Mr. Roy R. Takemoto, Chairman  
Environmental Quality Commission  
550 Halekauwila Street, Room 301  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. Takemoto:

Based on the recommendation of the Office of Environmental Quality Control, I am pleased to accept the environmental impact statement for the Moanalua Community Library and site selection as a satisfactory fulfillment of the requirements of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes.

This environmental impact statement will be a useful tool in deciding whether this project should be allowed to proceed. My acceptance of the statement is an affirmation of its adequacy under applicable laws and does not constitute an endorsement of the proposal.

When the decision is made regarding this action, I expect the proposing agency to carefully weigh the societal benefits against the environmental impact which will likely occur. This impact is adequately described in the statement, and, together with the comments made by reviewers, provides a useful analysis of alternatives to the proposed action.

With warm personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

George R. Ariyoshi

cc: Honorable Hideo Murakami
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CHAPTER 1: SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Department of Education, State of Hawaii proposed the construction of a community library to service the Salt Lake-Moanalua Valley area. The Moanalua Community Library project involves the determination of potential sites for the library and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The individual selected sites were evaluated and probable impacts were assessed fully in order to determine the best possible site for this future library.

BACKGROUND: The Moanalua community has expressed its interest in having its own library for many years. Presently, a bookmobile services the area every two weeks. In recent years the rapid growth of the adjacent areas of the Salt Lake, Aliamanu and Foster Village have added greater emphasis to the communities library needs.

At this time the Office of Library Services utilizes both population and distance from existing library facilities as criteria to determine whether a community qualifies for a new library. This criteria is explained in matrix form and entitled the "Capital Improvement Program Priority System," (1982). A community qualifies for a new library based on this criteria if there are no other libraries within two

1-1
miles and the community population is 20,000 people or greater.

The Moanalua, Salt Lake, Aliamanu, and Foster Village areas have a combined population of over 40,000 residents. This more than satisfies the population criteria and the nearest existing libraries are in Aiea and Kalihi, both four miles away. These distances also qualify the community for a new library.

LOCATION OF THE PROJECT AREA: The library service area will include Salt Lake, Aliamanu, Moanalua, Foster Village and Military housing areas (See Exhibit A and B). The center of the project area is the Salt Lake area.

SITE SELECTION: The service area has sixteen (16) potential sites that were chosen based upon the "Guidelines for Selecting Public Library Sites" (See Chapter 3). Exhibit F illustrates where these potential sites (A-0) are in the community. These sixteen sites were then evaluated against the "Minimum Site Criteria," in Chapter 5, and a list of six (6) alternative sites (1-6) resulted (See Exhibit F).

EXISTING CONDITIONS: All six alternative sites were vacant. These sites were described according to a complete list of criteria in Chapter 5. The existing conditions description included; a general site description, minimum site con-
ditions, functional conditions, utility and support services, environmental conditions, government regulatory considerations, and cost considerations. (The criteria used for this description is fully explained in Chapter 4).

LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS: All six sites are designated urban. Chapter 7 of the EIS provides an overview of the existing land use plans, policies and controls for the project. The specifics of each site's designations are discussed site-by-site in Chapter 8.

EVALUATION OF THE ALTERNATIVE SITES: All six sites were evaluated to determine the potential impacts that may result because of the proposed project. Chapter 4 laid out the site selection planning criteria that was used as the basis of this evaluation. A rating of good, fair, or poor was used to compare each site.

A summary of this evaluation is published in Chapter 9. It reveals that none of the six sites will pose any major environmental impacts. All sites are environmentally suitable for the siting of a library. However, the criteria analyzes cost considerations and optimum standards, as well as environmental impacts. Therefore, several of the sites are clearly more desirable than the others.

RESULTS: Two of the sites are better siting choices for the proposed library. These include Site "1" and "4" as shown
on Exhibit F. Site "4" is closest to the activity center and population center of the community, as well as being a site that may perhaps be obtained at no cost.

Development of the library on sites "1" and "4" will not cause any major impacts. Development on Sites "2," "3," and "6" will require more funds for acquisition. Sites 3 and 6 are park land and must be approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation. Site "5" is the least desirable site for development due to its distance from the center of the community, association with Nimitz Highway and its incompatible industrial designation.

State and County land use designations permit the development of the library on all sites. Impacts normally associated with construction projects on vacant sites such as employment, noise, and dust pollution, etc. will be created. However, these impacts are considered minor and are not anticipated to pose any permanent problems.
CHAPTER 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The Department of Education, State of Hawaii proposes the construction of a community library to service the Salt Lake-Moanalua Valley area as shown in Exhibit A. This library is proposed to help meet the Department of Education, Office of Library Services' goal of:

Providing for the information needs of the people of Hawaii. The library program endeavors to offer comprehensive library resources and services, place adequate free library services within the reach of every resident and visitor of the State and otherwise further the interest of the State and its people through library services.

In order to reach the long-range goal, the Office of Library Services has established a program of building new libraries and renovation and maintenance of existing libraries. Included as part of the long-range plans is the construction of a library to service the Salt Lake-Moanalua Valley area.
2.2 LOCATION OF THE PROJECT AREA

The library service area will include Salt Lake, Aliamanu, Moanalua, Foster Village and military housing areas. The center of the service area is the Salt Lake area (See Exhibit B: Service Area Map; pg. 2-6).
2.3 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

A. **Technical**: The Moanalua Community Library will be constructed to serve the people residing in Salt Lake, Moanalua Valley and the surrounding areas as shown in Exhibit B. The library will have a floor area of 10,650 square feet, including a Story Telling / Meeting Room with a capacity of 100 seats.

B. **Economic**: Construction of this library will remove approximately 30,000 square feet of land from the tax base if a privately owned site is selected. Construction expenditures for the library will be an estimated $1,500,000 for facilities and $300,000 for the land based on January 1981 prices. There will also be long-term operating and maintenance expenses.

C. **Social**: The Moanalua area is presently serviced every three weeks by a bookmobile from Pearl City. Benefits of the new library will be increased with convenient library services providing educational and informational opportunities to the surrounding communities. The library will also provide facilities for community meetings.

D. **Environmental**: Due to the urbanized nature of the study area, it is not anticipated that any rare,
threatened or endangered species of plants or animals and their habitats will be endangered. Nor will any items of natural or historical significance be affected.

In general, the construction of this library is not expected to create any major environmental impact.
2.4 USE OF PUBLIC FUNDS AND/OR LANDS

State funds will be required for design and construction of the Moanalua Library. Depending on which site is selected, the land will either be already owned or will have to be purchased by the State.

If the selected site is already State owned, the cost for construction will be $1,500,000 based on January 1981 prices. If the land must be purchased, the total cost for land acquisition, design and construction will be $1,800,000 based on January 1981 prices.
2.5 PHASING AND TIMING

Funds for construction of this project have not been appropriated at this time.
2.6 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

During the 1800's Salt Lake was composed of brackish water and was fed by a salt water spring. By the early 1900's, most of the land surrounding the lake was cultivated in sugar cane. Siltation from these fields eventually clogged the underground channels which fed the lake. This, combined with the drilling of an artesian well which fed the lake, caused the lake's conversion to a fresh water lake.

In the late 1950's residential development was begun in the Moanalua Valley, Moanalua Gardens and Red Hill areas. In 1974, after lengthy deliberations between governmental agencies and the developer, most of the lake was filled in and developed as a country club and golf course. The land surrounding the lake is used for a mix of residential developments, including single family dwellings, townhouses and low-to-high-rise apartments and condominiums. Military housing projects are also located in the area.
CHAPTER 3: GUIDELINES FOR SITE SELECTION

3.1 SERVICE AREA DESCRIPTION

Presently, the project area is not serviced by a library facility. A bookmobile from Pearl City currently services the Moanalua area once every three weeks.

The proposed service area for the Moanalua Community Library, as determined by the Department of Education, is based upon a three mile service area radius. This area should be centered between the existing three mile service area radii for the Kalihi Community Library and the Aiea Community Library.

The proposed service area radius is drawn from the center of the Salt Lake Community. The center of the community is based upon the population center and the activity center (shopping center) location. These areas are illustrated on Exhibit C; which is a neighborhood map. These areas are referred to further as important "guidelines for site selection."
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3.2 INVENTORY OF STATE LAND

The only sites the state owns in the service area large enough for a library are school sites. These schools are as follows:

1. Aliamanu Elementary and Intermediate Schools
2. Salt Lake Elementary School
3. Moanalua Elementary and Intermediate Schools
4. Moanalua High School
5. Radford High School

However, all of these lands are fully developed or have no land to spare for a library. These school sites are shown on the Exhibit C: Neighborhood Map; p. 3-2.

There are several types of libraries: regional, community, and community/school libraries. Population within the service area is the major determinant. The Moanalua Library has been defined as a community library because it will service a resident user population of 35,000 residents or greater.

The use of school sites for library facilities is generally confined to rural locations. Generally, these community/school libraries service populations of 2,000 to 7,500.
residents. Libraries that will serve large communities have a specific set of site selection criteria (see 3.3 Guidelines for Selecting Public Library Sites).

It may be noted that the land between the Puuola Interchange was owned by the State Department of Transportation. However, recently this land has been transferred to the City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation. (See Chapter 5 for more information on this site.)
3.3 GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING PUBLIC LIBRARY SITES

1. The site must be large enough to accommodate the ultimate size of the library.

2. The site should be near the center of activity of the area to be served so that it will be used by the maximum number of people, adults as well as children. This will usually be a shopping center in neighborhood communities.

3. It should be on a main thoroughfare to be seen by the maximum number of motorists. Also, the site must be accessible to these motorists.

4. It should be on or near a busline to be utilized by the maximum number of pedestrians.

5. The library should be located near the center of population if (2) can also be satisfied there.

6. The cost of the site shall be reasonable when compared to other sites in the same area.
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CHAPTER 4: SITE SELECTION PLANNING CRITERIA

4.1 METHODOLOGY

Certain guidelines were established by the Department of Education (DOE) and the Department of Accounting and General Services (DAGS) to be used in the selection of alternative sites (See Guidelines for Selecting Public Library Sites; p. 3-3). Sites not meeting the intent of these guidelines were eliminated from further consideration.

Criteria for evaluating each of the site alternatives were also established. The following "site selection planning criteria" were used for this purpose:

1. Minimum Site Criteria
2. Functional Criteria
3. Utility & Support Service Criteria
4. Environmental Criteria
5. Government Regulatory Criteria
6. Cost Considerations

Only sites meeting the Minimum Site Criteria will be evaluated against the remaining general site criteria rating and the comparative cost computations. The general site criteria rating (See Evaluation of Alternative Sites; p. 8-1) and the comparative cost analysis will be used to establish
a comparative ranking for each site. This ranking will then be used to select the library site.
4.2 MINIMUM SITE CRITERIA

Minimum site criteria have been established to set basic evaluation standards in the evaluation of alternative library sites. Only those sites that satisfy the following criteria will be evaluated further. (Note: Site size computations are provided in this chapter under Section 4.21 and 4.22)

A. LOCATION: The site must be within the service area.

B. SITE SIZE: The site must not be less than the minimum lot size of 30,000 S.F. for residential zones, or 25,200 S.F. for apartment zones.

C. VACANT: The site must not have improvements located on it, and will therefore require no displacement or relocations. The site has no requests for building permits currently being processed, or recently granted.

D. ACCESS: The site is easily accessible from a public roadway.

E. FLOOD ZONE: The site must not be in a major flood plain exposed to excessive storm water runoff if adequate drainage provisions, i.e., culverts, lined channels, etc., cannot be provided.
4.21 MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS

According to a letter dated, March 24, 1971, the City and County of Honolulu determined that Sections 21-505h (now 21-5.6h) of the Comprehensive Zoning Code provides adequate parking for branch libraries. This section outlines a requirement of one parking space per five seats in the main auditorium.

Preliminary plans call for enough space to accommodate 100 seats in the Story-Telling / Meeting Room. Accordingly, the parking requirements are computed based on 100 seats.

PARKING SPACES REQUIRED = 100 SEATS/5 = 20 PARKING STALLS

Each stall requires approximately 400 square feet including access to the street. At this rate, the land area required for parking computes to be:

PARKING LOT AREA = 20 PARKING SPACES X 400 SF = 8,000 SF

4.22 SITE SIZE COMPUTATIONS

The service area includes both residential and apartment zoning. Therefore, two sets of setback requirements must be considered.
RESIDENTIAL:

Under R-4, R-5, and R-6 zoning the required setbacks are as follows:

Front Yard 30 Feet
Side Yard 15 Feet
Back Yard 15 Feet

Utilizing the above setbacks, a conceptual site layout was prepared to determine site size as shown in Exhibit D.1. For this conceptual layout the dimensions used were 150 feet by 195 feet. This computes to be 30,000 square feet minimum.

APARTMENT:

Under A-2 and A-3 zoning, the required setbacks are as follows:

Front Yard 15 Feet
Side Yard 10 Feet
Back Yard 10 Feet

Utilizing the above setbacks a conceptual site layout was prepared to determine site size as shown in Exhibit D.2. For this conceptual layout, the dimensions used were 140 feet by 180 feet. This computes to be 25,200 square feet minimum.
LOT SIZE ILLUSTRATIONS

EXHIBIT D1

LOT SIZE 30,000 sq. ft.

LIBRARY
10,650 sq. ft.

PARKING
8,000 sq. ft.

ZONING: R-4
ZONING: R-5
ZONING: R-6
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EXHIBIT D2
LOT SIZE ILLUSTRATIONS

LIBRARY
10,650 sq. ft.

PARKING
8,000 sq. ft.

LOT SIZE 25,200 sq. ft.

ZONING: A-2
ZONING: A-3
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4.3 FUNCTIONAL CRITERIA

A. SHAPE: The shape should generally be rectangular.

Good: Length-width ratio 1:1 to 5:3.
Fair: Length-width ratio 5:3 to 2:1.
Poor: Length-width ratio 2:1 and greater.

B. SLOPE:

Good: The average slope of the site is between 1% and 5%.
Fair: The average slope of the site is between 5% and 10%.
Poor: The average slope of the site is greater than 10%.

C. FOUNDATION: (Soil Stability - See Exhibit E)

Good: Urban Usage Land Classification is Code I or II - Non-expanding soil, surface well drained.
Fair: Urban Usage Land Classification is Code III, IV, VI or VII - Expanding soil, surface well drained.
Poor: Urban Usage Land Classification is Code V - Marshy soil, surface poorly drained.

D. ACCESSIBILITY

Good: The site is off a low speed (25 mph) major roadway passing through the service area. The roadway is free of blind corners, sight obstructions, and other hazards. Adequate and safe pedestrian walkways to the site are available.
LEGEND
URBAN LAND CLASSIFICATIONS

SYMBOL

Soil Character
Depth to Consolidated Material
Underlying Material

U Urban Area

LAND CATEGORY CODE

SOIL CHARACTER

I Non-expanding soil, non-rocky, surface well-drained
II Non-expanding soil, rocky, surface well-drained
III Expanding soil, non-rocky, surface well-drained
IV Expanding soil, rocky, surface well-drained
V Marshy soil, non-rocky, surface poorly-drained
VI Coral sands, non-rocky, surface well-drained
VII Coral sands, rocky, surface well-drained

DEPTH TO CONSOLIDATED MATERIAL:

1 0' - 5 feet
2 6' - 10 feet
3 11' - 15 feet
4 15+ feet

UNDERLYING MATERIAL:

C Consolidated Coral
L Consolidated Lava
W High Water Table

SLOPE CATEGORIES

0 - 10 per cent
11 - 20 per cent
21 - 30 per cent
30+ per cent

SOURCE: DETAILED LAND CLASSIFICATION - ISLAND OF OAHU
LAND STUDY BUREAU, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
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Fair: Access to the site is via an improved collector street off of a major roadway passing through the service area. Safe walkways to the site may be constructed if not already available.

Poor: Access to the site is via a dead end street or off of a roadway with conditions which may create approach, and exit hazards such as a high speed limit (over 25 mph). Existing roadway conditions make walking to the library hazardous.

E. Proximity to Optimum Location (Activity Center):

Good: The site is located in the activity center of the community.

Fair: The site is located within one-half mile from the activity center and off a major roadway leading to the activity center.

Poor: The site is located more than one-half mile from the activity center and is off a roadway that does not lead to the activity center.

F. Visibility from Major Roadway:

Good: The site is readily visible from a major roadway when approaching and passing the site.

Fair: The site is readily visible from a major roadway when passing the site.

Poor: The site is not visible from any major roadway through the service area.

G. Aircraft:

Good: The site is more than a mile away from the normal aircraft flight patterns into and out of airports and air bases.
Fair: The site is far enough away (0.5 to 1.0 mile) from the normal flight patterns.

