

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.	
2	Agency Comments						
3	General Comments						
4	Proposed action or projects affecting the State Highways should be consulted with the Hawaii Department of Transportation (HDOT). A Traffic Impact Analysis Report may be required to be submitted to the HDOT for review and acceptance to evaluate and identify any potential traffic impacts to our state highways system.	Comment noted. No change needed.	-	-	HDOT	5/21/20	
5	Chapter 4 and Chapter 5						
6	In the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan, April 2020, on Pages 4-7 and 5-31 also refer to improvements that are existing conditions, in reference to sidewalks along Kalaniana'ole Highway. The HDOT requests that this be corrected before the Plan.	Recommend change. Remove last sentence in 1st bullet and sub-bullets 1 and 2 in Technical Report.	4, 5	2-42, 2-45, 4-7, 5-31	HDOT	5/21/20	
7	Technical Report						
8	In the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan Technical Report 1999-2020, Volume 1 on pages 2-42 and 2-45, under the sub-headers "Pedestrian Connectivity" it says that recommendations from HDOT's Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan include: "sidewalks on both sides of Kalaniana'ole Highway to Hawaii Kai Drive (with a few exceptions west of Wailupe) and sidewalks on one side of Kalaniana'ole Highway between Wailupe and Waialae and from Hawaii Kai Drive to Waimanalo" and "encourage sidewalk improvements along Kalaniana'ole Highway consistent with the Statewide Pedestrian Master Plan." These are existing conditions and not recommendations for improvement. The HDOT requests that this be corrected before the Plan is finalized.	Recommend change: Revise 9th bullet: "Improve pedestrian and bicycle conditions along Kalaniana'ole Highway to improve safety and mobility."	TR	2-42, 2-45	HDOT	5/21/20	
9	Public Comments						
10	The plan has many inconsistencies-it lacks internal integrity. By this I mean that it says one thing one place and then 1) misstates or 2) incompletely states or 3) omits it in other places. Such lack of consistency genuinely derogates the document so that subsequent reviews by departmental employees, elected officials, and private citizens suffer great difficulty in determining just what the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan 2020 intends for the planning period. Further, such lack of internal integrity may provide grist for misunderstandings, complaints, and attacks by parties that merely desire to circumvent or neutralize it as a directive planning document. Therefore, as currently revised/written, this plan says anything you want it to say-just look until you find something you agree with and go with it-such a plan does not bode well for good government. For instance, there are many maps of the region in the plan. They need to be consistent. All the features don't need to be labeled on every map. But when something is labeled it should get the same label it has been getting on other maps.	General comment noted. No change recommended.	-	-	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20	
11	Page ES-5, change second paragraph to read: "The issues addressed ... such as <u>recreation (parks, trails, shoreline)</u> , water delivery and consumption, wastewater services ... "	need for completeness of the EHSCP.	Recommend Change: "The issues addressed ... such as water delivery and consumption... and developing responsive transportation systems, and recreation facilities."	ES	ES-5	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
12	INTEGRATING PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY INTO DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES, include among the Principals: "• Acknowledge that sea level rise could reduce residential zones along the coastal and tidal zones of East Honolulu and this could mean serious disruption of existing, developed areas and reduced population capacity."	Refer to climate crisis forecasts of City's Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency	ES	ES-6	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
13	Change first bullet to read: "Population remains stable at approximately 50,000 or 5% of O'ahu population through 2035 and 2040."	Need for conformity with statements at last bullet on page ES-9, and last para on ES-1 and same many other places in the document. RATIONALE: Consistency with many other like passages throughout the document.	Var.	ES-10, 1-1, 2-7	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
14	Exhibit 2-1 and Exhibit 2-2 and Exhibit 2-3, remove the name Ka' iwi just southwest of Makapu' u Point on the maps	Its placement on the Exhibit maps is incorrect. Correctly, Ka' iwi is the ocean channel between O' ahu and Moloka' i. And the coastal lands there from Makapu' u to Kokohead are often referred to as the "Ka' iwi Coast" or "Ka' iwi Scenic Shoreline". The coastal lands there were known as Wawamalu in earlier times (per Place Names of Hawaii; Pukui, Elbert, and Moookini). Notes: Wawamalu Ranch was on Bishop Estate land leased to Alan Davis until the tsunami of 1946. In yet earlier times the area was called Awawamalu.	Var.	2-5, 2-9, 2-24, 4-4	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
15	Change "Panoramic View" to " Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline Panoramic Views	Makes more sense. Accuracy and completeness and consistency with the description of Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline on page 3-9. As currently marked it only points to the State's so-designated space east of the Alan Davis wall. The use of the same name for two places is problematical.	Var.	2-9, 3-4, 3-9, 3-19	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
16	Change markings on Exhibits 2-2, 3-1, 3-3, 4-1 to show that Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline stretches from Koko Head to Makapu' u Head.	Accuracy and completeness and consistency with the description of Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline on page 3-9. As currently marked it only points to the State's so-designated space east of the Alan Davis wall. The use of the same name for two places is problematical.	Var.	2-9, 3-4, 3-9, 3-19	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
17	Exhibit 2-2, in the key at bottom of page show a plain arrow and explain as " Panoramic View points (general) "	Makes more sense.	2.2.1	2-9	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.	
