January 14, 1985

Dr. Virginia B. Briggs
1676 Ala Moana Boulevard, Apt. 1305
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Dr. Briggs:

Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium

Thank you for your letter of December 27, 1984, in which you address the acceptability of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza hotel/condominium. The EIS was accepted on December 31, 1984, after the applicant submitted an "Addendum to the Final EIS." Copies of the Addendum have been distributed to libraries. A copy of the department's Acceptance Report is attached.

The issues you raised in your letter regarding the various State and County laws on land use policy are not irrelevant. Nevertheless, as stated in the Acceptance Report, Waikiki Special Design District (WSDD) Ordinance No. 4573 embodies the specific zoning regulations related to the legislated land use policies; and the project will be specifically evaluated against the WSDD ordinance as well as the Special Management Area ordinance (Ordinance No. 84-4). Please note that the EIS now states under "Necessary Government Approvals" (Section IV of the Addendum) that (1) approval must be obtained for use of the Public Precinct; and (2) a zoning variance for building setback is required. Also, please note that new material has been added to the analysis of wind impacts (Section IV of the Addendum).

If you have any questions on this matter, please contact Mr. Robin Foster of our staff at 527-5027.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

JOHN P. WHALEN
Director of Land Utilization

JPW:s1
attach.

EXHIBIT D.
Final
Environmental Impact Statement

for the proposed
Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium
Waikiki, City & County of Honolulu

Jack E. Myers, Developer
NOTICE

ALL reference material borrowed from this library will be on a 30-day loan period, limited to ONE RENEWAL ONLY. If borrowed material is not returned when DUE, is DAMAGED, or LOST, there will be a REPRODUCTION CHARGE OF 25¢ PER PAGE.

OEQC LIBRARY - PHONE 548-6915
5518ELEKAUWILA STREET - ROMMC301
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
for the proposed
YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA
Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii
December 1984

SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 343, HAWAII REVISED STATUTES,
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT REGULATIONS