Poor: The site is directly under (0 to 0.5 miles) the approach and takeoff patterns.
4.4 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CRITERIA

A. Water:

Good: The site has adequate water pressure and capacity to meet the ultimate library needs.

Fair: The existing water service is insufficient but adequate service is being developed which will meet the needs of the library.

Poor: The site has inadequate water service and will require the development of a water system to specifically meet the library needs.

* Actual availability of water for the project will be determined by the BWS when the building permit is submitted.

B. Sewer:

Good: The site has adequate sewer lines available to service the library.

Fair: The site will have adequate sewer service which is being developed to service the area.

Poor: The site has no sewer service and will require the construction of cesspools or a sewage treatment plant to meet the library needs.

C. Drainage:

Good: The site has adequate drainage facilities available to meet the ultimate needs of the library.

Fair: The site will have adequate drainage facilities which are being developed which will meet the needs of the library.

Poor: The site has no drainage facility and may require the development of a drainage system to specifically meet the library needs.
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D. **Power and Communication:**

**Good:** The site has adequate existing power and communications available to meet the ultimate library needs.

**Fair:** The site will have adequate power and communications which are being developed to serve the needs of the area.

**Poor:** The site has insufficient power or communications available and will require improvements on these services to serve the library needs.

E. **Police, Fire, and Medical Services:**

**Good:** Services provided in the area are adequate to service the site.

**Fair:** Service can be provided to the site, but due to location or access emergency service may not be reliable.

**Poor:** Services provided in the area are inadequate to service the site.

F. **Transportation Facilities (Traffic):**

**Good:** The site's transportation system is adequate and can accommodate the traffic generated by the project. Mass transit is available.

**Fair:** The site's transportation system may be congested during peak hours, but otherwise can accommodate the traffic generated by the project. Mass transit is available.

**Poor:** The site's transportation system is not capable of handling the traffic generated by the proposed project, and there is no mass transit available.
4.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. Geography / Geology:

   Good: The site has no major or minor geographical features or sub-surface geology that require special attention.

   Fair: The site has minor geographical features or sub-surface geology that require safeguarding.

   Poor: The site has major geographical features and/or sub-surface geology that will be impacted by the proposed project.

2. Soils:

   Good: The site is urbanized land, and is not identified as "prime" or "unique" soil on the Agricultural Lands of Importance for the State of Hawaii (A.L.I.S.H.) map for the area.

   Fair: The site is not urbanized land, however, it is not identified as "prime" or unique land (A.L.I.S.H.).

   Poor: The site is not urbanized, and is identified as "prime" or "unique" land (A.L.I.S.H.).

3. Surface Water:

   Good: The subject parcel has no major surface water quality considerations (i.e. Class AA coastal waters, and Class 2 fresh waters - streams and ponds).

   Fair: The subject parcel has minor surface water considerations (i.e. intermittent streams), however, the proposed project will only minimally affect its quality.
Poor: The subject parcel has major surface water on-site that the proposed project will adversely affect.

4. **Groundwater:**

Good: The subject parcel has no value for groundwater recharge; i.e. it has no moving or standing water, (neither above or below the site).

Fair: The site has some value for groundwater recharge, although it is minor (i.e. on-site moving water such as a stream), but is not a major seepage area (i.e. stationary water such as a pond or marsh).

Poor: The site has great value as an area for the groundwater recharge.

5. **Microclimate:**

Good: The subject parcel's ground temperature and windflow will not be significantly affected by the proposed project.

Fair: The subject parcel's ground temperature and windflow will be affected by the proposed project, but this will not cause an adverse impact to the site.

Poor: The subject parcel's microclimate will be adversely affected by the proposed project.

6. **Flora:**

Good: The site vegetation will not be adversely affected by the proposed project, because only grasses and shrubs of a common or noxious nature need be removed.

Fair: The site vegetation will be temporarily affected by the proposed project. Small trees and shrubs, in addition to grasses may need to be removed, however, these are common and can be replaced.
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Poor: The site vegetation will be significantly affected by the removal of exotic, unusual or endangered vegetation that cannot be replaced or salvaged.

7. Fauna:

Good: The site has no known wildlife habitats for common, rare, or endangered fauna.

Fair: The site has fauna which will be displaced, however, they are dogs, cats, rats, mongooses, etc. and are considered common or pests. Therefore their displacement is not considered significant.

Poor: The site is habitated by fauna which are considered rare, exotic or endangered, and should not be displaced or disturbed.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. Air Quality:

Good: The site is free from dust, odors, smoke and other nuisances created by adjacent activities.

Fair: The dust, odors, smoke and other nuisances from adjacent activities are periodic only, and well within human tolerances.

Poor: The dust, odors, smoke and other nuisances created from adjacent activities cause considerable discomfort, and interfere with library activities.

2. Noise Levels:

Good: The surrounding land uses do not generate a significant amount of noise, and are considered acceptable (does not exceed 45 DBA for more than 30 minutes per 24 hours).
Fair: The existing noise levels produced from such things as vehicular traffic and people participating in recreational activities will be periodically disruptive, but will be tolerable.

Poor: The surrounding land uses will generate an excessive amount of unwanted noise which interfere with library activities.


3. Storm Drainage and Flooding:

Good: The property drains adequately allowing surface runoff to discharge into an existing storm drainage system, waterway, or through on-site percolation.

Fair: The site is subject to occasional localized ponding during heavy rains at low spots on-site, however, this would not hinder library activities or the general health, safety, and welfare of the community.

Poor: The site is subject to periods of total inundation that will inhibit library activities and endangers the general health safety and welfare of the community.

4. Views and Aesthetics:

Good: The proposed project will improve the aesthetic values and view planes of the site (i.e. through the removal of existing visual barriers such as clearing nuisance vegetation, abandoned buildings, etc.) and will not obscure or conflict with existing aesthetic values and view planes.

Fair: The proposed project will temporarily improve aesthetic values and view planes by clearing and grading activities, however, the eventual construction of structures may partially impact existing values and view planes (depending on the siting and design of the structure).
Poor: The proposed project will not improve the aesthetic value and viewplanes of the site, because it will block existing viewplanes or negatively impact the existing surrounding aesthetics of the area.

5. Archaeological and Historical Resources:

Good: The site has no above-ground archaeological features nor any indication that significant features lie buried underneath the subject parcel.

Fair: No archaeological artifacts are known on-site, however, the site has an early history that indicates the possibility that construction activities may uncover previously undiscovered archaeological artifacts.

Poor: The site is known to have archaeological artifacts or historical resources.

Note: In establishing specifications for this job, the contractor will be required to stop work and contact the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) historic sites office immediately at 548-6408 if during clearing or grading he encounters any historic, archaeologic, or paleontological sites or remains (e.g., artifacts, shells, bones, charcoal deposits, burials, pavements or walls).
4.6 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CRITERIA
(The Relationship to Land Use Plans, Policies, and Controls)

A. State Land Use:

Good: The site is within an Urban District.
Fair: The site is within a Rural District.
Poor: The site is within a Agricultural or Conservation District.

B. Development Plan for the Primary Urban Center

Good: The site is designated for public facilities or commercial use.
Fair: The site is designated for residential or apartment use.
Poor: The site is designated for resort, industrial, park, agricultural, preservation, or open space.

C. Zoning:

Good: The site is zoned business.
Fair: The site is zoned residential, apartment.
Poor: The site is zoned hotel, industrial, preservation, or agriculture.

D. Special Design District (SDD)

Good: The site is outside the district or the site is located within the district, but the project will not detract from the intent of the district.
Fair: The site is within the district and there may be a potential conflict with the intent of the district.
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E. Historical, Cultural, and Scenic District (HCSD):

**Good:** The site is outside the district; or the site is located within the district, but the project will not detract from the intent of the district.

**Fair:** The site is within the district and there may be a potential conflict with the intent of the district.

**Poor:** The site is within the district and there will be a strong conflict with the intent of the district.
4.7 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. Land Acquisition:

The estimated market value of privately owned land and easements are used. The assessed value for each parcel was obtained through the tax office. Recently this assessed value has been established by the County at 60% of the market value.

Although State land would seemingly have no land acquisition cost per se, there is a cost to the State in terms of the alternate uses to which the land could be used. Therefore, for State land, the estimated fair market value on the highest and best alternative use of the land according to the County General Plan is used as the land acquisition cost.

Military lands that are available for public or private acquisition are classified by the military as "releasable" lands. The military land may be released in several ways. According to Executive Order 12348 and a GSA memo of April 6, 1982, land may be released through GSA on a public benefit discount basis as stipulated by law, provided:

"The application for discount conveyance was submitted to the Federal Government
before March 1, 1982, and disapproval of
the proposed conveyance would cause an
extreme hardship on the state or local
community; or

The application for discount conveyance
has exceptional merit and the proposed
use of the property represents its
highest and best use."

It may also be released through GSA subject to
determination of fair market value or as otherwise
provided by law.

Good: The site may be acquired at no cost.

Fair: The site may be acquired within the esti-
mated land acquisition allocation for this
project.

Poor: The site may only be acquired above the land
acquisition allocation for this project.

B. On-Site Development:

The following cost items are included in the on-site
development costs:

1. Grading: Cost of grading necessary to adapt the
existing topographic features for buildings,
parking area, and other facilities.

2. Utilities: Cost of making the necessary utility
connections due to special requirements such as
providing private sewer system.

3. Drainage: Cost of constructing major drainage facilities for site to prevent future flooding such as providing lining for streams.

Ranking:

Good: The site requires no on-site development costs.

Fair: The site requires minor on-site development costs.

Poor: The site requires major on-site development costs.

C. Off-Site Development:

The following cost items are included in the off-site development costs:

1. Utilities: Cost of providing additional lines or increasing sizes due to additional loads imposed by the library.

2. Drainage: Cost of constructing additional drainage facilities to accommodate the proposed runoff pattern of the library.

3. Access Roads: Cost of constructing necessary access roadways to the site if none are available.
Ranking:

Good: The site requires no off-site development costs.

Fair: The site requires minor off-site development costs.

Poor: The site requires major off-site development costs.
CHAPTER 5: DETERMINATION OF POTENTIAL LIBRARY SITES AND THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SITES SELECTED FOR
FURTHER EVALUATION

5.1 POTENTIAL LIBRARY SITES:

The potential sites were chosen based upon the "Guidelines
for Selecting Public Library Sites." The guidelines are
listed in Chapter 4, and generally call for sites to be:
located within the defined service area, accessible, near
the population center, and center of activity. These com-
munity characteristics are illustrated for reference on
Exhibit C: Neighborhood Map.

The potential sites are shown on Exhibit F, and include the
following parcels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Tax Map Key: Parcel No.</th>
<th>Total Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>TMK(S): 1-1-75: 60, 61, 62</td>
<td>26,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>TMK(S): 1-1-73: 52, 53, 54</td>
<td>.53 Ac.(23,162 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>TMK: (PUUOA H-1 INTERCHANGE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>TMK: 1-1-61: 3</td>
<td>.49 Ac.(21,461 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Tax Map Key:</td>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-59: 16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-59: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-59: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-10: por. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-02: 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>TMK:</td>
<td>1-1-63: 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS

EXHIBIT F
POTENTIAL SITES and
FLOOD HAZARD MAP

POTENTIAL SITE FOR FURTHER EVALUATION (SEE pg. 5-1)
ALTERNATIVE SITE SELECTED FOR FURTHER EVALUATION (SEE pg. 5-4)

ZONE A - AREAS OF 100 YEAR FLOOD
ZONE B - AREAS BETWEEN 100 YEAR AND 500 YEAR FLOOD ZONES
ZONE C - AREAS OF MINIMAL FLOODING
ZONE D - AREAS OF UNDETERMINED BUT POSSIBLE FLOOD HAZARDS
5.2 ALTERNATIVE SITES SELECTED FOR FURTHER EVALUATION

All of the afore-mentioned potential sites were evaluated to determine if they met the "minimum site criteria" for a library. The alternative sites (See list below) for a library therefore satisfied the following "Minimum Site Criteria:"

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area.

B. LOT SIZE: The site must not be less than the minimum lot size.

C. VACANT: The site does not have improvements located on it, and has no requests for building permits currently being processed, or recently granted.

D. ACCESS: The site is easily accessible from a public roadway.

E. FLOOD: The site must not be located in a major flood inundation zone.

ALTERNATIVE SITES (See Exhibits F, H-L)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Tax Map Key:</th>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Total Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. (D)</td>
<td>1-1-75: 73</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.146 Ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (I)</td>
<td>1-1-59: 16, 17, 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71 Ac.(30,784 SF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (K)</td>
<td>1-1-59: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.988 Ac.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. (M) 1-1-10: por. 4 1.583 Ac.
5. (M) 1-1-02: 01 3.4 Ac.
6. (O) 1-1-63: 18 (portion) 1.0 Ac.

The following potential sites (See Exhibit F; p.5-3) did not become selected sites because:

A. **LOCATION:** All sites were in the service area.

B. **LOT SIZE:** The following sites were not large enough to meet the minimum lot size criteria: (See Exhibits D.1 & D.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23,162 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>21,461 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **VACANT:** Except for Site P which is an existing park, the following sites were vacant but had obtained building permits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16.35 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.054 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4.591 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.695 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Park-Site with Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **ACCESS:** All sites have access from a public roadway.
E. FLOOD: Only Site E was subject to flood inundation according to the area 1980 National Flood Insurance Rate Map. This site is located in the upper Moanalua Stream flood plain and designated Zone A, or an area subject to 100 year floods. A portion of Site E lies above the plain and may be a potential site, however, most of this land has been turned over to the City Department of Transportation. The rest of the sites (and the entire Salt Lake - Airport area) fall within Zone D, which were not studied under the Flood Insurance Study, and are defined as areas of undetermined, but possible flood hazards (See Exhibit F).
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
ALTERNATIVE SITE

SITE 1

TMK #: 1-1-75: 73 (See Exhibit G)

Note: 6 = Chapter 6
      6.1 = Alternative Site 1
      6.11 = Standard Conditions Categories

6.10 GENERAL

This site is a parcel of undeveloped land in the center of a
single family residential neighborhood. It is an elongated
odd shaped parcel of 10.146 acres (See Exhibit G, Potential
Sites). The site fronts on Ala Puumalu and Ala Napunani
Streets, and backs up to Honolulu International Country Club
golf course. The other side of the site adjoins a single
family residential area.

6.11 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area
   located at the corner of Ala Puumalu and Ala
   Napunani Streets.

B. SIZE: The site is 10.146 acres.
C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not subject to flooding.

D. VACANT: The site is presently vacant. There are no known permits being processed for this site.

6.12 FUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS

A. SHAPE: The site is oblong.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the site is between 5% and 10% slope.

C. FOUNDATION: The Urban Usage Land Classification is IV 3L.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: The site fronts on Ala Napunani Street; a major arterial and Ala Puumalu. There are sidewalks fronting the site and pedestrian crosswalks at the corner.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately one mile from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is readily visible from Ala Napunani Street when approaching and passing the site.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is more than one mile away from the flight pattern of Honolulu International Airport.
6.13 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CONDITIONS

A. WATER: There are 12" water lines located along both Ala Napunani and Ala Puumalu Streets. Water pressure is approximately 55 PSI.

B. SEWER: There are three sewer lateral stub-outs of 8", 6", and 6" to service the site.

C. DRAINAGE: Portions of the site drain into two concrete line drainage ditches which empty into 18" underground drain lines. The remainder of the site drains naturally into Salt Lake. There is a 54" to 66" underground drain pipe which runs down Ala Puumalu Street.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. Emergency medical services are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on Ala Napunani Street, a major arterial roadway. Bus service is available on Ala Napunani Street.
The traffic that will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 - 5:00 PM) may be between 65 - 70 trip ends.

The latest Department of Transportation Services traffic count (November 9, 1976) was taken for Ala Napunani Street between Likini Street and Ala Nanu Place. This count indicate the following:

Traffic for 24 hours: 5,093 vehicles

AM Peak Flow (7:00-8:00 AM): 310 VPH (Northbound) 207 VPH (Southbound)

AM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 517 VPH

PM Peak Flow (5:00 - 6:00 PM): 163 VPH (Northbound) 207 VPH (Southbound)

PM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 370 VPH

(See Appendix A: Site 1 for More Information)

The streets that bound Site 1 are Ala Napunani Street, which is an 80-foot wide right-of-way, four lane collector street, and Ala Puumalu, which is a 60-foot wide right-of-way, both with two-way traffic.
The capacity of a collector street with a right-of-way width of 60 feet with no parking at grade intersection is 1,275 vehicles per hour for both directions of travel. The capacity of a local street with a right-of-way width of 44 feet with no parking and at grade intersection is approximately 600 vehicles per hour in one direction and 900 vehicles for both directions of travel.

