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FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR KILAUEA BOOSTER PUMP STATION
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), dated October 28, 2003, for this project was submitted to the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) for public review. At the time of the original submittal of the Draft EA, a final decision regarding the type of equipment to be used for transmission of radio waves for remote monitoring and operation, i.e., an antenna versus a monopole, had not yet been determined. After submittal of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA, the decision was made to use a sub-master with an 80-foot high steel monopole mast. A revised Draft EA was then submitted to OEQC, dated June 28, 2004, based on inclusion of the monopole as part of the booster pump station project. During the 30-day review period, several community members expressed concerns regarding the impact of the monopole. (See Appendix A for comments on the Draft EA and response letters.)

After careful consideration of the community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department of Water's (DOW's) plans for their Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, DOW has decided to eliminate the 80-foot monopole proposed for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station (BPS). This decision was made to allow for permitting of the BPS to proceed on its own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the BPS. The BPS will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system in lieu of the 80-foot monopole. This antenna system will not exceed the 40-foot allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the project.

This Final EA will be sent to the following government agencies and organizations for their review. These same government agencies and organizations were previously sent the June 28, 2004 Draft EA for review.

OFFICES IN:
HONOLULU, HAWAII
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII

REPLY TO:
551 SNaP Street, Suite 521 - Honolulu, Hawaii 96817-9201
PHONE 808-955-3542 • FAX 808-955-1207 • EMAIL: info@oakhawaii.com
1. Office of Environmental Quality Control  
236 S. Beretania Street  
Leloopapa A Kamehameha, Suite 702  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

2. Princeville Public Library  
4343 Emmalanil Drive  
Princeville, Hawaii 96722

3. Kilauea Neighborhood Association  
P.O. Box 1434  
Kilauea, Hawaii 96754

4. State of Hawaii  
Department of Land & Natural Resources  
Division of Aquatic Resources  
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 330  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

5. State of Hawaii  
Office of Hawaiian Affairs  
711 Kapilani Boulevard  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

6. Kauai Community Resources Coordinator  
State of Hawaii  
Office of Hawaiian Affairs  
3-3100 Kuhio Highway, Suite C4  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766-1153

7. State of Hawaii  
Department of Health  
Safe Drinking Water Branch  
Environmental Management Division  
919 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 308  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

8. State of Hawaii  
Department of Agriculture  
Planning Division  
1428 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

9. State of Hawaii  
State Historic Preservation Division  
Department of Land & Natural Resources  
5532 Tapa Street  
Koloa, Hawaii 96756
10. County of Kauai
   Planning Department
   4444 Rice Street, Suite 473
   Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766

11. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
    Pacific Island Fish & Wildlife Office
    300 Ala Moana Blvd
    Room 3-122
    Box 50088
    Honolulu, HI 96850

During preparation of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA, the following agencies were contacted, but did not request copies of the Draft EA.

1. United States Department of Commerce
   National Marine Fisheries Service

2. State of Hawaii
   Department of Land & Natural Resources
   Forestry and Wildlife Division

3. State of Hawaii
   Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
   The Office of Coastal Zone Management

The project involves the construction of a duplex booster pump station to increase the water pressure within the existing 8" waterline in Kuhio Highway. This will improve service to the eastern part of the Kilauea Water System, and will operate in conjunction with the recently constructed Puu Pane Reservoir. The two pumps would be identical, with a pumping rate of 350 gallons per minute (gpm).

Two 8" waterlines would also be installed to the pump station along Wailapa Road from connection points to the existing highway waterline. The waterlines will be in the grassed shoulder off the east edge of the paved travelway of Wailapa Road, and therefore, will not require repavement of Wailapa Road. A short section between the paved edge of Wailapa Road and the entrance gate to the booster pump station site will be paved with asphalt concrete pavement. Exposed areas within the booster pump station fenced site will also be paved with asphalt concrete pavement.
The pump station would be located in a grassy area within a portion of the parcel designated as TMK: 5-1-05:23. The southern portion of the pump station site had a greenhouse that has already been removed by the property owner.

The main aboveground component within the fenced pump station site would be a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building, with slab-on-grade, concrete masonry unit walls and a concrete roof. The building would be painted to blend into the surrounding environment. Other components would be a short segment of piping into the building and slab-on-grade mounted electrical cabinets.

An antenna will be mounted on a maximum 3-inch diameter galvanized steel pipe, with a height less than 40 feet, for transmission of radio waves to the DOW's SCADA control center for remote monitoring and operation of the pumps. The building and all other aboveground components would be obscured from view from Wailapa Road by existing ironwood trees along the edge of the road right-of-way.

Table 1. Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Map Key</td>
<td>4th Division 5-1-05:23 (Booster pump station site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Site Area</td>
<td>2,600 square feet (Booster pump station site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>Approximately 300 feet mean sea level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Land Use District &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>State Land Use District - Agricultural; General Plan - Agriculture; Zoning – A (Agricultural).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens, (Booster pump station site); County (Access road &amp; pipeline); State of Hawaii (Portion of pipeline within Kuhio Highway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting Authority</td>
<td>Department of Water, County of Kauai, 4398 Pua Loke Street, Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766; Edward Tschupp, Manager &amp; Chief Engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Department of Water, County of Kauai, 4398 Pua Loke Street, Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii 96766; Contact: Keith Fujimoto (808) 245-5449.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Permits and Approvals</td>
<td>Permits: Kauai Planning Department (Use, Zoning); Kauai Building Department (Building, Grading); State Department of Health (NPDES – Hydro-testing); State Department of Transportation (Construction within State Highway's Right-of-Way). Approval: State Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division (Historic Sites).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

1.1 Technical Characteristics

1.1.1 Project Background and Purpose of Environmental Assessment

The Department of Water (DOW), County of Kauai, proposes to construct the Kilaeua Booster Pump Station (BPS), with duplex pumps, and to install two 8" waterlines to this pump station from interconnection points with the existing DOW 8" waterline within Kuhio Highway. The purpose of this environmental assessment (EA) is to fully disclose potential environmental impacts of the Kilaeua BPS, and to identify any significant environmental impacts, if any. In this case, no significant environmental impacts have been identified. This EA is required because of the use of county funds.

1.1.2 Project Location and Purpose

The Kilaeua BPS will be located in Kilaeua, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii, approximately 700 feet north (makai) of the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa Road, within a portion of TMK 5-1-05:23, and at an approximate ground elevation of 300 feet mean sea level. The recently established Puu Pane Subdivision is on the south (mauka) side of the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa Road. (See Exhibits 1 and 2 for location and site maps, and photographs.)

The parcel within which the Kilaeua BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. The BPS site is just within an existing side gate into the parcel. This gate is not being used by the property owner, and therefore, will be used for direct access into the BPS. About two-thirds of the BPS site will displace a grassy area, with the other third displacing an existing greenhouse that has already been removed. The site has been designed to not require removal of any orchard trees, while maintaining vehicular access to an existing dirt road within the property.

The purpose of the Kilaeua BPS is to increase the pressure in the existing 8" waterline within Kuhio Highway. This will improve service to the eastern part of the Kilaeua Water System, and will operate in conjunction with the recently constructed 100,000-gallon reservoir at the top of the Puu Pane Subdivision. This waterline currently conveys water by gravity, from the existing DOW Kilaeua wells and two 250,000-gallon DOW Kilaeua Reservoirs that serve the entire Kilaeua Water System that extends along Kuhio Highway, to the existing Puu Pane Reservoir and Waipake BPS. (See Exhibit 3 for water system schematic, which includes
approximate distances between the reservoirs and BPSs.) The Puu Pane Reservoir was constructed at the same elevation as the Kilauea Reservoirs, thereby allowing these three reservoirs to "float" with each other and provide water to the same service area. However, due to the frictional loss in the conveyance pipeline, there is reduced pressure in the eastern part of the system. The Kilauea BPS would be designed to improve service pressure in eastern Kilauea.

DOW funds will be used for this project. Therefore, preparation of this EA is required to address the limited environmental impacts anticipated for this project, pursuant to Chapter 200, Title 11, Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), and Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS). There is also the potential for the project being funded by Federal funds through the State of Hawaii's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program, which requires that this EA include all of the environmental information to comply with the DWSRF program.

1.1.3 Project Description

The Kilauea BPS will encompass a 50' x 55' site surrounded by a 6' high chain link fence and 14' wide double swing chain link gate. Exposed areas within the BPS fenced site will be paved with asphalt concrete pavement, with a concrete header along the edges of the paved area. No landscaping is being proposed, as the existing ironwood trees along the Waipapa Road frontage of the site would already obscure the view of the aboveground components within the BPS from Waipapa Road. (See Exhibit 4 for site plan and sections.) The components within the fenced site of the Kilauea BPS will consist of the following:

- The Pump Building would be an approximately 13' x 12 ' x 10' high building with concrete masonry unit walls and a concrete roof. (See Exhibit 5 for architectural plan and elevations.) The building would house the duplex pumps and associated piping and electrical panels. The two pumps would be identical, with a pumping rate of 350 gallons per minutes (gpm), and with 5 horsepower motors. (See Exhibit 6 for piping plan and sections.)

- Slab-on-grade electrical cabinets will be located just outside of the Pump Building. An omni-directional antenna will be mounted on a steel pipe with a maximum diameter of 3-inch. A Yagi antenna, which is a remote radio antenna, will also be mounted on the pipe. The top of the omni-directional antenna will not be higher than 40 feet above the finish grade of the project. The antenna system will be used to communicate between the remote water facilities in the Kilauea-
Waipake-Kaliihiwai area. The supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) control center at the DOW baseyard will communicate with this site using Verizon's frame relay circuit. These telemetered radio wave signals, in tandem with similar signals from the Kilauea Reservoirs and the Puu Pane Reservoir monitor water levels within these three reservoirs, will be integrated into a program to control the automatic operation of the Kilauea BPS pumps.

Two 8" waterlines would also be installed to the BPS along Wailapa Road from connection points to the existing highway waterline. The waterlines will be in the grassed shoulder off the east edge of the paved portion of Wailapa Road. (See Exhibits 7A and 7B for plan and profile of waterlines.) A short section between the paved edge of Wailapa Road and the pavement within the BPS site at the entrance gate to the pump station site will be paved with asphalt concrete pavement.

1.1.4 Project Schedule and Estimated Cost

DOW will hire a contractor, through a public bidding process, to construct the Kilauea BPS and 8" waterlines, except for the SCADA system components. Construction of the BPS is expected to begin in mid 2005, and be completed by mid 2006. The SCADA system components are the SCADA cabinet and the galvanized steel pole with antenna at the Kilauea BPS, and equipment at DOW's SCADA control center. This SCADA work, which has been contracted separately, is expected to be completed prior to completion of the BPS.

The estimated construction cost for the Kilauea BPS is $550,000. Funding for the project will be entirely by DOW. There is the potential for the project being funded by Federal funds through the DWSRF program.

1.1.5 Service Area

The primary area to be serviced by the Kilauea BPS is eastern Kilauea from the Puu Pane Subdivision to Waipake and residences along Wailapa Road. In general, existing services off the existing waterline in Kuhio Highway between the Kilauea BPS and the Waipake BPS will experience slightly higher pressures, as will areas along Wailapa Road. This is due to the additional head provided by the Puu Pane Reservoir – even when the Kilauea BPS pump is not operating.

There may also be slight pressure reductions experienced by existing services close to the Kilauea BPS on its west side when the BPS pump is operating. This is due to the additional
frictional loss in the waterline when the pump is "pulling" 350 gpm through the waterline between the Kilauea Reservoirs and the Kilauea BPS – which would be a significantly higher rate than when water would be flowing by gravity.

1.2 Socio-economic Characteristics

1.2.1 Economic Impacts on the Community at Large

The Puu Pane Reservoir will provide additional storage capacity for the community at large, since it will be maintained at a higher water level, as a result of the booster pump station. Also service pressure will be improved in Kilauea. Therefore, the project will have a beneficial impact on the community at large.

1.2.2 Provision of Income for County or State and Creation of Employment Opportunities in Areas with High Unemployment Rates

The project provides benefits through jobs related to its implementation.

1.2.3 Targeted Segment of Population

Existing and future customers in the existing eastern Kilauea water service area are the primary beneficiaries of this project.

1.2.4 Population Density

The Kilauea BPS should have no effect on population density, since it does not involve the development of any additional potable water sources. The purpose of the project is to improve service for the existing Kilauea Community.

1.2.5 Recreational Facilities

There are no effects on recreational facilities, since there are no such facilities at the site of the project.

1.2.6 Child Care Provisions

There are no child care provisions associated with the project.

1.2.7 Relocation of Residences

No relocation of residences is required for construction of this project.

1.2.8 Project Cost and Economic Analysis

The estimated construction cost of the project is $550,000.
1.3 Environmental Characteristics

1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes

The project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. Existing ironwood trees alongside the Wailapa Road right-of-way would obscure the view of aboveground components within the BPS site, including the building, piping, electrical cabinets and antenna system, while traveling along Wailapa Road. Similarly, it is not anticipated that these components of the BPS would be visible from Kuhio Highway.

1.3.2 Air Quality

There will be some air quality effects during construction, which will be mitigated per county and state rules. However, there would be no long-term effects, since the project includes no air pollution sources and would not generate differences in traffic from existing conditions.

1.3.3 Traffic

Traffic along Kuhio Highway will be affected during installation of the approximately 25 feet of dual waterline within the highway right-of-way. However, a traffic control plan with flagmen, signs and cones will be required of the contractor for this installation to minimize disruptions. Inconvenience to local traffic using Wailapa Road will also temporarily be experienced during installation of the approximately 600 feet of dual waterline. However, this major segment of the waterline will be in the grass shoulder area, and not within the paved travel lane of Wailapa Road. Furthermore, like the segment within Kuhio Highway, installation of this relatively short length of waterline should be completed within a couple of weeks. Therefore, the resultant effects on traffic will be of short term and should be manageable.