18	Change second sentence of second bullet concerning Natural Landscape: "Limit vehicle operations which could cause degradation- Preclude, by installation of barriers, vehicular depredation to the dunes, vegetation, and beach at Wawamalu Beach."	Protect natural areas from vehicular depredation. Sustains/aligns with Policies and Guidelines for 3.1.2.5 Natural Resources and Preserves (page 5-20) "Implement management programs in areas where intense human activity threatens the sustainability of the resources."	Recommend change: "Limit <u>recreational</u> vehicle operations...". No change recommended for barriers (other solutions than barriers may apply).	3.1.2.2	3-9	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
19	Table 3-3, second column, under Nature Parks/ Preserves add a line for: <u>Wawamalu Beach Nature Park (acreage about 10)</u>	Long designated as "park" on city land use maps, this shoreline area bordered by Kalaniana' ole Highway and seven Davis Wall was even marked with City park signage until winter of '18-'19 (Do not Drive on the Beach, the prohibition signs forbidding animals, alcohol, vehicles, etc). And City Park's No Dumping signs still around there. Its natural dunes, native and other vegetation, beach rock and beach are severely in need of protection behind barricades (like boulders, old pilings, etc.). Besides these Nature Park features , at each end of this park land there are barren places that can be demarcated for much needed parking of recreational users of the coast. Aligns with words of final sentence of final paragraph on page 2-16, as well as many other like passages throughout the document. . " <u>Sustains/aligns with Policies and Guidelines</u> for 3.1.2.5 Natural Resources and Preserves (page 5-20): "Implement management programs in areas where intense human activity threatens the sustainability of the resources." <u>Sustains/aligns with Policies and Guidelines</u> for 3.2.3.1 Passive or Nature Parks (Page 5-22): "Provide educational and passive recreation opportunities to preserve the Kaiwi coast."	No change recommended. Wawamalu Beach is not currently designated as a City Beach Park by DPR and suggested improvement to Wawamalu Beach as a nature park is already in the plan text.	3.2.1	3-25	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
20	Change first line of first para to read: "East Honolulu's six seven ... Sandy Beach, <u>Wawamalu Beach Nature Park</u> , Kawaiku'i,..."	Resources and Preserves (page 5-20): "Implement management programs in areas where intense human activity threatens the sustainability of the resources."		3.2.1.3	3-27	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
21	<u>"Develop Wawamalu Beach Nature Park for demarcated parking and protected</u> natural dunes, native and other vegetation, beach rocks and beach."	<u>Sustains/aligns with Policies and Guidelines</u> for 3.2.3.1 Passive or Nature Parks (Page 5-22): "Provide educational and passive recreation opportunities to preserve the Kaiwi coast."		3.2.3.1	3-30	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
22	last para: State's Bike Plan Add last sentence: <u>"Coordinate with State to add signed, shared bike routes/roadways on Kalaniana'ole Highway from Lunalilo Home Road to Makapu'u that take advantage of State's scenic Maunaloa-Makapu'u Scenic Byway."</u>	Aligns this paragraph with dashed bike route on Exhibit 4-1 Bikeway System.	Change recommended: "A signed shared roadway is proposed along the Hawai'i Kai Drive-Kealahou Street corridor and along 'Anali'i Street and Po'olā Street. <u>Lunalilo Home Road to Makapu'u is recognized as a candidate for a shared-road shoulder bikeway. Such a bikeway would take advantage of the State's scenic Maunaloa-Makapu'u Scenic Byway."</u>	4.1.3	4-4	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.	
23	Add a third bullet to say: "• Sea level rise could reduce residential zones along the coastal and tidal zones of East Honolulu and this could mean serious disruption of existing, developed areas and reduced population capacity."	Refer to climate crisis forecasts of City's Office of Climate Change, Sustainability and Resiliency	5.6.2	5-9	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20	
24	fix typo in title of SEC 3.1: PRESERVATION	Recommend Change: "PRESERVATION"	5.7	5-17	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20	
25	Maintain Makai view channels along Kalaniana'ole Highway between Wai'alae and Koko Head Makapu' u.	Recommend Change: " Koko Head - Makapu'u "	5.7	5-18	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20	
26	3.1.2.2 Shoreline Areas: Insert a new block (topic): "Protect and maintain or recover distressed shoreline environments to encourage natural dunes, native vegetation, and natural shoreline rock formations and beach-particular in the corridor of the Maunalua Makapu'u State Scenic Byway. Purposes are to provide natural habitat for native animals and sealife as well as recreational areas for fishing, surfing, picnicking, walking, hiking and gazing."	Serves purposes above and provides natural barriers to shore erosion due to rising sea levels.	Change recommended. Add to the end of Natural Landscape bullet: "... <u>Work with the State on efforts to protect and maintain or recover distressed shoreline environments, encourage natural dunes, native vegetation, and natural shoreline rock formations.</u> "	5.7	3-10, 5-18	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
27	MAP 1,2,and 3, change markings on Map 1, 2, and 3 to show that Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline stretches from Koko Head to Makapu'u Head.	Accuracy and completeness and consistency with the description of Ka Iwi Scenic Shoreline on page 3-9. As currently marked it only points to the State's so-designated space east of the Alan Davis wall. The use of the same name for two places is problematical.	Recommend change on Appendix map labels to "Kaiwi <u>Coast</u> " and move label inland away from shoreline access arrow.	APX Maps	A-13, -15, -17	William Reese Liggett	5/28/20