Nearly all of the local streets have a right-of-way width of 50 feet and pavement width of 20 feet. The capacity of such a local street is slightly lower than that of a local street with a 44-foot right-of-way and pavement width of 28 feet. However, all of the major streets are either a 56 or 80-foot right-of-way.

As indicated by the AM and PM peak hour counts the traffic generated by the library (65 - 70 trip ends) will not overtax the capacity of either road.

6.14 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has a continuous rolling topography and an underlying base of consolidated lava. There are no unique or unusual geological features.
2. SOILS: The site is urbanized land with no other ALISH identification.

3. SURFACE WATER: A portion of the site drains into an off-site intermittent stream which empties into Salt Lake.

4. GROUNDWATER: Runoff from rain showers flow from the site into an intermittent stream.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The ground temperature of the site is higher than the surrounding area due to sparse vegetation. Windflow in general is from prevailing trade winds.

6. FLORA: The predominant site vegetation is natural grasses and haole koa.

7. FAUNA: There are common species on site including mice, rats, and lizards. There are no known habitats for rare, exotic or endangered species of animals.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

1. AIR QUALITY: There are no unusual levels of dust, odors, smoke, or other nuisances generated by adjacent activities.

2. NOISE LEVELS: There will be occasional noise created by traffic along Ala Napunani Street.
3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: The site is well drained with surface runoff flowing into concrete lined drainage ditches and an intermittent stream. The site is outside of a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: There are significant vistas into the golf course area from residences on the north side of Ala Puumalu.

5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archaeological sites.

6.15 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONDITIONS

A. STATE LAND USE: The site has an Urban designation.

B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN: The site is designated Residential.

C. COUNTY ZONING: The site is zoned R-4 residential.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

E. HISTORICAL, CULTURAL, AND SCENIC DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.
6.16 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The tax office has assessed the entire 10.146 acre site at $1,413,687. This figure represents 60% of the market value which is estimated at $2,356,145.00, or $5.33 per square foot. A 30,000 SF portion of the site may be assumed to cost $159,900.

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: The portion of the site which is adjacent to the main roads is essentially flat and would require minimal grading work.

2. UTILITIES: There are no special utility requirements necessary to develop the site.

3. DRAINAGE: Existing drainage facilities preclude flooding on the site.

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT

1. UTILITIES: The existing utilities are designed to accommodate development in this area.

2. DRAINAGE: The existing system is sufficient to absorb runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADWAYS: Access to the site is via the existing secondary roadway system.
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CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
ALTERNATIVE SITE (CONTINUED)

SITE 2
TMK # 1-1-58: 16, 17, 18 (See Exhibit H)

Note: 6 = Chapter 6
       6.2 = Alternative Site 2
       6.21 = Standard Condition Categories

6.20 GENERAL

This site is composed of three contiguous residential lots.
The lots front on Likini Street and back up to Salt Lake.
There are other residential lots on both sides. The three
sites are owned by two parties.

6.21 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area
   located on the north side of Likini Street between
   Ala Nanala Street and Ala Namu Street.

B. SIZE: The site is 30,784 square feet.

C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not subject to flooding.

D. VACANT: The site is vacant.
EXHIBIT H
ALTERNATIVE SITE 2

SITE PLAN

TMK #: 1-1-58:16,17,18
TOTAL AREA: 30,784 SF

NORTH
SCALE 1"=60'
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6.22 FUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS

A. SHAPE: The site is a curved rectangle.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the site is below 5% slope.

C. FOUNDATION: The Urban Usage Land Classification is IV.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: Access is from Likini Street, an improved collector street off a major arterial passing through the area. There is a sidewalk fronting the site, however, since the site is mid-block, crosswalks traversing Likini Street are several hundred feet away in both directions.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately 1/3 mile from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is visible from Likini Street, a minor arterial roadway.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is more than one mile from the air traffic pattern of Honolulu International Airport.
6.23 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CONDITIONS

A. WATER: There is a 10" water line running along Likini Street.

B. SEWER: There is a 12" sewer line along Likini Street.

C. DRAINAGE: The site drains into the street and from there into an 18" drain line.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. Emergency medical services are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on Likini Street, a minor arterial roadway. Bus service is available on Likini Street.

The traffic that will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 - 5:00 PM) may be between 65 - 70 trip ends.
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The latest Department of Transportation Services traffic count (March 5, 1975) was taken for Likini Street between Ala Nalu Street and Ala Napunani. This count indicates the following:

Traffic for 24 hours: 6,847 vehicles
AM Peak Flow (7:00 - 8:00 PM) = 589 VPH (Westbound)  264 VPH (Eastbound)
AM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 853 VPH
PM Peak Flow (5:00 - 6:00 PM) = 244 VPH (Westbound)  311 VPH (Eastbound)
PM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 555 VPH
(See Appendix A: Site 2 for More Information)

Site 2 is bounded by only Likini Street, which is a 44-foot right-of-way road; with two-way traffic, curbs, gutters, sidewalks and parking. The capacity of a local street with a 44-foot right-of-way with no parking is approximately 600 vehicles per hour in one direction and 900 vehicles for both directions.

Based on the traffic a library would generate (65 - 70 trip ends) and the near capacity condition of the road it is possible that this added traffic may adversely impact the roadway. However, the library peak use period is before the 5:00 - 6:00 PM peak traffic flow.
6.24 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has a continuous flat topography and an underlying base of consolidated lava. There are no unusual geologic features.

2. SOILS: The site is urbanized land with no other ALISH identification.

3. SURFACE WATER: There is no major surface water on the site.

4. GROUND COVER: The site has no moving or standing water.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The site temperature is increased by the asphalt of Likini Street. The windflow is from the prevailing trades.

6. FLORA: The site is a graded residential area with almost no plant material. A few noxious weeds are present.

7. FAUNA: There is no evidence of animal habitats on the site.
B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. AIR QUALITY: Vehicular traffic along Likini Street generates periodic odors and smoke.

2. NOISE LEVELS: Vehicular traffic along Likini Street generates periodic noise.

3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: The site drains into an existing storm drainage system, and is not located within a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: There are some viewplanes across the site from the apartment buildings along Likini Street.

5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archaeological sites.

6.25 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONDITIONS

A. STATE LAND USE: The site has an Urban designation.

B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN: The site is designated residential.

C. COUNTY ZONING: The site is zoned R-6 residential.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.
E. HISTORIC, CULTURAL, AND SCENIC DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

6.26 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The tax office has assessed the three lots that are included in the site at $63,162, $63,162 and $66,376 which results in a total assessed value of $192,700. This figure represents 60% of the market value which is estimated at $321,166 or $10.43 per square foot.

There are three separate parcels of property which make up the site and they are owned by separate private parties.

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: The site is essentially flat and would require minimal grading work.

2. UTILITIES: There are no special utility requirements necessary to develop the site.

3. DRAINAGE: There are no existing drainage facilities on the site.
C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT

1. UTILITIES: The existing utilities are designed to accommodate development in this area.

2. DRAINAGE: The existing system is sufficient to absorb runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADWAYS: Access to the site is via the existing secondary roadway system.
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
ALTERNATIVE SITE (CONTINUED)

SITE 3

TMK # 1-1-49: 5 (See Exhibit I)

Note:

6 = Chapter 6
6.3 = Alternative Site 3
6.31 = Standard Conditions Categories

6.30 GENERAL

GENERAL: The site is Hoaloha Park located at the end of Ala Loke Street, a cul-de-sac. The site has a panhandle shape which fronts on Ala Ilima Street. The site is surrounded by existing and proposed condominium and apartment buildings. The Department of Parks and Recreation has indicated that they would be opposed to the use of any Salt Lake area park sites for a library.

6.31 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area located at the end of Ala Loke Street.

B. SIZE: The site is 3.988 acres.

C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not subject to flooding.

D. VACANT: The site is vacant except for some recreational play equipment.
EXHIBIT I
ALTERNATIVE SITE 3

SITE PLAN
TMK# 1-1-59:5
AREA: 3.988 AC

NORTH
SCALE 1"=100'
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6.32 FUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS

A. SHAPE: The site is a broad L-shape.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the site is below 5% slope.

C. FOUNDATION: The Urban Usage Land Classification is IV.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: Access is from Ala Loke Street, a dead end street; and Ala Ilima, a collector. There are sidewalks fronting the site and a pedestrian crosswalk adjoining the site at Ala Ilima.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately 600 feet from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is visible from Ala Ilima Street.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is over one mile from the air traffic pattern of Honolulu International Airport.

6.33 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CONDITIONS

A. WATER: There is an 36" water line on Ala Lilikoi Street.

B. SEWER: There is an 18" waste water line which runs through the site which empties into 21" line running along Ala Ilima Street.
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C. DRAINAGE: The site drains into a concrete drainage channel and from there into a 24" drain pipe.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. Emergency medical services are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on Ala Ilima Street, a major arterial roadway. Bus service is available along Ala Ilima Street.

The traffic that will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 - 5:00 PM) may be between 65 - 70 trip ends.

The latest Department of Transportation Services traffic count (March 25, 1981) available for Ala Ilima Street was recorded between Ala Napuaa Place and Ala Napunani Street. This count indicates the following:
Traffic for 24 hours: 9,067 vehicles
AM Peak Flow (7:00 - 8:00 AM): 323 VPH (Eastbound)
AM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 336 VPH
PM Peak Flow (5:00 - 6:00 PM): 234 VPH (Eastbound)
PM PEAK HOUR TOTAL: 675 VPH
(See Appendix A: Site 3 for More Information)

Site 3 is bounded only by Ala Ilima Street which is a 44-foot right-of-way street, with two traffic lanes, two parking lanes, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. The capacity of a 44-foot R.O.W. road without parking is approximately 600 VPH in one direction and 900 VPH for both directions. The traffic generated by a library (65 - 70 trip ends) may impact this road as it has only two lanes for traffic. However, the library peak use period is before the 5:00 - 6:00 PM peak traffic flow.

6.34 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has a continuous flat topography and an underlying base of consolidated lava. There are no unusual geological features.

2. SOILS: The site is urbanized land with no other ALISH identification.
3. SURFACE WATER: There is no major surface water on the site.

4. GROUNDWATER: The site has no moving or standing water.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The site temperature is moderated by the turf covering the ground. The windflow is disrupted by the surrounding high and mid-rise buildings.

6. FLORA: The site vegetation includes some monkeypod trees and bermuda grass turf.

7. FAUNA: There is no evidence of animal habitats on the site.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. AIR QUALITY: Vehicular traffic along Likini Street generates periodic odors and smoke.

2. NOISE LEVELS: Vehicular traffic along Likini Street generates periodic noise.

3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: The site drains into an existing storm drainage system, and is not located within a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: There are no significant views into or from the site.
5. ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archaeological sites.

6.35 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONDITIONS

A. STATE LAND USE: The site has an Urban designation.

B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN: The site is designated Park.

C. COUNTY ZONING: The site is zoned P-1 Preservation.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

E. HISTORIC, CULTURAL, AND SCENIC DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

6.36 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The tax office has appraised the 3.988 acre park site at $1,502,017. This represents 60% of the market value which is $2,670,028 or $15.37 per square foot. A 30,000 SF portion of this site may be assumed to cost $461,110.

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: The site is essentially flat and would require minimal grading work.
2. UTILITIES: There are no special utility requirements necessary to develop the site.

3. DRAINAGE: Existing facilities preclude flooding on the site.

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT

1. UTILITIES: The existing utilities are designed to accommodate development in this area.

2. DRAINAGE: The existing system is sufficient to absorb runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADWAYS: Access to the site is via the existing secondary roadway system.
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
ALTERNATIVE SITE (CONTINUED)

SITE 4
TMK #: 1-1-10: por. 4 (See Exhibit J)

Note:
6 = Chapter 6
6.4 = Alternative Site 4
6.41 = Standard Conditions Categories

6.40 GENERAL

This site is contiguous to the campus of Aliamanu Intermediate and Elementary Schools. The site is a 1.583 acre triangular shape which fronts Salt Lake Boulevard and Arizona Road. The other side of the site is formed by the access road to the school. It is owned by the Department of Defense but has been identified as a "releasable area." The State of Hawaii is presently in the process of obtaining this land at no cost to meet school parking and bus loading requirements. Construction plans have been prepared for the paving and landscaping of most of this site for parking stalls and driveways. However, due to funding limitations, the Salt Lake Boulevard/Arizona Road corner of the lot, which has about 27,000 S.F. is presently being left undeveloped and may be available as a library site.

Salt Lake Blvd.

Possible vehicular access along school driveway

Allamanu Elem. and Inter. Schools

SITE PLAN
TMK # 1-1-10:por. 4
TOTAL AREA-1.58 ac.
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SCALE: 1"=40'

EXHIBIT J
ALTERNATIVE SITE 4
6.41 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is located at the corner of Salt Lake Boulevard and Arizona Road and adjacent to Aliamanu Elementary and Intermediate Schools.

B. SIZE: The overall site is 1.583 acres and the area useable for the library is 27,000 S.F. Although the site is smaller than the minimum site size required by R-6 zoning, the benefits of sharing access and parking with the adjoining schools should compensate for the smaller site.

C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not within a flood zone.

D. VACANT: The site is vacant.

6.42 FUNCTIONAL CRITERIA

A. SHAPE: The overall shape is triangular.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the slope is between 5% and 7%.

C. FOUNDATION: The Urban Usage Land Classification is IV.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: The site is accessible from Arizona Road. There is a sidewalk fronting the Salt Lake Boulevard edge of the site, and signalized crosswalks are located at the intersection.
E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately 200 feet away from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is visible to traffic travelling both directions on Salt Lake Boulevard.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is more than a mile away from the flight pattern for Honolulu International Airport.

6.43 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CRITERIA

A. WATER: There is a 24" and a 36" water main running along Salt Lake Boulevard and a 24" water main running along Arizona Road. The pressure is approximately 62 PSI. There is also a 12" U.S. Navy water line running through the site.

B. SEWER: There is an 8" sewer line running along Salt Lake Boulevard. There are also sewer lines serving the school site.

C. DRAINAGE: The adjoining schools have drainage systems including a 36" drain line.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.
E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. Emergency medical service are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on a major arterial roadway. Bus service is approximately 200' away.

The traffic that will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 - 5:00 PM) may be between 65 - 70 trip ends.

The latest Department of Transportation Services traffic count (January 29, 1981) affecting Site 4 was recorded at the intersection of Salt Lake Boulevard and Arizona Road. This count indicated the following:
Traffic for 24 hours: 3,487 vehicles

AM Peak Flow (7:00 - 8:00 AM): 34 VPH (Right turn from Arizona Road onto Salt Lake Blvd.)
178 VPH (Left turn from Arizona Road onto Salt Lake Blvd.)

AM Peak Flow Total: 212 VPH

PM Peak Flow (5:00 - 6:00 PM): 16 VPH (Right turn from Arizona Road onto Salt Lake Blvd.)
390 VPH (Left turn from Arizona Road onto Salt Lake Blvd.)

PM Peak Flow Total: 406 VPH

Site 4 is bounded by both Salt Lake Boulevard and Arizona Road. Regular access to the site is from Arizona Road while access to and from Salt Lake Boulevard through the school parking lot is limited to right hand turns. Arizona Road is a 60-foot right-of-way road with four traffic lanes and no curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. Since capacity of a 60-foot right-of-way road is 1275 VPH, the traffic generated by a library (65 - 70 trip ends) should not adversely impact the roads.
6.44 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has a continuous surface with a 2' berm along the south edge of the site. There are no unusual geological features.

2. SOILS: The site is urban land with no other ALISH designation.

3. SURFACE WATER: There is no major surface water on the site.

4. GROUNDWATER: Due to the slope of the site there is no moving or standing water.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The temperature of the site is increased by the reflected heat from the surrounding asphalt streets and parking lot. The airflow is moderately affected by the traffic flow along Salt Lake Boulevard.

6. FLORA: The site vegetation is mowed grass. One kiawe tree and noxious weeds.

7. FAUNA: No significant animal life is evident on the site.
B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. AIR QUALITY: Traffic along Salt Lake Boulevard will create odors and smoke. Periodic dust may be generated by recreational activities at the school.

2. NOISE LEVELS: Vehicular traffic along Salt Lake Boulevard will create noise. Periodic noise will also be created by recreational activities at the school.

3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: The site presently drains into an existing storm drain system at the school, and is not in a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: There are no significant view planes from the site. The site itself has only minimal aesthetic value, due to its proximity to Salt Lake Boulevard. However, its relationship to the open space of the school grounds is a positive factor.

5. ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archeological sites in the area.

6.4B GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CRITERIA

A. STATE LAND USE: The site is designated Urban.
B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT: The site is designated Military adjacent to Public Facility.