Minimal traffic inconvenience may also be experienced from construction materials being delivered to the site by heavy trucks and trailers. However, such deliveries would be during off-peak traffic hours (6:30 AM to 3:30 PM). The contractor will be required to follow existing regulations regarding road clean up, if necessary, resulting from this construction traffic.

1.3.4 Noise Levels

There will be some temporary increase in noise levels during normal weekday work hours for construction of the project. The contractor will be required to meet Department of Health noise regulations. Enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further
attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horsepower pump motors during operation of the facility.

1.3.5 Effects on Water Quality

The project will have no significant impact on water quality, since no unauthorized discharges to state waters are expected during construction. An NPDES permit may be required for discharge of hydro-testing water used to pressure test and disinfect the waterlines. However, an NPDES permit for construction de-watering is not expected, due to the location of the site relative to streams and the elevation of the site relative to sea level.

1.3.6 Other Environmental Effects

There are no other environmental effects anticipated.
2. DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

2.1 Location

The Kilauea BPS will be located in Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii, approximately 700 feet north (makai) of the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa Road, within a portion of TMK 5-1-05:23 and at an approximate ground elevation of 300 feet mean sea level.

2.2 Land Ownership and Tenancy

Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens, Inc. owns the parcel of land on which the Kilauea BPS will be constructed. The Chairman and CEO of this company, Ms. Joyce H. Doty, has agreed to provide a lease and/or an easement for the BPS in favor of the County. Access to the Kilauea BPS will be along Wailapa Road, which is a County road. The alignment for the dual waterline to the BPS from the connection point to the existing waterline within Kuhio Highway will be within the existing State Highway and Wailapa Road rights-of-way.

2.3 County Zoning and State Land Use District

The proposed project is in a State Agricultural District, and is zoned as Agricultural by the County of Kauai. The land is designated Agricultural in the County's General Plan, which was adopted in November 2000. The proposed project will require approval of a Use and Zoning permit.

2.4 Special Management Area and Coastal Zone Management Consistency

The proposed project is inland of the boundary of the Special Management Area (SMA), and therefore, will not require a SMA Permit.

2.5 Land and Water Use

The site for the Kilauea BPS is currently a grassy area upon which was located a greenhouse that has recently been removed by the owner. No agricultural type of vegetation will be irretrievably displaced by the BPS. The access road to the BPS site is totally paved with asphalt concrete pavement. Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west of the BPS site. However, this distance is significant enough such that the project should not impact Wailapa Stream.
2.6 Land and Related Water Use Plans

2.6.1 County of Kauai General Plan

The County's General Plan designates the project site and surrounding area for agricultural use.

2.6.2 State of Hawaii

There are no specific state plans for the project location, and the project site and surrounding areas are designated as an agricultural district.

2.6.3 Federal

There are no federal plans for the area.

2.7 Flora

There is no threatened or endangered flora at the project site. The Kilauea BPS site is a grassed area. The area to be disturbed by installation of the dual waterline from Kuhio Highway to the access road to the site is the grassed shoulder area for Waiapa Road.

2.8 Fauna

No threatened or endangered fauna or mammals were observed within the limited area of the Kilauea BPS site. Birds that may frequent the site are expected to be cardinals, doves and sparrows, which are typical for this type of habitat.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was contacted during preparation of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA, and they indicated that the project site is in an area through which the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel, Newell's shearwater and the Hawaiian hoary bat, all federally listed under the Endangered Species Act, are known to fly. In addition, several species that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act, but are covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, such as the wedge-tailed shearwater, may transit the area. The Fish and Wildlife Service initially expressed concern that the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel and Newell's shearwater may strike the 80-foot monopole. However, upon further examination of the project, it was deemed unlikely that these federally protected species would collide with the monopole due to the placement of the monopole behind existing ironwood trees at a height not significantly more than the surrounding vegetation. (See Appendix B for correspondence with the Fish and Wildlife Service.) Since the monopole is now being replaced with the much shorter, and smaller diameter, pipe-mounted antenna that will not extend above the surrounding vegetation, the
antenna is not expected to have any negative impact on the protected species, even more so than the monopole.

2.9 Soils

Soils in the vicinity of the proposed project site are classified in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey, August 1972, as belonging to the Puhi silty clay loam series (PnC). This series consists of well-drained soils derived from basic igneous rock. Runoff is slow on this type of soil, and the erosion hazard is slight.

2.10 Water Quality

Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet to the west of the project site, but is safely distant such that it will not be impacted by the project.

2.11 Historical/Archaeological Sites and Traditional Practices and Cultural Impacts

In a document dated August 4, 2004, the State of Hawaii Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) of the Department of Land and Natural Resources noted they believe that "no historic properties will be affected" by the project. (See Appendix A for review document.)

2.12 Sensitive Habitats or Bodies of Water Adjacent to Proposed Project

There are no sensitive habitats or bodies of water adjacent to the proposed project.

2.13 Flood Zone

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM Panel 1500020055C), the project is outside of known flood hazard areas, and is in Zone X, designated for areas outside the 500-year flood plain.

2.14 Topography

The Kilauea BPS site is located at approximate elevation 300 feet mean sea level, with a slope of about 3 per cent in the northeasterly direction, away from Wailapa Road. Wailapa Road has a gradual upward slope of about 3 per cent halfway to the BPS site from Kuhio Highway, and then a 3 per cent downward slope from this high point to the site.

2.15 Hydrogeology

Construction of the Kilauea BPS, including installation of the waterlines to the BPS from Kuhio Highway, will not require excavating to a depth of more than about 5 feet, except for a short length of excavating to a depth of 8 feet at a drainage culvert crossing. It also does not
involve any work that impacts the groundwater. Therefore, the hydrogeology of the area should have no bearing on the project.

2.16 Drainage

There are no perennial streams or any storm drain systems within 500 feet of the project site. The existing drainage pattern is in a northeasterly direction of sheet flow across the BPS site, and longitudinally along Wailapa Road to the site from Kuhio Highway. The BPS site will be graded to divert water away from the Pump Building, while maintaining the drainage pattern towards the northeast fence line of the site. The waterlines within the access road will be buried throughout, with no improvements to the road surface. Therefore, there will be no change to the drainage pattern along Wailapa Road.

2.17 Seismic Activity

Earthquake risk in the vicinity is low, since Kauai is classified as a Seismic Zone 1 (area of least risk), per the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC). However, DOW intends to use the UBC Seismic Zone 3 standards for design purposes. The Pump Building and the antenna pole will meet this seismic requirement.

2.18 Hurricane Resistance

Due to two hurricanes experienced on Kauai within the past 25 years, DOW has required that aboveground components be designed for a minimum wind load of 125 miles per hour (mph). The Pump Building will be designed accordingly. The only other aboveground components will be short lengths of piping, the slab-on-grade mounted electrical cabinets and the antenna pole. The piping would easily withstand wind velocities exceeding 125 mph, as is expected of the cabinets. The antenna pole, however, is expected to be rated for a 110-mph wind load. Nevertheless, DOW has determined that this lesser wind load capability for the antenna is acceptable.

2.19 Roadways and Site Access

The Kiluaea BPS site will be accessed from Kuhio Highway along Wailapa Road. No new access road will be required.
2.20 Climate

The average monthly temperature in the vicinity of the project site ranges from approximately 69° F to 76°. The average annual rainfall in the area is about 68 inches (State of Hawaii Data Book, 1999).

2.21 Population

In 2000, the population of the Hanalei District, which includes Kilauea, was 6,348 (State of Hawaii Data Book, 1999 Update, http://www.hawaii.gov/dbedt/). The projected population growth over the next 25 years, based on proportional populations in the State of Hawaii, is estimated to reach 7,749. The population projection is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>51,177</td>
<td>58,463</td>
<td>71,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanalei District</td>
<td>4,631</td>
<td>6,348</td>
<td>7,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. MAJOR IMPACTS AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

3.1 Significant Positive and Beneficial Impacts

Positive and beneficial impacts of the proposed project include improved pressure to existing and future customers in the existing DOW service area in eastern Kilauea.

3.2 Significant Negative Impacts

There are no significant negative impacts associated with the proposed project.

3.3 Alternatives Considered

This section presents a discussion of the alternatives considered during the formulation of the proposed project. The three basic alternatives are as follows:

- **NO ACTION.** The no action alternative would result in no improvements to the existing water system.

- **DELAYED PROJECT.** Any delay in the proposed project would result in delays in the needed improvements.

- **ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS FOR PUMP STATION.** DOW has considered several alternative locations for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station (BPS). The proposed location was determined to be the most feasible site, as discussed further in this section.

3.3.1 Proposed Location for Pump Station

The proposed (preferred) location for the Kilauea BPS within TMK 5-1-05:23 was determined after the other initially proposed locations were deemed unfeasible. The preferred location for the BPS has the advantage of benefiting eastern Kilauea and at the same time being situated, such that pressure fluctuations within the existing waterline in Kuhio Highway on the Kilauea side of the BPS should not be significant enough to be disruptive to the existing services when the pumps are operating.

3.3.2 Location within Kuhio Highway Right-of-Way

The initially proposed location for the BPS was within the Kuhio Highway right-of-way (ROW), just a few feet on the west side of the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Kalaumakua Place. However, this location within the ROW was deemed unacceptable by the Kauai District of the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation (DOT), since DOT does not allow
construction of any aboveground components within the state highway ROW. (See letters to and from DOT in Appendix B.) Therefore, this alternative – as well as any other alternative involving locating the BPS within the Kuhio Highway ROW - was eliminated from consideration.

3.3.3 Location within Puu Pane Subdivision

A 10-foot square easement was initially created within the Puu Pane Subdivision for a BPS. However, this area was determined to be inadequate, and construction of a 50' x 55' fenced site along the frontage of a residential property would also be aesthetically unacceptable.

3.3.4 Location within other Private Property along Kuhio Highway

Other private properties along Kuhio Highway were investigated for siting of the BPS. However, none of these sites were deemed acceptable. One in particular, within TMK 5-2-21:22 along Kalaumakua Place, was pursued through the design stage. However, as a major portion of this parcel was being used as a cemetery, archaeological concerns were raised by the State’s Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). There was also significant opposition from several Kilauea residents to this site selection during the Use Permit application process, which ultimately resulted in DOW seeking an alternative site and selecting the proposed site.
4. PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 Potential Problems and Appropriate Mitigation, Including Best Management Practices

There are no anticipated significant problems related to the proposed project. Best management practices will be applied with regards to traffic, dust and noise control. (See following paragraphs.)

4.2 Mitigation or Preservation Plan Prepared for the State Department of Land and Natural Resources Historic Preservation Division

No mitigation is proposed because it is anticipated that no historic/archaeological sites will be altered or affected by the proposed project. However, if during construction the site is found to contain archaeological remains, work will immediately cease and the SHPD will be consulted prior to resumption of work. Temporary protection of existing archaeological sites outside the specific project area may be necessary, if so directed by SHPD.

4.3 Environmental Factors

4.3.1 Aesthetics and View Planes.

There will be no significant change in the visual environment. The BPS site is screened by ironwood trees along the edge of Wailapa Road. The access road, Wailapa Road, is existing and the pipeline will be buried beneath the roadway grass shoulder.

4.3.2 Air Quality

Existing air pollution at the project site is minimal. There are no stationary sources of air pollution in the area. Construction activities and operation of heavy vehicles and equipment at the project site will generate temporary dust and pollution emissions. These impacts will cease when the construction is complete. To mitigate impacts on air quality caused by the project activities, dust control measures will be undertaken by the project contractor. Such measures will include the use of dust screens and water sprinkling as necessary to minimize levels of dust. To minimize exhaust emissions, the contractor will be required to properly maintain their equipment and comply with DOH Administrative Rules (Title 11, Chapter 59 and 60 regarding Air Pollution Control). There will be no long-term effects, because the proposed project includes no air pollution sources and would not generate significant differences in traffic from existing conditions.
4.3.3 Traffic

No significant or long-term impacts to Kuhio Highway or Wai'apa Road are expected with this project. There will be little effect on traffic, except during periods when construction materials are delivered to the site by heavy trucks and trailers. However, such deliveries would be during off-peak traffic hours (8:30 AM to 3:30 PM). The contractor will be required to follow existing regulations regarding road clean-up, if necessary, resulting from this construction traffic.

4.3.4 Noise Levels

No significant or long-term impacts in ambient noise levels to surrounding communities will occur. There will be some increase in noise levels during construction of the project, which will occur during normal working hours. Contractor's equipment is required to meet State Department of Health noise regulations (Title 11, Chapter 46, "Community Noise Control"). The pumps will be housed within the Pump Building, which would significantly attenuate the noise from the pump motors.

4.3.5 Flora

No threatened or endangered flora were observed at the project site.

4.3.6 Fauna

As mentioned previously in Section 2.8, the project site is in an area through which some federally protected species are known to fly. However, since the antenna pole will not extend above the surrounding vegetation, the pole is not expected to have any negative impact on the protected species.

4.3.7 Soils

The soil in the vicinity of the project site may be classified as belonging to the Puhi silty clay loam series (PnC). This series consists of well-drained soils derived from basic igneous rock. Runoff is slow on this type of soil, and the erosion hazard is slight.

4.3.8 Water Quality

Wai'apa Stream is approximately 500 feet to the west of the project site, but is safely distant such that it will not be impacted by the project.
4.3.9 Historical, Archaeological and Cultural Sites

No historical or archaeological remains are expected to be encountered during construction of the pump station, as confirmed by the State of Hawaii Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Land and Natural Resources. (Refer to Appendix A.)