F.J. RODRIGUEZ
AUTHORIZED AGENT FOR JACK E. MYERS

Developer: Jack E. Myers
Architect: Welton Becket Associates
Environmental Consultants:
Environmental Communications, Inc.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>I-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Project Location</td>
<td>II-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Statement of Objectives</td>
<td>II-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. General Description of the Action's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical, Economic,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and Environmental Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Characteristics</td>
<td>II-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Characteristics</td>
<td>II-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Funding and Phasing</td>
<td>II-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROBABLE IMPACTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Geographic Characteristics</td>
<td>III-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>III-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>III-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>III-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Biological Characteristics</td>
<td>III-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>III-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Hydrological Characteristics</td>
<td>III-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Traffic</td>
<td>III-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Count Data</td>
<td>III-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Investigation</td>
<td>III-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip Generation</td>
<td>III-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Impact Summary</td>
<td>III-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Air Quality</td>
<td>III-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Air Quality</td>
<td>III-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Air Quality Impact of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Construction</td>
<td>III-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Air Quality Impact of Decreased Traffic</td>
<td>III-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Noise Quality</td>
<td>III-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Noise Environment</td>
<td>III-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted Noise Impacts</td>
<td>III-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Public Utilities and Services</td>
<td>III-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>III-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewer System</td>
<td>III-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Drainage</td>
<td>III-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Utilities</td>
<td>III-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Service Facilities</td>
<td>III-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Protection Services</td>
<td>III-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Protection Services</td>
<td>III-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital and Medical Care</td>
<td>III-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools and Public Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>III-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Historic and Archaeological Sites</td>
<td>III-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Socio-Economic Characteristics</td>
<td>III-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE, POLICIES, PLANS AND CONTROLS</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Land Uses</td>
<td>IV-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Special Management Area</td>
<td>IV-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Park Dedication</td>
<td>IV-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Reflective Glass</td>
<td>IV-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Waikiki Special Design District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>ANY PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED AND MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE IMPACT</td>
<td>V-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION</td>
<td>VI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>AN INDICATION OF WHAT OTHER INTERESTS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES ARE THOUGHT TO OFFSET THE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION</td>
<td>VIII-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED DURING THE EIS COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE</td>
<td>IX-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX I</td>
<td>Traffic Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX II</td>
<td>Air Quality Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX III</td>
<td>Evaluation of Potential Noise Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>II-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tax Map Key</td>
<td>II-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Model Perspective</td>
<td>II-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Model Perspective</td>
<td>II-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preliminary Site Plan</td>
<td>II-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternative Site Plan</td>
<td>II-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>II-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Access</td>
<td>II-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vehicular Access</td>
<td>II-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Landscape Concept Plan</td>
<td>II-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Typical Section (Mauka)</td>
<td>II-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Typical Section (Makai)</td>
<td>II-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Flood Zone Designation</td>
<td>III-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Waikiki Census Tracts</td>
<td>III-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Zoning Map</td>
<td>IV-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shadow Study</td>
<td>IV-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Exterior Finish-Tower</td>
<td>IV-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-A</td>
<td>Sun Reflection Study</td>
<td>IV-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-B</td>
<td>Sun Reflection Study</td>
<td>IV-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-C</td>
<td>Sun Reflection Study</td>
<td>IV-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-D</td>
<td>Sun Reflection Study</td>
<td>IV-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Waikiki Special Design District</td>
<td>IV-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Angular Towers</td>
<td>IV-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Curvilinear Towers</td>
<td>IV-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Single Curvilinear Structure</td>
<td>IV-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Scheme 1</td>
<td>IV-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Scheme 2</td>
<td>IV-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Scheme 3</td>
<td>IV-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>View Study</td>
<td>IV-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>View Study</td>
<td>IV-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>View Corridor</td>
<td>IV-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table          Page
1  Plant Inventory                        III-5
2  Trip Generation Summary                III-11
3  Summary of Air Pollutant Measurements At Nearest Monitoring Stations III-15
4  Waikiki Census Data                    III-32
5  Organizations and Agencies Consulted During the EIS preparation Notice IX
6  Organizations and Commenting on the Draft EIS IX

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit          Page
1  Letter from Department of Accounting and General Services IV-3
2  Letter from Department of Transportation, Harbors Division IV-4
3  Site Map from Department of Transportation, Harbors Division IV-5
I. SUMMARY
I. SUMMARY

Developer/Applicant: Jack E. Myers

Approving Agency: Department of Land Utilization

Agent for the EIS: Environmental Communications, Inc.

Architect: Welton Becket Associates

Project Location: 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard
Waikiki, Honolulu, Hawaii

Tax Map Key: 2-6-10: 10, 6

Project Name: Yacht Harbour Plaza

A. Proposed Action

The developer and applicant, Jack E. Myers, proposes to construct a mixed-use hotel and residential condominium comprised of 408 hotel guest rooms and 174 condominium apartments respectively. The 350 foot curvilinear structure will be located on a 2 1/2 acre site at the Makai Ewa corner of the Waikiki Special Design District. Specifically, the rectangular project site is bounded by Ala Moana Boulevard, the Ilikai Marina hotel condominium and a State of Hawaii owned service road on the south and west bounds along the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

The hotel portion of the tower will consist of 29 single-loaded floors atop a five-story base of lobbies, parking garage and common areas provided for the entire project.
The hotel floors are separated linearly from the condominium portion of the project by a solid concrete partition wall. The exterior of the structure will be encased with low reflectivity glass, colored in a mauve tone within code requirements.

A typical hotel floor would contain approximately 12 guest rooms, ranging in size from 435 to 450 square feet. Suites will range from 600 to 900 square feet.