28	This section, paragraph 3, still makes reference to an "uncompleted section of Hawaii Kai Drive in the Kamilo Nui Valley area" that is being proposed to be extended and completed. Completing the extension of Hawaii Kai Drive from the Kamilo Nui Valley area to the intersection of Hawaii Kai Drive and Lunalilo Home Road is no longer a project desired by the community, and therefore this paragraph should be deleted. The road extension was to benefit anticipated developments and was included in the 2008 Plan, but with neighborhoods now well established and fully built-out and Hawaii Kai slated for "aging in place," the desires of the community and neighborhoods have changed. Hawaii Kai Drive from Kalama Valley has had severe speeding problems, with drivers accelerating "to make the light" at the intersection of Hawaii Kai Drive and Lunalilo Home Road. This is an ongoing safety issue with multiple, repetitive accidents, involving both pedestrians and vehicles. The neighborhoods surrounding the proposed road extension are seeking an increased effort from the city to execute safe, walkable communities and are opposed to paving over green space or creating needless vehicle roads that unnecessarily increase our carbon footprint.	No change recommended. DPP prefers to keep options open if it is determined necessary at a later date.	4	4-2	HKNB	9/4/20	

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
29	Also under Glossary of Terms (Page A-4) Highways, Arterials, and Major Collector Streets there is the following conflicting statement. “The Public Facilities Map includes the connection of Hawaii Kai Drive through Kamilo Nui Valley only as a future bicycle lane as it appears in the O’ahu Bike Plan.” The community has no objection to completing this section as a bike path only. Bike access to Kamilo Nui Valley has existed for over 40 years. With the development of LeOlani homes an additional private road was established on the west end of the valley and has been providing pedestrian and bike access for the past 15 years. Bicyclists now do ‘the loop,’ entering from Lunalilo Home Road, through the Mariners Cove subdivision to Kamilo Nui Valley, and exiting past LeOlani homes (Keahole St., passing the HK Post Office) and vice versa. The community supports a dedicated bike lane on existing roads, reflecting the existing community usage.	No change recommended.	APX	A-4	HKNB	9/4/20
30	The Plan makes minimal reference to the Koko Crater Stables. Included is a statement: “Access to Recreation Facilities – Public recreation facilities should be available to users of all skill levels and incomes, particularly Koko Crater Stables.” Also, 3.4.1 Historic and Cultural Resources, Overview (Page 3-39) “The farms at Kamilo Nui Valley and Koko Head as well as the Koko Head Stables retain the historic legacy of the area and should be perpetuated.”	Recommend change to bullet under 3.2.3.2 Access to Recreation Facilities – “Public recreation facilities should be available to users of all skill levels and incomes, particularly Koko Crater Stables <u>to continue horseback riding for public recreational use</u> .”	3.2.3.2, 3.4.1	3-30, & -39	HKNB	9/4/20
31	The Plan should include a statement that supports the continuation of the horse-riding stables into the future. For example, “To perpetuate East Honolulu’s paniolo history, continue the preservation of the Koko Crater horse-riding stable for public recreational use, and for all levels of riders.”	.”	3.2.3.2	3-30, & -39	HKNB	9/4/20
32	Note: There is considerably more discussion of the Botanical Gardens in this current plan with barely any mention of the stables. This is not consistent with the community’s expressed desire to maintain the stables and restore the original riding trails.	No change recommended.	3.2.3.2	3-30, & -39	HKNB	9/4/20
33	Remove the sentence from the top of page 3-30 that reads: “Protect the fragile topography of Koko Crater by restricting recreational uses such as horseback riding to areas apart from the conservation plant collections.” Riding trails within the botanical gardens could be utilized with the existence of a shared use agreement that includes a plan for well-marked trails and agreement that any horse droppings are cleaned daily by the stables crew. A shared use plan with community input should be developed for the stables and the botanical garden. The co-existence of the horseback riding stables and botanical gardens has endured for decades and proper planning and management to resurrect trail riding beyond the stables is warranted. (The crater consists of 200 acres while the Botanical Gardens use only approximately 60 acres.)	No change recommended, language is from DPR.	3.2.3.1	3-29	HKNB	9/4/20
34	A strong statement also needs to be included that “continues to maintain” Koko Crater Stables for the community’s use in future decades.	Recommended change from line 31. “ <u>...to continue horseback riding for public recreational use</u> .”	3.2.3.1	3-29	HKNB	9/4/20
35	Request that the viewshed map from the previous plan, Figure 2-4 Koko Head – Makapuu Viewshed, remain in the revised plan in support of preserving the scenic value of the Koko Head – Makapuu Viewshed.	No change. Figure 2-4 (1999) is now Exhibit 2-2 and has been renamed. The map has been expanded upon. Protecting significant views is still an important element of the Plan.	2.2.3		HKNB	9/4/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