4.3.10 Sensitive Habitats or Bodies of Water Adjacent to the Proposed Project

There are no sensitive habitats or bodies of water adjacent to the proposed project.

4.3.11 Flood Zone

The site is located at an elevation above identified flood hazard areas.

4.3.12 Seismic Activity

The proposed project is within Seismic Zone 1 (area of least risk).

4.3.13 Drainage

There are no perennial streams or any storm drain systems within 500 feet of the project site. The existing drainage pattern is in a northeasterly direction of sheet flow across the BPS site, and longitudinally along Wailapa Road to the site from Kuhio Highway. The BPS site will be graded to divert water away from the Pump Building, while maintaining the drainage pattern towards the northeast fence line of the site. The waterlines within the access road will be buried throughout, with no improvements to the road surface. Therefore, there will be no change to the drainage pattern along Wailapa Road.
5. COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE OF HAWAII’S DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND (DWSRF) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

5.1 General

This project may be funded by Federal funds through the State of Hawaii’s Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program. The U.S. Congress established the DWSRF program as a new section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), 33 U.S.C. 300j-12, by the SDWA Amendments of 1996, Public Law 104-182. The DWSRF was established to help prevent contamination through source water protection and enhanced water system management. It also emphasizes the needs of small water systems. The proposed project is consistent with the overall program intent to prevent potential contamination and also the program emphasis on small water systems. This EA includes all of the environmental information required for compliance with the DWSRF program. (See Appendix A for confirmation letter from DOH.)

5.2 Cross-Cutting Federal Authorities

5.2.1 Archeological and Historic Preservation Act and National Historic Preservation Act

The project site is located in an area that has been used extensively for agriculture for many years and no known archeological or historic features exist at the site. As mentioned previously, the SHPD noted they believe that “no historic properties will be affected” by the project. (Refer to Appendix A for review document.) The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) was also provided a copy of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA for their review. Their comments on the Draft EA, along with a response letter, are included in Appendix A. OHA reiterated that although SHPD noted they believe “no historic properties will be affected”, the possibility of finding human remains still exists. OHA also stated that if any remains are discovered during construction, then work on the project should immediately cease and the SHPD should be consulted prior to resumption of work.

5.2.2 Clean Air Act

Air quality at the site of the proposed project is good. Only minor amounts of grading and excavation will be required for the project. This, and the wet climate, means that fugitive dust will not be a problem during construction.

Normal operation of the proposed facilities will not produce on-site air emissions, will not alter air flow in the vicinity, and will have no other measurable effect on the area's micro-climate.
The electrical power consumed in the operation of the pumps will require additional power generation (and, therefore, fuel consumption and gaseous emissions) by Kauai Island Utility Corporation. However, the increase represents such a small portion of the total power use that its effect will be not be significant in and out of itself.

5.2.3 Coastal Zone Management Act

Enacted as Chapter 205A, HRS, the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program was promulgated in 1977 in response to the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. The CZM area encompasses the entire state, including all marine waters seaward to the extent of the state's police power and management authority, including the 12-mile U.S. territorial sea and all archipelagic waters.

The Hawaii CZM Program focuses on ten policy objectives:

- **Recreational Resources.** To provide coastal recreational opportunities accessible to the public and protect coastal resources uniquely suited for recreational activities that cannot be provided elsewhere.

- **Historic Resources.** To protect, preserve and where desirable, restore those natural and manmade historic and prehistoric resources in the coastal zone management area that are significant in Hawaiian and American history and culture.

- **Scenic and Open Space Resources.** To protect, preserve, and where desirable, restore or improve the quality of coastal scenic and open space resources.

- **Coastal Ecosystems.** To protect valuable coastal ecosystems, including reefs, from disruption and to minimize adverse impacts on all coastal ecosystems.

- **Economic Uses.** To provide public or private facilities and improvements important to the state's economy in suitable locations; and ensure that coastal dependent development such as harbors and ports, energy facilities, and visitor facilities, are located, designed, and constructed to minimize adverse impacts in the coastal zone area.

- **Coastal Hazards.** To reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion, subsidence, and pollution.
• **Managing Development.** To improve the development review process, communication, and public participation in the management of coastal resources and hazards.

• **Public Participation.** To stimulate public awareness, education, and participation in coastal management; and maintain a public advisory body to identify coastal management problems and provide policy advice and assistance to the CZM program.

• **Beach Protection.** To protect beaches for public use and recreation; locate new structures inland from the shoreline setback to conserve open space and to minimize loss of improvements due to erosion.

• **Marine Resources.** To implement the state's ocean resources management plan.

Other key areas of the CZM program include: a permit system to control development within a Special Management Area (SMA) managed by the Counties and the Office of Planning; a Shoreline Setback Area, which serves as a buffer against coastal hazards and erosion, and protects view-planes; and the Marine and Coastal Affairs. Finally, a Federal Consistency provision requires that federal activities, permits and financial assistance be consistent with the Hawaii CZM program.

The proposed project is located approximately 4,000 feet from the coastline. It does not involve the placement, erection, or removal of materials near the coastline. The type and scale of the activities that it involves typically do not have the potential to significantly affect coastal resources. Finally, it is consistent with the CZM objectives that are relevant to a project of this sort.

The Office of Coastal Zone Management at the State of Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism was contacted, and it was determined that their review of the Draft EA would not be required, unless requested by another agency.

### 5.2.4 Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act provides broad protection for species of fish, wildlife and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered in the U.S. or elsewhere. The Act mandates that federal agencies seek to conserve endangered and threatened species and use their authorities in furtherance of the Act's purposes. Provisions are made for listing species, as well
as for recovery plans and the designation of critical habitat for listed species. The Act outlines procedures for federal agencies to follow when taking actions that may jeopardize listed species, and contains exceptions and exemptions.

As mentioned previously in Section 2.8, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that the project site is in an area through which some federally protected species are known to fly. However, since the antenna pole will not extend above the surrounding vegetation, the pole is not expected to have any negative impact on the protected species.

The State Department of Land and Natural Resources was sent a copy of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA for review. There was no comment from DLNR regarding this project.

5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act

The U.S. Congress adopted the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (Public Law 97-98) on December 22, 1981. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has national leadership for administering the FPPA. The effective date of the FPPA rule is August 6, 1984.

The stated purposes of the FPPA are to:

- Minimize the extent to which Federal programs contribute to the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.
- Assure that Federal programs are administered in a manner that, to the extent practicable, will be compatible with State, unit of local government, and private programs and policies to protect farmland.

"Farmland", as used in the FPPA, includes prime farmland, unique farmland, and land of statewide or local importance. "Farmland" subject to FPPA requirements does not have to be currently used for cropland. Because the project will result in the use of 2,600 square feet of agricultural land, and might use Federal funding assistance from a Federal agency, the proposed action is subject to the FPPA.

The area that would be affected is a very small fraction of the agricultural land of a privately owned parcel, and will not interfere with any future agricultural use of the parcel or other nearby areas. The project is instead intended to serve residents of a small community whose existing water supply requires improved domestic and fire protection water service. Consequently, the project is in substantial compliance with the FPPA.
5.2.6 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, authorizes the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce to require consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the fish and wildlife agencies of States where the "waters of any stream or other body of water are proposed or authorized, permitted or licensed to be impounded, diverted... or otherwise controlled or modified" by any agency under a Federal permit or license. Consultation is to be undertaken for the purpose of "preventing loss of an damage to wildlife resources."

The proposed project will not result in the diversion of any water body and will not result in impacts on fish or wildlife resources. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that the project site is in an area through which some federally protected species are known to fly. However, since the antenna pole will not extend above the surrounding vegetation, the pole is not expected to have any negative impact on the protected species.

The State DLNR was sent a copy of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA for their review. There was no comment from DLNR regarding this project.

5.2.7 Floodplain Management

Based on the latest available Flood Insurance Rate Map for the area, the site proposed for the project lies outside a defined floodplain. The project does not involve property acquisition, management or construction within a 100-year flood plain (Zone A or V), and it does not involve a "critical action" within a 500-year flood plain. Consequently, it is consistent with applicable regulations and guidance relating to floodplain management.

5.2.8 Safe Drinking Water Act

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) is the principal federal law that ensures the quality of Americans' drinking water. Under SDWA, EPA sets standards for drinking water quality and oversees the states, localities, and water suppliers who implement those standards. The SDWA requires that all public water systems meet stringent water quality standards. These standards cover a long list of potential chemical, radiological and biological contaminants. The standards distinguish between surface water and ground water sources, with the testing and monitoring requirements for surface water and ground water under the influence (GWUDI) sources being far greater than those for ground water sources.

The purpose of the proposed project is to boost the pressure of the existing water system to improve domestic and fire protection water services, and does not involve any surface
or ground water source development. Consequently, the project is consistent with the requirements of the SDWA.

5.2.9 Protection of Wetlands

There are no wetlands on or near the site. Neither are there food resources on the site that are important to wildlife that use wetlands elsewhere on the island. A copy of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA was sent to the State Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), Aquatic Resources Division. There was no comment from DLNR.

5.2.10 Environmental Justice, Executive Order 12898

5.2.10.1 General Overview

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12909, with the following instructions to all Federal agencies, expressed:

Agency Responsibilities. To the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law, and consistent with the principles set forth in the report on the National Performance Review, each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effect of its programs policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands.

EPA's Environmental Justice Implementation Plan (EPA 1996) defines its commitment to Environmental Justice, as follows:

No segment of the population, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, as a result of EPA's policies, programs, and activities, suffers disproportionately from adverse human health or environmental effects, and all people live in clean and sustainable communities.

Those who must live with environmental decisions -- community residents, environmental groups, State, Tribal and local governments, businesses -- must have every opportunity for public participation in the making of those decisions. An informed and involved local community is a necessary and integral part of the process to protect the environment.
Thus, to be consistent with this Executive Order, Federal Agencies must ensure that projects subject to their authority do not disproportionately affect minority and/or low-income communities; support the maintenance of clean and sustainable communities; and provide adequate public input to the decision-making process. The project’s compliance with each of these factors is specifically addressed, as follows:

5.2.10.2 General Considerations

EPA’s guidance on environmental justice identifies a number of general principles to consider when determining whether a proposed action raises issues relevant to environmental justice. These include: (i) whether minority populations are present in the affected area, (ii) whether low-income populations are present in the affected area, and (iii) if present, whether there may be disproportionately high and adverse human health effects on them.

5.2.10.3 Presence of Minority Populations

The entire concept of “minority populations” is difficult to apply to Hawaii’s racially diverse people. The state’s population consists of many ethnic minorities and no majority. According to the 2000 Census, the two main races in Kilauea are white (47.8%) and Asian (26.6%). In comparison, the statewide population data indicates a larger Asian population of 41.6%, and a white population of 24.3%. However, when considered together, non-whites still comprise more than half of the population, the criterion typically used to determine if an area qualifies as “minority”.

5.2.10.4 Presence of Low-Income Populations

The reported median income for Kilauea is $41,313, which is less than the reported statewide median income of $49,820. Approximately half of the households have median incomes less than the statewide median income. The percentage of families below the poverty level is 10%, which is similar to statewide and national percentages of 7.6% and 9.2%, respectively. Therefore, Kilauea is not considered to have a significant low-income population.

5.2.10.5 Presence of Disproportionately High Adverse Effects

Not only does the community fail to meet the text of being populated predominantly by ethnic minorities or low-income households, the overall environmental impacts from the project are expected to be small. Consequently, they do not have the potential to cause any substantial adverse human effect or to jeopardize the neighborhood’s character as a “clean and sustainable community.”
5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny

This project was subjected to extensive public scrutiny when the County Department of Water prepared its environmental assessment for the project at the originally intended site. This included the normal procedural notifications that are required for every environmental assessment and a direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through specific distribution of a Draft EA. The re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA with additions to comply with the requirements of the DWSRF program, offered the public opportunity for input. Submittal of the June 28, 2004 Draft EA also allowed for public comment. (Comments on the June 28, 2004 Draft EA, along with responses to the comments, are included in Appendix A.)

In addition to distribution of the Draft EAs, DOW met with the Kilauea Neighborhood Community Association on August 5, 2003 to discuss the proposed booster pump station. DOW met again with the Community Association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the previously proposed 80-foot monopole with 12-foot antenna at the project site. There were no adverse comments at either meeting and, at the time, the Association indicated that they would endorse the booster pump site and monopole installation.

The DOW met again with the Kilauea Neighborhood Community Association on October 5, 2004, to discuss the project. At the meeting, DOW stated that after careful consideration of the community concerns; the DOW would withdraw their application for permitting the previously proposed 80-foot monopole antenna structure.

5.2.10.6 Summary

In summary, the project is consistent with Executive Order 12898 because it does not affect disproportionately minority populations or low-income populations; it does not jeopardize the maintenance of clean and sustainable communities; and it has been and will continue to be subject to extensive consideration by the public and by the appropriate government agencies.

5.2.11 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Section (b) to the preamble to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act states:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they and their"
Immediate environments shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. The Congress declares that the established national policy of dam and other construction at appropriate sections of the rivers of the United States needs to be complemented by a policy that would preserve other selected rivers or sections thereof in their free-flowing condition to protect the water quality of such rivers and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

The Wailapa Stream, the only stream that could potentially be affected by the project, has not been listed as a Wild and Scenic River. Furthermore, the project does not have the potential to affect this stream. Because the project will have no impact on any Wild and Scenic River, it is consistent with the objectives of this legislation.
6. EXPECTED DETERMINATION

6.1 Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

The proposed project will not have significant effects on the environment, and therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required. This document constitutes a Notice of Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact for the proposed project. This determination was based on review and analysis of the "Significance Criteria" in Section 11-200-12 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules, as documented below.