The condominium, as contemplated, will contain one-bedroom and two-bedroom units ranging from approximately 840 to 975 square feet and 930 to 1450 square feet respectively. All condominium amenities including an extensive recreation deck, pool, jaccuzi and cabana are currently planned to be on the same level as the hotel amenities.

All public access is designed to be on the makai side of the structure facing the Ala Wai Boat Harbor. An expansive porte cochere for both the hotel and condominium entrances will be open towards the yacht harbor directing traffic away from Ala Moana Boulevard. A State-owned roadway, which was originally designed as an internal harbor road for harbor users, will be utilized under preliminary design plans as the major access and egress road for the proposed project.

The hotel, in addition to some 408 guest rooms, will provide meeting and ballroom facilities along with a fine gourmet restaurant. There will also be a lounge, disco-theque, lobby bar, and poolside bar and grill with outdoor cafe services.

The design concept and planning theme which has been developed by the project architect utilizes portions of State-owned lands for certain architectural design features and
open space requirements. These State-owned lands are currently under negotiation therefore, two design alternatives were developed. The focus of this document is on a preliminary design which utilizes the aforementioned lands. An alternative design, which is completely within the developer's property bounds, is also included in this document as an alternative design.

The site is in urban use and is presently designated as public facility. Since 1958 the site has housed the Kaiser Foundation Hospital and outpatient clinic. The hospital, which is scheduled to move to the newly built Moanalua facility and proposed out-patient clinic on Pensacola and King streets, will vacate in early 1986 allowing the site to revert back to its underlying resort zoning.

The demolition of the existing structure and construction of the proposed hotel condominium will take place in one phase with no additional phases. Total development and construction cost is approximately 124 million dollars.

3. Evaluation of Major Impacts

1. Physical Impacts. The impact of construction is normally adverse; however, it is not a long-term impact and is subject to many standards, codes, and regulations. A review of noise and air quality impacts indicate that no significant effects related to these concerns will likely occur.

Vehicular traffic will be accommodated as indicated in the traffic impact study. The site is bounded by major thoroughfares which can adequately serve the expected number of vehicles generated by the proposed uses on the project site. The preliminary project plan proposes the use of
an internal harbor road as the principal access road for the project.

**Air Quality** will be improved due to the decrease in traffic volume generated by the proposed facility.

**Noise.** The building, once constructed, will not generate excessive noise. The commercial use of the building and its fully enclosed business spaces will not add to the ambient noise environment. Noise from the parking garage in form will be mitigated through careful design with an emphasis on sound attenuation.

The **visual environment** will be affected. The building will be noticeable from various streets and other structures. However, the height will be within the zoning regulations and the WSDD review will include height considerations. In the surrounding area, there are a significant number of buildings with heights of 300'+, the proposed building will not be inconsistent with these high-rise developments.

2. **Economic Impacts.** A wide range of economic impacts will occur. These include direct and indirect income generated by the project, employment, property taxes, and increased governmental expenditures for services and facilities on and for the project. For the most part, long-term economic impacts are expected to be very beneficial to the State economy.

3. **Social Impacts.** There will be no dislocations or job losses due to the development of the proposed project. The project will be a significant employment generator and is consistent and compatible with surrounding uses.
Public services and facilities are essentially adequate as indicated by the letters received from various City agencies. Where appropriate, the consultant engineer and architect will work with the City agencies to insure the adequacy of facilities, connection procedures, easements and maintenance rights, and agreement to pay a fair share cost of the proposed improvements.

C. Alternatives

An alternative plan for the proposed development has been considered and is presented in this document. While the preliminary design of the project utilizes State-owned lands, currently under negotiation, the alternative plan will contain the project entirely within the project site bounds.

D. Land Use Considerations

The extension of the hotel/condominium into the Public Precinct is considered a non-conforming use by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Land Utilization. However, the major portion of the project is located on the designated project site and is consistent with the State and County land use designations.

E. Other Considerations

No commitment of natural resources will occur if the project is implemented. Building material, labor, and land will be committed to the project.

