________
and the said ____________________________
acknowledged said instrument to be the free act and deed of

Notary Public, Fifth Circuit
State of Hawaii
My commission expires: __________
STATE OF HAWAII  
COUNTY OF KAUAI  

On this ______ day of _________, 19 _____, before me
personally appeared _____________________________
to me personally known, who being by me duly sworn (or
affirmed) did say that he is the attorney in fact of

________________________________________________
duly appointed under power of attorney dated the ______
day of ______________, 19 _____, recorded in book ______,
at page ______, and that the foregoing instrument was
executed in the name and behalf of said ________

________________________________________________
by ________________________________
as its attorney in fact; and ______________________________
acknowledged the instrument to be the true act and deed of

Notary Public
State of Hawaii
My Commission Expires: __________
December 11, 1993

In reply refer to:
File #93-6-102DR

Stanley Yim & Associates, Inc.
2850 Paa Street, Suite 200
Honolulu, HI 96819

Attention: Mr. Jason Yim

SUBJECT: NEW KAPAA II ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SITE #4 AND #5 SELECTION
RIDGE #45 REPORT

Dear Mr. Yim:

This letter is to confirm the telephone conversation between our
Mr. Robert Romero and your Mr. Jason Yim on December 2, 1993.

Please be informed that the proposed plan of sites #4 and #5
located along Kuhio Highway and Papesco Road vicinity can be
served by our existing distribution facilities located along
Kuhio Highway.

A complete set of construction and electrical plans are required
before any further engineering.

Mr. Robert Romero is the individual assigned to your project, and
I am the Supervising Engineer. We can be reached at our
Engineering office at 246-4152 or 246-4367, respectively, should
you have any further questions on this matter.

Very truly yours,

PATTY FIHAY
Customer Engineer
PP:ten
HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
List of Federal Status and Heritage Global Ranks

Federal Status

Lined Endangered (LE) = Species formally listed as endangered.
Lined Threatened (LT) = Species formally listed as threatened.
Proposed Endangered (PE) = Species proposed to be formally listed as endangered.
Proposed Threatened (PT) = Species proposed to be formally listed as threatened.
Category 1 (C1) = Species for which the USFWS has substantial information on biological vulnerability and deems to support a proposal to list them as endangered or threatened.
Category 1* (C1*) = Same as above, but possibly exists.
Category 1** (C1**) = Same as above, possibly extinct in the wild but known to be present in cultivation.
Category 2 (C2) = Species for which the USFWS has information indicating they are possibly endangered or threatened. More data on biological vulnerability and threat is needed before they can be proposed for listing as endangered or threatened.
Category 3A (C3A) = Species for which USFWS has persuasive evidence of extinction. If rediscovered, such species might acquire high priority for listing.
Category 1R (C3) = Species do not meet ESA’s definition of "species".
Category 2C (C3C) = Species that are not being considered for listing as threatened or endangered species.
NONE = No federal status. Reasoned as rare by Hawaiian biologist and confirmed by Heritage data.

Heritage Global Ranks
G1 = Species critically imperiled globally (typically 1-5 current locations).
G1S1.1 = 1 relatively pristine/main/visible occurrence known.
G1S1.2 = 5 relatively pristine/main/visible occurrences known.
G1S1.3 = >5 visible occurrences, but all seriously threatened.
G2 = Species imperiled globally (typically 6-20 locations).
G2S2.1 = Majorly immediately threatened.
G2S2.2 = Majorly not immediately threatened, but status developing.
G2S2.3 = Majorly not immediately threatened, some apparently secure.
G3 = Species very rare with restricted range (typically 21-100 current locations).
G4 = Species apparently secure globally typically >100 locations.
G5 = Species demonstrably secure globally.
GH = Species known only from historical populations (not observed within the past 15 years).
I1 = Possibly imperiled globally, but not threatened, more information needed.
OX = Extinct species (no recent observations, no expectation of re-discovery).
GNT = Global rank unavailable, insufficient data available to assign definitive rank.
T = Same criteria as Global Ranks above, but applies to subspecies or varieties.