6.2 Finding and Reasons Supporting the Determination, Including Justifying Evidence

6.2.1 No irrevocable commitment to loss or destruction of any natural or cultural resource would occur.

The proposed project will not cause loss or destruction of any natural or cultural resource.

6.2.2 The proposed project would not curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment.

The proposed project will not affect the beneficial uses of the existing environment, which is now in agricultural land.

6.2.3 The proposed project would not conflict with the state's long-term environmental policies or goals and guidelines.

The proposed project will not conflict with the state's environmental policies. The quality of life would be preserved through the availability of a reliable potable water system.

6.2.4 The proposed project will improve the economic and social welfare of the community and the state.

The proposed project will contribute to the economic welfare of the community and the state by the creation of jobs in the construction and maintenance of the project, and by providing for a reliable potable water system.

6.2.5 The proposed project would not substantially affect public health.

The proposed improvements will benefit public health by maintaining a reliable potable water system.
6.2.6 No substantial secondary impacts, such as population changes or effects on public facilities are expected.

The project will not cause secondary impacts. The project should have no effect on population density, since it does not involve the development of an additional potable water source. The purpose of the project is to enhance the reliability of the existing water system.

6.2.7 No substantial degradation of environmental quality is expected due to the proposed project.

Construction activities will have minimal impacts. Excavation for the installation of the pipelines will occur within the existing roads.

6.2.8 No cumulative effect on the environment or commitment to larger actions will be involved.

The project has no cumulative effects on the environment or commitment to larger actions.

6.2.9 No rare, threatened or endangered species or their habitats are affected.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has indicated that the project site is in an area through which the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel, Newell's shearwater and the Hawaiian hoary bat, all federally listed under the Endangered Species Act, are known to fly. In addition, several species that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act, but are covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, such as the wedge-tailed shearwater, may transit the area. However, since the components of the project will not extend above the surrounding vegetation, the protected species are not expected to strike any of the project components, and thus, the project is not expected to have any negative impact on the protected species.

6.2.10 The proposed project will not detrimentally affect air or water quality or ambient noise levels.

Construction activities may cause short-term impacts to the air or noise quality. However, the contractor will be responsible to adhere to state and county rules and regulations regarding to construction practices.

6.2.11 The proposed project will not detrimentally affect environmentally sensitive areas such as flood plains, tsunami zones, beaches, erosion-prone areas, geologically hazardous lands, estuaries, fresh waters or coastal waters.

The proposed project is not in a flood or tsunami area, is not near a beach, is not erosion-prone, is not in a geologically hazardous area and is not near an estuary, fresh, or
coastal waters. Therefore, there will be no detrimental impacts in environmentally sensitive areas.

6.2.12 The proposed project will not substantially affect scenic vistas and viewplanes identified in county or state plans or studies.

The project will not substantially affect the scenic vistas and viewplanes in the surrounding areas. There are no known County or State plans or studies associated with the scenic vistas and viewplanes in the vicinity of the project site.

The project will be obscured from view from either direction along Wallapa Road and Kuhio Highway, and will blend into the surrounding landscape along the access road.

The booster pump station (BPS) site will be bordered by a 6-foot high chain link fence and gate. The existing ironwood trees along the edge of the Wallapa Road right-of-way fronting the BPS site would serve to screen the aboveground components of the project from view while driving along Wallapa Road. Most of the required piping for the BPS will be installed underground to mitigate the appearance of a BPS facility.

6.2.13 There will be no requirement for substantial energy consumption.

The size of the motors for the duplex pumps will be only about 5 horsepower. Therefore, the proposed project will not require substantial energy consumption.
7. IDENTIFICATION OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED, AND PERMITS OR APPROVALS REQUIRED

7.1 State of Hawaii

7.1.1 Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD)

SHPD has noted they believe that "no historic properties will be affected" by the project.

(Refer to Appendix A for review document.)

7.1.2 Department of Transportation (DOT), Highways Division, Kauai District

The DOT must approve this project because of the short segment of waterline installation work to be done within Kuhio Highway right-of-way.

7.1.3 Department of Health (DOH), Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC)

Coordination with the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) has occurred through the use of their guidelines for preparation of this EA.

7.2 County of Kauai

7.2.1 Kauai Department of Water (DOW)

DOW is the sponsor of the project.

7.2.2 Kauai Planning Department

The Planning Department must approve the project because the project is not a permitted use according to the land use classification and zoning code. The Planning Department commented on the June 28, 2004 Draft EA in a letter dated August 6, 2004, and the DOW responded to their comments in an October 11, 2004 letter. (See Appendix A for correspondence.)

The DOW informed the Planning Commission that DOW was researching alternate sites for the BPS, since it was decided not to pursue the previously proposed site along Kalaumakua Place. (See Appendix B for DOW's letter to Planning Commission.)
7.3 Community, Organizations and Individuals

Ms. Joyce Doty, who is the Chairman and CEO of the current land owners – Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens, Inc.– has agreed to provide a lease and/or an easement for the area required for the BPS within the property.

7.4 Public Involvement Prior to Preparation of the Environmental Assessment

DOW informed all concerned residents in the Kilauea area that alternate sites were being researched, shortly after DOW informed the Planning Commission on February 28, 2003 of this decision. DOW attended an August 5, 2003 Kilauea Neighborhood Community Association meeting to present the new proposed site for the Kilauea BPS, and it was received favorably. DOW also attended a January 6, 2004 meeting with the Community Association to discuss the previously proposed 80-foot monopole, and there were no adverse comments at the meeting regarding the project. After comments were received from the community on the June 28, 2004 Draft EA, DOW met again with the Community Association on October 5, 2004 to discuss the project and address community concerns. At the meeting, DOW stated that after careful consideration of the community concerns; the DOW would withdraw their application for permitting the previously proposed 80-foot monopole antenna structure.

7.5 Permits or Approvals Required

The following table summarizes the permits or approvals required for the proposed project. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for the construction site storm water runoff is not required, since the site is less than 1 acre in area. Also, an NPDES permit for dewatering is not anticipated for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permit – Use, Zoning</td>
<td>Kauai County, Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit – Building and Grading</td>
<td>Kauai County, Building Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit – NPDES, Hydro-testing</td>
<td>State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Clean Water Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit – Water main connection within Kuhio Highway (State Right-of-Way)</td>
<td>State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Highways Division, Kauai District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval - Archaeological.</td>
<td>State of Hawaii, Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REVIEW COMMENTS ON
JUNE 28, 2004 DRAFT EA
October 11, 2004

Ms. Genevieve Salmonson, Director
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
235 S. Beretania Street, Suite 702
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms. Salmonson:

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pumps, your Communication dated August 4, 2004 on the Draft EA

After careful consideration of the community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department’s plans for our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, the Department of Water (DOW) is withdrawing our application at this time for permitting the 80-foot SCADA monopole antenna structure at the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Facility. This decision has been made to allow for permitting of the Booster Pump Facility to proceed on its own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the Booster Pump Facility. The Booster Pump Facility will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system that does not exceed the 40-foot allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the project.

Elimination of the monopole will compromise DOW’s SCADA system performance, particularly to our facilities in Waipalae, which likely will require development of an alternative communications strategy for those facilities. DOW will seek alternatives to using tall monopole-type antenna systems (including telephone, smaller antenna, alternative locations, etc.) for SCADA controls of our Kilauea facilities. However, if acceptable alternatives are not identified, it may be necessary in the future to seek permitting (via separate permit actions) for monopole antennas.

We therefore believe that the smaller antenna mast will blend with the surrounding area. If there are any questions, please call Keith Fujimoto at 245-5449.

Sincerely,

Edward Tschupp
Manager & Chief Engineer

KF:rm
ProjectLetters/Job 97-10, Kilauea Booster – OEQC (10-12-60).mm

4398 Pau Loke St., P.O. Box 1704, Lihue, HI 96766 Phone: 808-245-5400
Engineering and Fiscal Fax: 808-245-5813, Operations Fax: 808-245-5402, Administration Fax: 808-246-6626
August 04, 2004

Mr. Edward Tschupp  
Department of Water Supply  
County of Kauai  
3498 Puakea Street  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766

Dear Mr. Tschupp:

Subject: Draft EA Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kauai

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. We have the following comments.

1. Please illustrate the visual impacts of the proposed 80-foot monopole from public places such as roads and lookouts. Photos of existing conditions taken from public viewpoints are helpful in evaluating visual impacts. Provide renderings of future structures superimposed on photos of existing views. We recommend constructing and painting the structure with materials and colors that blend with the surroundings. We also recommend landscaping with native Hawaiian plants to reduce the visual impacts.

For more information, please contact Jeyan Thirugnanam at 586-4185.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Salmonson  
Director

c: Austin, Tsutsumi & Associates
October 11, 2004

Mr. Ian Costa, Director
Planning Department
County of Kaua’i
Līhu’e, HI 96766

Dear Mr. Costa:

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kīlauea Booster Pumps, your communication dated August 6, 2004 on the Draft EA

We are replying to your comments and concerns on your review of the Draft Environmental Assessment. Please note that following submittal of comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment, the Department of Water (DOW) is proposing the following change to the project:

"After careful consideration of community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department’s plans for our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, the Department of Water (DOW) is withdrawing our application at this time for permitting the 80-foot SCADA monopole antenna structure at the proposed Kīlauea Booster Pump Facility. This decision has been made to allow for permitting of the Booster Pump Facility to proceed on its own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the Booster Pump Facility. The Booster Pump Facility will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system that does not exceed the 40-foot allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the project.

Elimination of the monopole will compromise DOW's SCADA system performance, particularly to our facilities in Waipake, which likely will require development of an alternative communications strategy for those facilities. DOW will seek alternatives to using tall monopole-type antenna systems (including telephone, smaller antenna, alternative locations, etc.) for SCADA controls of our Kīlauea facilities. However, if acceptable alternatives are not identified, it may be necessary in the future to seek permitting (via separate permit actions) for monopole antennas."

1. Visual impacts: We will provide landscaping acceptable to your office. Preliminarily, we are considering hibiscus or ti leaf hedges. As indicated by the deletion of the monopole antenna, visual impacts from the broader community will be eliminated.
Mr. Ian Costa, Director

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pumps, your communication dated August 6, 2004 on the Draft EA

October 11, 2004

2. Endangered or Threatened Bird Hazards: Please refer to the memo to the US Fish and Wildlife Agency. We will submit their reply upon receipt. Note that the elimination of the monopole should significantly mitigate concerns involving birds.

3. Noise and Vibration Impact: The noise created by the booster pumps will be “contained” within the concrete masonry unit (CMU) building. There will be no vibrations from the operation of the booster pumps.

4. Future Generator: There are provisions for powering the booster pumps with a generator, however, that operation would be utilized only during an extended (longer than a few days) power outage. Should this be required, the Department would mobilize a generator to the site and manually monitor its operation. It is most probable that a generator would be deployed to this facility only under local power outage conditions; in the event of extensive large scale power outages, DOW’s generators would be deployed primarily to well sites.

5. Irrigation Easement: The Department consulted with the landowner and have addressed their concerns affecting the irrigation easement and their facilities.

6. Permits: The Department will be submitting the applicable permits upon completion of the Environmental Assessment process.

7. Ownership: The Department will make the applicable corrections.

8. Lease vs. easement: Based on the requirement for subdivision associated with a lease, the Department will probably negotiate an easement with the landowner, however, in either case the DOW will comply with the applicable requirements for the lease or easement.

9. Possible mitigation/alternatives: The Department of Water has conducted preliminary research on alternative sites, including the site of the existing Kauai Island Utility Cooperative (KIUC) antenna at the end of Mihi Road, and others. To date, we have not identified an alternative that provides a good solution to our Kilauea system communications needs. The Department of Water has expended considerable effort for both the monopole antenna and booster pump projects at this site. We believe the elimination of the monopole substantially mitigates impacts of the Booster Pump Facility. As indicated, we will continue to pursue alternatives for completion of our SCADA system.

If there are any questions, please call Project Engineer Keith Fujimoto at 245-5449.

Sincerely,

Edward Tschupp
Manager & Chief Engineer

ET:rm
August 6, 2004

County of Kaua‘i
Department of Water
4398 Pua Loke Street
Līhu‘e, Hawai‘i 96766

Attn: Keith Fujimoto

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment
Kilaeua Booster Pump Station
TMK 5-1-5: 23 (por.) West Waiakea, Hanalei, Kauai

The Planning Department has reviewed the Draft Environmental Assessment dated June 28, 2004, for the subject project. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

We anticipate the following impacts:

1. **Visual impacts** - The proposed monopole is located immediately adjacent to Wailapa Road, a public roadway. Landscaping proposed for mitigation is located within the right-of-way, and is not under the control of the applicant. Visual impacts are anticipated to neighboring properties, Wailapa Road users, and possibly from Kēhī Highway or other areas of Kilaeua.

2. **Endangered or Threatened Bird Hazards** - In past monopole/antenna applications, US Fish and Wildlife has expressed concerns regarding solitary poles which protrude above surrounding vegetation or structures as posing hazards to endangered or threatened seabird species which travel inland for nesting.

3. **Noise impact** - The proposed installation may generate some noise and vibration that should be mitigated.

4. **Future genset** - No details are provided regarding the future genset. Please address fumes, noise and fueling which may be associated with the emergency generator and any proposed mitigation.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
5. **Irrigation Easement** - A portion of the proposed site is located within a twenty-foot wide irrigation easement which borders the east side of Wailapa Road, as noted on the Tax Maps and approved subdivision map for the property.