A remaining unresolved issue exists in the land negotiations ongoing between the developer and the State DOT Harbors Division. This consideration is detailed in the document; however, final resolution of this issue cannot be addressed presently.
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Location

The project site is located at the entrance to Waikiki on Ala Moana Boulevard fronting the Ala Wai Boat Harbor (Figure 1). The lot area consists of 110,607 square feet bounded by Ala Moana Boulevard, the Ilikai Marina and a State owned service road. A portion of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor lies along the southwest end of the site. The site is defined by Tax Map Key 2-6-10: 10, 6 (Figure 2).

The site is presently in urban use and is designated as a resort and public facility on the Development Plan Land Use Maps. The project site is the current location of the Kaiser Medical Center housed in two structures, the 216,953 square foot hospital and the 33,193 square foot Pacific Insurance Building containing some administrative and out patient clinic facilities. The Medical Center employs some 1,080 workers composed of 601 hospital employees and 479 clinic employees.

The present Kaiser Medical Center consists of a 174 bed hospital and a clinic providing both in-patient and out-patient health care services, respectively. Their operations are separate and distinct; however, they are integrated. Their proximity provides mutual benefits of convenience and shared facilities.

The project site is located along the Airport-to-Waikiki corridor at the entrance to Waikiki. The proposed hotel extends the chain of hotels along the Waikiki shoreline, of which the Ilikai Hotel is its immediate neighbor to the east (Diamond Head). Mauka of Ala Moana Boulevard lies a high-rise residential area, while to the west
(Ewa) and Makai of the proposed development lies recreational areas including the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and Ala Moana Beach Park.

The preliminary proposed project site lies within the Resort Hotel and Public Precincts of the Waikiki Special Design District (WSDD) and is considered to be within a Waikiki gateway area. The alternative project design would be continued within the metes and bounds of the applicant's land.

B. **Statement of Objectives**

It is the developer's intent to create a project comprised of hotel guest rooms and condominium units that will provide a deluxe level of service to the visitors and residents of Oahu. The Waikiki gateway project is designed to create a desirable destination for visitors as well as provide additional housing opportunities to full time and part time residents.

The project site currently designated as a public facility, would utilize the site to its "highest and best use" and provide a visually attractive landmark at Waikiki's entrance in addition to increasing the value of the surrounding area.

C. **General Description of the Action's Technical, Economic, Social and Environmental Characteristics**

1. **Design Characteristics**

Presently, the developer proposes to construct a mixed-use hotel and residential condominium comprised of 408 hotel guest rooms and 174 condominium
apartments. The curvilinear structure will rise 350 feet over a 2 1/2 acre site which will incorporate extensive park-like landscaping (Figures 3 and 4).

The hotel and condominium are to be incorporated into a single structure (figures 5 and 6). Each will benefit from this approach in connection with the cost to develop and maintain the entire project. Both the hotel and condominium will operate completely separate systems (energy, mechanical, parking security, etc.) so that all aspects of operations will be clearly identifiable to the corresponding user.

The hotel portion of the tower will consist of 29 single-loaded floors atop a five-story base of lobbies, parking garage and common areas provided for the entire project. The hotel floors are separated linearly from the condominium portion of the project by a solid concrete partition wall. The exterior window wall system is laminated glass, colored in a mauve gold tone designed to comply with Ordinance No. 82-35 (Sunlight Reflection Regulation).

All public access is designed on the makai side of the structure facing the Ala Wai Boat Harbor (Figure 7 & 8) utilizing the Boat Harbor service road. This road is on land which is currently under negotiation, will be designed to conform to State Department of Transportation requirements for road width, curbs and sidewalks. The design work for improvements to the service road will be done when negotiations for use of these State Lands have been finalized. An expansive porte cochere for both
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FIGURE 7
the hotel and condominium entrances will be open
towards the yacht harbor directing traffic away from
 Ala Moana Boulevard (Figure 9).

