

Name: Mark Hyde

Agenda Items: C. 2. Section 2.2 Safe Livable Communities for All and C. 3. A Complete, Balanced and Connected Transportation System

Received: 12/7/2022 via [wearesouthmaui@mauicounty.gov](mailto:wearesouthmaui@mauicounty.gov)

### Testimony for December 14, 2022 CPAC Meeting

Here are my thoughts on the Agenda + earlier subjects/ the overall draft plan posted to the website.

**First, I think it would be very instructive for CPAC to revisit the specifics of what the next plan is to include (and forgive me if you have already done so). See Maui County Code 2.80B.070.E.**

For instance, see item 1 under E, which reads:

1. A **statement of the major problems and opportunities** concerning the needs and development of the community plan area."

New plan development usually begins here, first by describing, succinctly, expansively and with complete candor, the current situation, then comparing it to the desired state. Next, strategies and plans are developed to bridge gaps identified. In my view, the current draft falls short of this.

Some problems, by example, that are evident to me but not addressed in the South Maui Toady chapter (beginning at page 22) are:

**Water availability** - for existing and projected growth in the face of persistent drought, a desert environment, thousands of development permits already approved including final buildout of Wailea and Makena Resorts, the R&T Park, potentially Honua'ula, + new claims on existing water supplies that may emerge from upcountry deficits. Also, recent mayoral debates raised the possibility of interconnecting water sources so other areas of the island, particularly upcountry, could gain access to much needed but limited water resources. This might affect water resource allocation to South Maui. Also, consider the creation of newly approved local water authorities which could upend current assumptions about water distribution and prioritization. In light of this, water should be high on the list of issues to be addressed, particularly given the tremendous amount of water relied upon and guzzled by the Wailea Resort area, soon to be joined by Makena Resort. Should we just assume that water will remain in abundant supply? That the larger community will be content with the current state? Not to my mind.

While transportation issues are mentioned in the draft, nowhere that I saw is there acknowledgement that **HDOT has assigned Service Level D designation to this essential (versus incidental) roadway**. It has had this designation for some time now, and anyone who drives the highway can attest that this grade is well earned. Furthermore, we know that literally thousands of units of new development have already been approved for south Maui, not to mention the soon to be opened Kihei High School, perhaps more commercial development along

the highway (e.g., the Pi'ilani Promenade parcels,) etc. Can this be brushed aside? Should we be content with the possibility of another major highway being constructed above the current *mauka* growth boundary. No. If such a highway is to be built, when? The Maui County Code requires the community plan update to address the next 20 years. Is it reasonable to assume an upper highway will be operable soon? No way. Maybe not even in my lifetime. (Think Ohau rail line.)

I also believe it would be useful and instructive in this early section to review action items contained in the existing KMCP and to note items unaddressed 25 years later. I say instructive for two reasons. First, the inability of the county to implement area community plans is a key reason things are in the state they are in. **Second, because so many items in the current community plan have not been achieved, CPAC should be wary of embracing loose assumptions and platitudes in the next plan iteration.** The fact is (worth noting as a "major problem") county government has not been able to implement community plans. Local case in point - the Collector road, one of the key deliverables identified in the 1998 plan.

**This leads to a comment specific to the 12/7 Agenda.** I encourage use of outcome oriented language to describe what needs to be done. "Shoulds" are unenforceable. An example of a clear directive is found at 2.2.29, "Prohibit new gated communities." No wiggle room.

Finally, I'd like to comment on discussion of the Pi'ilani Promenade property at page 92. I am very familiar with this property. Through South Maui Citizens for Responsible Growth, I and others challenged and prevailed before the state LUC to prevent what would have been an unapproved large retail shopping center developed at this site. At the time, one quarter of the property in the back was designated for 250 affordable housing, so by accepting a land use here that converts both rear parcels to housing but leaves retail in the front you will enable the owner basically to do that which was denied by the LUC - to build a massive retail shopping center complex fronting Pi'ilani Highway. The evidence at trial confirmed that a retail shopping center presence at this location would significantly increase traffic on Pi'ilani Highway due to the nature of retail shoppers coming and going at all hours of the day and evening. If, instead, you allow retail presence *to serve those living in the surrounding neighborhoods* (not attracting highway travelers to fast food restaurants, visitor-oriented shopping, etc.), then perch retail away from the highway and within adjacent housing. This would be akin to the approach taken by the R&T Park, where retail is allowed off the highway, buried in the development to serve locals, not wooing traffic off the highway. In do doing, Pi'ilani is spared the burden of additional traffic while creating a sense of place within. Not so if on the highway.

Mark Hyde  
4320 E. Waiola Loop  
Wailea, Hawaii