6. **Permits** - Use and Class IV Zoning Permits are required for the booster pump station. Because the North Shore Development Plan requires approval of the Planning Commission for utility structures over 40’, a Use (rather than a Variance) Permit, Special Permit, and Class IV Zoning Permit are required for the monopole and antenna.

7. **Ownership** - Na ‘Aina Kai Botanical Gardens is listed as owner of the property in County of Kaua‘i Finance Department, Real Property Division records (see Executive Summary).

8. **Lease vs. easement** - Although a lease would require subdivision, an easement may not.

**Possible mitigation/alternatives** - Although paint color may help to mitigate visual impacts somewhat, additional setback from Wailapa Road would assist, provided that adequate landscaping is maintained between the site and public roadways. To address visual impacts and the potential for bird hazards, an alternative may be to locate an alternate site for the SCADA submaster at sufficient elevation to reduce height of the pole and antenna at both the booster pump site and the submaster site. The Applicant should explore several existing antenna “arms” located in the Kilauea area, and other county-owned lands that may be potential sites.

Should you have any questions, please contact planner Barbara Pendragon at 241-6677.

OEQC

IAN K. K. COSTA
PLANNING DIRECTOR
October 11, 2004

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Courture
P. O. Box 803
Anahola, HI 96703

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Courture:

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pumps, your Communication dated July 31, 2004 on the Draft Environmental Assessment.

Thank you for your review of the environmental assessment (EA) for this project. After careful consideration of the community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department’s plans for our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisiton (SCADA) system, the Department of Water (DOW) is withdrawing our application at this time for permitting the 80-foot SCADA monopole antenna structure at the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Facility. This decision has been made to allow for permitting of the Booster Pump Facility to proceed on its own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the Booster Pump Facility. The Booster Pump Facility will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system that does not exceed the 40-foot allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the project.

Elimination of the monopole will compromise DOW's SCADA system performance, particularly to our facilities in Waipake, which likely will require development of an alternative communications strategy for those facilities. DOW will seek alternatives to using tall monopole-type antenna systems (including telephone, smaller antenna, alternative locations, etc.) for SCADA controls of our Kilauea facilities. However, if acceptable alternatives are not identified, it may be necessary in the future to seek permitting (via separate permit actions) for monopole antennas.

We hope this answers your concerns. If you have further questions, please call Keith Fujimoto, Project Engineer, at 245-5449. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Edward Tschupp
Manager & Chief Engineer

KFrm
ProjectLetter/Job 97-10, Kilauea Booster, Peter & April Courture (10-12-04).tm
4398 Pue Loke St, P.O. Box 1706, Lilue, HI 96766 Phone: 808-245-5400
Engineering and Fiscal Fax: 808-245-5813, Operations Fax: 808-245-5402, Administration Fax: 808-246-8628
31 July 2004

Office of Environmental Quality Control
OEQC
235 S. Beretania Street
Leluopapa A. Kamehameha, Suite 702
Honolulu, HI 96813
facsimile +1 (808) 586-4186

Re: Klauea Booster Pump Station

Dear Authorities:

We are in favor of increased water supplies for agricultural and residential uses on Kauai, but respectfully submit that the Klauea Booster Pump Station, as proposed by the Department of Water, fails to meet the applicable criteria for approval. Briefly: (i) the project inappropriately seeks approval for an antenna tower without showing that other lesser intrusive approaches are feasible; and (ii) the project fails to consider the true ecological and economic impacts of the proposed antenna tower.

1. The antenna tower is neither necessary nor justified

The report concedes that the installation of the antenna tower is neither permitted nor consistent with the existing land usage and plannings (i.e., page 7 admits "Special Permit and Variance" would be needed). The report nowhere explains why this Booster Pump Station justifies a special permit or variance, nor how the project is consistent with the plan.

The report assumes that the tower should be located at the same site as the Booster Pump Station. It is respectfully submitted that this assumption is unsupported, and it is belied by the fact that the Booster Pump Station is convenient to conventional less intrusive links. The report implicitly concedes that communication with the Booster Pump Station itself can be done using conventional wired links. Report page B. If mere remote areas absolutely require a spread spectrum link, then it may be appropriate to consider the optimal location and siting for such a link. The report nowhere considers which is the ideal or preferred site location for the antenna; the report does not explain what other sites for the antenna are technically possible; nor does it make a comparison of the relative impacts and costs/benefits of the alternatives. The question of the antenna tower and its location need to be resolved, but they are not resolved in the report.

Law # 2004
2/ The report fails to assess the ecological and economic effects of the proposed antenna tower.

   The report completely lacks factual support for its conclusions that there will be no significant change in the visual environment. The report concedes that the project, if visible, is detrimental to the environment. Report 1.3.1. The report concludes that if the buildings can be hidden by tall tree growth, there will be no adverse effect.

   The report fails to address the effect of the antenna tower, looming above the agricultural, residential and wooded areas. This project is proposed in an area which has been cultivated for agricultural uses — where people have made investments and nurtured plant life with the promise that this was agricultural, not “city.” The intrusion of the high technology antenna in a position of prominence so near to such developments cannot be viewed as anything other than significant. The project will adversely effect the appearance of the agricultural areas involved. A special permit, a waiver or a variance for the antenna tower is unjustified and contrary to plan and public interest.

   Additional questions are unanswered. For example, what is the effect of this project (especially the tower and its radiations) on the native bat (and its radar communications) and on the other indigenous and resident populations? What is the economic impact of the antenna site choice to existing property owners?

   For all these reasons, I respectfully submit that the plan as proposed must be declined.

Yours sincerely,

April Couture

April Couture and Peter Couture
Co-owners of 20 West Waiakalua Unit C

Post Office Box 803
Anahola, HI 96703
the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wallapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w,(dirt driveway).

AESTHETICS

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13' x 12' x 10' high building with a 92-foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically unpleasing conglomerate every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pau Pene subdivision as well as from Wallapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

NOISE

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative visual impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have
taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB’s, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal street is around 70dB’s. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This undisturbed silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna.

**TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION**

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wallapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wallapa road intersection was removed, pushing the stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before interring the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.6 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wallapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wallapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wallapa Road. Wallapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall
October 11, 2004

Ms. Linda Sproat
Kilauea Neighborhood Association
P. O. Box 99
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms. Sproat:

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pumps, your Communication dated August 4, 2004 on the Draft EA

We thank you for allowing us the opportunity to update the association on the project at your October 5th meeting. As presented, after careful consideration of the community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department’s plans for our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, the Department of Water (DOW) is withdrawing our application at this time for permitting the 80-foot SCADA monopole antenna structure at the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Facility. This decision has been made to allow for permitting of the Booster Pump Facility to proceed on its own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the Booster Pump Facility. The Booster Pump Facility will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system that does not exceed the 40-foot allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the pproject.

Elimination of the monopole will compromise DOW’s SCADA system performance, particularly to our facilities in Waipake, which likely will require development of an alternative communications strategy for those facilities. DOW will seek alternatives to using tall monopole-type antenna systems (including telephone, smaller antenna, alternative locations, etc.) for SCADA controls of our Kilauea facilities. However, if acceptable alternatives are not identified, it may be necessary in the future to seek permitting (via separate permit actions) for monopole antennas.

We further appreciate your resolution for supporting the Department in its efforts in proceeding with the installation of the booster pump and look forward to receiving the endorsement.

Sincerely,

Edward Tschupp
Manager & Chief Engineer

KFirm
Project Letters/Job 97-10, Kilauea Booster – Linda Sproat, KNA (10-12-04)
August 06, 2004

Ms. Linda Sproat, President
Kilauea Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 328
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms. Sproat:

Subject: Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kauai

Thank you for your letter of August 4, 2004 concerning the above project. OEQC is asking the County Department of Water Supply to address the issues you raise and provide a response as required under Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 343.

With regard to your request that OEQC "not let this project advance until all options have been fully explored," we regret to inform you that state law does not give OEQC the authority to stop projects. State law (HRS 343) gives the Department of Water Supply the authority to make determinations on its environmental assessments. OEQC encourages you to work with the Department of Water Supply to resolve outstanding concerns.

If you have any questions, please contact Jeyan Thirugnanam at 586-4185.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Salmonson
Director

c: Austin, Tsutsumi & Associates
Kilauea Neighborhood Association
August 4, 2004

To: Office of Environmental Quality Control State of Hawai’i
235 South Beretania Street, Suite 702
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Kilauea Booster Pump Station (TMK 5-1-05-23)
Kilauea, Kaua‘i, Hawai‘i

Attention: Ms. Genevieve Salmonson, Director

At the monthly meeting of the Kilauea Neighborhood Association (KNA) held last evening at the local neighborhood center, at least a dozen area residents came to express their extreme displeasure with the subject project as described in the current environmental assessment. Concerns centered around the degradation of scenic and natural assets from placement of the massive and extremely tall 80 foot monopole (92 feet with the antenna) along with the utilitarian block house on an agricultural site that is green, spacious, and planted in trees. There was also a question about possible interference by the proposed facility with the activities of the endangered Hawaiian hoary bat. There’s some concern about noise impacts on residences closest to the proposed site, though from the information presented so far, problems seem unlikely. The biggest concern expressed at the meeting was that alternatives had not been adequately considered. For example, we learned that the antenna can be far removed from the pump and that it may be able to be placed on Crater Hill where “line of sight” would be ideal and visual impacts nil.

Hence, since there are legitimate concerns about this proposal and there are potential, suitable alternatives, the 12 (of 15) KNA board members in attendance, voted unanimously to ask you not to let this project advance until all options have been fully explored.

Aloha nui loa,

Linda Sproat, KNA President
AUG - 4, 2004

Log #: 2004.2088
Doc #: 0407NM22.doc

State of Hawaii
Department of Land and Natural Resources
Historic Preservation Division
KAKUHEHEA BUILDING, ROOM 555
601 KAMOKLA BOULEVARD
KAPOLEI, HAWAII 96707

HAWAI'I HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DIVISION REVIEW

Applicant/Agency: Lisa Applegate, Project Engineer
Austin Tsuzuki and Associates Inc.
501 Sunner St., Suite 521
Honolulu, HI 96817-5031

Subject: Chapter 6E-8 Historic Preservation Review - Department of Water, County of Kauai - DEA for Kilauea Booster Pump Station Construction of Booster Pump Station.

Ahuupua'a: Kilauea
District, Island: Hanalei, Kauai
TMK: (4) 5-1-005:023

1. We believe there are no historic properties present, because:
   - a) intensive cultivation has altered the land
   - b) residential development/urbanization has altered the land
   - c) previous grubbing/grading has altered the land
   - d) an acceptable archaeological assessment or inventory survey found no historic properties
   - e) other:

2. This project has already gone through the historic preservation review process, and mitigation has been completed.

   - Thus, we believe that "no historic properties will be affected" by this undertaking.

Aloha,

P. Holly McElowney, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division
Ms. Lisa L. Appelgate
Austen, Tutsuiani and Associates, Inc.
501 Summer Street, Suite 521
Honolulu, Hawaii  96817-5031

August 5, 2004

Dear Ms. Appelgate:

SUBJECT:  REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, JUNE 28, 2004
KILAUEA BOOSTER PUMP STATION
KILAUEA, HANALEI, KAUAI, HAWAII


The Draft EA adequately addresses the environmental review items that are required for DWSRF projects. This includes an appropriate review of the Federal Cross Cutters, consultation with applicable agencies, and adequate notice in the document and in the Environmental Notice that federal monies may be used, for the public participation purposes.

Please note that this project is not currently on the DWSRF Priority List of Projects. If the County of Kauai, Department of Water is interested in funding this project via DWSRF funds, they must include the project on the DWSRF Priority List.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Denise Dang of the Safe Drinking Water Branch, at (808) 586-4258.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

WILLIAM WONG, P.E.
CHIEF
Safe Drinking Water Branch
Environmental Management Division

DD:slm

C:  Mr. Edward Tsuchupp, KDOW
     Mr. Wayne Hinazumi, KDOW
     Mr. Keith Fujimoto, KDOW
     Ms. Kyumi Solchaga, KDOW
     Wastewater Branch
Mr. Clyde W. Namu'o, Administrator  
State of Hawaii  
Office of Hawaiian Affairs  
711 Kapi'olani Boulevard, Suite 500  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. Namu'o:

Subject: Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kauai

Thank you for your comments in your August 23, 2004 letter regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the subject project, dated June 28, 2004.

As you requested in your letter, we have included language to Section 4.2 of the Final EA that if any remains are discovered, work will immediately cease and the State Historic Preservation Division will be consulted prior to resumption of work.

We hope that this letter, and the revision of Section 4.2 of the Final EA, adequately address your concerns. A copy of the Final EA will be sent to you for review, as well as to other interested parties.

Please feel free to contact me at 533-3646 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

AUSTIN, TSUTSUMI & ASSOCIATES, INC.

By

LISA L. APPELGATE, P.E.
Project Engineer

Cc: Keith Fujimoto - Kauai Department of Water
August 23, 2004

Lisa Appelgate, P.E.
Austin, Tsutsumi & Associates
501 Sunner Street, Ste 521
Honolulu, HI 96817-5031

RE: Kilauea Booster Pump Station Revised Draft EA

Dear Ms. Appelgate:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced revised draft EA. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) appreciates your responses to our previous letter of November 26, 2003.

We would like to reiterate one point, however, which your responses did not fully address. We noted in our earlier letter that cultural deposits have recently been found in highly urbanized parts of Honolulu. Therefore despite the assurances from the State Historic Preservation Division that “no historic properties will be affected” by the project because the area has been altered, the possibility of finding human remains still exists. In response, we request that you include language to section 4.2 on page 19 that if any remains are discovered, work will immediately cease and the State Historic Preservation Division will be consulted prior to resumption of work. This is a standard condition on many permits and environmental compliance documents that helps to alert contractors of their legal requirements.