The hotel, in addition to some 408 guest rooms,
will have meeting and ballroom facilities along with
a fine gourmet restaurant. There will also be a
lounge, discotheque, lobby bar, poolside bar and
grill with outdoor cafe services.

A typical hotel floor would contain approximately 12
guest rooms, ranging in size from 435 to 450 square
feet. Suites will range from 600 to 900 square feet.

The condominium, as contemplated, will contain one-
bedroom and two-bedroom units ranging from 840 to
975 square feet and 930 to 1450 square feet respec-
tively. All condominium amenities including an
extensive recreation deck, pool, jaccuzi and cabana
will be on the same level as the hotel amenities.

2. Landscaping Plan

The conceptual landscape plan (Figures 10, 11 and 12)
features extensive use of shade trees, palms, hardy
windbreak plants and flowering plants. Revised flow-
ering plants. Revised concept plans will delete the
potted plants placed along the harbor sidewalk (Fig-
ures 3, 4 and 8).

3. Economic Characteristics

An economic analysis of the proposed development
(Pannel Kerr Forster, May 1984) projects that approxi-
mately 500 jobs will be created and $2.5 million in
State and County tax revenues will be generated annually.

Hotel Complex Impacts

It is estimated that the proposed project will generate total direct (405) and indirect (81) employment of 486 jobs. In addition to the creation of employment opportunities, the development will generate approximately $2.0 million in State and County revenues expressed in current 1984 dollars as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Unemployment Tax</td>
<td>$319,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Gross Income Tax</td>
<td>931,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Personal Income Tax</td>
<td>393,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Real Property Tax</td>
<td>318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,961,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment

According to the Department of General Planning, City and County of Honolulu report "Employment and Population Impacts of Resort Development at Five Oahu Sites," March 1978, the average number of direct employees per hotel room is .7. According to PKF experience of deluxe hotel facilities, the ratio is 1.5 employees per room. Based on the quality orientation of the proposed hotel, a ratio of 1.0 employees per hotel room \((405 \times 1.0 = 405\) was applied to compute total direct employment. Secondary or indirect employment was computed using a factor of 20 percent of total direct jobs \((405 \times 20\% = 81\) in accordance with the above mentioned study.
State Unemployment Tax

These funds were estimated based on 4.5 percent of the first $14,600 of salaries and wages of each of the 486 new employees. The 4.5 percent rate was derived from State of Hawaii Tax Department records as the average currently paid by hotel taxpayers (wage earners).

State Gross Income Tax

These funds were based on 4.0 percent of total estimated revenues generated from all sources at the proposed hotel. Revenue estimates are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rooms</td>
<td>$13,337,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>6,401,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage</td>
<td>2,444,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>302,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments</td>
<td>232,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>93,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>465,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,277,312</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Personal Income Tax

These funds were estimated based on taxable income per employee of $9,058 x an average tax rate of 6.7 percent x the 486 employees. State tax office records were the source of estimated data.
Real Property Tax

These funds were estimated based on currently applied tax rates per thousand dollars of assessed valuation. The 1986 land and construction costs were reduced to 1984 values using a deflator of 5.0 percent in 1986 and 4.6 percent in 1985.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$26,500,000</td>
<td>$24,017,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
<td>11,329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39,000,000</td>
<td>$35,346,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
1,000 \\
35,346 \\
\times \\
\frac{9.00}{9.00} \\
318,114
\end{align*}
\]

Say $318,000

Condominium Complex Impacts

The employment generated by this segment of the project will not be significant since, only approximately 10 jobs will be created. However, the project will generate approximately $635,400 in 1988, in County real property taxes based upon the projected sales price of the units, $70.6 million, at the 1983/84 tax rate of $9.00 a thousand.