C. COUNTY ZONING: The site is zoned R-6 residential.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

E. HISTORICAL, CULTURAL, AND SCENIC DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

6.46 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The tax office has not assessed this site since it is owned by the Federal Government. The adjoining school site of 25.635 acres has been assessed at $3,370,787.00. This figure represents 60% of the market value which is estimated at $5,617,945 or $5.03 per square foot. Based on this figure, the market value of the 27,000-square foot site would be approximately $135,810.00.

The site has been identified by the Department of Defense in Military Property Requirements in Hawaii, State of Hawaii, April 1979, as a "releasable area." The State of Hawaii has requested title to this land for Department of Education purposes.
B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: Some grading will be necessary to accommodate the building and parking lot.

2. UTILITIES: There are no special utilities required.

3. DRAINAGE: There are no unusual drainage requirements for the site.

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. UTILITIES: The capacity of the existing infrastructure can accommodate loads from the library.

2. DRAINAGE: The existing drainage system can handle runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADS: Access to the site is via Arizona Road and Salt Lake Boulevard.
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
ALTERNATIVE SITE (CONTINUED)

SITE 5
TMK # 1-1-02: 01 (See Exhibit K)

Note:
6 = Chapter 6
6.5 = Alternative Site 5
6.51 = Standard Conditions Categories

6.50 GENERAL

This site is a parcel of military land near the airport
adjacent to Nimitz Highway known as Hickam AFB
Administration Annex. It has been identified by the
Department of Defense as a "releasable area."² The site is
presently vacant except for the remains of a concrete
bunker-type structure.

6.51 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area
located at the corner of Nimitz Highway and Elliot
Street.

B. SIZE: The site is 3.4 acres.

Footnote: ² Military Property Requirements in Hawaii,
State of Hawaii, April 1979; PP F-64, F-65;
United States Department of Defense.
EXHIBIT K
ALTERNATIVE SITE 5

H-1 Freeway Viaduct (above)
Nimitz Highway (below)

SITE PLAN
TMK# 1-1-02 por. 01
TOTAL AREA 3.4 AC
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C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not subject to flooding.

D. VACANT: The site is vacant of usable structures. There are the remains of a concrete bunker-type structure, and an un-used asphalt parking area on the site.

6.52 FUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS

A. SHAPE: The site is rectangular.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the site is below 5%.

C. FOUNDATIONS: The Urban Usage Land Classification is Urban.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: Access is from Nimitz Highway via Elliot Street. There is a sidewalk along Nimitz Highway and a crosswalk adjoins the site at the intersection of Elliot Street and Nimitz Highway.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately one mile from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is visible from Nimitz Highway from both directions.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is less than one mile from a runway at Honolulu International Airport. Air traffic patterns are more than a mile away from the site.
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6.53 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CONDITIONS

A. WATER: There is a 16" water line running along the east edge of the site.

B. SEWER: There is a 24" sewer line along the south edge of the site.

C. DRAINAGE: There is a drainage easement located along Nimitz Highway, and a drainage system in the Post Office/Airport area.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. The Board of Water Supply has indicated that an off-site fire protection source is needed for this site. Emergency medical services are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on a major highway. Bus service is provided along Nimitz Highway.
The traffic will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 - 5:00 PM) may be between 65 - 70 trip ends.

Peak flow data is not available for the intersection of these two roads. However, 24 hour counts indicate Elliot Street has a flow southward of 5,179 vehicles and 7,438 vehicles northward. Nimitz Highway east of Elliot Street has a westbound flow of 13,040 vehicles and an eastbound flow of 14,601 vehicles. West of Elliot Street the flows are larger with a westbound flow of 15,837 vehicles and an eastbound flow of 15,139 vehicles.

In practice, a multi-lane highway may carry up to 1800 VPH per lane. Nimitz Highway at this point is three lanes in each direction.

6.54 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has a continuous rolling topography and an underlying base of consolidated lava. There are no unusual geological features.

2. SOILS: The site is urbanized land with no other ALISH identification.
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3. SURFACE WATER: There is no major surface water on the site.

4. GROUNDWATER: The site has no moving or standing water.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The ground temperature is affected by the asphalt roadways on the sides of the site and asphalt parking area on the site. The windflow is moderately affected by vehicular traffic along Nimitz Highway and H-1 freeway, and viaduct structure of H-1 freeway.

6. FLORA: The site vegetation includes one Coconut tree, natural grasses and noxious weeds.

7. FAUNA: The site has common animal species including mice, rats, and lizards. There are no known habitats for rare, exotic or endangered species.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. AIR QUALITY: There is dust, odors, and smoke generated by vehicular traffic along Nimitz Highway and H-1 Freeway.

2. NOISE LEVELS: There is noise generated by vehicular traffic along Nimitz Highway and H-1 Freeway.

Aircraft utilizing Honolulu International Airport
generate noise.

3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: There is some ponding at low spots on site. The site is not located in a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: There are no significant views into or from the site.

5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archeological sites.

6.56 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The tax office has assessed the 3.4 acre site at $3,389,474. This figure represents 60% of the market value which is estimated at $5,649,123, or $38.14 per square foot. A 30,000 SF portion of this site may be assumed to cost $1,144,200.00.

There is the possibility that some of this land may be released by the military at no cost if it is for the use of Department of Education.

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: It is essentially flat and would require minimal grading work.

2. UTILITIES: There are no special utility requirements necessary to develop the site.
3. DRAINAGE: Existing drainage facilities preclude flooding on the site.

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT

1. UTILITIES: The existing utilities are designed to accommodate development in this area.

2. DRAINAGE: Provision must be made to connect to the drainage system along Nimitz Highway and in the Post Office/Airport area to absorb runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADWAYS: Access to the site is via the existing roadway system.
CHAPTER 6: DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS FOR EACH
   ALTERNATIVE SITE (CONTINUED)

SITE 6

TMK # 1-1-63: POR 18 (See Exhibit L)

Note:

6 = Chapter 6
6.6 = Alternative Site 6
6.61 = Standard Conditions Categories

6.60 GENERAL

The site is a portion of the land which is set aside for
Salt Lake District Park. The site fronts Likini Street and
is approximately 30,000 S.F. with favorable slope con-
ditions. The Department of Parks and Recreation has indi-
cated that they will be opposed to the use of any park site
for a library.

6.61 MINIMUM SITE CONDITIONS

A. LOCATION: The site is within the service area
   located at Salt Lake District Park along Likini
   Street.

B. SIZE: The site is approximately 30,000 S.F.

C. FLOOD ZONE: The site is not subject to flooding.

D. VACANT: The site is vacant.
SITE PLAN
TMK 1-1-63: por. 18

LOCATION MAP

SALT LAKE DISTRICT PARK
EXHIBIT L
ALTERNATIVE SITE 6

APPROX. 30,000 SF AREA

Likini Street

RESIDENTIAL

8" SEWER
6" WATER

POSSIBLE VEHICULAR ACCESS

SITE LOCATION

NORTH
SCALE 1"=60'
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6.62 FUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS

A. SHAPE: The site is roughly rectangular.

B. SLOPE: The majority of the site is below 5% slope.

C. FOUNDATION: The Urban Usage Land Classification is IV.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: Access is from Likini Street. The site is fronted by a sidewalk. The nearest pedestrian crosswalk is at the corner of Likini Street and Ala Lilikoi Street.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION: The site is approximately one half mile from the activity center.

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY: The site is visible from Likini Street.

G. AIRCRAFT: The site is more than one mile from the air traffic pattern of Honolulu International Airport.

6.63 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CONDITIONS

A. WATER: There is a 6" water line along Likini Street.

B. SEWER: There is a 8" sewer line along Likini Street.
C. DRAINAGE: There is no drain line, although there is a storm drainage easement nearby.

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The surrounding areas are presently serviced with power and communication. The services can be provided to the site.

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES: Officers operating from the Kalihi substation respond to calls from this area. The site is within the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake fire station. Emergency medical services are provided by ambulances from St. Francis Hospital.

F. TRANSPORTATION: The site is located on a major arterial roadway. Bus service is available on Likini Street.

The traffic that will be generated by a library of this size at peak hour usage times (Saturdays, and weekdays 2:30 – 5:00 PM) may be between 65 – 70 trip ends.

The latest traffic flow information for Likini Street near Site 6 was recorded between Ala Lehua Street and Ala Lili'ikoi Street. This study indicates only the 24 hour two-way flow total of 3,714 vehicles.
The normal tolerable traffic capacity of a 44-foot right-of-way street such as Likini Street with no parking is approximately 600 VPH in one direction or 900 VPH for both directions. Utilizing information gathered for Likini Street at Site 2, it is evident that Site 6 is located on a less travelled stretch of Likini Street that traffic generated by a library (65 - 70 trip ends) would not adversely impact the roadway.

6.64 ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

1. GEOGRAPHY / GEOLOGY: The site has relatively flat topography and an underlying base of consolidated lava. There are no unusual geological features within this one acre portion of the larger parcel.

2. SOILS: The site is urbanized land with no other ALISH identification.

3. SURFACE WATER: There is no major surface water on the site.

4. GROUNDWATER: The site has no moving or standing water.

5. MICROCLIMATE: The site has a vegetative cover which shadows and lowers ground temperature. The
windflow is from the prevailing trades.

6. FLORA: The following is a list of plants which have been identified in the Salt Lake District Park Environmental Impact Statement proposed for the City and County of Honolulu, Department of Parks and Recreation by Wilson Okamoto & Associates, Inc., September 1979.

These may be found on the site:

**Grasses:**
- Natal redtop grass (*Setaria verticillata*)
- Swollen finger grass (*Chloris inflata*)
- Panic grass (*Panicum maximum*)
- Bristly foxtail (*Setaria verticillata*)
- Honohono grass (*Commeline diffusa*)

**Vines:**
- Hairy Merremia (*Merremia aegyptia*)
- Pohapoha (*Passiflora foetida*)
- Balsam apple (*Momordica charantia*)

**Shrubs & Herbs**
- Lantana (*Lantana camara*)
- Koa haole (*Leucaena leucocephala*)
- Klu (*Acacia farnesiana*)
- Panini (*Opuntia nacacabtha*)
- Ilima (*Sida fallax*)
- Purslane (*Portulaca oleracea*)
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False ilima (malvastrum coromandelianum)  
Spurflower (Plectranthus parciiflorus)  
Wild spurge (Poinsettia geniculata)  
Indian fleabane (Pluchea odorata)  
Chinese violet (Asystasia gangetica)  
Spanish needle (Bidens pilosa)  
Garden spurge (Euphorbia hirta)  
Hialoa (Waltheria americana)  
Gaillardia (Gaillardia pulchella)  
Spiny amaranth (Amaranthus spinosus)  
Spike elephantopus (Pseudoelephantopus spictatus)  
Desmanthus (Desmanthus virgatus)  
Prickly sida (Sida spinosa)  

Trees:  
Kiawe (prosopis pallida)  
Christmas berry (Schinus terebinthifolius)  

7. FAUNA: Species which may be found on the site are common and include rats, mice, mongooses, feral dogs, and feral cats. The site is removed from the lake area, and no waterfowl were evident. There is no evidence of habitats for rare and endangered species.
B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1. AIR QUALITY: There are no unusual levels of dust, odors, smoke, or other nuisances generated by adjacent activities.

2. NOISE LEVELS: Vehicular traffic along Ala Lilikoi Street generates periodic noise.

3. STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING: The site is not located within a flood plain.

4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS: The site has no significant view planes either in or out of it. It is located against a rock outcropping that isolates the parcel from outside views. Aesthetically, this parcel is of high value due to this nearby natural feature.

5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES: There are no known archaeological sites.

6.65 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CONDITIONS

A. STATE LAND USE: The site has an Urban designation.

B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN: The site is designated Preservation.

C. COUNTY ZONING: The site is zoned P-1 preservation.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.
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E. HISTORIC, CULTURAL AND SCENIC DISTRICT: The site is outside the district.

6.66 COST CONSIDERATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: The 84.29 acre park site was assessed at $278,183 by the tax office. This figure represents 60% of fair market value which is $463,638 or $5,500 per acre. A 30,000 SF portion of this site may be assumed to cost $3,780.00.

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. GRADING: The site would require clearing and grading work.

2. UTILITIES: There are no special utility requirements necessary to develop the site.

3. DRAINAGE: There are no existing drainage facilities on the site.

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT:

1. UTILITIES: The existing utilities are designed to accommodate development in this area.

2. DRAINAGE: The existing system is sufficient to absorb runoff from the site.

3. ACCESS ROADWAYS: Access to the site is via the existing secondary roadway system.
CHAPTER 7: THE LAND USE POLICIES AND CONTROLS FOR THE AFFECTED AREA

7.1 STATE LAND USE

The State Land Use designations for the service area is shown in Exhibit G. It is a portion of the Puuoa quadrangle map 0 - 10, and Honolulu quadrangle map 0 - 13 prepared by the State Land Use Commission.

The State Land Use District Maps have four districts, they are: urban, rural, conservation, and agriculture. The permissible uses within these districts are explained in the State Land Use District Regulations of the State Land Use Commission.

Libraries are permitted in the Urban District only. However, should a library site be selected in an area that is not within an Urban District, a Land Use District Boundary Amendment would have to be requested. The districts that are within the service area are Urban (U) Districts and Conservation (C) Districts.
7.2 HAWAII STATE PLAN

The Hawaii State Plan identifies the goals, and policies of the State to serve as a guide for future development. While the State Plan objectives are broad and cover a wide range of issues, these objectives are further defined by the State Functional Plans. The following are the relevant objectives and policies of the Hawaii State Plan.

PART I: OVERALL THEME, GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES:

Section 21 - Objectives and Policies for Socio-Cultural Advancement - Education

Ensure the provision of adequate and accessible educational services and facilities that are designed to meet individual and community needs. (Policy: Sec. 21, b(2), p.33, The Hawaii State Plan)

PART III: PRIORITY DIRECTIONS:

Section 104 - Population Growth & Distribution Implementing Actions:

Encourage CIP expenditures, public services, and housing developments that recognize the needs and preferences of the Counties. (Priority Action: Sec. 104, b(5), p. 45, The Hawaii State Plan)

...and wherever possible, locate state buildings and facilities within urban centers close to public transportation;... (Priority Action: Sec. 104, c(3), p.45; The Hawaii State Plan)

STATE EDUCATION PLAN

Although the State Functional Plans have not been adopted by the Legislature, they have been distributed to all State departments. The Governor has advised all departments to use the Functional Plans as guidelines.
The State Education Plan was prepared to implement the policies and priority directions of the Hawaii State Plan. The aforementioned policies and priority actions most directly reflect the State's direction in library services, as does the following statement:

Provide a safe and secure environment for schools and libraries. (Concern of the State Education Plan Advisory Committee)

The recommended implementing action proposed in the State Education Plan most relevant to Public Library Facilities is as follows:

4) That the Board of Education seek funds for the building as a new facility, the expansion of the library system, and for renovation of existing structures. The time frame is 1982 – 1983. (p.202, State Education Plan.)
7.3 THE GENERAL PLAN

City and County of Honolulu

The General Plan identifies the long-range objectives and policies which the City and County government hopes to actualize for the benefit of the people of Oahu. The General Plan contains objectives and policy statements which address 9 different areas of concern. A single project such as the proposed action can only be related to such a document in a very general way; the following are the relevant objectives and policies.

POPULATION

OBJECTIVE B
Policy 2: Provide adequate support facilities to accommodate future growth in the number of visitors to Oahu.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

OBJECTIVE A
Policy 2: Require development projects to give due consideration to natural features such as slope, flood, and erosion hazards, and water recharge areas.

OBJECTIVE B
Policy 3: Locate roads, highways, and other public facilities and utilities in areas where they will least obstruct important views of the mountains and the sea.
PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT AND URBAN DESIGN

OBJECTIVE A

Policy 1: Plan for the construction of new public facilities and utilities in various parts of the Island according to the following order of priority: first, in the primary urban center; ...  

Policy 6: Locate community facilities on sites that will be convenient to the people they are intended to serve.
7.4 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PRIMARY URBAN CENTER

City and County of Honolulu

The City and County of Honolulu has recently adopted the Development Plan for the Primary Urban Center. Exhibit H represents the current Development Plan for the project site.

As indicated by Exhibit H, the Development Plan designates the service area with a number of urban classifications. Designations that are considered compatible with the proposed library use are: public facilities, commercial, residential or apartment uses. The designations that are less compatible are: hotel, industrial, preservation, and agriculture.
7.5 COUNTY ZONING

City and County of Honolulu

The provisions of the County Zoning Code (CZC) are meant to implement the purpose and intent of the General Plan of the City. It does this by encouraging the most appropriate use and occupancy of buildings, and by providing reasonable standards with respect to the locations, height, bulk, size of buildings, yards areas, courts, off-street parking facilities, and other open spaces, etc.