If you have further questions, please contact Dr. Jonathan Licate Scheuer at 594-1946 or by e-mail at jonathans@oha.org.

Sincerely,

Clyde W. Nāmu’o
Administrator
United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3-122
Box 50088
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

In Reply Refer to:
1-2-2004-1-295

Lisa Appelgate
Austin, Tsutsumi and Associates, Inc.
501 Sumner Street, Suite 521
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817-5031

Dear Ms. Appelgate:

Thank you for your letter dated September 2, 2004, regarding your proposed project to construct a booster pump station with duplex pumps in Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii. The project will consist of constructing a pump building with associated cabinets and an 80-foot monopole with a 12-foot whip antenna attached on top. Your letter was received in our office on September 3, 2004.

In our letter to you dated July 13, 2004, we informed you that the proposed project site is in an area through which the federally listed Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel (Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis), Newell’s shearwater (Puffinus auricularis newelli), and the Hawaiian hoary bat (Lasiusus cinereus semotus) are known to fly. Because the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel and Newell’s shearwater have been documented to strike objects, such as towers, which protrude above the mean vegetation height of the surrounding landscape, we did not concur with your determination that the proposed project was not likely to adversely affect listed species. However, in consideration of additional information that our office received after our initial response, we now concur with your determination. This is because we do not anticipate that federally protected species will collide with the proposed tower during the lifetime of the project due to the placement of the tower behind existing ironwood trees at a height not significantly more than the surrounding vegetation.

We appreciate your efforts to conserve endangered species. If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth Sharpe, Fish and Wildlife Biologist (phone: 808/792-9400; fax: 808/792-9580).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for Jeff M. Newman
Acting Field Supervisor
Ms. Elizabeth Sharpe  
United States Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office  
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3-122  
Box 50088  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96850

Dear Ms. Sharpe:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

Thank you for your review of the DEA for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station. In your response letter (refer to 1-2-2004-TA-173) you noted that the project site is in an area through which the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel, Newell's shearwater and the Hawaiian hoary bat, all federally listed under the Endangered Species Act, are known to fly. You also indicated that there are several species of birds that are covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, such as the wedge-tailed shearwater, that may transit the area. We will include this information in our Final Environmental Assessment for this project.

As we discussed on the phone, the monopole will be located directly behind existing ironwood trees that are estimated to be approximately 60 feet tall. (Refer to Photos 2 and 3 in the DEA.) The monopole will be 80 feet tall with a 12-foot high “whip” antenna, approximately 2 inches in diameter, mounted on top of the pole. Therefore, the pole will most likely rise above the tops of the trees. However, our understanding is that the birds can be expected to avoid striking the pole and antenna, since the birds will be flying well over the tops of the ironwood trees.

We would appreciate your confirmation that the proposed monopole installation is not expected to adversely affect the endangered and migratory birds in the area.

Thank you for your assistance regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me at 533-3646 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

AUSTIN, TSUTSUMI & ASSOCIATES, INC.

By  
LISA L. APPELGATE, P.E.
Project Engineer

cc: Keith Fujimoto – Kauai Department of Water
United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3-122
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

In Reply Refer to:
I-2-2004-TA-173

Lisa Appelgate
Austin, Tsutsumi and Associates, Inc.
501 Sunner Street, Suite 521
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817-5031

Dear Ms. Appelgate:

Thank you for your May 26, 2004 facsimile letter regarding your proposed project to construct a booster pump station with duplex pumps in Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii. We understand from Ivan Nakatsuka of your office that funding is being sought from the Environmental Protection Agency for the proposed project that consists of constructing a pump building with associated cabinets and an 80-foot monopole with a 12-foot whip antenna attached on top. You requested our confirmation that “there are no endangered species at the project site and that the monopole will not adversely affect any endangered birds in the vicinity.”

Based on our review of the information contained in your letter and in our files, including data compiled by the Hawaii Natural Heritage Program, the proposed project site is in an area through which the Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel (*Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis*), Newell’s shearwater (*Puffinus auricularis newelli*), and the Hawaiian hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus semotus*), all federally listed under the Endangered Species Act, are known to fly. The Hawaiian dark-rumped petrel and Newell’s shearwater have been documented to strike objects that protrude above the mean vegetation height of the surrounding landscape. Also, several species that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act, but are covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, such as the wedge-tailed shearwater (*Puffinus pacificus*), may transit the area. We recommend that you assess potential effects to these species.

We appreciate your efforts to conserve endangered species. For further technical assistance, please contact Elizabeth Sharpe, Fish and Wildlife Biologist (phone: 808/792-9400; fax: 808/792-9580).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For Jeff M. Newman
Acting Field Supervisor
October 11, 2004

Ms. Cheryl Guevara
P. O. Box 1217
Kilauea, HI 96754

Dear Ms. Guevara:

Subject: Job No. 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pumps, your Communication dated August 5, 2004 on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA)

We are replying to your comments and concerns on your review of the draft environmental assessment. We are trying to address each of the main concerns you have raised. Thank you for identifying the main points by using bold text, it has helped the Department of Water organize our reply.

First, we want to identify a modification in the project that the Department of Water believes will constitute a significant mitigation for many of your concerns. After careful consideration of community concerns, and re-evaluation of the Department’s plans for our Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, the Department of Water (DOW) is withdrawing our application at this time for permitting the 80-foot SCADA monopole antenna structure at the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Facility. This decision has been made to allow for permitting of the Booster Pump Facility to proceed on it’s own merits, recognizing that there are separate impacts associated with the SCADA monopole that do not have direct bearing on the Booster Pump Facility. The Booster Pump Facility will operate with SCADA controls using radio communication via a maximum 3-inch diameter steel pipe antenna system that does not exceed the allowable height consistent with zoning requirements. The DOW believes this antenna configuration will significantly mitigate visual and other impacts associated with the project.

Elimination of the monopole will compromise DOW’s SCADA system performance, particularly to our facilities in Waipake, which likely will require development of an alternative communications strategy for those facilities. DOW will seek alternatives to using tall monopole-type antenna systems (including telephone, smaller antenna, alternative locations, etc.) for SCADA controls of our Kilauea facilities. However, if acceptable alternatives are not identified, it may be necessary in the future to seek permitting (via separate permit actions) for monopole antennas.

4398 Puu Loke St., P.O. Box 1706, Lihue, Hi 96766 Phone: 608-245-5400 Engineering and Fiscal Fax 608-245-5813, Operations Fac 608-245-5402, Administration Fax 608-246-6528
Ms. Cheryl Guevara
Subject:  Job No. 97-10, Kiluaea Booster Pumps, your Communication dated August 5, 2004 on the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA)
October 11, 2004
Page 2 of 4

The following comments address the key points you have identified.

1. Notification: There are several times during the development of a public project in Hawai‘i that notification is required. One of the initial opportunities for notification is the preparation and publication of a Draft Environmental Assessment Report (Draft EA), the document upon which you have commented. The Department of Water has complied with all applicable notification requirements associated with the publication of the Draft EA. The next major project milestone that requires notification is the permitting process with the County. The DOW will soon be proceeding with requesting permits from the County Planning Commission, and notification will be provided as per the requirements of the County permitting process.

In addition to these formal notifications, the Department of Water has previously provided briefings of our plans to develop a Booster Pump Facility in Kiluaea to the Kiluaea Neighborhood Association on February 4, 2003, August 5, 2003 and January 6, 2004.

Finally, as you are clearly interested in this project, at future milestones in the permitting process we will keep you notified of the progress of this project.

2. Aesthetics and Viewplanes: It is the Department’s opinion that the monopole antenna structure was the most significant visual impact associated with the proposed project, and we believe that fences, gates and small buildings are not incompatible with the agricultural zoning or current land use characteristics. We will provide landscaping acceptable to the Planning Department, County of Kauai, which should provide a vegetative screen of the concrete masonry unit (CMU) pump building. The building will also be painted dark green to blend with the surrounding trees. The landscaping and color scheme are intended to minimize visual impacts in the immediate vicinity of the facility, such as along Wallapa Road.

We believe that elimination of the monopole tower and antenna will substantially mitigate visual impacts from the surrounding areas; however, there will be a need for a much smaller antenna, which we believe will not pose a significant visual impact (this proposed antenna will not exceed height limits, is a much smaller profile, and will not extend above the height of the adjacent trees). Within the general vicinity (including Puu Pene and much of the residences along Wallapa Road), because of the surrounding vegetation, scenic view planes do not overlook the proposed booster pump building and revised antenna.
3. Electromagnetic Frequencies: The system being utilized for the data communications is a 900 MHz (spread spectrum) radios, similar to most household cordless phones and garage door openers. The system has been designed to meet the Federal Communications Commission’s requirements in meeting the radio frequencies (RF) emission limits.

4. Noise Impact: We believe that the motors are not as large or noisy as may be imagined, and we would welcome your visiting some of our existing facilities where similar sized motors are in service to hear for yourself the noise levels actually generated. The noise created by the booster pumps will be attenuated by the concrete masonry unit (CMU) building. Overall, as the operator of several booster pumps facilities in various areas of the island, including several in the Kilauea area, the Department of Water does not experience complaints about noise levels from these facilities.

5. Traffic: There will be a slight increase in traffic along Wailapa Road during the construction of the project, which is anticipated to take less than a year. Additionally, there will be approximately one month during construction of the pipeline along Wailapa Road where one of the lanes will be closed off and controlled by flagmen during the weekday time hours. Following construction, the only increase in traffic will be by the Department of Water’s personnel conducting routine maintenance at the site; this work is estimated to be a single vehicle not more than three times per week.

6. Drainage: We have determined that developing approximately 2,500 square feet of property situated several hundred feet from the stream will not drastically increase the flooding potential of the area. The main concerns appear to be accidental discharges, either during construction or during routine operation. Construction-related drainage concerns are addressed through the contractor’s responsibility to properly manage the construction site. Operationally, there can be main breaks within the water system that can result in runoff. This is a fact associated with operation of a water system. The addition of the Booster Pump facility will not materially change the potential for occurrence of a main break.

7. Possible alternatives: In looking for sites for the booster pump, the Department of Water has had considerable difficulty locating a site meeting the requirements for operation of a booster pump facility, consistent with water system operations, and having the consent of the property owner for the use of the property. In looking for a site, the Department contacted many landowners in the area for permission for the pump site. Only the landowner of the proposed site was agreeable to help the Department and the community in providing a site that accomplishes the
booster pump requirements for the good of the community. In agreeing to the site, the Department and landowner negotiated to the currently selected site. As indicated, we believe that deleting the monopole antenna structure will substantially reduce the impacts of the project. We will need to make alternative arrangements for our telecommunications system. With respect to the Booster Pump facility, our alternative options are far more limited. The need for the facility to better serve the community remains, and there are real costs to the Department and the community associated with attempting to relocate the facility to an alternative site that is increasingly more difficult to identify, gain access and develop.

Thank you for your considered comments and input. If you have any questions, or would like to arrange a visit to a comparable DOW facility, please contact either Keith Fujimoto at 245-5449 or Kymn Solchaga at 245-5455.

Sincerely,

Edward Tschupp
Manager & Chief Engineer

KF/ET:rm
Project/Job 97-10, Kilauea Booster Pump – Response to Wylies (10-11-04):rm
Besides sending this letter to:

Ms. Cheryl Guevara  
P. O. Box 1217  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Also sent the same letter to:

Mr. and Mrs. Tom Wylie  
5875 Lokelani Road  
Kapa‘a, HI 96746

Mr. and Mrs. Aaron Hawthorne  
P. O. Box 969  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Mr. and Mrs. Todd Rundgren  
P. O. Box 1167  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Carlson  
P. O. Box 698  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Ms. Caren Diamond  
P. O. Box 536  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Ms. Georgia Poppin  
P. O. Box 702  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Ms. Cyndee Lehrig  
P. O. Box 565  
Kilauea, HI 96754

Mr. Robert Wolaver  
P. O. Box 93  
Kilauea, HI 96754

William Kreutzmann  
c/o Emmet Deville  
4504 Kukui Street, Ste. 7  
Kapa‘a, HI 96746
August 5, 2004

Akinaia & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819
Contact: Sheldon Yamashita

Dear Sirs,

I am a Wailapa Road resident and live in the house directly across the street from the proposed Booster Pump Station. This letter will express my opposition to this proposed construction and serve as public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment. Like my neighbors, I support following the legal and respectful procedures on these matters. It is curious that folks in the mauka subdivision where the pump house was originally planned wanted it moved. Perhaps for the same reasons there is opposition now. Our neighborhood is known, respected and priced for its beauty, peace and healthful environment.

Neither I nor any of my neighbors have received Notification of the proposed station. The impact of this project, according to further details below, warrants individual notification. Any individual homeowner deserves this respect and consideration.

Aesthetics and Viewplanes would be significantly altered in the visual environment. There would be a 14-foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence, a 13' x 12' x 10' building and a 92-foot tall antenna, all visibly placed and close to Wailapa Road. The electromagnetic frequencies emanating from the antenna pose a clear and documented health concern.

Noise Levels are an equally important concern, as five horsepower motors would be required to pump large amounts of water. These pumps have a high frequency range of noise, which would penetrate the pump house walls. They will likely come on very early in the morning and sound all day and into the evening.

The corner of Wailapa and the Highway is dangerous. The highway has turns and no right turn lane from the south. Due to construction of left-hand turn lanes on the Highway for the mauka subdivision, the makai stop from Wailapa Road was set back so that now cars have to pull out into the highway traffic in order to see in both directions. This project would further jeopardize the already dangerous Traffic situation.