Converting this 1988 potential tax revenue to current 1984 dollars based upon the estimated deflators referred to previously will mean tax revenues of approximately $513,000 in 1984, or a total of almost $2.5 million for the entire project.
Full absorption of the units by the market place is expected to take between 1 1/2 to 2 years.

While the hotel is presently designed to accommodate approximately 408 guest rooms, the total potential for guest rooms at this quality level is nearly 800 rooms.

This would be achieved by reducing or eliminating the condominium portion of the project. The exact balance and mix of hotel and condominium use is sufficiently flexible at this stage pending the refinement of market strategies, concepts, financing techniques and timing for the development.

4. Social Characteristics

The mixed use concept for the proposed project makes total occupancy projections difficult, however, the hotel's target market of Free Independent Travelers (FIT's) are generally unaffected by adverse national economic trends. For this reason occupancy is expected to remain stable.

Residents of the condominium units of the project are expected to be primarily older, affluent, professionals. Many are also anticipated to be part time residents to Hawaii. The project's entertainment facilities should be utilized by both Waikiki residents and those residing outside of Waikiki; however, total use of the entire complex is not expected to be as intensive as the existing hospital facility.
D. **Funding and Phasing**

The developer will fund the proposed project through monies obtained from conventional loan sources or institutions. No State or County monies will be involved in the construction of the proposed building; however, portions of State-owned lands will be utilized under the preliminary design alternative. Total construction costs are estimated to be $124,000,000 million.

The project will be constructed in one phase with no additional phases. The developer intends to initiate construction of the project upon filing and granting of all approvals and permits. Construction is estimated to take 21 months, with final outfitting of furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE) taking an additional 3 months.
III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROBABLE IMPACTS
III. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROBABLE IMPACTS

Impacts of the proposed project can be viewed in the short- and long term. Short-term impacts, beneficial and adverse, generally result from construction-related activities. Consequently, these impacts are of short term duration and should last no longer than the duration of the construction. Long-term impacts, beneficial and adverse, result from the implementation and operation of the proposed project.

A. Geographical Characteristics

1. Topography

The project is a level, graded parcel which currently contains the Kaiser Foundation Hospital. The hospital site contains two separate buildings connected by an overhead ramp. The makai boundary of the site is contiguous with the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and lies approximately 90 feet from the water's edge within the harbor. The site rises approximately 45 feet above mean sea level.

The entire site is at grade as are all adjacent and surrounding sites. The entire area is intensively developed, and there are no unique or unusual topographic features.

Topographic Impacts

Minimal impact is anticipated. Some excavation for the basement parking and utilities will be required;
however, the existing structure is currently sub-graded for the existing basement/garage.

2. Soils

The project site was once part of a swamp-type environment which existed in Waikiki until the early 1920's when the Ala Wai Canal was built and drainage was provided. This allowed lands adjacent to Ala Wai Canal to be filled in and urbanization to occur. Consequently, the soil is classified Fill land, mixed (FL) by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). The SCS publication, *Soil Survey Interpretation - Islands of Kauai, Oahu, Maui, Molokai, and Lanai, State of Hawaii*, described this land type as follows:

"It consists of areas filled with material dredged from the ocean or hauled from nearby areas, garbage, and general material from other sources....This land type is used for urban development including airports, housing areas, and industrial facilities."

The plans call for a pile-driven foundation to support the proposed building. The 150 ton precast concrete piles will be driven approximately 85 feet below grade.

A soils study will be undertaken, if required, for the foundation of the structure.
Impact on Soils

Minimal impact on the site's soil is anticipated. Presently the soil is covered with buildings and pavement. The proposed action will not significantly alter this condition.

3. Climate

The climate in the Waikiki area is dry, mild, and uniform. The annual average rainfall for Waikiki is approximately 20 inches. The temperature, much like the rest of the island, ranges from 60°F (January - mean low temperature) to 85°F (mean high temperature) in the summer months.