The CZC zoning designations within the service area are shown in Exhibit I. The zoning of the various alternative sites is used to determine the building setback, and size of parcel for the library (see Exhibits B-1 and B-2). The zoning districts that are compatible with a library are business, residential, and apartment zones.
7.6 OTHER CONTROLS

7.61 SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA (SMA)

The project service area does not fall within a shoreline setback area, therefore no special use permit is necessary.

7.62 HAWAII COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT (CZM)

The project service area does not influence valuable or vulnerable coastal resources. The CZM program therefore does not apply.

7.63 SPECIAL DESIGN DISTRICT (SDD) / HISTORICAL CULTURAL SCENIC DISTRICT (HCSO)

The service area does not lie within either an SDD or HCSO. Therefore the selected sites are not subject to their provisions.

7.64 TSUNAMI ZONE

The entire service area is well inland and above the tsunami inundation zone.

7.65 FLOOD

The project will be designed and constructed in compliance with the requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program, the City and County of Honolulu Drainage Standards, and Grading Ordinance. The service area is subject to significant flood erosion and subsidence hazard along Moanalua Stream and the H-1 Freeway, and below Puuloa Road.
CHAPTER 8: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

(THE PROBABLE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED ACTION)

This Chapter deals with the evaluation of the alternative sites according to the site selection criteria that is set forth in Chapter 4. In order to avoid repetitions this Chapter will evaluate all six alternative sites by each criterion (rather than using the criteria six times to evaluate all the sites separately), and the results will be presented for each criterion so that a comparative ranking can be determined. The ratings will be listed as follows:

A. POTENTIAL SITES CRITERIA

1. Minimum Site Criteria: The alternative sites have all passed the minimum site criteria listed in Chapter 4 and were therefore chosen for evaluation according to the remainder of the general criteria.

B. ALTERNATIVE SITES OR GENERAL CRITERIA

1. Functional Criteria

2. Utilities and Support Service Criteria

3. Environmental Criteria

4. Government Regulatory Criteria
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5. **Cost Criteria**

The alternative sites will be rated good, fair, or poor with regard to the particular criterion on the basis of the standards established in Chapter 4.

The summary and comparison of the evaluation of the alternative sites will be presented in Chapter 9: SUMMARY OF EVALUATIONS.

### 8.1 FUNCTIONAL EVALUATION

**A. SHAPE:** Under this criterion Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are all larger than the minimum site size. Therefore portions of each site will have an acceptable width to length ratio. These sites are rated "good."

Site 2 is curved rectangle in shape and is made up of three separate but contiguous lots. The length of these lots is 100 feet with a combined width of 300 feet. Therefore the length to width ratio is 3:1 which earns it a "poor" rating.

**B. SLOPE:** All six sites are rated "good" for this criterion since the average slope of each is 5% or less.

**C. FOUNDATION:** Under this criteria all six sites are rated "fair." The foundation characteristics of the
soil classifies them all as sites with expanding soil, with a well-drained surface.

D. ACCESSIBILITY: Access to Site 1 is off a low speed major roadway; access to Sites 2, 3, and 6 are off improved collector streets; and access to Site 4 and 5 are off both a high speed roadway and a collector street.

Therefore site 1 is rated "good," sites 2, 3, and 6 are rated "fair," and sites 4 and 5 are also rated "fair" in that both sites could be accessed off the collector roads which are considered safer.

E. PROXIMITY TO OPTIMUM LOCATION (ACTIVITY CENTER)

Sites 1 and 5 are located more than one-half miles away from the activity center and are therefore rated "poor." Sites 2, 3, and 6 are within one half mile of the activity center, and thus are rated "fair." Site 4 is located in the activity center and is rated "good."

F. VISIBILITY FROM MAJOR ROADWAY

Site 1, 2, and 4 are readily visible from major roadways both approaching and passing. These sites are rated "good." Sites 3, 5, and 6 are harder to spot from both directions, are a bit out of the way, and are rated "fair."
G. AIRCRAFT: All but one of the sites are a mile or more away from Honolulu International Airport. However, even this site (5) is more than one mile from the normal aircraft flight path. Therefore all sites are rated "good."
8.2 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE IMPACTS

A. WATER AVAILABILITY: Water service to Sites 1 through 6 is available from the water main located in the roadway fronting the site. The availability for water service to all alternative sites is therefore rated as "good." However, the actual availability of water for the project will be determined when the building permit is submitted.

B. SEWER AVAILABILITY: The availability of sewer services for all sites is rated as "good." Presently, all six sites have sewer lines that run along the street fronting the site, and in one case the line runs through the subject property.

C. DRAINAGE: The drainage for Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 is rated as "good." Site 6 has no on-site or nearby drainage facilities, and was therefore rated "poor."

D. POWER AND COMMUNICATION: The availability for power and communication services for all six alternative sites was rated as "good."

E. POLICE, FIRE, AND MEDICAL SERVICES

All six sites are adequately serviced by existing police, fire, and medical services. All sites are therefore rated "good."
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F. TRANSPORTATION: The transportation systems for all six sites become congested during peak traffic periods but otherwise are adequate to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed library. All six sites are also serviced by bus service and are rated as "fair."
8.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. PHYSICAL IMPACTS

1. GEOGRAPHY/GEOLoGY: All sites are relatively flat and without significant landforms or geology. Therefore all sites are rated as "good."

2. SOILS: All six sites are urbanized land and have no ALISH designation. They are all therefore rated as "good" sites according to the criterion.

3. SURFACE WATER: The six sites in question have no major or minor surface water considerations. Therefore all six sites are rated "good."

4. GROUNDWATER: Only Site 1 has periodic runoff from rain showers that flow from the site into an intermittent stream. Site 1 is therefore rated "fair." Sites 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 have no moving or standing water on site and are therefore rated "good."

5. MICROCLIMATE: Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are rated "good" because their ground temperature and windflow will not be significantly affected by the proposed project. Site 6 is rated "fair" because it has a vegetative cover of haole koa, grasses etc. that will be disturbed by the proposed project. However, this project is not expected to cause an adverse impact on the site.
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6. **FLORA:** The site vegetation for all sites will not be adversely affected by the proposed project, because only grasses and shrubs of a common or noxious nature need be removed. All sites are therefore rated "good."

7. **FAUNA:** There is no evidence on any of the sites of habitats for rare, exotic or endangered species. The least urbanized site is Site 6 and it has common species of fauna which will be displaced. Site 6 is therefore rated as "fair," and Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are rated "good."

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY IMPACTS**

1. **AIR QUALITY:** Sites 1 and 6 are rated as "good" because they are free from unusual levels of dust, odors, smoke, and other nuisances. Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 are subject to periodic odors, dust, etc. from adjacent activities, but they were all well within human tolerances.

2. **NOISE LEVELS:** Sites 1, 2, and 6 rated as "good;" Sites 3 and four are rated "fair" because of the potential of periodic disruption from vehicular traffic and recreational activities. Site 6 is rated "poor" because of its proximity to Honolulu International Airport and the potential of aircraft noise disruptions.
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3. **STORM DRAINAGE AND FLOODING:** All sites are rated "good" because they drained adequately and are not in a flood plain.

4. **VIEWS AND AESTHETICS:** Sites 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are all rated "good." All these sites (except Site 6) are urbanized and will be improved by a well designed and sited library. Although Site 6 is not urbanized it is in an urbanized area, and will not obscure or conflict with existing views or values.

Site 2 is rated as "fair" because there are significant views to the golf course from the residences across the street that require sensitive siting and design of the proposed library.

5. **ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES:** All sites are rated "good." None of the sites have any known or assumed archaeological sites.
8.4 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY EVALUATION

A. STATE LAND USE: All sites are designated as "Urban" on the State Land Use Commission Maps. All six sites are therefore rated "good."

B. COUNTY PRIMARY URBAN CENTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN: Only Site 4 is ranked "good" because it is a military property in the process of being transferred to the Department of Education (public facilities designation). Sites 1 and 2 are rated fair because they have residential designations. Sites 3, 5, and 6 are ranked "poor" since the DP designations are park, preservation, or industrial which are considered incompatible uses.

C. COUNTY ZONING: Sites 1, 2, and 4 are residentially zoned and rated "fair." Sites 3, 5, and 6 are zoned preservation, industrial and preservation respectively, thus receiving "poor" ratings.

D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: All six sites are outside this district. All are rated "good."

E. SPECIAL DESIGN DISTRICT/HISTORIC CULTURAL SCENIC DISTRICT: All sites are outside the boundaries of these districts and are all therefore rated "good."
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8.5 COST EVALUATIONS

A. LAND ACQUISITION: Sites 1, 4* and 6 are rated as "fair" because their square footage cost is below $10 which puts them at or below the allocation for land acquisition of $300,000, based on a 30,000 SF site. Sites 2, 3, and 5 are more expensive and are therefore rated "poor."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE SITES</th>
<th>LAND ACQUISITION COST</th>
<th>COST PER SQ.FT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$159,900.00</td>
<td>$5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$321,166.00</td>
<td>$10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$461,110.00</td>
<td>$15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$135,810.00</td>
<td>$5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,144,200.00</td>
<td>$38.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,780.00</td>
<td>$1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT: All sites are currently unimproved and will require minor on-site development costs, however, none of these are estimated to be major. All sites are therefore rated "fair."

C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT: The surrounding area (for all sites) is very urbanized. Therefore utilities, drainage facilities, and roadways are all deemed to

*The State has requested the Federal Government to deed the site to the State at little or no cost for use by the Department of Education.
be adequate to accommodate development of all six sites. There will of course be minor costs associated with connecting these services to the proposed library. All six sites were therefore rated "fair."
CHAPTER 9: SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

The six alternative sites chosen for further evaluation were first evaluated against the Minimum Site Criteria and the Guidelines for Site Selection in Chapter 5. This criteria determined whether they should be considered as possible sites for the proposed library. These six sites were chosen because they met this criteria. These alternative sites were then evaluated against the remaining Functional, Environmental, Regulatory, Service, and Cost Criteria in Chapter 6. The results of this in-depth evaluation are provided in Table I - Evaluation Table (p. 9-2).

The major criteria groupings provide a structure to the table and provide the best means to further evaluate the sites. The rating for each criterion reflect an evaluation of good, fair, or poor for each site. No numerical value or weighting of the items was undertaken. A comparison of sites is possible by comparing the differences in the evaluation table.
### EVALUATION TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
<th>Site 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. FUNCTIONAL CRITERIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. SHAPE</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SLOPE</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. FOUNDATION</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. ACCESSIBILITY</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. PROX. TO OPT. LOCATION</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. VISIBILITY</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. AIRCRAFT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. WATER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SEWER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. DRAINAGE</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. POWER/COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. POLICE, FIRE, MEDICAL</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. TRANSPORTATION FAC.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PHYSICAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. GEOGRAPHY/GEODEMY</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SOILS</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SURFACE WATER</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GROUNDWATER</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MICROCLIMATE</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FLORA</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FAUNA</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>Site 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NOISE LEVELS</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. STORM DRAINAGE/FLOODING</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. VIEWS AND AESTHETICS</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CRITERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. STATE LAND USE</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. DEVELOPMENT PLAN</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ZONING</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. SDD/HCSO</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ON-SITE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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By looking at each of the five major criteria groupings it is possible to compare one site to another. The results of such a comparison are as follows:

9.1 FUNCTIONAL CRITERIA RATING

Site 4 received the highest ranking in this criteria. Sites 1, 2, and 5 all had one "poor" rating each. Sites 1 and 5 were rated "poor" because they were more than one-half mile from the main activity center of the area; Site 2 was rated "poor" because of its 1:3 length-width ratio.

For this category sites 3, 4, and 6 are ranked better overall than sites 1, 2, and 5.

9.2 UTILITY AND SUPPORT SERVICE CRITERIA RATING

All sites received "fair" ratings for transportation facilities due to rush hour traffic. Many sites ranked fairly even in this category. Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were ranked "good" for all other utility and support service criteria. Site 6 was ranked "poor" because there is no drainage system in the immediate area.
9.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA RATING

A. PHYSICAL FACTORS

Due to the relative proximity of all sites the physical factors rating were very similar. Sites 2, 3, 4, and 5 were ranked good for all criteria. Site 1 received a "fair" rating because it has minor value for groundwater recharge due to the runoff that flows across the property into the drainage channels along the boundary of the site. Site 6 received two "fair" ratings because it is a relatively natural and untouched site, and the wildlife and microclimate of the site will be impacted due to the removal of vegetation on site.

9.3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Sites 1 and 6 were rated "good" for all criteria. Sites 2, 3, and 4 each had three good ratings and 2 "fair" ratings. Sites 3 and 4 were rated "fair" for air quality and noise levels due to their proximity to highways and recreational areas and other adjacent activities; Site 2 was rated "fair" for air quality for similar reasons as well as views because a building may impact existing views to the golf course. Site 5 was rated fair for air quality and poor for noise levels because it fronts on busy Nimitz Highway.
Overall, Site 1 received the highest ratings all together. Sites 2, 3, 4, and 6 were rated "good" in 10 out of 12 categories. And site 5 was lowest with one "poor" rating. However, all sites were so similar that this difference is not great.

9.4 GOVERNMENT REGULATORY CRITERIA RATING

Site 4 had the highest number of "good" ratings and thus the least regulatory hindrances. Sites 1 and 2 were rated "fair" for both the Development Plan and Zoning, however, this does not mean a library is not possible on these sites; only less compatible than other uses. Site 3, 5, and 6 were all rated "poor" or incompatible with the Development Plan and zoning intended use. However, this was largely due to the fact that Sites 3 and 6 are park land on which a library may be an allowable use. Site 5 is industrial land, and this is not a compatible use for a library.

9.5 COST CRITERIA RATING

All were rated "fair" for on-site and off-site development. All sites were evaluated as requiring minor development or hook up costs. Sites 1, 4 and 6 were rated "fair" for acquisition because their market value is within the budget for state acquisition. Site 2, 3, and 5, however, were more expensive and thus rated "poor."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
<th>Site 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.6 RESULTS OF EVALUATION

Based on the above evaluations it is clear that Sites 1 and 4 are the best sites and are rated very similarly. Sites 2 and 3 are the next best sites followed by Sites 6 and 5. Site 4 is located near the center of community activity and is located on a main thoroughfare for visibility and accessibility to the maximum number of motorists.

Site 1 is a good second choice. Its major drawback is that it is over one half mile from the activity center of the community.

Site 2 is owned by two parties and is irregular in size, thus it may be hard to acquire as well as develop.

Site 3 and Site 6 are owned by the City and County of Honolulu and are park sites. Therefore, these sites are already designated for recreational usage. The Department of Parks and Recreation has expressed its opposition to the use of any park sites in the Salt Lake area for a library.
Site 5 is an industrially designated parcel along Nimitz Highway. The airport viaduct fronts this site as well. This parcel is out of the way, imposed upon by the highway, and subject to traffic and aircraft noise. It is therefore recommended that Site 5 be dropped as an alternative site.
CHAPTER 10: ANY PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

The proposed Moanalua Library is anticipated to have some unavoidable adverse environmental effects. However, these effects would likely be present in any development proposed for all alternative sites since they are all located close to one another. Because the project is a public facility and requires a relatively small amount of land the nature of the effects are beneficial as well. The following is a list of unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

GENERAL:

1. The physical appearance of the project site will be altered. Short-term impacts: Sitework and construction will alter the open space appearance of the site; vegetation will be cleared and the soil exposed for a short period. Long term impacts: a low-rise library building with its parking lot and landscaped grounds will be visible from the roadway and surrounding area.

2. All construction activities will temporarily increase noise levels, air quality deterioration as well as increase traffic congestion when construc-
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tion activities are occurring immediately adjacent to or within existing roadways.

3. Air quality will be adversely affected. For a short-term period, sitework and construction will create fugitive dust. Intermediate impacts include the indirect effect of vehicular emission on the ambient air quality. Higher ambient noise levels will also be produced by air conditioning and increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic levels.

4. The need for public utilities and services will increase.

5. User vehicles entering and leaving the proposed project will increase traffic volume and congestion on the roadway fronting the selected site.

6. The aesthetics of "openness" will be replaced by development of the site. This adverse effect is subject to interpretation based on personal values.

7. During special events such as public or community organization meetings the capacity of the proposed 20 vehicle parking lot may be exceeded. In these situations it is anticipated that overflow parking will occur on the adjoining roadways, except for site 4 where overflow parking for evening events can be accommodated in the adjoining school parking lot.
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The proposed library will compliment the education and cultural guidelines by providing public facilities to service the community. All sites will promote this equally.

The development of the community library will contribute to the life style of the community. The facility will be designed to be compatible with the architectural style of the surrounding buildings, and will therefore pose no adverse impact in this regard.
CHAPTER 11: ALTERNATIVES TO THE ACTION

The alternatives to building a new library which have been considered by the Department of Education are:

1. **No Action** -- This would require service to the community by a bookmobile. The bookmobile service does not provide an adequate level of service to the community according to the Department of Education's library standards.