Wailapa Stream loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the Drainage running northwest down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall per year, rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa Road and angling off west down slope through existing residential properties into the Stream. An accidental discharge, especially during heavy rains, could cause flooding along natural drainage lines.

It is the collective position of the impacted Kālua residents that an Alternative is available. Moving the location at least 1000 feet, preferably more, to the east within the same property would prevent existing roads from further danger and the pipeline could be laid directly with the one existing on the Highway to the south. The site would be invisible, and the surrounding density of the uncut orchards would buffer the noise. The pump needs to be strategically placed so that no residents are impacted.

We trust and appreciate your favorable consideration in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Shannon Wylie, Sister-in-Law to Owner, William Kreutzmann
Resident, 4470 Wailapa Road
August 5, 2004

Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819
Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

Dear Sirs,

I am a Waipuna Road resident and live in the house directly across the street from the proposed Booster Pump Station. This letter will express my opposition to this proposed construction and serve as public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment. Like my neighbors, I support following the legal and respectful procedures on these matters. It is curious that folks in the mauka subdivision where the pump house was originally planned wanted it moved. Perhaps for the same reasons there is opposition now. Our neighborhood is known, respected and priced for its beauty, peace and healthful environment.

Neither I nor any of my neighbors have received Notification of the proposed station. The impact of this project, according to further details below, warrants individual notification. Any individual homeowner deserves this respect and consideration.

Aesthetics and Viewplanes would be significantly altered in the visual environment. There would be a 14-foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence, a 13' x 12' x 10' building and a 92-foot tall antenna, all visibly placed and close to Waipuna Road. The electromagnetic frequencies emanating from the antenna pose a clear and documented health concern.

Noise Levels are an equally important concern, as five horsepower motors would be required to pump large amounts of water. These pumps have a high frequency range of noise, which would penetrate the pump house walls. They will likely come on very early in the morning and sound all day and into the evening.

The corner of Waipuna and the Highway is dangerous. The highway has runs and no right turn lane from the south. Due to construction of left-hand turn lanes on the Highway for the mauka subdivision, the makai stop from Waipuna Road was set back so that now cars have to pull out into the highway traffic in order to see in both directions. This project would further jeopardize the already dangerous Traffic situation.

Waipuna Stream loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the Drainage running northwest down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall per year, rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Waipuna Road and angling off west down slope through existing residential properties into the Stream. An accidental discharge, especially during heavy rains, could cause flooding along natural drainage lines.

It is the collective position of the impacted Kilauea residents that an Alternative is available. Moving the location at least 1000 feet, preferably more, to the east within the same property would prevent existing roads from further danger and the pipeline could be laid directly with the one existing on the Highway to the south. The site would be invisible, and the surrounding density of the uncut orchards would buffer the noise. The pump needs to be strategically placed so that no residents are impacted.

We trust and appreciate your favorable consideration in this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tom Wylie
Resident, 4470 Waipuna Road
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 635-3856 should you have any questions.

Andrew Smith
4390 Wailapa Rd.
Kilauea, HI 96754
County of Kauai  
Department of Water  
4998 Pua Loke St.  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766  

July 26, 2004  

Dear Sirs,  

This letter is public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii.  

We are giving notification that the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we believe this report lacks sufficient information and otherwise fails to promote and preserve the goals and objectives of the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance and the Standards For Use Permits contained in CZO section 8-20.5 because the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower:  

a. Will not be compatible with other uses in the area;  
b. Will be detrimental to other uses in the area;  
c. Will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing in the area; and  
d. Will violate the goals and objectives of the North Shore Update, as adopted by the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance, including the following:  

   Goal A: To preserve the unique natural beauty of the North Shore Planning Area.  
   Goal B: To preserve the special rural charm of the North Shore Planning Area.  
   Goal C: To provide for the Safety and welfare of the people and of their property in the North Shore Planning Area.  

NOTIFICATION  

If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to be notified to insure, as much as possible, compliance with governmental laws, rules and
regulations, all in the interest of the general public. This is to ensure that any development will not adversely impact adjoining properties or the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wailapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wailapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wailapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which was a re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004, received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004. Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilauea BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers housing less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local business's, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the driveway to the residences is
the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wailapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w,(dirt driveway).

**AESTHETICS**

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13' x 12' x 10' high building with a 92-foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically unpleasing conglomerate every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane sub-division as well as from Wailapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

**NOISE**

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative aural impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have
taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB's, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal street is around 70dB's. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This undisturbed silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna.

**TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION**

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wallapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wallapa road intersection was removed, pushing the stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before entering the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wallapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wallapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wallapa Road. Wallapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall
per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumpers that can pump 1500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

**ALTERNATIVES**

So in answer to the question,"What can be done with this project to make it a win win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wailapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

**SIGNATURES**

We the undersigned are against the location of the Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower project, and request proper notification of any future proposals.

[Signatures]

4390 Wailapa Rd, Kilauea 96754
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 635-3856 should you have any questions.

Bill Kreutzmann
4470 Wailapa Rd.
Kilauea, HI 96754
July 26, 2004

County of Kauai
Department of Water
4398 Pua Loke St.
Lihue, Hawaii 96766

PUBLIC COMMENT

This letter is public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii.

We are giving notification that the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we believe this report lacks sufficient information and otherwise fails to promote and preserve the goals and objectives of the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance and the Standards For Use Permits contained in CZO section 8-20.5 because the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower:

a. Will not be compatible with other uses in the area;
b. Will be detrimental to other uses in the area;
c. Will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing in the area; and
d. Will violate the goals and objectives of the North Shore Update, as adopted by the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance, including the following:

Goal A: To preserve the unique natural beauty of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal B: To preserve the special rural charm of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal C: To provide for the Safety and welfare of the people and of their property in the North Shore Planning Area.

NOTIFICATION

If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to
be notified to insure, as much as possible, compliance with governmental laws, rules and regulations, all in the interest of the general public. This is to ensure that any development will not adversely impact adjoining properties or the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wallapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wallapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wallapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which was a re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004, received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004 Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project Location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilauea BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers housing less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local business’s, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as
shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the driveway to the residences is the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wallapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w,(dirt driveway).

AESTHETICS

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building with a 92- foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically displeasing conglomeration every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane sub-division as well as from Wallapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

NOISE

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative aural impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping
and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB’s, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal street is around 70dB’s. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This unadulterated silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna.

**TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION**

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wailapa road intersection was removed, pushing the Stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before interring the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wailapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wailapa Road. Wailapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the
drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.25 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumpers that can pump 1500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win-win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wailapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

Sincerely,

Bill Kreutzmann

[Signature]
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualea Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 635-3856 should you have any questions.

JOHN HAWTHORNE
P.O. BOX 969
KILAUEA, HI 96754

For the Residents of Weihapa Rd.
County of Kauai  
Department of Water  
4398 Pua Loke St.  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766  

July 26, 2004

Dear Sirs,

This letter is public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii.

We are giving notification that the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we believe this report lacks sufficient information and otherwise fails to promote and preserve the goals and objectives of the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance and the Standards For Use Permits contained in CZO section 8-20.5 because the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower:

a. Will not be compatible with other uses in the area;
b. Will be detrimental to other uses in the area;
c. Will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing in the area; and
d. Will violate the goals and objectives of the North Shore Update, as adopted by the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance, including the following:

Goal A: To preserve the unique natural beauty of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal B: To preserve the special rural charm of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal C: To provide for the Safety and welfare of the people and of their property in the North Shore Planning Area.

NOTIFICATION

If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to be notified to insure, as much as possible, compliance with governmental laws, rules and
regulations, all in the interest of the general public. This is to ensure that any development will not adversely impact adjoining properties or the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wailapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wailapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wailapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12,2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which was a re-publication of the October 28,2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004, received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004 Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilauea BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers housing less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local business’s, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the driveway to the residences is
the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wailapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w (dirt driveway).

**AESTHETICS**

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building with a 92- foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically unpleasing conglomeration every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane sub-division as well as from Wailapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

**NOISE**

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative aural impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have
taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB’s, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal street is around 70dB’s. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This undisturbed silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna.

**TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION**

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wailapa road intersection was removed, pushing the Stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before interring the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wailapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wailapa Road. Wailapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall
per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wallapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wallapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wallapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumper tanks that can pump 1,500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wallapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

SIGNATURES

Signatures begin on the following page.
We the undersigned, are against the location of the Kilauea Booster Pump Station and Antenna project, and request proper notification of any future proposals.

Aaron Hawthorne  
Po Box 969  
Kilauea 635-3850

Robert Walgren  
Po Box 93  
Kilauea 828-1824

Linda Fehry  
Po Box 565  
Kilauea 828-0873

Chris Carson  
Po Box 697  
Kilauea 828-1563

Jack F  
Po Box 697  
Kilauea 828-1563

Chris Carson  
Po Box 697  
Kilauea 828-1563

Georgia Poppi  
P.O. Box 702  
Kilauea 828-1757

Carrie Gimblett  
Po Box 1217  
Kilauea 828-1753

Carin Diamond  
Po Box 536  
Hanalei 826-5150
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 635-3856 should you have any questions.

Donna Apisa
PO Box 223190
Princeville, HI 96722
County of Kauai  
Department of Water  
4398 Pua Loke St.  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766  

Dear Sirs,  

This letter is public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii.  

We are giving notification that the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we believe this report lacks sufficient information and otherwise fails to promote and preserve the goals and objectives of the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance and the Standards For Use Permits contained in CZO section 8-20.5 because the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower:

a. Will not be compatible with other uses in the area;

b. Will be detrimental to other uses in the area;

c. Will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing in the area; and

d. Will violate the goals and objectives of the North Shore Update, as adopted by the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance, including the following:

   Goal A: To preserve the unique natural beauty of the North Shore Planning Area.

   Goal B: To preserve the special rural charm of the North Shore Planning Area.

   Goal C: To provide for the Safety and welfare of the people and of their property in the North Shore Planning Area.

NOTIFICATION

If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to be notified to insure, as much as possible, compliance with governmental laws, rules and
regulations, all in the interest of the general public. This is to ensure that any development will not adversely impact adjoining properties or the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wailapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wailapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wailapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilaeua Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which was a re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 received by the Kilaeua Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004 Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilaeua BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers housing less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local business’s, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the driveway to the residences is
the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wallapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w.(dirt driveway).

AESTHETICS

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building with a 92- foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically unpleasant congregation every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane sub-division as well as from Wallapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

NOISE

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative aural impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have
taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB's, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal street is around 70dB's. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This undisturbed silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna.

TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wailapa road intersection was removed, pushing the Stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before entering the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wailapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wailapa Road. Wailapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall
per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumbers that can pump 1,500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wailapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

SIGNATURES

We the undersigned are against the location of the Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower project, and request proper notification of any future proposals.

Danna Agin, 4360 Wailapa Rd., Kilauea, HI. 96754
per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumpers that can pump 1500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wailapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

SIGNATURES

We the undersigned are against the location of the Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower project, and request proper notification of any future proposals.

Donna Agnoi, 4380 Wailapa Rd., Kilauea, HI. 96754

Montgomery

1568 WHEESORT AVE WESTLOPE VILLAGE OR 97361
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinska & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 635-3856 should you have any questions.

JOHN HAWTHORNE
P.O. BOX 969
KILAUEA, HI 96754
County of Kauai
Department of Water
4398 Pua Loke St.
Lihue, Hawaii 96766

Dear Sirs,

This letter is public comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for Kilauea Booster Pump Station, Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii.

We are giving notification that the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we believe this report lacks sufficient information and otherwise fails to promote and preserve the goals and objectives of the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance and the Standards for Use Permits contained in CZO section 8-20.5 because the proposed Kilauea Booster Pump Station and SCADA Tower:

a. Will not be compatible with other uses in the area;
b. Will be detrimental to other uses in the area;
c. Will be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort and general welfare of persons residing in the area; and
d. Will violate the goals and objectives of the North Shore Update, as adopted by the North Shore Development Plan Ordinance, including the following:

Goal A: To preserve the unique natural beauty of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal B: To preserve the special rural charm of the North Shore Planning Area.
Goal C: To provide for the Safety and welfare of the people and of their property in the North Shore Planning Area.

NOTIFICATION

If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to be notified to insure, as much as possible, compliance with governmental laws, rules and
regulations, all in the interest of the general public. This is to ensure that any development will not adversely impact adjoining properties or the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wailapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wailapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wailapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which was a re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004, received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004 Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilauea BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers housing less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local business’s, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the driveway to the residences is
the site where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wailapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w.(dirt driveway).

AESTHETICS

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building with a 92-foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road, and will be visible from 3 adjacent properties and visible from 2 existing residences and 2 future residences and will have a negative visual impact on these properties. The iron wood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically displeasing conglomeration every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane sub-division as well as from Wailapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

NOISE

We contend that the operation of the Booster Pump Station Motors will have a detectable negative aural impact on the surrounding Agricultural area and will create an adverse impact to the immediate urban residential subdivision.

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have
taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only
51dB’s, which is very low. To demonstrate how silent this is, sound readings for a normal
street is around 70dB’s. This silence will allow the noise created by these motors to easily
be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning
when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime,
this area is deathly still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels
this low. This undisturbed silence is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the
residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful
environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for
nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and
fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and
situate it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very
opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states
that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding
communities will occur. No mention is given to the EMT waves generated by the radio
transmitters, which is now proven to be a health hazard. If it is recommended that holding
cell phones to your ear can be dangerous, what will be the effect of these radio signals to
the surrounding populace? We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans
and fauna.

TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and
Wallapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the
intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in
the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wallapa road intersection was removed,
pushing the Stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio
Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars
have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before interring the highway.
There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased
traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the
danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully.
Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and
paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wallapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and
the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wallapa Stream and
that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wallapa
Road. Wallapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the
drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall
per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumper that can pump 1500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win-win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.

We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wailapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

Sincerely,
John Hawthorne
P.O. Box 969
Kilauea, HI 96754
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

July 30, 2004

TO: Akinaka & Associates, Ltd.
3049 Ualena Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

ATTENTION: Contact: Sheldon Yamasato

SUBJECT: Kilauea Booster Pump Station
Kilauea, Hanalei, Kauai, Hawaii

WE are transmitting a copy of the letter of Public Comment on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Kilauea Booster Pump Station for your review. Please feel free to contact me at (808) 828-0636 should you have any questions.

ANN WYLIE
4470 WAILAPA ROAD
KILAUEA, HI 96754
County of Kauai  
Department of Water  
4398 Pua Loke St.  
Lihue, Hawaii 96766  

July 26, 2004

PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE DRAFT ASSESSMENT FOR KILAUEA BOOSTER PUMP STATION, KILAUEA, HANALEI, KAUA'I, HAWAII

We are giving notification the surrounding neighbors are not in agreement with the proposed construction of the Booster Pump Station and included antenna and we protest the implementation of such a proposal. Due to the lack of consideration of the negative impact to the surrounding neighbors, we are of one mind that such proposal will have an extremely negative impact on the surrounding neighbors. It is aesthetically unacceptable and has a very detrimental health impact, and may very well have a negative impact on the environment.

NOTIFICATION

In reference to paragraph 5.2.10.5 Public Scrutiny which calls for public scrutiny including procedural notifications and direct involvement of the immediate neighbors of the project site through distribution of a Draft EA, I notify you that you are in violation of this statement.

Our property, tax map key 4-5-1-005-014-0000-004, which includes 4 residential units and 2 future residential sites, is located directly across the street, Wailapa Road, from the proposed location. The proposed 14 foot wide gate is located directly across the street from the driveway of these residences, and the connection to the water line on Wailapa Road is located in the center of said driveway, as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections. Further more, the proposed location for the antenna pole which will be 92 feet high is just inside the fence adjacent to Wailapa Road directly across from said driveway and residences. No notification of the proposed construction of the said Booster Pump Station and 92 foot high Antenna has been received by any residents in the proposed area. If governmental protocol or procedures are not correctly followed, then it violates our private property rights and our environmental health. Proper and statutory procedure for implementing this program has to be followed and the people most affected need to be notified.

According to your own documents, Draft EA dated June 28, 2004 and received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, the DOW met with the association on January 6, 2004 to discuss the proposed booster pump and antenna which
was a re-publication of the October 28, 2003 Draft EA. However, no notification of the surrounding neighbors was submitted before this time, so that they could be present. Again, with Draft EA dated June 28, 2004, received by the Kilauea Neighborhood Association on July 12, 2004, another re-publication, no notification was given to the surrounding neighbors as of this revision either. This revised Draft EA has been submitted less than one month before the deadline for public comment on August 7, 2004. Why has all this time gone by without notification of the immediate neighbors as required by State and County Guidelines?

This seems like an attempt to prevent the surrounding neighbors from responding to this proposal because this document is misleading and alludes to the fact that this site is contained within an orchard within the property and that there are no surrounding neighbors and residences. Even the photograph shown in Photo 2, which also shows the front gate to these residences on the right hand side, is taken at an angle to avoid showing the existing residences and proposed residence site, directly across the street within 50 feet of the proposed booster pump and antenna site. The statement in paragraph 1.1.2 Project location and Purpose, alludes to the parcel within which the Kilauea BPS will be sited is being used for agricultural purposes, primarily orchards. This is misleading as there are workers living less than 50 feet away and warehouse buildings containing local businesses, and the site is located opposite of the driveway to the residences as shown in Exhibit 4, Site Plan and Site Sections, where the water pipe is to connect to the main line on Wailapa Road and is labeled simply as: dirt d/w.(dirt driveway).

AESTHETICS

In paragraph 1.3.1 Aesthetics and Viewplanes, it states that the project will not result in a significant change in the visual environment. This is false, as there is a 14 foot wide gate and 50 feet of chain link fence which you look through to a 13’ x 12’ x 10’ high building with a 92-foot tall antenna sitting right next to the fence, which directly abuts the road. The ironwood trees are very sparse along this area and the main foliage is above the height of the fence. All of this is directly across the street from the existing residences. The residents who live there and the visitors to the Na Aina Kai Botanical Gardens will be seeing this gross aesthetically displeasing conglomeration every time they drive by and will wonder who put this mess there. The 92-foot tall antenna will be seen by all the residences in the Pua Pane subdivision as well as from Wailapa Road and Kuhio Highway. The original document, which called for a 12-foot pole, was misleading. The designers of the system knew all along that an antenna of this height was required. We consulted with a radio engineer and were told that anyone involved in this kind of work knows that the terrain of the islands dictates an antenna of this height. Just
look at the existing cell phone antennas. If an alternative to this antenna were desired then they could go with a phone operated system.

NOISE

In paragraph 1.3.4 Noise Levels, it states that enclosure of the pumps within the Pump Building will further attenuate the already minimal noise to be generated by the low horse power pump motors. What a gross misstatement, if ever there was an attempt to put one over on the public. This might be the biggest concern here. Five horsepower motors as required to pump a large amount of water are substantial, very huge and very noisy, especially in the high frequency range, which will penetrate the concrete walls of this building and bounce off the surrounding wall of trees in the background and reflect back towards the residences located directly across the street. Little swimming pool motors create sufficient noise to be offensive, just realize that these two huge motors running together which multiplies the sound exponentially will definitely impair sleeping and be a health hazard from exposure to the constant whine of these motors. We have taken readings with a sound pressure meter and at 7 am in the morning the level is only 51dB’s, which is very low. To demonstrate how quite this is, sound readings for a normal street are around 70dB’s. This quite will allow the noise created by these motors to easily be heard across the narrow street. These pumps will come on very early in the morning when all the irrigation systems turn on so that pressure can be maintained. At nighttime, this area is dead still, only the most expensive sound meter can measure sound levels this low. This quite is one of the reasons this area is preferred by the residents. High frequency sounds will carry for very long distances in this peaceful environment. Once again the pumps will still be running to maintain water pressure for nighttime watering and household use. Normal sleep cycles will be interrupted, and fatigue and depression can result. What a crime to create noise pollution like this and site it so close to residential dwellings. We the surrounding neighbors are very opposed to this situation. This also applies to paragraph 4.3.4 Noise Levels, which states that no significant or long term impacts in ambient noise levels to the surrounding communities will occur. We believe this is an environmental health hazard, to humans and fauna. Songbirds heavily populate this area and the potential harm to the fauna from the noise is certainly present.

TRAFFIC, DRAINAGE, & FIRE PROTECTION

In relation to paragraph 1.3.3 Traffic, the intersection of Kuhio Highway and Wailapa road is already a very dangerous intersection. During construction of the intersecting road for the Pua Pane Subdivision, when the left turn lanes were installed in the center of Kuhio Highway, over 4 feet of the Wailapa road intersection was removed,
pushing the Stop sign and road entrance area back behind the existing banks along Kuhio Highway, removing the sight lines down Kuhio Highway in both directions. Now cars have to pull out into traffic just to see if anything is coming before intruding the highway. There have been numerous severe accidents since this alteration and now with increased traffic, the problem has only gotten worse. Construction in this area will increase the danger significantly. The County should have inspected this alteration more carefully. Here again, unsuspecting residents and visitors are the ones to suffer.

Paragraph 2.5 Land and Water Use and paragraph 2.14 Topography, and paragraph 2.16 Drainage, state that Wailapa Stream is approximately 500 feet west and the distance is significant enough that the project should not impact Wailapa Stream and that the site has about a 3 percent slope in the northeasterly direction, away from Wailapa Road. Wailapa Stream actually loops east and is about 350 feet from the site with the drainage running northwest right down into this stream. With 68 inches of normal rainfall per year, runoff is not slow, and heavy rains have substantial natural runoff directly down Wailapa road and angling off west downslope through existing residential properties into Wailapa Stream. An accidental discharge or heavy rain during construction will follow these natural drainage lines to Wailapa Stream.

Paragraph 5.2.5 Farmland Protection Policy Act, claims to improve fire protection service. This project does not improve fire protection. The existing connections for fire protection have 2 1/2-inch diameter standpipes. This system is already undersized and cannot provide any more water than it already does. The Fire Department has brand new pumps that can pump 1500 gallons per minute, however a 2 1/2-inch standpipe cannot flow any more water due to limited size, it is volume, not pressure that is needed. If fire protection was desired, 4 1/2-inch diameter fire hydrants should be installed in all of the Kilauea area.

ALTERNATIVES

So in answer to the question, "What can be done with this project to make it a win win situation for all involved?" We the surrounding neighbors believe that the aesthetically unacceptable aspects and the negative health impact for the inhabitants could be remedied by moving the location another 800 to 1000 feet east. It would still be within the same property, and could still use existing roads, and the pipeline could be laid directly to the existing line on Kuhio Highway to the south. The whole site would then be invisible and the surrounding density of the orchards would attenuate the noise, and a site could probably be found where no trees need be removed, as there are huge open spaces through this area.
We hope the involved parties can reach a solution that can be lived with by friends, neighbors, and visitors for years to come and Kilauea and Wallapa neighborhoods set an environmental example with respect to all.

SIGNATURES

We the undersigned, are against the location of the Kilauea Booster Pump Station and Antenna project, and request proper notification of any future proposals.

Shannon Wylie 4470 Wailapa Rd
Ann H. Wylie 4470 WAILAPA RD
Thomas G. Wylie 4470 WAILAPA RD
APPENDIX B
MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE
In response to your request, enclosed are exhibits for the subject pump station (PS), proposed to be constructed within the grassed shoulder area of Kuhio Highway. Under consideration are either a custom or a package type of PS - as shown in Exhibits 2 through 5.

The preferred location, as shown in Exhibit 1, is near the entrance to the Puu Pane Subdivision – on the mauna side of Kuhio Highway Station 32+50±. The alternative location, as shown in the last enclosure, is on the makai side of Kuhio Highway Station 9+00±.

Both of these sites for the PS are in bank areas higher than the paved highway, and therefore, are generally not in any potential vehicular pathway. However, the advantage of the preferred location is that the bank area is wider - due to a wider highway right-of-way - as compared to the alternative location. Also, the difference in elevation between the paved highway and the PS is greater at the preferred location - which would further prevent travel to the PS by a wayward vehicle.

Thank you for your timely review of this request to construct the PS within the Kuhio Highway right-of-way. Please feel free to call me at (808) 533-3646 should you have any questions.

Cc: Bruce Inouye – Kauai DOW (808-245-5813)
Access to & from Cemetery shall be permitted during construction.
September 5, 2000

Mr. Ivan Nakatsuka
Austin Tsutsumi & Associates, Inc.
501 Summer Street, Suite 521
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817-5031

Dear Mr. Nakatsuka:

Subject: Proposed Booster Pump Station
(Puu Pane Subdivision)
Kilauea, Kauai, Hawaii
TMK: 5-1-05:52

Review of the sketches showing the proposed locations of the DOW booster pump station in Kilauea has been completed and we have the following comments:

1. Notwithstanding the fact that the pump station and appurtenances are proposed to be sited above the travel lanes and away from vehicular pathways, as a general policy, we have not permitted the siting of above ground water facilities, including pipes, valves, pump stations, etc., within the State Highway Right of Way. In keeping with that general policy, we will not permit the booster pump station, above ground piping & valves, etc., to be sited within the State Highway Right of Way.

The State Highways Division Rights of Way Office was informed of your proposal and, they, too, indicated that such facilities should not be sited within the State Highway Right of Way.

2. The requirements for the booster pump station appears to be related in some way with the new water tank that is scheduled to be constructed to service the Puu Pane Subdivision. The Department of Water should rightly secure an easement in one of the subdivision’s parcel to site the pump station and appurtenances.

[Signature]
The Department of Water not being able to secure an easement within one of the Puu Pane Subdivision parcel should not translate into the State Highways Division being obligated to accept what we consider a proposal that is not in compliance with our general policy.

In light of the above, at this time, we will not allow the booster pump station and appurtenances to be sited within the State Highway Right of Way. Our recommendation is that the Department of Water site the booster pump station and appurtenances and access roads in easements outside of the State Highway Right of Way.

If you have any questions, please call Steve Morikawa at 274-3118.

Sincerely,

GLENN YAMAMOTO, P.E.
Acting District Engineer

SM:es

cc: HWY-RM
   Attn: Mr. Michael Aruho/Ms. Joanne Izumi

       Dept. Of Water
       County of Kauai
       Attn: Mr. Bruce Inouye
February 18, 2003

Planning Commission  
County of Kauai  
Attn. Sandi Kato-Klutke, Chair  
4444 Rice Street  
Lihue, HI 96766

Dear Ms. Kato-Klutke:


We would like to request for a continuance of the public hearing scheduled for March 11, 2003 to your meeting scheduled for June 10, 2003. We are researching alternate sites for the booster pump and will not be ready to make a presentation till then.

We look forward to your favorable reply.

If there are any questions, please contact Mr. Keith Fujimoto of my staff at 245-5449.

Sincerely,

Wayne Hinazumi  
Chief of Engineering Division

cc: Barbara Pendragon