The observed surface winds (as recorded at the Honolulu International Airport) show that the predominant wind direction and higher wind speeds are from the north, north-east, and east direction (66.7 percent of the time), and averages 11.2 knots per hour.

Although 13 percent of the time winds blow from the north to west quadrant, these winds have lower wind speeds, 5.75 knots per hour. The yearly mean wind speed is 9.7 miles per hour.

Impacts on Climatic Conditions

Little or no impact on climatic conditions is expected. The factors controlling the climatic conditions should not be affected by the relatively minuscule land area utilized by this project; however, surface winds will be altered by the building mass.
and the landscaping material. Wind related impacts upon the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and surrounding sites are addressed in Section IV.

B. Biological Characteristics

1. Flora

The flora on the project site primarily consists of common and exotic plants and shrubs (Table 1). Because the project site is already highly developed, there are not many existing plants. These plants have been planted and maintained by man's efforts and there are no indigenous or rare plants on the project site.

Impact on Flora

The impact on existing vegetation will be significant since construction will require removal of most of the trees; however, many can be saved for relocation later. Present plans call for more extensive landscaping than now exists. These plans will augment the retained vegetation and provide a denser, more attractive variety of plants.

2. Fauna

The commercial uses of the project site limits fauna to pests such as rats and mice. Avifauna (birds) are more numerous on the project site. Because of the availability of discarded food, many sparrows were noted on the project site. Other birds in this area include the common mynah, cardinals, pigeons,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT MATERIAL</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>SIZE/CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHRUB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Ginger (Alpinia Purpurata)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>hedge planting in front of Pacific Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Ginger (Alpinia speciosa)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti (Cordyline spp.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croton (Codiaeum hookerianum)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eranthemum (Pseudoerantheremum reticulatum)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>hedge planting along Pacific Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougainvillea (Bougainvillea spp.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock Orange (Murraya paniculata)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hedge planting along sidewalk &amp; parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal Plum (Carissa grandiflora)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUNDCOVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauae fern (Polypodium phymatodes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngonium (Syngonium podophyllus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pothos (Scindapsus aureus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>limited area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkeypod (Samanea saman)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30-40' - difficult to transplant, possible save 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut (Cocos nucifera)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40-60' trunk; difficult to transplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12-15' trunk; on state land, possible to transplant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassaia (Brassaia actinophylla)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandanus (Pandanus spp.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitex (Vitex spp.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autograph Tree (Clusia rosea)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10'; in planter, possible to save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumeria (Plumeria spp.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8-10'; in planter, possible to save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyon (Ficus retusa)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40'; difficult to transplant, possible to save</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

doves, white-eye, house finch, ricebird, and mockingbird. These are common, exotic birds found throughout the urban areas of Honolulu. There are no threatened or endangered species of fauna at the site.

**Impact on Fauna**

Site clearing and construction activities will displace birds which presently feed or nest on the project site. Upon completion, some birds may periodically visit the area, and possibly nest in the trees. The primary impact will be the displacement of the birds feeding on discarded foodstuff. This is not considered an adverse impact because of the common species and other available urban areas in which these birds can relocate.

**C. Hydrological Characteristics**

The project site is located makai and Diamond Head of the Ala Wai Canal and mauka of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

During the EIS Consultation Period, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Pacific Ocean Division stated that the project site is located in an "AO" Zone (Figure 13) where the average depth of flooding is 2 feet. "AO" zones are defined as areas of 100-year shallow flooding where depths are between one (1) and three (3) feet. Base flood elevations are shown, but not flood hazard factors are determined. The site is not in a designated tsunami zone.

The building will be elevated above the present ground level. Additionally, vehicular entrance/exits to the
basement area will include drainage features so that flooding in the basement will not occur. Additionally, the basement slab has been designed for hydrostatic uplift pressure due to the high water elevation of +3.0 feet.