2. **Convert the Moanalua High School Library into a Community / School Library** -- This alternative was not pursued because the need for a community library to service the Salt Lake - Mililani area has been established as indicated by the Long-Range Program, Hawaii State Library System 1980 - 84.

3. **Lease Space to Accomodate the New Library** -- Most of the leaseable commercial space is located in a flood plain.

12.1 SHORT TERM USES

The short term uses of man's environment include the use of resources for construction, and the use of 30,000 square feet of land. Once the land is used for this purpose, it is unlikely that the selected parcel will be put to any other use during the life-span of the structure. It is also unlikely that once built, the structure will be torn down and the site returned to open space. Therefore, the construction of the library will preclude the use of the land for open space or for a more intensive land use. Other short term uses include labor for construction.

12.2 LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The maintenance and enhancement of long term productivity provide major long term benefits to the public. The goal of the library is to provide increased opportunities for personal educational development, vocational and avocational reference, and increased opportunities for general enjoyment and recreation. In addition the library will create permanent jobs to staff and maintain the library and provide a meeting place for community groups and organizations.
CHAPTER 13: MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE IMPACT

Mitigation measures will be employed in order to minimize adverse short-term and long-term environmental impacts. These measures would be used to reduce the impact of noise, fugitive dust, erosion, siltation, air pollution, and increased user traffic generated by the new library.

A. Noise Pollution will be minimized by adherence to Public Health Regulations requiring adequate muffling of construction equipment and receiving a noise permit if construction noise is expected to exceed allowable levels. Long term reduction of both on-site and off-site noise may be provided by landscape planting to screen and buffer surrounding uses.

B. Fugitive Dust during construction will be controlled according to Public Health Regulations through periodic wetting of loose soil with water or other suitable chemicals. Dust generated by adjoining uses may be reduced within the library by controlled air circulation and air conditioning.

C. Erosion control will be in accordance with Grading ordinances.
D. Siltation and water pollution will be controlled in accordance with Public Health Regulations governing Water Pollution control and Water Quality Standards.

E. Air Pollution Control will be in accordance with Public Health Regulations governing Ambient Air Quality and Air Pollution Control.

F. Hazards to pedestrians may be reduced by the addition of crosswalks where necessary when none are available near the site.
CHAPTER 14: ANY IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

Should the proposed action be implemented, the following resources would be committed:

1. LAND: A site of approximately 30,000 square feet will be committed to library use. The use of land will effectively preclude other options for the site.

2. LABOR: Labor needed for planning, design, construction, and maintenance will be committed. Labor is irretrievable, however it is compensated.

3. BUILDING MATERIALS: Construction materials such as wood, cement, rock, steel, carpets, fixtures, and landscape material will be committed to the project. Once these resources have been used, it is unlikely that a substantial amount will be used again.

4. VIEWS: If site #2 is selected some views from the surrounding residential areas into the country club/golf course area may be affected. All other sites pose no major threat to existing views.

5. ENERGY: Long-term use of electrical energy will be required for lighting and air conditioning of the library facilities.
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6. POTABLE WATER: Water will be used during construction and in the long term for restroom facilities, drinking water, irrigation and possibly the air conditioning system.
CHAPTER 15: OTHER INTERESTS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES THAT MAY OFFSET THE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The most significant governmental policies which would offset any adverse environmental effects relate to public educational goals. These State and County policies encourage the provision of educational facilities in areas accessible to the people. Some of these government policies are discussed in Chapter 7.

The Basic Objective of the State of Hawaii Department of Education with respect to library services is, "To provide comprehensive library resources and services to the people of the state of Hawaii, offering good free library service within the reach of every resident of the state, and otherwise further the interests of the state and its people through library services."

The Hawaii State Plan, Section 21, Objectives and Policies for socio-cultural advancement; Education Policy (b2) states that it shall be the policy of the State to: "Ensure the provision of adequate and accessible educational services and facilities that are designed to meet individual and community needs."

The General Plan for the City and County of Honolulu, Objectives and Policies for Health and education states as
an objective, "to provide a wide range of educational opportunities for the people of Oahu.

It is anticipated that the development of a library will not create any substantial adverse environmental effects and therefore the benefits to the people of Hawaii and conformance with the government policies are felt to offset any minor adverse effects to the environment.
CHAPTER 16: LIST OF NECESSARY APPROVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
<td>Governor of Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Selection</td>
<td>Governor of Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition Authority</td>
<td>Governor of Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Bd. of Land and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Plans</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Accounting &amp; General Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit</td>
<td>Dept. of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Water Supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 17: AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS CONSULTED

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Moanalua Community Library Site Selection was transmitted to the agencies, organizations, and persons named in the mailing list included within this chapter.

The comments received relative to the project, as well as the replies sent in response are provided in CHAPTER 18: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE DURING THE CONSULTATION PHASE and CHAPTER 19: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PHASE.
Federal

1. Department of the Air Force
   15th Air Base Wing, HQ
   Hickam AF Base, HI 96853

2. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
   Pacific Ocean Division
   Bldg. 230, Ft. Shafter, HI 96858

3. Environmental Protection Agency
   Prince Kuhio Federal Bldg., Rm. 1302
   Honolulu, HI 96850

4. Fish and Wildlife Service
   U.S. Department of the Interior
   P. O. Box 50167
   Honolulu, HI 96850

5. Facilities Engineer
   Headquarters, Naval Base
   Box 110, Pearl Harbor, HI 96860

6. Soil Conservation Service
   U.S. Department of Agriculture
   P. O. Box 50004
   Honolulu, HI 96850

State

1. Department of Agriculture, Mr. Jack Suwa
3. Department of Education, Dr. Donnis Thompson
4. Department of Health, Mr. Charles Clark
5. Department of Land & Natural Resources, Mr. Susumu Ono
6. Department of Planning & Economic Development, Mr. Hideto Kono
7. Department of Social Services & Housing, Mr. Franklin Sunn
8. Department of Transportation, Dr. Ryokichi Higashionna
9. University of Hawaii Water Resources Research Center, Dr. Stephen Lau
10. Office of Environmental Quality Control, Ms. Jacqueline Parnell
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County

1. Department of General Planning, Mr. Willard Chow
2. Department of Housing & Community Development, Mr. Joseph Conant
3. Department of Land Utilization, Mr. Michael McElroy
4. Department of Parks & Recreation, Mr. Robert Masuda
5. Department of Public Works, Mr. Roy Tanji
6. Department of Transportation Services, Mr. Roy Parker
7. Board of Water Supply, Mr. Kazuyoshi Hayashida

Public Utilities

1. Gasco., Inc.
3. Hawaiian Telephone Co.

State and Community Organizations

1. Aliamanu/Salt Lake/Foster Village N.B. #18
c/o Neighborhood Commission, City Hall
Honolulu, HI 96813

2. Moanalua Gardens Foundation
1352 Pineapple Place
Honolulu, HI 96819

3. Aliamanu Community Association
c/o Samuel S. Luke, President
4024 Salt Lake Blvd.
Honolulu, HI 96818

4. Foster Village Community Association
c/o June Kaiser, President
1298 Kukila St.
Honolulu, HI 96818

5. Moanalua Gardens Community Association
c/o Ester Izu, President
1403 Haku St.
Honolulu, HI 96819

6. Moanalua Valley Community Association
c/o L. C. McDonald, President
1468 Ala Iolani St.
Honolulu, HI 96819

7. American Lung Association of Hawaii
245 North Kukui St.
Honolulu, HI 96817
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MAILING LIST
(Additional)

Federal

Director of Engineering and Housing
Department of the Army
Headquarters USASCH
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858

Community

Lakeside Manor Owners Assoc.
Mary Jane Tiedemann, Pres.
3030 Ala Ilima Street, #503
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Century West Owners Assoc.
c/o Resident Manager
3161 Ala Ilima Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Harbour Ridge Owners
c/o Resident Manager
3045 Ala Napuaaa Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Lakeview Sands Owner Assoc.
c/o Manager
1441 Alnapua Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

Sunset Lakeview Assoc.
c/o Hugh Yamashiro
3215 Ala Ilima Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

E Foster Village Assoc.
Manager
4341 Hakupapa Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Holiday Lakeview Owners
c/o Manager
949 Ala Nanala Street, #202
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Moanalua Shopping Center
Merchants Assoc.
c/o General Manager
P. O. Box 6218
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Nimitz Business Association
John Connelly, Chairman
3103 N. Nimitz Hwy.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819

Linda Ito
1307 Ala Hoku Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96819
CHAPTER 18: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE DURING THE CONSULTATION PHASE

The comments received during the Consultation Phase are provided in the order that they were received. This Draft EIS Comment List records the date the comments and responses were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency, Organization, or Person</th>
<th>Comment Date</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State</td>
<td>8-16-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major General Arthur U. Ishimoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State</td>
<td>8-17-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Clarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State</td>
<td>8-17-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ryokichi Higashionna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. City and County of Honolulu</td>
<td>8-23-82</td>
<td>10-20-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Masuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Federal</td>
<td>8-23-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State</td>
<td>8-26-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Franklin Sunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. City and County of Honolulu</td>
<td>8-27-82</td>
<td>10-28-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of General Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Willard Chow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Federal</td>
<td>9-1-82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Engineering &amp; Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>State Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
<td>9-3-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Private Moanalua Gardens Community Association</td>
<td>9-7-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Federal Department of the Air Force</td>
<td>9-7-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Facilities Engineer, Headquarters, Naval Base, Pearl Harbor</td>
<td>9-9-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State Department of Education</td>
<td>9-9-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Office of Environmental Quality Control</td>
<td>9-9-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>9-13-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services</td>
<td>9-13-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City and County of Honolulu Board of Water Supply</td>
<td>9-13-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>City and County of Honolulu Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>9-16-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Federal Department of Army</td>
<td>9-16-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>City and County of Honolulu Department of Land Utilization</td>
<td>9-20-82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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21. State
Department of Agriculture
Mr. Jack Suwa
9-20-82 NCR

22. State
University of Hawaii Environmental Center
Mr. Doak Cox
9-20-82 10-26-82

23. Public Utilities
Hawaiian Telephone Co.
9-22-82 NCR

*NCR - No Comment Required
MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Kikio Mishibika
   State Public Works Engineer

From: Deputy Director for Environmental Health

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Consultation Phase for Honolulu Community Library Site Selection

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject EIS. On the basis that the project will comply with all applicable Public Health Regulations, please be informed that we do not have any objections to this project.

We realize that the statements are general in nature due to preliminary plans being the sole source of discussion. We, therefore, reserve the right to impose future environmental restrictions on the project at the time final plans are submitted to this office for review.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Office of Environmental Quality Control
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Hideo Murakami, State Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services

FROM: Director of Transportation

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT PHASE FOR NONALUA COMMUNITY LIBRARY SITE SELECTION

August 17, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Hideo Murakami, State Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services

FROM: Director of Transportation

SUBJECT: CONSULTANT PHASE FOR NONALUA COMMUNITY LIBRARY SITE SELECTION

Mr. Hikio Nishioha
State Public Works Engineer
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, HI 96810-0119

August 23, 1982

Dear Mr. Nishioha:

Subject: Consultation Phase for Nonalua Community Library Site Selection, Salt Lake-Nonalua Valley Area, Oahu

We have reviewed the draft environmental impact statement for the subject library and have no comments to make.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Francis C. H. Lui
State Conservationist

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in finalizing the subject EIS document.

We have no substantive comments to offer to assist you in your work.

[Signature]

Ryukichi Higashimura

Ryukichi Higashimura
Response

STATE OF HAWAI'I
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS
P.O. Box 4013
Honolulu, Hawaii  96808

OCT 20  1982

Mr. Emiko I. Kudo, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
City and County of Honolulu
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Kudo:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Moanalua Community Library

Thank you for the August 23, 1982 comments on the subject project. Your department's opposition to development of the subject library on any of the existing park sites in the Salt Lake area will be noted in the EIS.

Very truly yours,

RIKIO NISHIOKA
State Public Works Engineer

August 23, 1982
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Honorable Hideo Murakami
   State Comptroller

FROM: Franklin Y.K. Sonn, Director
       Department of Social Services and Housing

SUBJECT: Consultation Phase for Waimanalo Community Library Site Selection

We have reviewed the subject draft environmental impact statement and have no comments to offer relative to the proposed action.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

[Signature]

Director

Mr. Nishikawa:
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Waimanalo Community Library has been reviewed and we have no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Donald A. Coppello
LTC(P), EN
Director of Engineering and Housing
August 27, 1982

Mr. Nikio Nishioka
State Public Works Engineer
Department of Accounting and
General Services
P. O. Box 139
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0139

Dear Mr. Nishioka:

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Moanalua Community Library

The EIS identifies six potential sites within the library service area. It is our understanding that the EIS should be prepared for a specific action on a specific site. Until the final selection is made, the submission is somewhat premature.

However, there are other items of interest we feel need to be discussed regardless of the site finally selected. They include:

Potential Traffic Impact Due to the Proposed Action

1. Vehicular capacity of existing roadways servicing the proposed site and the adequacy of the facilities to handle current vehicular volume and the projected increase in traffic that may be generated by the project.

2. Traffic on the roadway fronting the site may be impeded by vehicular turn movements during library construction and upon completion of the project, by user vehicles entering and leaving the site.

3. Off-site parking problems which may be generated in the neighborhood.

4. Traffic hazards to pedestrians.

5. Deterioration of air quality and higher ambient noise levels in the neighborhood.

6. Adequacy of the proposed library driveway and its ability to accommodate the various traffic movements that can be associated with a library.

7. Surrounding land uses (nearby schools, park, etc.) with potential of providing conflicting traffic movements in the immediate vicinity.

Site Considerations:

1. A plot plan showing location of proposed structures and the vehicular/pedestrian circulation pattern within the project site.

2. Vehicular entry and exit points.

Mitigation Measures, such as:

1. Provision of crosswalks for allowing safe crossing of street to reduce potential hazards to pedestrians.

2. The need for installing traffic lights for pedestrian/vehicular safety.

3. Other considerations with a view to reducing traffic congestion and eliminating unsafe traffic conditions.

Sincerely,

RALPH KANAHANA
Planner

APPROVED:

WILLARD T. CHOW

Mr. Nikio Nishioka
Page 2

for
Dr. Willard Chow  
Chief Planning Officer  
Department of General Planning  
City & County of Honolulu  
Honolulu, Hawaii  

Dear Dr. Chow:  

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Moanalua Community Library  

Thank you for your August 27, 1982 comments (DUG/82-2812) on the subject project. Our response to your comments is as follows:  

Specific Site - We believe the intent of the EIS is to expose all of the environmental concerns before a decision is made on a specific site rather than select a site and then expose the environmental concerns. Therefore we do not feel the processing of this EIS covering the alternative sites is premature.  

Potential Traffic Impact  

1. The capacities of the existing roadways servicing the proposed site, the current vehicular volume, and the projected traffic increase from the library will be included in the EIS.  
2. Traffic flow on the roadway fronting the site will be impacted to some minor extent by vehicles entering and leaving the site.  
3. Parking stalls will be provided according to the County Zoning Code. However, occasional special events may cause library users to park in the neighborhood.  
4. The alternative sites do not appear to pose any unusual traffic hazards to pedestrians.  

5. Library users from this area must now drive to a library outside their area. Therefore this library should not cause any increase in air pollution or ambient noise levels in the neighborhood.  

6. The adequacy of the proposed library driveway is a planning and design matter that will be discussed with the County Department of Transportation Services at the appropriate time. We do not see anything that would cause unusual traffic problems.  

7. The peak traffic generated by the library does not coincide with the peak traffic for the school or the morning and afternoon rush hours for the community. Therefore no major conflicts in traffic movements are anticipated.  

Site Considerations - It would be premature at this time to prepare a plan showing the location of proposed structures, vehicular entry and exit points, and vehicular/pedestrian circulation pattern within the project sites. This plan will be drawn during the planning/design phase of the project. However, possible access points will be shown on the site plans in the EIS.  

Mitigation Measures - The need for crosswalks and traffic lights will be discussed with the County Department of Transportation Services. These will be included under mitigation measures if a safety problem is anticipated.  

If there are any questions, please have your staff call Mr. Herbert Ishida of the Planning Branch at 548-3921.  

Very truly yours,  

[Signature]

HIJO HISHIBA  
State Public Works Engineer
Honorables Hides Manakami
State Controller
Department of Accounting and
General Services
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Dear Mr. Manakami:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Moanalua Community Library.

Paragraph 4.7, appearing on page 4.22, should be modified to reflect present federal policy. The present policy is to sell federal surplus property at market value rather than providing it to local governments at no cost.

Conveyance to local governments at no cost is now made only for correctional facilities. This policy was made by the Property Review Board in compliance with President Reagan's Executive Order 12220 of February 25, 1982 (attached). For the same reason, paragraph 6.46, appearing on page 6-29 should also be modified.