36	Guidelines pertaining to shoreline areas are listed below the section: 4th bullet, Lateral shoreline access, needs to include Portlock and not just Maunaloa Bay to Wai'alaie Beach Park.	Recommend change to Lateral Access bullet – "Improve, protect, and maintain lateral shoreline access along reaches of the beach from Koko Kai Beach Park to Wai'alaie Beach Park. "	3.1.2.2		HKNB	9/4/20
37	The community has expressed the desire to keep the following statement in the plan: "...pursue opportunities to acquire additional pedestrian rights-of-way from the highway to the shoreline in sections which have high recreational value but no similar public access within at least a quarter-mile."	No change. Guideline is still intended to maintain and improve public access.	3.1.2.2	3-10		9/4/20
38	Include the words "long-term apartment rentals" in the second paragraph on page 3-53 on the Hawaii Kai Towne Center. The sentence should read "Enhance the Hawaii Kai Towne Center as a focus of activity by offering a greater diversity of uses potentially including long-term apartment rentals, public uses, and indoor small to medium-sized service-industrial establishments." Set a cap on apartment rentals if permitted, so as not to adversely impact commercial opportunities. Any redevelopment of the Center buildings should continue to be limited to the current, low level heights to protect the established view-sheds.	Recommend change: "Enhance the Hawaii Kai Towne Center as a focus of activity by offering a greater diversity of uses potentially including <u>long-term</u> apartment rentals, public uses, and indoor small- to medium-sized service-industrial establishments."	3.6.3	3-53	HKNB	9/4/20
39	Page 3-53, under Resorts and Institutional, there is a sentence that says "If redeveloped, the resort area in Kahala needs to take into account the projected impacts of climate change and sea level rise over the length of the building's lifespan." It goes on to limit building heights to 60 feet for institutional use and 70 feet for Resort use.	No change recommended. The passage is recommending not increasing existing zoning heights.	3.6.3	3-53	HKNB	9/4/20
40	Include a similar statement in the Planning Guidelines for the Regional Town Center noting that if redevelopment occurs, the projected impacts of climate change and sea level rise should be accounted for and building heights should continue to be limited to the current, low level heights.	No change. The Plan is not proposing changing the existing zoning height limits.	3.6.3	3-53	HKNB	9/4/20
41	The Board of Water Supply's Watershed Management Plan is minimally referenced in the EHSCP Revised, as the Watershed Management Plan has not yet been completed. Both Plans should be compatible and reference each other. As the Board of Water Supply's Watershed Plan is due out soon, perhaps the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan, Revised should be delayed.	Comment noted, no change needed. The DPP and BWS have been coordinating through both processes. DPP will continue to work with BWS to ensure alignment of the Plans but does not agree with delaying this SCP.			HKNB	9/4/20
42	Concerns were raised over the following two bullets as these proposals did not originate with the East Honolulu community.	See below.	3.2.3.2	3-30	HKNB	9/4/20
43	The first bullet, "Expansion – Expand Sandy Beach Park to include Golf Course 5 and 6 properties, thereby increasing East Honolulu's active recreation areas." The previous plan specified: "Expand the Koko Head Regional Park boundary to include Golf Course 5 and 6 properties, thereby increasing East Honolulu's active recreation areas." The plan now calls for expanding Sandy Beach Park. The following statement should be inserted to clarify development issues: "A mix of low and medium intensity uses are envisioned with respect to the Ka Iwi scenic shoreline and the Makapu'u – Maunaloa Scenic Byway." Avoid the use of the terms "Golf course 5 and 6 properties" to refer to the open space across from Sandy Beach as the terms are no longer relevant and are confusing to those in the community who are unaware of their history. We recommend changing the statement to: "Expand Koko Head Regional Park boundary to include the open space/preservation lands (once slated for Golf Courses 5 and 6), thereby increasing East Honolulu's active recreation areas."	Recommend change to first bullet: "Expansion – Expand Sandy Beach Park <u>Koko Head Regional Park boundary</u> to include <u>the open space/preservation lands mauka of Kalaniana'ole Highway (previously known as Golf Courses 5 and 6) properties</u> , thereby increasing East Honolulu's active recreation areas.	3.2.3.2	3-30	HKNB	9/4/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
44	The fifth bullet, "Picnic Amenities – Provide amenities and service facilities to accommodate 'tailgate' picnics in parking areas for sporting events, including shading canopy trees within the parking lot as well as nearby picnic tables and outdoor grills." Where are such amenities to be included? The statement is vague and should be made more specific and/or descriptive. We are also concerned about the use of outdoor grills anywhere along the Ka Iwi Coast due to periodic seasonal wildfires. If the grills are intended for the Koko Head Regional Park, please reference the Park's Master Plan.	Recommend deletion of fifth bullet: Picnic Amenities – Provide amenities and service facilities to accommodate "tailgate" picnics in parking areas for sporting events, including shading canopy trees within the parking lot as well as nearby picnic tables and outdoor grills. Defer to DPR to determine appropriate siting of facilities.	3.2.3.2	3-30	HKNB	9/4/20