Abbreviations Used in Element Occurrence Records

& = number
# = abundant
ABUND = abundant
AC = acres
ACC = acres
ADJ = adjacent
ADG = agreement
AGREE = agreement
ANN = annual
APPROX = approximately
ASSOC = associate(s)
AUD = audio
AVERAGE = average
AVG = average
BDY = boundary
BETWN = between
CA = circa
CIR = circa
CM = centimeter(s)
COL = collected, collection
COMM = communication
CONT = continued
COOP = cooperative
COORD = coordinates
CULT = cultivation
DEG = degrees
DEPT = department
DESC = description
DET = determine(d)
DIAM = diameter
DIV = division
DLNR = Department of Land and Natural Resources
DM = decimeter
DOPAW = Division of Forestry and Wildlife
DOM = dominated(d)
E = east
ELEV = elevation
ESP = especially
FED = federal
FLO = flower(s), ed, ing
FOR RES = Forest Reserve
FRS = fruit(s), ed, ing
FT = foot, feet
GLCH = globe(s)

GOVT = government
HAWN = Hawaiian
HRC = hectare(s)
HI = Hawaii (state)
HT = height
HWY = highway
ID = identified
INDM = immature
IN = inch(es)
INCL = including
INDS = individual(s)
INDIG = indigenous
INSECT = not yet published
INF = inflorescence
INFO = information
INVERTEBR = invertebrate
JAC = junction
JUV = juvenile(s)
KM = kilometer(s)
LAT = latitude
LF = leaf
LG = large
LOC = locality, location
LONG = longitude
LV = leaves
M = meter(s)
MGMT = management
MI = mile(s)
MIL RES = Military Reservation
MIN = minutes
MM = millimeter
MT = Mount
MTN = mountain
MTNS = mountains
N = north
NA = not applicable
NAR = Natural Area Reserve
NARS = Natural Area Reserves
NATL = national
NC = natural community
ND = none
NP = National Park

Hawaii Heritage Program, Natural Diversity Database, The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii. 1116 Smith St., Suite 201 Honolulu, Hawaii 96817
| NR | near |
| NWHI | Northwest Hawaiian Islands |
| NWR | National Wildlife Refuge |
| OBS | observed, addition |
| ORVS(s) | off-road vehicle(s) |
| PEKS | personal |
| PK | park |
| POP(s) | population(s) |
| POSS | possible |
| PPT | parts per thousand |
| PT | point |
| RD | road |
| RDG(s) | ridge(s) |
| RECOM | recommend(ed) |
| RECRUF | recruitment |
| REPROD | reproduction |
| RES | reserve |
| RTE | route |
| S | south |
| SECT | section |
| SLP | slope |
| SM | small |
| SP | species (sing.) |

| SPP | species (pl.) |
| SPEC(S) | species(s) |
| SPRG | spring |
| SQ | square |
| STA | station(s) |
| STRM | stream |
| SURR | surrounding |
| TEMP | temperature |
| TR | trail |
| TRAN | transit |
| UNPUBL | unpublished |
| USFWS | United States Fish & Wildlife Service |

| VAR | variety |
| VEG | vegetation |
| VRT | vertebrate |
| VIS | visual |
| VLY(S) | valley(s) |
| W | west |
| WJT | westward |
| YD | yard(s) |

---

**Type of Element**

- GREEN = Natural Community
- YELLOW = Plant
- ORANGE = Vertebrate
- PURPLE = Invertebrate
- BLUE = Special Managed Areas

**Precision Symbol**

- ₀ = Specific location (locally mapped within 0.33 mile radius).
- ₁ = Medium precision (locally mapped within approximately 1.5 mile radius, typically based upon an older record containing only place name information).
- ₂ = General locality (locally mapped within 5 mile radius, approximately 20 acre size), typically based upon an older record containing only place name's or regional information.