In establishing specifications for this job, please require the contractor to stop work and contact our historic sites office immediately if he encounters any historic, archaeological, or palynological sites or remains (e.g., artifacts, shells, bones, charcoal deposits, burials, pavements or walls).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chairman, Board of Land and Natural Resources
State Historic Preservation Officer

Attachment
September 7, 1982

Mr. Rikio Hishikawa
State Public Works Engineer
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0119

Dear Mr. Hishikawa:

The Moanalua Gardens Community Association is in favor of the plans for a library in any of the locations that were mentioned in your letter. We are sure the Community will make good use of this facility.

Yours very truly,

Edward Shimana
President
MCCA

7 September 1982

Office of Environmental Quality Control
550 Kamehameha Street, Room 301
Honolulu, HI 96813

1. This office has reviewed the subject Draft EIS and has no comment relative to the proposed project.

2. We greatly appreciate your cooperative efforts in keeping the Air Force apprised of your project and thank you for the opportunity to review the document.

3. We are returning the copy of the Draft EIS.

R. W. J. Utum
Deputy Director, Civil Engineering

Cc: Mr. Rikio Hishikawa
State Public Works Engineer
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, HI 96810
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Ho'omaluhia Community Library (July 27, 1982)

The subject draft EIS, submitted by Mr. Hideo Murakami, State Comptroller on August 11, 1982, has been reviewed.

The Navy agrees with the first choice selection, Site 4, for the proposed Ho'omaluhia Community Library. Site 4 is located near the center of civilian and Navy communities and as noted in paragraph 3 of page 4-22, the property would possibly be acquired at no cost to the State of Hawaii. For your information, an existing 12" Navy waterline crosses the site as shown in enclosure (1).

Sincerely,

M. M. DIAZ
CAPTAIN, CIC, U.S. NAVY
BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMANDER

Enclosure

Copy to:
State WOS

MEMO TO: Mr. Hideo Murakami, State Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services
F R D M: Bartholomew A. Kane, State Librarian

SUBJECT: Consultation Phase for Ho'omaluhia Community Library Site Selection

The Office of Library Services has reviewed the subject draft of the site selection and EIS, prepared by Phillips Brand Reddick and Associates, and has the following comments.

The Office of Library Services is in agreement with the recommendation of site #4. The location, size of lot, environment and other physical factors, required in our criteria, are adequate and acceptable. The draft study was comprehensive and the in-depth evaluation on each of the six alternative sites were appreciated.

The Office of Library Services will be coordinating any comments and communications received from the community association's contact person, to the DAS planning branch.

If there are any questions concerning the subject project, please contact Mr. James Hiyake at 568-8767.

BCC: J. Hiyake
A. Fujino
L. Ito

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
September 9, 1982

Mr. Hideo Murakami, Controller
Department of Accounting and
General Services
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Dear Mr. Murakami:

Subject: Moanalua Community Library
EIS Consultation Phase

We have reviewed your draft environmental impact statement
for Moanalua Community Library and have no comments to make
at the present time.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Parnell
Director
September 13, 1982

Mr. Nishio Hishikawa
State Public Works Engineer
Department of Accounting
and General Services
State of Hawaii
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0119

Dear Mr. Hishikawa:

Subject: Your Letter of August 11, 1982, On
The Consultant Phase for
Maulalua Community Library Site Selection

Thank you for allowing us to review the draft environmental impact statement for the proposed project.

We offer the following comments on the proposed project:

1. Off-site fire protection is required for Alternate Site No. 5, Exhibit K, page 6-32.

2. The availability of water for the project will be determined when the building permit is submitted for our review and approval.

If you have any questions, please contact Lawrence W. Hwang at 548-5321.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

RASU HAYASHIDA
Manager and Chief Engineer

Response

OCT 20 1982

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS
P. O. BOX 119, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

Mr. Nishio Hishikawa
State Public Works Engineer
City & County of Honolulu
630 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hishikawa:

Subject: Consultation Phase for Maulalua Community Library Site Selection
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your September 13, 1982, comments on the subject project. It will be noted in the subject EIS that off-site fire protection is required for Alternate Site No. 5 and that the actual availability of water for the project will be determined when the building permit is submitted.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

RASU HAYASHIDA
Manager and Chief Engineer
Response

September 13, 1982

Mr. Roy A. Parker
Director
Department of Transportation
Services
City and County of Honolulu
Hawaii

Mr. Niklo Hishikawa
State Public Works Engineer
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0119

Debre Mr. Hishikawa:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for Koolau Community Library

We have the following comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement:

(1) The draft acknowledges the fact that the project will increase traffic on the roadway fronting the selected site. Based on this, a discussion of existing traffic conditions at each site should also be included in the final EIS. Areas with extreme congestion should be avoided if possible.

(2) Exhibit C - Neighborhood Map (Bus Routes) contains erroneous information. The City bus route does not "turn around" on Alahanaul Street. The present bus route "turns around" Ala Pauwala Street.

Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to review and comment on the project.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

OXY A. PARKER
Director

Mr. Niklo Hishikawa:

Subject: Consultation Phase for Koolau Community Library

Thank you for your September 13, 1982 comments on the subject project. The subject EIS will be revised to include a discussion of existing traffic conditions at each site and the Neighborhood Map (Bus Routes) Exhibit C will be corrected.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

NIKLO HISHOKA
State Public Works Engineer
Mr. Nikio Nishioka
State Public Works Engineer
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Dear Mr. Nishioka:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for
Manoa Valley Community Library

A review of the proposed project's potential for impact on
HECO's transmission, distribution and substation facilities
indicates the subject project should have no adverse impact on
HECO's facilities in the area.

Thank you for providing HECO with the opportunity for
review and comment.

Sincerely,

Richard L. O'Connell
Manager, Environmental Department

Mr. Nikio Nishioka
State Public Works Engineer
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Dear Mr. Nishioka:

Subject: Consultation Phase for Manoa Valley Community
Library Site Selection

We have no comments to offer at this time. However, we would
appreciate a copy of the final environmental impact statement
(EIS) when a site is selected and the EIS prepared.

Thank you for forwarding this draft EIS for our review.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U. S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
Ft. Shafter, Hawaii 96858

MR. HIDEO MURAKAMI
State Controller
State of Hawaii
Department of Accounting and General Services
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, HI 96810

Dear Mr. Murakami:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Moanalua Community Library dated 11 August 1982. Based on our review, we provide the following comments:

a. A Department of the Army (DA) Permit is not required for this project.

b. Fifteen of the sixteen potential library sites are designated Zone D under the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for Oahu which was prepared by the Federal Insurance Administration. Zone D represents areas of undetermined but possible flood hazards. These areas were not studied under the FIS. Site E is the only site subject to flooding, as addressed in the FIS (Attachment 1). It is located in the upper Moanalua Stream flood plain, and is designated Zone A or approximate areas of the 100-year flood. The 100-year event has a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chief, Engineering Division

1 Attachment

As stated

Response

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS
Ft. Shafter, Hawaii 96858

OCT 21 1982

Mr. Hideo Murakami, Chief
Engineering Division
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District,
Honolulu
Ft. Shafter, Hawaii 96858

Dear Mr. Murakami:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
For Moanalua Community Library

Thank you for your September 16, 1982 comments on the subject project. Your information on flood zones in the Flood Insurance Study will be included in the subject EIS.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Ryozo Ishioka
State Public Works Engineer

[Local text]
Mr. Michael M. McElroy
Director
Department of Land Utilisation
City and County of Honolulu
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Manoa Community Library Site Selection

Thank you for your September 20, 1982 letter (LUB/82-4699 JON) informing us that rezoning is not required for the subject project at any of the alternative sites. The EIS will be revised accordingly.

Very truly yours,

Michael M. McElroy
Director of Land Utilization

MR#1151

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Manoa Community Library

We have reviewed the subject Draft EIS and have the following comments to offer:

Reference: Chapter 16: List of Necessary Approvals, Page 16-1.

Comment: County zoning approval by the City Council is not required to implement the proposed library facility at any of the six alternative sites. Public libraries are allowed as principle uses and structures under the present zoning designation for each alternative site. A request for rezoning, although not necessary for this project, would require City Council approval.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this Draft EIS. Should you have any questions, please contact John Nakagawa of our staff at 523-4877.

Very truly yours,

Michael M. McElroy
Director of Land Utilization

Mr. Rikio Hishida
State Public Works Engineer
Department of Accounting
& General Services
P.O. Box 319
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0319

Dear Mr. Hishida:

We have reviewed the subject Draft EIS and have the following comments to offer:

Reference: Chapter 16: List of Necessary Approvals, Page 16-1.

Comment: County zoning approval by the City Council is not required to implement the proposed library facility at any of the six alternative sites. Public libraries are allowed as principle uses and structures under the present zoning designation for each alternative site. A request for rezoning, although not necessary for this project, would require City Council approval.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this Draft EIS. Should you have any questions, please contact John Nakagawa of our staff at 523-4877.

Very truly yours,

Michael M. McElroy
Director of Land Utilization
MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Kikio Nishida
   State Public Works Engineer

Subject: Consultation Phase for Ilanilua Community Library Site Selection

The Department of Agriculture has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Ilanilua Community Library and does not have any comments to offer. We are returning the Draft EIS for your further use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jack S. Iima
Chairman, Board of Agriculture

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Hidoo Morikami

"Support Hawaiian Agricultural Products"
Dear Mr. Kimbrough,

The Environmental Center review of the above cited document has been prepared with the assistance of Sheldon Varney, Educational Administration, Jacqueline Miller, and Richard Erwin, Environmental Center.

A study by the University of Hawaii at Manoa Community Library has been recognized by our reviewers as a welcome and much-needed project for this area. Although the DEIS on the Manoa Community Library seems quite complete and accurate, we do have several comments to offer for your consideration.

First, it appears that the criteria for site selection overlooks the possibility that a location adjacent to schools, such as the Alakai schools, is also a plus in terms of usage. The DEIS mentions the possibility of a negative effect from noise and dust of school activities, but does not mention the possibility of greater usage (e.g., library on Campbell High School site). This certainly enhances meeting the "community information" needs mentioned in the objectives of the various plans.

Second, the most adverse aspects of Site # appear to be in terms of environmental quality, specifically air quality (II-1, pp. 4-30) and noise levels (III-2, pp. 6-36). It might be helpful for the revised EIS to include a discussion of possible mitigation measures such as planting of trees, shrubs, etc., or by modification of insulation or construction materials. A discussion of such measures and the economics involved would be useful in evaluating and selecting the best site.

Third, in Section 12 the long-term maintenance and enhancement of productivity of the library is listed primarily in terms of "the creation of permanent jobs for staff" and "acquisition of furniture and equipment". It seems inappropriate that long-term productivity of the site is not discussed in terms of the primary library goal of citizen information, but rather discussed in terms of job opportunities for the library staff.

Finally, there appears to be a significant typographical error on page 8-10, Section 8.40. Should sentence #1 read "only Site 4 rather than "only Site 1"? We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this DEIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Office of Environmental Quality Control
Sheldon Varney
Jacqueline Miller
Richard Erwin

cc: Office of Environmental Quality Control
Sheldon Varney
Jacqueline Miller
Richard Erwin

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
Mr. Dusk Cox  
Director  
Environmental Center  
University of Hawaii  
2550 Campus Road  
Honolulu, Hawaii  

Dear Mr. Cox:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Hoanalua Community Library

Thank you for your September 20, 1982, comments (RF10359) on the subject project. Our response to your comments is as follows:

1. Criteria - The site selection criteria does not address the advantage of a location adjacent to schools because the primary objection of the subject library is to service a community of 10,000 residents or greater. Community-school libraries, such as the one at Campbell High School, are generally confined to rural locations where their small population does not justify a community library. School and community-school libraries are provided to meet the needs of the school. All of the schools in the Hoanalua Community Library service area already have their own library.

2. Environmental Quality - Noise level factors would be minimal for Site #4 because the library will be air conditioned regardless of the site selected. In terms of air quality, Site #5 would probably be subjected to a higher level of pollution from highway vehicles than the other sites. However, this is not anticipated to be a major factor due to the stricter environmental regulations being imposed on vehicles and due to the prevailing tradewinds which dissipate the pollution.
September 22, 1982

Mr. Tiklo Hishihaka
State Public Works Engineer
P. O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810 - 0119

Dear Mr. Hishihaka:

Subject: Consultation Phase for Hoaluas Community Library Site Selection

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Hoaluas Community Library. The comments contained therein pertaining to the availability of communication services to all of the six potential sites are satisfactory.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft EIS.

Sincerely,

Richard Hsu
Engineering & Construction
Staff Manager

cc: R. E. Salto
C. Kaneko
CHAPTER 19: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW PHASE

The comments received during the Public Review Phase are provided in the order that they were received. This Final EIS Comment List records the date, the comments, and responses that were made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency, Organization, or Person</th>
<th>Comment Date</th>
<th>Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Environmental Quality Commission Mr. Charles Ice</td>
<td>11/19/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. City and County of Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation Mrs. Emiko I. Kudo</td>
<td>12/02/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. City and County of Honolulu Department of General Planning Mr. Willard T. Chow</td>
<td>12/03/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. City and County of Honolulu Department of Land Utilization Mr. Michael M. McElroy</td>
<td>12/06/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. State Department of Transportation Dr. Ryokichi Higashionna</td>
<td>12/08/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State Board of Land and Natural Resources and State Historic Preservation Officer Mr. Susumu Ono</td>
<td>12/09/82</td>
<td>NCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State Office of Environmental Quality Control Ms. Jacqueline Parnell</td>
<td>12/10/82</td>
<td>1/18/83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. City and County of Honolulu
   Department of Transportation Services
   Mr. Roy Parker 12/10/82 1/18/83

9. State
   Department of Defense
   Office of the Adjutant General
   Captain Jerry M. Matsuda 12/13/82 NCR

10. City and County of Honolulu
    Department of Housing and Community Development
    Mr. Joseph K. Conant 12/14/82 NCR

11. Aliamanu-Salt Lake-Foster Village
    Neighborhood Board No. 18
    Ms. Bette Tatum 12/20/82 1/19/83

12. State
    Department of Planning and Economic Development
    Mr. Hideto Kono 12/21/82 NCR

13. State
    University of Hawaii
    Environmental Center
    Mr. Doak C. Cox 12/23/82 1/18/83

14. State
    Department of Education
    - Central Oahu
    Mr. Francis M. Hatanaka 12/27/82 1/18/83

15. City and County of Honolulu
    Department of Public Works
    Mr. Michael J. Chun 12/28/82 NCR

16. Moanalua High School
    Student Association Senate
    Mrs. Lana Mito 1/30/83 2/7/83

19-2
Dear Reviewer:

Attached for your review is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was prepared pursuant to Chapter 363, Hawaii Revised Statutes and the Rules and Regulations of the Environmental Quality Commission:

- **Title:** Manoa Community Library
- **Location:** Salt Lake, Oahu
- **Classification:** Agency action

Your comments or acknowledgment of no comments on the EIS are welcomed. Please submit your reply to the accepting authority or approving agency:

- Jacqueline Fournet, Director
  Office of Environmental Quality Control
  550 Naucke Avenue, Room 301
  Honolulu, HI 96813

Please send a copy of your reply to the proposing party:

- Herbert Ishida
  Public Works Division, Department of Accounting & General Service
  1181 Punchbowl Street, Room 430
  Honolulu, HI 96813

Your comments must be received or postmarked by: December 23, 1992.

If you have no further use for this EIS, please return it to the Commission.

Thank you for your participation in the EIS process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News Media</th>
<th>Amount Sent</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Star Bulletin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun Press - Oahu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke Ola O Hawai'i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Tribune</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hawaii Today</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Oahu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui News</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HONOLULU - CITY & COUNTY AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>News Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of General Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Land Utilization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Transportation Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit Division</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HAWAII - COUNTY AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>News Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>News Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Community College Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hawaii Community College Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>News Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Water Supply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Community College Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Main Branch (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailua Regional Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamehameha Regional Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl City Regional Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikele Regional Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa Regional Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewa Beach Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailua Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliha Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koko Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapolei-Makaha Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilo Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilo Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Manoa Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH Manoa Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAILÔA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodie Memorial Library (Kohala)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohala Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokaa Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kealakehe Libary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hau Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kealakehe Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokaa Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaha Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaha Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipahu Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipahu Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikele Park Memorial Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimanalo Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIMĀI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahului Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahaina Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molokai Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANAI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanai Community-School Library</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Optional*
December 2, 1982

Ms. Jacqueline Parnell, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
550 Kalakaua Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parnell:

SUBJECT: MAHALIA COMMUNITY LIBRARY
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

We have reviewed the EIS and would like to reiterate our position that because of the limited developed public park facilities in the Halamaun/Salt Lake area, we are opposed to the development of the proposed library on Kalihi Park.