45	"The primary use of all lands designated as agriculture is that they should be open, agriculture uses, or uses directly supportive of the agriculture industry." The use of the term "agriculture industry" could be used to promote agri-tourism or agricultural industry (leading to brick and mortar buildings) – all such uses are NOT appropriate for these lands and could potentially create conflicts because residential communities closely border the farmlands. Change the sentence to read "... or uses directly supportive of agriculture and farming."	No change recommended. Agriculture uses are defined by the LUO.	2.2.1.1	2-10	HKNB	9/4/20
46	A statement needs to be included in this section that acknowledges the current location of the wastewater treatment plant, and any other septic systems and cesspools in the area, that would be impacted by sea level rise and climate change.	Recommend change. Add bullet: "<u>Water Quality - Reduce groundwater contamination that could be exacerbated by climate change and sea level rise through cesspool conversion and wastewater system improvements in East Honolulu.</u>"	4.3.5	4-15	HKNB	9/4/20
47	The statement in the first box states: "Improve management and enforcement of regulations relating to the operation of transient vacation units (TVUs) in residential neighborhoods." The community strongly objects to TVUs in the Hawaii Kai area or in regional town shopping centers.	Comment noted. No change needed.	3.5.2	3-45, 5-27	HKNB	9/4/20
48	We continue to request different photos be used for the cover of the Revised Plan as the current photos are not indicative of the East Honolulu Community. We are collaborating with Neighborhood Board #2 on photos more representative of our community for your consideration.	No change. No alternate photos have been received by DPP.	Cover	Cover	HKNB	9/4/20
49	Comments Regarding Kuliouou					
50	The reviewers support the concerns of the Kuli'ou'ou-Kalani Iki Neighborhood Board #2 that Tax Map Key 3-8-013-001 property was shown as outside the Community Growth Boundary (Urban Community Boundary) in the 1999 version of the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan and is now shown as inside the Community Growth Boundary in the Revised Plan. We agree with the Kuli'ou'ou-Kalani Iki neighborhood that the property should remain outside the Community Growth Boundary in the Revised Plan and be made part of the Kuli'ou'ou Forest Reserve. It is a concern that property designations could be so easily changed from one version of the Plan to the next without community input. This particular change would impact the Kuli'ou'ou-Kalani Iki neighborhood, and particularly existing residences on Kaeleloi Place, by allowing additional residential units to be built on a mountain slope of approximately 32 degrees without the community's input.	General comment noted. No change needed. The Community Growth Boundary as depicted in the Plan is not intended to be parcel specific.	2	2-5, -8	HKNB	9/4/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
51	I believe ALL of Kalapa o Maua (Paiko Ridge) should be protected from all development for generations to come. The two parcels that make up the majority of Kalapa o Maua (TMK: 3-8-013-001 and TMK: 3-8-014-001) have been the subject of development controversy for many years now. The threat of rock fall liability and unsuccessful negotiations with the land owners have delayed the permanent protection of these two parcels.	General comment noted.			Various	Aug-20
52	This 'aina needs to be completely zoned as preservation. The East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan (EHSCP), the plan that guides appropriate development in East Honolulu, is being revised.	General comment noted.			Various	Aug-20
53	The Community Growth Boundary in the EHSCP, the boundary that guides future development in East Honolulu, once established, will remain fixed through 2040. It is vital that the revised EHSCP protect ALL of Paiko Ridge, including that portion on the Paiko Ridge West Kuli'ou'ou valley wall currently identified within the State Urban District, by placing this section outside of the Community Growth Boundary. It is critical that this section be immediately protected as it is the current focus of the land owner's development plans. Until we, the community, can navigate our way through the many issues that surround this beautiful mountain, we must remain vigilant in protecting the policies pertaining to development in East Honolulu.	Comment noted.			Various	Aug-20
54	1. The State Urban District section of Paiko Ridge (TMK: 3-8-013-001) be excluded from the Community Growth Boundary and identified with red marking as illustrated in the revised East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan, Exhibit 2-1: Community Growth Boundary.	Comment noted.			Various	Aug-20
55	2. In Table 2-1: Potential Housing Within CGB on Lands Zoned for Residential Use in the revised East Honolulu Communities Plan, remove the row containing "Kuli'ou'ou" under the "Project Area" column; remove "8" under the "Possible Units" column; and remove "Large Vacant Lot" under the "Description" column. The area for these units will be changed to be outside the Community Growth Boundary.	Comment noted.			Various	Aug-20