**Key to Map Reference Numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key to Map Reference Numbers</th>
<th>Kepaa Elementary School Study Project Area</th>
<th>Kepaa QUAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Element</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 JUN 1993</td>
<td>Page No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 1</strong></td>
<td>1916 ACACIA KOAI</td>
<td>KOAI’A, KOAI’I, PDK1602OH00200 C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1916 LAGOSIA NIHUAENKIS</td>
<td>‘OHIA, ‘OHIA, ‘OHIA WAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 2</strong></td>
<td>1981 MIRANDOIIDON HACEMOSUM</td>
<td>FDRA070010001 PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 3</strong></td>
<td>1978 ANAS NYXILLIANA</td>
<td>HAWAIIAN DUCK, ABH96067D0043 LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 4</strong></td>
<td>1988 LAGOSIA CINERUS SEDUTUS</td>
<td>‘OPE’APE’A, HAWAIIAN HOARY BAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 5</strong></td>
<td>1976 HAWAIIAN CONTINUOUS PERENNIAL STREAM</td>
<td>HAWAIIAN CANYS00000041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 6</strong></td>
<td>1988 MONACHUS SCHAUINSLANDI</td>
<td>HAWAIIAN SEAL, AM2014020015 PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 7</strong></td>
<td>1989 MONACHUS SCHAUINSLANDI</td>
<td>HAWAIIAN SEAL, AM2014020010 LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAP REFERENCE # 8</strong></td>
<td>1990 RIBIBUSIS CLAYI</td>
<td>KOI‘O ‘ULA ‘ULA PDMAL000001 PE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Records Processed
06/08/93  HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

ECODE: PD2AM0D0400
ISLANDCODE: KA
QUADNAME: KAPAA
NAME: ACACIA KOAIA
COMMON: KOA'I'A, KOA'I'E, KO'A'OHA
GRANK: G2 SRANK: 52.2 FED. STATUS: C2
STATE STATUS: PLEASE FILL OUT
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1916 LAST OBSERVATION: 1916-10-17
DIRECTIONS: /NOUNOU MTS/ HABITAT-GENESC: EDDATA:
COMMENTS: CITATION OF FORBES 596.K
SOURCECODE: CITATION: A79S7J03HNIUS
SPECIMENS:

06/08/93  HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

ECODE: PD2AM0D0400
ISLANDCODE: KA
QUADNAME: KAPAA
NAME: LEBELLA MIHAIWAISS
COMMON: 'OHA, HANA, 'OHA NAI
GRANK: G2 SRANK: 52.1 FED. STATUS: LE
STATE STATUS: PLEASE FILL OUT
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1916 LAST OBSERVATION: 1916-10-17
DIRECTIONS: /NOUNOU (+UGS NOUNOU) MT/ (516FORBM) HABITAT-GENESC: GROWING ON WET CLIFF (516FORBM) EDDATA:
COMMENTS: 1 PLANT SEEN. COBOLLA UNIFORMLY DARK REDISH PURPLE, CALYX DARK GREEN, FL (516FORBM)
SOURCECODE: CITATION: 516FORBMNIUS A39S7J03HNIUS
SPECIMENS:
NAME: *Munroidendron racemosum*

COORDS:

GRANK: G1 SRANK: S1.3 FED. STATUS: FE STATE STATUS: 

FIRST OBSERVATION: 1916 LAST OBSERVATION: 1981-??-??

DIRECTIONS: [MONO] MT, W SIDE OF S END, 600-820 FT ([UZI])\[MONO] MT, MAUNA SLIP, 800 FT ([UZI])\[MONO] MT, FIRST SLIP ON M FACE

HABITAT:

TALLER MORE CLOSED FOREST DOMINATED BY INTRODUCED KUKUI (ALEURITES MOLUCCANA) & GUAVA (PSIDIIUM GUAIJAVA), FREQUENTLY ASSOC SPP: ALEURITES MOLUCCANA, COROLLINE TERMINALIS, LANTANA CAMARA, PANDANUS GDBHATJIS, PSIDIIUM GUAIJAVA (200LAMO); W: KUKUI (ALEURITES) IN DANG POCKETS ([UZI])\[MONO]; AMONG PSIDIIUM, LANTANA ([UZI]); W: PANDANUS, CEDEES, ALEURITES IN PSIDIIUM FOREST ([UZI]); SECONDARY FOREST ON STEEP SLIP ([UZI]); RATHER DRY SLIP ([UZI]); W: PANDANUS, ALEURITES, LANTANA & PSIDIIUM GUAIJAVA ([UZI]); ASSOC W: SUCH SPP AS CAVAHALLA GALEATA, SIDA EP, PLECTRANTHUS AUSTRALIS, MUCUNA GIGANTEA, ALEURITES MOLUCCANA, COROLLINE FRUTICOSA, PSIDIIUM GUAIJAVA, LANTANA CAMARA, & OTHER ARIDITY-TOLERANT PLANTS ([UZI])

EODATA:

ABOUT 5 MATURE TREES, AREA OF POP 50 ACRES ([UZI]); TREES 35 FT TALL, FL ([UZI]); TREE 40 FT TALL, LEAFLESS W MILFS, EXCEEDINGLY THIN ([UZI]); TREE 40 FT TALL W WHITE BARK, FL W CHEM-COLORED PERIANTH SEGMENT WITHIN, STRONGLY RIBBED ON BOTH SURFACES, FR W BLACK-BLACK APEX, VERY RARE ([UZI]); OLDER TREE 12 M TALL, 6 MT DHH, W THICK BRANCHES, DARK MAROON, GLOSSY, ON 18 FT, BUDS UNDEFINED ([UZI]); TREE, 6 M HT ([UZI]); TREE 70 CM; TREE 40 FT X 20-24 IN. RATHER BROAD BRANCHING, ONLY 1 TREE FOUND ([UZI]); ABOUT 10 TREES WERE REQUIRED AT TYPE LOC, USUALLY OCCURRING AS INDIVIDUALS IN SEPARATED LOCS ([A17])

REBD: NO RETD FROM 1 FEBRUARY THIS YR & ANOTHER & SOME SEEDLINGS LAYERED ([A17])
06/08/93

HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

CODE: AB3810070*043

ISLANDCODE: KA
PRECISION: S
QUADNAME: KAPAA
MAP REFERENCE (DOT): 19
TENTEN: 8,4

NAME: AMAS MVILLIANA
COMNAME: HAWAIIAN DUCK, KOLOA
GRANK: G1
SRANK: S1.2
FED. STATUS: LE
STATE STATUS: LE
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1978
LAST OBSERVATION: 1978-01-12

DIRECTIONS: /NAIKAE CANAL/ IN KAPAA TOWN (H97EL01)
HABITAT-GENESC:
ECODE: DOPAN WNT 1978 4 BIRDS OBS, 1979-01 NO BIRDS OBS (UBRHIPO2, AB7901) 122
COMMENTS:
SOURCECODE: TELFER, T. WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST, DIVISION OF FORESTRY & WILDLIFE, KAUAI. 3060 EWA ST, LIHUE, HI 96766. (808) 245-4420.
SOURCECODE: CITATION:
PROTOLI1NI TELFER, Thomas. Wildlife Biologist, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, Kauai County. 3060 Ewa Street, Lihue, Hawaii 96766.


H97EL01NI TELFER, T. 1977. USGS topographic map of Kauai 1:20,500 with waterbird habitats.

AB7901NI HISTORY OF ENDANGERED HAWAIIAN BIRDS. PART I: HISTORICAL HABITAT-PHOTOS. SPECIES ACCOUNTS. FRESHWATER BIRDS. KOLOA-MAUI. COOPERATIVE NATIONAL PARK RESOURCES STUDIES UNIT, UNIV. OF HAWAI I AT MANOA. AVIAN HISTORY REPORT 120.

SPECIMENS:

06/08/93

HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

CODE: AMAC05031*130

ISLANDCODE: KA
PRECISION: M
QUADNAME: KAPAA
MAP REFERENCE (DOT): 27
TENTEN: 6,6

NAME: LASIUSUS CINEREUS SEMOTUS
COMNAME: 'OPE'APE'A, HAWAIIAN NOARY BAT
GRANK: GST2
SRANK: S2.2
FED. STATUS: LE
STATE STATUS: LE
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1971
LAST OBSERVATION: 1980-03-07

DIRECTIONS: /WAILUA/ WAILUA BAY (USOT001); WAILUA RIVER, MAP AVAILABLE (AB9FU01)
HABITAT-GENESC:
ECODE: DOPAN WNT 1978 4 BIRDS OBS, 1979-01 NO BIRDS OBS (UBRHIPO2, AB7901) 122
COMMENTS:
SOURCECODE: TELFER, T. WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST, DIVISION OF FORESTRY & WILDLIFE, KAUAI. 3060 EWA ST, LIHUE, HI 96766. (808) 245-4420.
SOURCECODE: CITATION:
PROTOLI1NI TELFER, Thomas. Wildlife Biologist, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, Kauai County. 3060 Ewa Street, Lihue, Hawaii 96766.


H97EL01NI TELFER, T. 1977. USGS topographic map of Kauai 1:20,500 with waterbird habitats.