Sincerely yours,

(Handwritten)

(EK)  I. KIKO, Director

cc: Mr. Herbert Ishida, OAS
Ms. Jacqueline Parnell, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
550 Halsekauila Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parnell:

Hoanalau Community Library
Environmental Impact Statement and Site Selection

Our comments on the proposed project were forwarded to you in our August 27, 1992 review of the draft impact statement. We have no additional comments.

Sincerely,

Ralph Kikuchi
RALPH KIKUCHI
Planner

APPROVED:

W. CHOW
WILLIAM T. CHOW

cc: Mr. Herbert Ishida
Public Works Division
Dept. of Accounting & General Services

Ms. Jacqueline Parnell, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
State of Hawaii
550 Halsekauila Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parnell:

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
and Site Selection
Hoanalau Community Library
Salt Pond, Oahu

We have reviewed the EIS for the Hoanalau Community Library and have no comments to offer.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this EIS. If you should have any questions, please contact Lorene Nakai at 523-4077.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL M. HEGELHOFF
Director of Land Utilization

cc: Mr. Herbert Ishida
EAGS, Public Works Div.
MEMORANDUM

TO:  Ms. Jacqueline Parnell, Director
     Office of Environmental Quality Control

FROM:  Director of Transportation

SUBJECT:  ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
          KAHOALUA COMMUNITY LIBRARY
          EALY LAKES, OAHU

Dear Mrs. Parnell:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the environmental impact statement for Naalehu Library. We have no comments to add to our September 3, 1982 letter to the State Controller.

Sincerely,

Edgar Nakano

SUZUKI KOG., Chairman
Board of Land and Natural Resources
and
State Historic Preservation Officer

cc:  Mr. Herbert Ishida, OAHU
Response

STATE OF HAWAI'I
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
P.O. BOX 110
HONOLULU, HI 96810

December 10, 1982

Mr. Hideo Murakami
State Comptroller
Department of Accounting and
General Services
P.O. Box 110
Honiolu, HI 96810

Dear Mr. Murakami:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Manoa Community Library Site Selection

We have reviewed the various proposed library sites and do not believe that any of them will have a great environmental impact. Since the library site selection is primarily a community concern, the library's location should be the public's decision.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Jacqueline Farnell
Director

Ms. Jacqueline Farnell, Director
Office of Environmental Quality
Control
550 Saloanewa Street, Room 303
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Farnell:

Subject: Manoa Community Library
Site Selection
Environmental Impact Statement

Thank you for your December 10, 1982 letter regarding the subject project. We agree that the library site selection is a community concern and welcome their input. However, we do not agree that selection of the location should be in the governing public's decision because there may be other considerations. Please be assured that community input will be given due consideration when a recommendation on the site is made to the Governor.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
HIDEO MURAKAMI
State Comptroller
Response

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES

December 10, 1982

Mr. Jacqueline Parnell
Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
550 Bethel Street, Room 201
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parnell:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for Manaulu Community Library

Our review indicates that Exhibit C (Neighborhood Map) is incomplete. The map should be revised to show bus routes on University Highway, Elliot Street and Salt Lake Boulevard between Ala Lilihi Street and Ala Napunani Street.

Very truly yours,

ROY A. PARKER
Director

cc: Herbert Ishida

Mr. William A. Bonnet
Director
Department of Transportation Services
City and County of Honolulu
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Bonnet:

Subject: Manaulu Community Library
Site Selection
Environmental Impact Statement

This is in response to your December 10, 1982 letter to the Office of Environmental Quality Control regarding the subject project. Exhibit C of the subject EIS will be revised to show bus routes on University Highway, Elliot Street and Salt Lake Boulevard between Ala Lilihi Street and Ala Napunani Street.

We thank you for your comment on the subject EIS.

Very truly yours,

HIDEO HIRAYAMA
State Comptroller
Ms. Jacqueline Parmell, Director  
Office of Environmental Quality Control  
550 Raleigh Street, Room 301  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parmell:

Nanakuli Community Library

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the proposed project, "Nanakuli Community Library" Environmental Impact Statement.

We have completed our review and have no comments to offer at this time.

Yours truly,

JERRY M. HATUWA  
Captain, HANO  
Cont & Bugs Officer

Enclosures

cc: Herb Ishida

Re: 555 S. King St.
December 20, 1992

Jacqueline Parnell, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
256 Naliaina Avenue, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Aloha,

How exciting for our neighborhood residents to at last have a library in our future!

Herbert Kimura of the Public Works Division, DOH, suggested I write to you to let you know the consensus of those present at our special neighborhood board meeting last Thursday regarding the library site.

After listening to a thorough presentation of how the various sites were evaluated—criteria used, etc.—there's no doubt in the minds of those board members present, or of the neighborhood residents present, or of our legislators present (State Senator Richard Kao and Representative Connie Chun and Representative Joanna Yamauchi) that the choice site would be Aliamanu School (shown as site number 4 on the map of selection sites).

Thank you for a favorable consideration of our number one choice.

Nahale

EDWIN TANAKA
Chairman

State Environmental Quality Control

cc: Edwin Kohda, State Librarian

Dear Mr. Tatum:

Subject: Konaona Community Library
Site Selection
Environmental Impact Statement

This is in reply to your December 20, 1992 letter to the Office of Environmental Quality Control regarding the subject project. Please be assured that the recommendation of Alternative Site No. 4 by Neighborhood Board No. 18 will be given serious consideration along with other factors when a recommendation on the site is made to the Governor.

We thank you for your comments on the subject project.

Very truly yours,

RODD MURAKAMI
State Comptroller
December 21, 1982

Ref. No. 0920

Mr. Jacqueline Parnell
Director
Office of Environmental Quality
Control
500 Kapiolani Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Mr. Parnell:

Subject: EIS and Site Selection for Manoa Community
Library, Salt Lake, Ohio

We have reviewed the environmental impact statement for the
Manoa Library and have no concerns to raise.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: Mr. Herbert Ishida, DAG
December 23, 1982

Jacqueline Parneill, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
330 N畴kaua Street, Room 301
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Parneill:

The Environmental Center review of the above cited document has been prepared with the assistance of Sheldon Varney, Educational Administration; Peter Rappa, Information Specialist, Sea Grant Extension Service; Sam Dhiaica, Environmental Center Librarian; Jacqueline Miller and Pamela Rahsen, Environmental Center. We have the following comments and questions:

First, we note that great detail has been given to the actual site selection of the library within the Salt Lake - Moanalua Valley area. It would be appropriate if some discussion were offered as to how it was determined that this particular area was in need of a community library.

Second, special consideration and provision for our handicapped population is needed when considering user access to the library site and facility. Has this been considered in the accessibility and design of the library?

Third, Chapter 13 indicates that, "Reduction of traffic impacts can be realized by arranging library hours of operation to avoid conflict with peak flow traffic conditions." (13-2, G). We suggest that the criteria for setting library hours be determined by the needs of the community that it serves and not by "peak flow traffic conditions."

Fourth, the apartment zoning required setbacks given in Chapter 4, page 5 do not correspond to those given on page 7 (Exhibit D-2). In the text (6-3) the setbacks are "Front Yard—10 feet" and "Side Yard—15 feet." In the exhibit (6-2) the setbacks are "Front Yard—15 feet" and "Side Yard—10 feet." What are the correct setbacks under A-2 and A-3 zoning?

Please note that Stephen Lai is Director of the Water Resources Research Center (13-2). Donn Cox is Director of the Environmental Center as listed in Chapter 15, page 3.

Jacqueline Parneill, Director

December 23, 1982

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this DEIS and hope you will find our comments useful in the preparation of the final revised document.

Yours truly,

Donn C. Cox
Director

cc: Herbert Ishida, Public Works Division, Dept. of Accounting & General Services
Peter Rappa
Sheldon Varney
Sam Dhiaica
Jacqueline Miller
Pamela Rahsen
Response

Dr. Dook C. Cox, Director
Environmental Center
University of Hawaii
2550 Campus Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Dr. Cox:

Subject: Manoa Community Library
Site Selection
Environmental Impact Statement

This is in response to your December 23, 1982 letter to the Office of Environmental Quality Control regarding the subject project. Our responses to your comments are as follows:

1. Need for a Community Library

   According to the Office of Library Services of the Department of Education, a community qualifies for a public library when there is no public library within two miles and the community population is 20,000 or greater. The Aliamanu, Salt Lake, Manoa, and Kaimuki Village areas have a total population of over 40,000 residents and the closest public libraries, Ateneo Community Library and Kailua Community Library, are located over four miles away. Chapter 1 of the subject EIS will be revised to include the above information.

2. Provisions for the Handicapped

   The library will be designed according to the ANSI A113.1-1980 Standard Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to and Usable by Physically Handicapped People.

3. Criteria for Setting Library Hours

   Item C on Page 13-2 will be deleted because the library peak use period of 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. should not conflict with the peak traffic hours of 7:00 to 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. It is presently estimated that the proposed library will be open a minimum of 46 hours per week. Library hours are expected to be 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on two weekdays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on two weekends and Saturdays. The library would be closed on Fridays for workshops, etc.

4. Apartment Zoning Setback

   The text on page 4-5 will be revised to correspond to the correct setbacks as shown in Exhibit D-2.

5. Mailing List

   The mailing list on page 13-2 will be revised to read "H. University of Hawaii Water Resources Research Center, Dr. Stephen Lau."

We thank you for your comments on the subject EIS.

Very truly yours,

HIDEO NUKAAMI
State Comptroller
December 31, 1982

Mr. Lekio Nishida
State Public Works Engineer
Department of Education
1100 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

SUBJECT: Hawaiian Community Library Site Selection

Dear Mr. Nishida,

We are in reply to your December 21, 1982 letter regarding the subject project. We have reviewed the subject project and its potential impact on the City and County. We have also reviewed the site plan for the community library and the surrounding area. We believe that the plans for the library will include appropriate parking and facilities for the community library users.

We thank you for your comments on the subject project.

Very truly yours,

SIGNED

[Signature]

State Engineer
December 28, 1982

Mr. Herbert Ishida
Public Works Division
Department of Accounting and
General Services
State of Hawaii
1151 Punchbowl Street, Room 410
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Ishida:

Re: EIS for Maunalua Community Library,
Honolulu, Hawaii

We have reviewed the subject EIS and have the following
comment.

Existing municipal sewers are adequate for the proposed
sites for the library.

He me aloha pumehana,

MICHAEL J. CHUH
Director and Chief Engineer

CO: GRC

WAM
Mr. Hidets Muraoka, Comptroller  
Department of Accounting and General Services  
P.O. Box 129  
Honolulu, HI 96810

Dear Mr. Muraoka:

The Moanalua High School Student Association Senate, representing all the students at the school, prefers the site near the Moanalua International Country Club near Ala Hapunani and Ala Pauwai Streets for the proposed community library.

We hope that you will take our preference into consideration when the final site selection is made. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Tamah-Lani S. Nakamoto  
Moanalua High School  
2825 Ala Iliia Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Mrs. Lana Nito  
Director of Student Activities

Response

Mrs. Lana Nito  
Director of Student Activities  
Moanalua High School  
2825 Ala Iliia Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96818

Dear Mrs. Nito:

Subject: Moanalua Community Library  
Site Selection

This is in reply to your January 30, 1983 letter regarding the subject project. The preference of the Moanalua High School Student Association Senate for Site 1 at the corner of Ala Pauwai and Ala Hapunani Streets will be considered in our recommendation to the Governor on the site selection for the subject library.

We thank you for your comments on the subject project.

Very truly yours,

HIDEO MURAOKA  
State Comptroller
CHAPTER 20: SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES

This study has addressed all issues that have been identified through research, investigation, consultation, and public review. In addition, mitigation measures have been proposed in Chapter 13 to minimize any adverse environmental impacts that this project may generate. Other issues regarding the commitment of resources should the project be implemented are addressed in Chapter 14, and Chapter 15.
APPENDIX A: TRAFFIC DATA

ROADWAY CAPACITIES

The capacity of a collector street with a right-of-way width of 60 feet with no parking and at grade intersection is 1,275 vehicles per hour for both directions of travel. The capacity of a local street with a right-of-way width of 44 feet with no parking and at grade intersection is approximately 600 vehicles per hour in one direction and 900 vehicles for both directions of travel.

Nearly all of the local streets have a right-of-way width of 50 feet and pavement width of 20 feet. The capacity of such a local street is slightly lower than that of a local street with a 44-foot right-of-way and pavement width of 28 feet. However, all of the major streets are proposed on the present City and County Detailed Land Use Plan for either a 56 or 80-foot right-of-way.

Source: "Final EIS for the proposed Kapiolani Community College at Fort Ruger" MASTER PLAN February 1981, p. A-68

By: Henry Tuck Au, Consulting Engineer 33 South King Street, Suite 507 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Revised: June 1980
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** ALA NAPUWANI N & LICHN ST

**Date:** 1/1-3 (Tues)

**Count Number:** 677 (Tues)

**Recorder:** (1) S. BROWN (2) N. BROWN

**Page of:**

A-2
### Site 2 & 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Traffic Counts</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Traffic Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/7/71 - 7/12/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17/7/71 - 7/12/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/13/71 - 7/27/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/13/71 - 7/27/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/28/71 - 8/2/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7/28/71 - 8/2/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/71 - 8/7/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/3/71 - 8/7/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/71 - 8/12/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/8/71 - 8/12/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/71 - 8/17/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/13/71 - 8/17/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/71 - 8/22/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/18/71 - 8/22/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/28/71 - 9/1/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8/28/71 - 9/1/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/2/71 - 9/6/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9/2/71 - 9/6/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/7/71 - 9/11/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9/7/71 - 9/11/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/71 - 9/16/71 PM 24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9/12/71 - 9/16/71 AM 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub Total** 372

**Location:** Likini St  3081 Alania Napunahi St

**Date:** 7/7/71 - 7/8/71

**Recorder:** Maka R. A

**Page:** 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>HUT 90</th>
<th>TRAFFIC COUNTS</th>
<th>HUT 24</th>
<th>TRAFFIC COUNTS</th>
<th>HUT 51</th>
<th>TRAFFIC COUNTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:00 PM</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:15 PM</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-1:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-2:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-3:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-3:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total 1</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15-4:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-4:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-5:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15-6:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-6:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-7:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15-7:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30-7:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15-8:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-8:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-11:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:15 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:30 PM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-12:45 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hour Total</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: ALA ILIMA ST W + ALA NAPUNAKI ST
Date: 3-24-81 (FOC) 3-24-81 (FOC) COUNTOUR NUMBER: 66-67

1 W. HUT 90
2 E. HUT 24
3 E. HUT 51

A-4
Site 5

TRAFFIC COUNTS

LIKINI STREET between Lehua and Ala Lilikoi Streets on November 1976 - 24 hour two-way total of 3714 vehicles.

NIMITZ HIGHWAY at ELLIOT STREET on July 10, 1979 - 24 hour flows.

NIMITZ WEST OF ELLIOT STREET

WESTBOUND 15,837 vehicles
EASTBOUND 15,139 vehicles

NIMITZ EAST OF ELLIOT STREET

WESTBOUND 13,040 vehicles
EASTBOUND 14,601 vehicles

ALONG ELLIOT STREET

NORTHBOUND 7,438 vehicles
SOUTHBOUND 5,179 vehicles
LIBRARY TRIP GENERATION

The department of library services has indicated that trips generated by staff for a community library would be primarily limited to the arrival and departure of librarians and maintenance personnel. This would not make a significant addition to the peak traffic flow.

Based upon a user (student) trip generation rate of 41.8 trips/1000 S.F. a library of 10,000 S.F. would generate 418 trips per day. A peak hour generation of 16.0% will result in 66.88 trips during the peak use hour.

State Librarian, Mrs. Fujino has indicated that their library user counts have shown the after school hours of 2:30 to 6:00 PM to be the peak hour library usage times.

VEHICLE TRIPS TO AND FROM GENERATED BY URBAN LIBRARIES

TRIPS PER 1000 SQUARE FEET GROSS FLOOR AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF TRIPS IN PEAK HOUR OF GENERATION: 16%

TYPICAL AUTO OCCUPANCY 1.55 PERSONS

% OF TRIPS USING PUBLIC TRANSIT - 6%


Published by: Transportation Research Board, National Research Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Building Type</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>590</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable—Trips per</td>
<td>1,000 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF TRIP GENERATION RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Trip Rate</th>
<th>Maximum Rate</th>
<th>Minimum Rate</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
<th>Average Size of Independent Variable/Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends</strong></td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Hour of Adjacent Traffic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 9</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and 6</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Hour of Generator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M.</td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday Vehicle Trip Ends</strong></td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday Vehicle Trip Ends</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source Numbers</strong></td>
<td>10, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITE Technical Committee 6A-6—Trip Generation Rates

Date: 1975