56	3. Denial of Subdivision Application 2018/SUB-171, the application requesting the 4.12 acres be subdivided out from TMK: 3-8-013-001. I support that TMK: 3-8-013-001 remain fully intact and that it be acquired by the Department of Land and Natural Resources to be added to the existing Kuli'ou'ou Forest Reserve. The following Supreme Court rulings have maintained that a County's Development Plan carries the weight, force and the effect of law: 1. Lum Yip Kee v. City & County of Honolulu, 70 Haw.179, 767 P.2d 815 (1989), at 817-818 2. GATRI v. Blane, 88 Hawaii 108,962 P.2d367 (1998), at 374 3. Save Sunset Beach Coalition v. City & County of Honolulu, 102 Haw 465, 78 P.3d 1 (2003), at 18 4. Leone v. County of Maui, 128 Hawaii 183,284 P.3d 956 (Haw.App. 2012)	No change. In GATRI, the SMA permit, which implements the plans, is the regulatory tool which was guided by the policy of the plans. Sunset Beach was about zoning, which is regulatory, is what implements the policy of the plans. The Plan never claims to be arbitrary as Lum Yip Kee, the earliest of the cases cited, attempted to. Both in GATRI and Lum Yip Kee, the development plans were guided by Charter which describes them as "relatively detailed schemes" Charter §5-409. Today's Charter and Plans no longer claims this, instead the Plan "which shall not be detailed, in the manner of zoning maps" Charter §6-1509.			Various	Aug-20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
57	Thus, I do not agree with the Department of Permitting and Planning's comments on the Planning Commission's Deferral response approval (with conditions) of the Subdivision application to subdivide this section of TMK: 3-8-013-001. This conflicts directly with the East Honolulu Sustainable Communities Plan and is the first-step for continued expansion onto undeveloped, sloped valley wall areas.	Comment noted. 2018/SUB-171 expired 9/27/20 without conditions of deferral being met.			Various	Aug-20
58	I humbly ask for your assistance with these 3 very important issues. The State Urban District section of TMK: 3-8-013-001 resides on a steep mountain slope of approximately 32 degrees and exists directly above 20 existing residential homes on Kaelelo Place. I believe this area is not safe for development, and should be zoned preservation.	Comment noted. No change. The EHSCP is not recommending downzoning lands.			Various	Aug-20
59	I am writing in opposition to building in Kuliouou Valley because of the impact on traffic on Elelupe Rd and Lower Kuliouou Rd. We already have been impacted by monster homes when elderly home owners have sold their property. Many have been replaced the old home and yard with "monster" home with very limited parking on their property. Cars are being parked on the street; drivers have to weave between parked cars like Kuliouou Rd. If more homes are being planned in Kuliouou Valley, it will definitely impact an already congested street.	General comment noted.			Elsie Ota	8/7/20
60	I can barely reverse out of my driveway with the parked cars on street. I can't imagine reversing out of my driveway when additional homes are built in Kuliouou Valley. If each new home has at least 2 cars, this could mean 40 or more cars, using Elelupe and Kuliouou Rds. I think It is unfair that residents on Elelupe Road have to redesign their driveway to accommodate the additional homes in valley. Who pays for redesigning/improving the driveway or the accidents that could result from the additional cars? Unlike Aina Haina, Niu Valley and Hawaii Kai, Kuliouou was not planned for expansion, so the both Elelupe and Kuliouou Rds. are like side streets and not the main street in those valleys.	General comment noted.			Elsie Ota	8/7/20
61	If homes are being built on a steep slope, the department should also check on Hoana Place in Aina Haina. The steep road is filled with pot holes that were caused by construction trucks with heavy equipment and materials, driving up and down the street. With support from State Representative Hashem the pot holes have been temporarily repaired. However with a terrible rain storm the pot holes recur. Building in Kuliouou Valley on a steep slope will probably have similar pot hole issues, especially during the rainy season/flooding. In addition any development in the valley will impact Elelupe Rd and Lower Kuliouou Rd when heavy equipment trucks, construction materials, etc. are transported to and from the site. If there are any damages of the street, who will repair them, how promptly will they be repaired, etc.	No change. There are already rules and regulations in place that construction vehicles that damage roadways are responsible for repairs as approved in part of construction management plans.			Elsie and Mechthild Ota	8/7/20
62	It has been brought to my attention that someone is trying to build 21 homes in the Kuliouou Valley.	General comment noted.	-	-	Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
63	My in-laws have lived on Elelupe Rd since 1945 and have observed many changes. In recent years many old time residents have passed away and their children have sold their homes. This resulted in many "Monster homes" being built and many people having rentals, whose residents have to park on the road. This complicates getting in and out of the owner's property.	General comments noted.	-	-	Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
64	Kuliouou Rd is highly congested, as the properties are smaller and more people live there. As there is no space on their properties, residents are forced to park on the road. Take a drive to Kuliouou Valley using Kuliouou Rd and you'll experience a tightly congested road. Cars parked on both sides of the road, which forces drivers to stop and go in order to let other cars go by. Now picture this with heavy trucks and equipment going up and down this narrow street! It would be a nightmare for residents and the workers. Just the thought of this will make you Shake your head and say: "NO!"	General comments noted.	-	-	Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
65	Consider 21 homes being constructed using Kuliouou Rd and Elelupe Rd as access to the valley. These roads will be severely damaged. The neighbors will be impacted by excessive traffic, dust, dirt and noise.	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
66	In the 70s several homes, which had been built in the valley slipped, due to rain and other factors.	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