AB7901NI HISTORY OF ENDANGERED HAWAIIAN BIRDS. PART I: HISTORICAL HABITAT-PHOTOS. SPECIES ACCOUNTS. FRESHWATER BIRDS. KOLOA-MAUI. COOPERATIVE NATIONAL PARK RESOURCES STUDIES UNIT, UNIV. OF HAWAI I AT MANOA. AVIAN HISTORY REPORT 120.

SPECIMENS:
06/08/93

HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

EOCODE: CANFS000AO*041

ISLANDCODE: KA
QUADNAME: KAPAA

PRECISION: SC

MAP REFERENCE (DOT): 32
TENEN: 8,4

HAWAIIAN CONTINUOUS PERENNIAL STREAM

GRANK: G1
SRANK: 51.3
FED. STATUS: STATE STATUS:

FIRST OBSERVATION: LAST OBSERVATION: 1976-77

DIRECTIONS: "KOHONIKI STREAM, MOUTH AT WAIKEA CANAL, CA 0.1 KM S OF KAPAA BEACH PK/"

HABITAT-
GENDEC: IN GENTLE SLP, ADJ VEG ALIEN DOM

EODATA: PHYSICAL FEATURES DATA IN B7801H1, SPP LIST AVAILABLE, INCLUDES NATIVE ATVOIDA RISULATA, THREATS INCLUDE ALIEN MACROBRACHIUM LAM & XIPHIODONTUS, CHANNEL REALIGNMENT 6/8 VEG REMOVED ALONG 1/8 OF CHANNEL (B781H1)

COMMENTS: RANKED LIMITED BY HAWAII STREAM ASSESSMENT (HSA), ADDITIONAL DETAILS IN HSO1H1


HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

ECODE: ANA00300*020
INLANDCODE: KA
QUADNAME: KAPA
MAP REFERENCE (DOT): 34
TENTEN: 6.4

NAME: MONACHUS SCHAUHISLANDI
COMMON NAME: HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL
GRANK: G2
Srank: 2.1
FED. STATUS: LE
STATE STATUS: LE
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1988
LAST OBSERVATION: 1989-02-02
DIRECTIONS: [S KAUAI, KAPA BEACH PARK/ AT SHERATON COCONUT BEACH HOTEL (UG0NF01)]
HABITAT-GENDEC: BEACH (UG0NF01)
EDODATA: 1 OBS 1989-02-02, 108 OBS 1988-09-30 (UG0NF01)
COMMENTS: 
BESTSOURCE: NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE. 1990. COMPUTER PRINTOUT OF HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL SIGHTINGS ON MAIN HAWAIIAN ISLANDS AND NORTHWESTERN HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.
SOURCECODE: CITATION: UG0NF01
USNMFOILS
USNMFOILS