67	I have lived at Hoana PI for 42 years and had similar issues with neighbors making improvements, as well as two homes being constructed on a property which used to be zoned as conservation.	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
68	If you take the time to Google Search landslides in Kuliouou you will find numerous documents validating our concerns. Kuliouou Valley should remain conservation zoned without any opportunities to develop the area. In addition, the question of the development moving on top to the hill, facing the Holy Trinity area is also of concern .	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
69	Too much has been built in East Honolulu in recent times, and must be stopped!	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
70	7000 Hawaii Kai Drive was built without anyone knowing that a permit had been given for this so called affordable housing project. There are no units available. All of them have been sold, but not at the "affordable" rate advertised.	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
71	There is enough high priced housing in East Honolulu, and we don't want any more!	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
72	The traffic on Kalaniana'ole Hwy into town in the morning is a problem also. How about all of the water main breaks we've heard about recently? The infrastructure is lacking to accommodate more building.	General comment noted. Permits will not be granted to projects without assurances of adequate infrastructure.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
73	It seems that developers are all about making money fast. They don't care about what happens when the homes are built and the problems begin to show. East Honolulu properties are sought after at high price. WE DO NOT WANT ANY MORE DEVELOPMENT IN THIS AREA!	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
74	Protect Kuliouou Valley! Preserve the beauty of our valley for our children and grandchildren. The zoning must be CONSERVATION! CLOSED TO ANY AND ALL BUILDING!	General comment noted.			Mechthild Ota	8/18/20
75	Please find attached Figure 2-1 of the Urban Community Boundary (UCB) from the 1999 EHSCP. Also attached is Exhibit 2-1 of the Community Growth Boundary (CGB) from DPP's published revised EHSCP. There is a huge discrepancy between the two which has major development implications for the Kuli'ou'ou area.	No change. The slight change in the UCB was made to reflect existing zoning. The 1999 EHSCP boundary would demand a downzoning which was never the intent. Moreover, there was never a formal boundary interpretation made of the property. There are no development implications from the revised Plan as the land is already entitled with zoning. The maps are only intended to be conceptual.			Waipa Parker	8/16/20
76	First, Figure 2-1 of the 1999 EHSCP clearly shows the State Urban District area of TMK: 3-8-013-0001, which is mauka of Kaelelo'i Place, to be outside of the UCB. Please refer to the area in the red circle on the attachment. The area is a darker gray color and is referred to in the map legend as "Areas Outside Urban Community Boundary but Within State Urban District". Exhibit 2-1 of DPP's revised EHSCP shows that this area is NO LONGER outside of the CGB. Please also refer to the red circle on that attachment. Those areas which are outside, are now marked with red color and is referred to in the map legend as "Areas Outside of the CGB but Within State Urban District". However, there is no red marking identifying the aforementioned State Urban District section as outside the CGB.	No change. The 1999 map is also intended to be conceptual. This is a misinterpretation of the 1999 map which is only intended to acknowledge the differences between State and City designation/zoning.			Waipa Parker	8/16/20
77	This is a very troubling discrepancy. The 1999 EHSCP clearly identifies this section as an area that is NOT to be developed on. Now, the revised EHSCP does not display this. The result is that development of this area is possible. And because of that, this is indicated in new Table 2-1 of the revised EHSCP, (as you verified with me earlier via phone). Please note: I do see the "new" disclaimer stating that the map on Exhibit 2-1 is for illustrative purposes only. However, the red marking should still be illustrated in this area.	No change. The 1999 map is also intended to be conceptual. This is a misinterpretation of the 1999 map which is only intended to acknowledge the differences between State and City designation/zoning.			Waipa Parker	8/16/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
78	Just so you are aware, this section is literally the side of a mountain with a steep slope of approximately 32 degrees that has been identified by the U.S. Geological Survey as an area containing Vertisol soils. The property boundary of this area is extremely small going upwards, and spreads (mauka to makai) directly above 20 existing residential homes on Kaelelo Place. Ground disturbance from development of this area threatens all these homes and puts the safety of the Kaelelo Place neighborhood at undue risk. This area has been the subject of contentious development attempts in the recent past in which the Community has voiced their opposition numerous times.	No change. The Plan already encourages preservation of steep slopes from development. Page 2-6 says inclusion of lands within the CBG with unstable soils should not be developed in ways that exacerbate their hazards.			Waipa Parker	8/16/20
79	Please provide a response regarding this discrepancy. There are many community members who are very concerned about this issue. Numerous testimonials have already been submitted, with much more to follow. We are also extremely concerned that DPP is rushing this process during a time when public comment at required hearings is difficult to coordinate and plan due to the current COVID-19 Pandemic. We feel that because of these unprecedented times, consideration should be extended to the public and the process should be put on hold. If you are not the person who can help with this, please forward this email to the person who can. If you have any questions, please reply to this email and I will get back with you as soon as possible. I look forward to your response.	Comment noted, no change. There have been two delays in the public review process to allow for more comments. The first was for the PRD, originally scheduled to end in June 2019, extended to December 2019. The Proposed Revised Plan, published in April 2020, was originally scheduled to go to the Planning Commission in July 2020, and extended to September. The Plan revision is likely not the appropriate tool to preserve an area that is already entitled with some residential zoning.			Waipa Parker	8/16/20
80	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
81	incorrect comma usage line 3, delete comma after "should follow"	Recommend change as noted.	¶1	ES-8	HKNB	9/4/20
82	subject/verb disagreement 1st sentence, "the purpose of ... are"	Recommend change as noted.	¶4		HKNB	9/4/20
83	line 5, insert "the" before "need to provide"	Recommend change as noted.	2.1.2 ¶1	2-3	HKNB	9/4/20
84	line 9, change "have" to <u>has</u>	Recommend change as noted.	3.1.2.2, ¶1	3-8	HKNB	9/4/20
85	line 7, change "that was" to <u>which was</u>	Recommend change as noted.	Kaiwi Sce	3-9	HKNB	9/4/20
86	line 8, delete comma after "and"	Recommend change as noted.			HKNB	9/4/20
87	line 14, delete comma after "Shoreline"	Recommend change as noted.			HKNB	9/4/20
88	line 3, insert comma after "erodes"	Recommend change as noted.	Vegetatio	3-10	HKNB	9/4/20
89	line 7, change "uses" to <u>use</u>	Recommend change as noted.	¶1	3-13	HKNB	9/4/20
90	line 4, change "purposes" to <u>purpose</u>	Recommend change as noted.	Kaiwi Ma	3-18	HKNB	9/4/20
91	line 1, Unclear, word missing?- "Major channelized <u>_(what)_?___ and"</u>	Recommend change: "Major channelized and <u>unchannelized...</u> ".	Streams	3-24	HKNB	9/4/20
92	last sentence, subject/verb disagreement "location are"	Should be locations.	3.2.1 Overview		HKNB	9/4/20
93	line 1, references Koko Head Park Master Plan then refers to it as a "report" rather than plan	Recommend change to "plan".	¶2	3-26	HKNB	9/4/20
94	5th bullet, line 2, insert " <u>avoid</u> " between "and" & "the" to clarify	Recommend change as noted.	3.2.2	3-28	HKNB	9/4/20
95	line 3, change "privately" to <u>private</u>	Recommend change as noted.	¶3	3-33	HKNB	9/4/20
96	Last sentence, Unclear, word missing? "These <u>_(what)_?___ include"</u>	Recommend: these include , "particularly at...".	¶3	3-38	HKNB	9/4/20
97	lines 1, 2, 5 Inconsistent capitalization for "heiau"	Recommend change. Should be lower case except for names.	¶2	3-40	HKNB	9/4/20
98	line 5, "line of site" change to <u>sight</u>	Recommend change as noted.			HKNB	9/4/20
99	3rd bullet, remove underline marking after "maintain"	Change made.	3.4.2	3-41	HKNB	9/4/20
100	1st bullet, "only for those features <u>for which</u> the State ... has recommended such treatment."	Recommend change as noted.	3.4.3		HKNB	9/4/20

Line	Written Comment	DPP Response	Section	Page #	Reviewer	Date Rec.
101	line 1, subject/verb disagreement (“development...are”) recommend inserting changes from between “While” and “the”	Recommend change as noted.	¶3	3-43	HKNB	9/4/20
102	line 2, Remove brackets around “Water Resource	Recommend change as noted.	¶3	4-9	HKNB	9/4/20
103	lines 3 & 4, Unclear, word missing? “and causes ____ (what)? ____ and mixing”	Remove “and causes”.	4.3.3, ¶3	4-14	HKNB	9/4/20
104	last entry, line 1, change “of” to <u>for</u> , “shall account <u>for</u> “	Recommend change as noted.	4.4.1	4-17	HKNB	9/4/20
105	line 3, awkward sentence, change “during what type of disaster it will open for.” to <u>what types of disasters it provides shelter for.</u>	Change made.	¶3	4-26	HKNB	9/4/20
106	change “Develop” to <u>Developing</u> - grammar consistency	Recommend change as noted.	7th bullet	5-1	HKNB	9/4/20
107	line 5, change “provision” to <u>provide</u> - grammar consistency	Recommend change as noted.	5.1 ¶1		HKNB	9/4/20
108	line 3, change “pays” to <u>pay</u> - grammar	Change made.	¶2	5-3	HKNB	9/4/20
109	line 3, insert comma after “services”	Recommend change as noted.	5.4 ¶2		HKNB	9/4/20
110	title, Change “PRESEVATION” to <u>PRESERVATION</u>	Recommend change as noted.	SEC 3.1	5-17	HKNB	9/4/20
111	Cites “ROH” both in description and Program column, but ROH not included in abbreviations listing	Recommend change as noted.	4th entry	5-18	HKNB	9/4/20
112	USFS cited as Agency implementer but not in listing	Recommend change as noted.	last entry	5-20	HKNB	9/4/20
113	SUP cited under Program, not in listing	Recommend change as noted.	1st entry	5-24	HKNB	9/4/20
114	3rd line description “those features <u>that</u> the Officer	Recommend change as noted.	last entry	5-25	HKNB	9/4/20
115	has recommended”/ should be <u>for which</u>	Recommend change as noted.			HKNB	9/4/20
116	Agency column reads SHD change to <u>SHPD</u>	Recommend change as noted.			HKNB	9/4/20
117	Agency column reads OCCST, should it be OCCSR?	Recommend change as noted.	3rd entry	5-31	HKNB	9/4/20
118	Shouldn’t Kahala Elem. be listed too?	No change recommended.	Elem. Sch	A-8	HKNB	9/4/20
119	Other DPP Housekeeping Measures					
120	A park symbol was erroneously added since the PRD to demonstrate the City's intent to preserve the land. However, the park symbol reflects a different use that was not intended to be shown, and is recommended to be removed.	Recommend Change. Remove previously added park symbol at Aina Haina Nature Preserve.	Map A-1	A-13	DPP	