HAWAII HERITAGE PROGRAM
ELEMENT OCCURRENCE RECORD

ECODE: FAM00000*001
INLANDCODE: KA
QUADNAME: KAPA
MAP REFERENCE (DOT): 37
TENTEN: 5.5

NAME: HIBISCUS CLAYI
COMMON NAME: KOI 'ULA'ULA
GRANK: G1
Srank: 1.1
FED. STATUS: FE
STATE STATUS: 
FIRST OBSERVATION: 1916
LAST OBSERVATION: 1990-06-05
DIRECTIONS: [MONO (M. USGE, MONO), 800-1150 FT/ ON MONO SLEEPING GIANT TR, 120 M (391 FT) (UG0PER01); CREST OF SLEEPING GIANT MT, 1100-1150 FT (S8H0RM8); MONO TR, 1150 FT (S8H0RM8); MONO NR KAPA HOMEHRES, DRY SLP, 400 M (1312 FT, EDSON (HIGHEST POINT ON MONO IS 1541 FT) (S27MACBM); MONO MT, IIAKA [SOUTHWARD] SLP, 800 FT (S8H0RM8); MONO HTS (S8H0RM8); MONO, W SIDE, 1000 FT (S8H0RM8); CHRISTENSEN 27: ABOVE MONO MT TR, 1000 FT (S75CHRBM); CHRISTENSEN S.N. & 1: MONO MT, 1000 FT (S75CHRBM)
HABITAT-GENDEC: TOPOGRAPHY - UPPER SLP, SLP - MODERATE, ASPECT - E.
SUNSPRAY - SOIL, ASSOC SPS: ALIEN VEG/UNGRADED ACACIA KOA FOREST, MUNIOENDRON RACEMOSUM, ACACIA KOA, GAUNIKA, PISIDIA CATELIAMM, COHOSINE, OPILIMENUS, OLEVILLA, MAJOR THREATS - WEEDS (UG0PER01); SECONDARY FOREST OF GUAVA [PISIDIA], JAVA PISM (STEGYDUM), & SCHRING, W FORESTRY PLANTINGS & RARE ENDUANTS (S87F0RM8) OPEN OR SHADE (S8H0RM8); CHRISTENSEN 27: DRYLAND FOREST, ACACIA KOA, MUNIOENDRON (S75CHRBM)
EDODATA: 2 LIVE TREES, 1 TREE 10 FT HT W/ FR & FL, OTHER FALLEN OVER SPINDLY TREE (UG0PER01): TREE 4 M TALL W/ 2 Erect Trunks 10-12 CM DIAH, BARK SMOOTH, PALE BROWN, LVS DARK SHINY GREEN ABOVE, COROLA DEEP RED, BARE, ONLY 2 SEEN LOCALLY (S87B0RM8); NATURAL SYNTHOT; MANY SEEDLINGS (S8H0RM8); SHRUB 5 M (S27MACBM): WOODY HABIT, UP TO 15 FT TALL (S8H0RM8); TREE 8 M X 10 CM (S52SIBS8); CHRISTENSEN 27: POP 18 TREES COUNTED ON MAY 1975, ANOTHER SEEN APRIL 22, TALLEST TREE 25 FT, WILD SEEDLINGS W/ VARIEGATED 1/1 COLORED WHITE ALONG VINES WERE NOTED APRIL 22, 1976, NEW STEM GROWTH (S75CHRBM); CHRISTENSEN S.N.: 18 PLANTS IN COLONY, TREES TO 24 FT IN HT (S75CHRBM); CHRISTENSEN S.T.: TREES TO 24 FT HT (S75CHRBM)
EXCODE: POMALOHIAO001

COMMENTS:
BESTSOURCE: PERLMAN, S. 1990. HAWAII PLANT CONSERVATION CENTER ACCESSION DATA.

SOURCECODE: CITATION:
UH0PER0H1US
578L0RPHHEUUS
5888NORH1US
577MA0H1US
54840R0H1US
5160RD0H1US
532STJR0H1US
5758R0R0H1US

SPECIMENS:

Special Notice to Developers and Consultants

The Nature Conservancy's Hawaii Heritage Program database is dependent on the research and observations of many scientists and individuals. In most cases, this information is the result of comprehensive site-specific field surveys, and is not confirmed by the Heritage staff. Many areas in Hawaii have never been thoroughly surveyed, and new plants and animals are still being discovered. Heritage information should therefore be regarded as final statements or estimates for areas surveyed or evaluated for environmental assessment. Data provided by the Heritage Program do not represent a position taken by The Nature Conservancy of Hawaii. If Heritage information is distributed in any way, the above statement must accompany this information.
APPENDIX H - MISCELLANEOUS PROPERTY TAX OFFICE INFORMATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR</th>
<th>AREA:</th>
<th>VALUE:</th>
<th>PERCENT-OWNER</th>
<th>TITLE-DESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>555000</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37800</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>555000</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37800</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>388500</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37800</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37800</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>249700</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37718</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>105300</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>175.18100 A</td>
<td>37718</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8.10000 A</td>
<td>105300</td>
<td>EXEMPT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE ADDRESS: OLOHENA RD

MAILING ADDRESS: LIHUE PLANTATION CO LTD
2970 KELE ST
LIHUE HI 96766

-------------------------- SEE PARCEL SHEETS FOR MORE INFORMATION --------------------------
04/27/93

INSTR-DESC: DLNR-L/O PERMIT S-679
INST-NO: R920000456
INST-DATE: 04/27/93
REC-DATE:

AREA: 12.00000 ACRE
FROM: STATE OF HAWAII
TO: KAUAI SAND & GRAVEL INC
P O BOX 3256
WAILUA, HI 96796

PURPOSES: PASTURE
RENTAL: $41.25/MO, COMMENCING 2/1/92
EFFECTIVE DATE: 1/16/92

TM# NOTE: PARCEL AREA SHOWN AS 12.0 AC
TMK 4-1-09:17
WAILUA, HUNA
11.796 AC

OWNERSHIP: NAME:
F 0011 *STATE OF HAWAII
P 0011 *KAUAI SAND & GRAVEL INC

MAILING ADDRESS: *STATE OF HAWAII
CONDO MASTER
*STATE OF HAWAII

04/29/92

INSTR-DESC: GRANT OF NON-EXCLUSIVE ESMT
INST-NO: 92-006635
INST-DATE: 03/30/92
REC-DATE: 04/29/92

AREA: 12.00000 ACRE
FROM: STATE OF HAWAII
TO: MICHAEL KUAI'ANU 64F, KUAI'ANU T/T
GRANTOR DOES HEREBY GRANT UNTO GRANTEE PERPETUAL ESMT RIGHTS IN, OVER,
UNDER & ACROSS LAND DESCRIBED IN EXH "A"
FOR GOV'T LAND 3,750 SF DSS
F/D: SUBJ TO 15 FT ACCESS ESMT [3,750 SF] IN FAVOR OF 4114-54

OWNERSHIP: NAME:
F 0011 *STATE OF HAWAII
P 0011 *KAUAI SAND & GRAVEL INC

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1993
-PITT: 100
AVERAGE: 12.00000 A
VALUE: 1381800 EXEMPT:

SITE ADDRESS: KAULANA RD
AFT:

MAILING ADDRESS: *STATE OF HAWAII
CONDO MASTER
*STATE OF HAWAII

10/07/87

OWNERSHIP: NAME:
F 0011 *STATE OF HAWAII

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1992
-PITT: 100
AVERAGE: 12.00000 A
VALUE: 1381800 EXEMPT:

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1991

-----------SEE PARCEL SHEETS FOR MORE INFORMATION-----------
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS

| TMK: 4 4 1 009 01S | PAGE: 1 |

10/07/87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNERSHIP: NAME</th>
<th>F TC</th>
<th>%-OWNER</th>
<th>TITLE-DESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 0011</td>
<td>STATE OF HAWAII</td>
<td>L 0011</td>
<td>WAILUA YOUNG PEOPLES CLUB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1994
- PITT: 100 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 114000 EXEMPT: 114000
  BLDG TOTALS: 117000 EXEMPT: 117000

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1993
- PITT: 100 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 114000 EXEMPT: 114000
  BLDG TOTALS: 122000 EXEMPT: 122000

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1992
- PITT: 100 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 114000 EXEMPT: 114000
  BLDG TOTALS: 122000 EXEMPT: 122000

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1991
- PITT: 100 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 114000 EXEMPT: 114000
  BLDG TOTALS: 116000 EXEMPT: 116000

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1990
- PITT: 100 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 74100 EXEMPT: 74100
  BLDG TOTALS: 116000 EXEMPT: 116000

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1989
- PITT: 152 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 62715 EXEMPT: 62715
  BLDG TOTALS: 7932 EXEMPT: 7932

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1988
- PITT: 152 AREA: 15400 F VALUE: 54535 EXEMPT: 54535
  BLDG TOTALS: 7799 EXEMPT: 7799

SITE ADDRESS: HALEIWI RD

MAILING ADDRESS: WAILUA YOUNG PEOPLE CLUB
4831-A MOLOKA'I RD
WAIAHUA HI 96746

--------------------------------SEE PARCEL SHEETS FOR MORE INFORMATION--------------------------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10/07/87</th>
<th>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1993</th>
<th>F TC</th>
<th>%-OWNER</th>
<th>TITLE-DESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNERSHIP: NAME</td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1993</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 404600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHUE PLANTATION CO LTD</td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1993</td>
<td>PITT: 500</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1992</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 404600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1992</td>
<td>PITT: 500</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1991</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 441400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1991</td>
<td>PITT: 500</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1990</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 367800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1990</td>
<td>PITT: 500</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1989</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 43560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1989</td>
<td>PITT: 520</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1988</td>
<td>PITT: 400</td>
<td>AREA: 1.00000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 43560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 1988</td>
<td>PITT: 520</td>
<td>AREA: 287.90000 A</td>
<td>VALUE: 81762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE ADDRESS:</td>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td>KUHIO HWY</td>
<td>LIHUE PLANTATION CO LTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2970 KELE ST</td>
<td>LIHUE HI</td>
<td>96766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- SEE PARCEL SHEETS FOR MORE INFORMATION ---