D. Traffic

The information provided in this section is from Appendix I. Traffic report for the proposed Hotel/Condominium project on the existing Kaiser Medical Center site, Honolulu, Hawaii, prepared by Austin, Tsutsumi and Associates, Inc.

1. Traffic Count Data

Traffic counts were taken on Hobron Lane and Yacht Harbor Drive at Ala Moana Boulevard on July 5-6, 1984 (Thursday-Friday). Twenty-four hour count totals show 12,138 vehicles per day (vpd) on Hobron Lane with a 50/50 directional split and 2,656 vpd on Yacht Harbor Drive with an 80/20 directional split, makai bound. The afternoon peak hour occurs roughly between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM with 871 vehicles per hour (vph) and 251 vph on Hobron Lane and Yacht Harbor Drive, respectively. There was no apparent morning peak period of traffic.

Additional traffic counts on Ala Moana Boulevard at the Ala Wai Canal Bridge were obtained from the State Department of Transportation. The January 11-12, 1983 (Tuesday-Wednesday) counts show 47,487 vph with a 55/45 split, westbound. The morning peak hour occurs between 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM with 3,222 vph, total for both directions. The afternoon peak
hour occurs between 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM with 3,824 vph, total for both directions.

2. Field Investigation

Field investigation during the morning and afternoon peak periods showed queueing in the right lane of Ala Moana Boulevard in the eastbound direction up to the Yacht Harbor Drive intersection. Because of the upstream signal control at Atkinson Drive/Ala Moana Park Drive, the vehicular platoons arrive in regular intervals and volumes. The traffic congestion during the morning peak period is not as heavy as in the afternoon peak period due primarily to the relatively light side street demands. The eastbound lanes clear on most signal cycles. However, while the through lanes clear, the left turn lane stores vehicles for the next signal cycle. During the afternoon peak period, the left turn lane is usually full and sometimes queues into the through lane.

During the afternoon peak period, Hobron Lane queues in the mauka bound direction back to Yacht Harbor Drive. Yacht Harbor Drive experiences occasional congestion when vehicles turning into the Kaiser Medical Center parking lot queue back onto the roadway, blocking both directions of traffic.

The existing traffic conditions are generally heavy during the peak periods and throughout most of the afternoon. Traffic is generally heavy on weekends during the afternoons and evenings.
3. Trip Generation

The proposed hotel/condominium project is a redevelop-
ment of an existing hospital and clinic. In terms of traffic generation, a hospital and a clinic are considered higher land use intensities than a hotel and condominium development of the type proposed. Therefore, a net reduction in traffic demand can be expected with the redevelopment of the existing Kaiser Medical Center site into the proposed hotel/condominium development.

Comparative trip generation rates for both the hospital/clinic facility and the hotel/condominium development are based upon generally accepted methods developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and published in a report entitled "Trip Generation, Third Edition - 1982". These empirical rates are developed by correlating traffic demand with various independent variables commonly used to define the magnitude of land development in terms of trip generation potential.

The trip generation totals for the existing develop-
ment and for the proposed development are shown in Table 2. The hospital/clinic and the hotel/condo-
minium have different trip generating characteris-
tics; the first being a destination and the latter being an origin. The proposed development shows significant decreases in traffic demand over the existing development, especially during the peak hours of generation.

On the average weekday, the morning peak period of a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>NET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>5771</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Between Exit</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF 7 and 9 Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>356</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT STREET P.M. Enter</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET Between Exit</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC 4 and 6 Total</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF Total</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR P.M. Enter</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>NET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>NET CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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hospital or clinic is relatively low, primarily consisting of employees. The afternoon peak hour of generation generally occurs between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM during the afternoon employee shift change which coincides with the after-work hospital visitation and out-patient trips to the clinic. On the other hand, the hotel and condominium will exhibit two distinct peak periods between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. The proposed project shows an increase in exiting traffic during the AM peak hour, as can be expected by an origin trip generator; however, the overall demand shows a net decline. The PM peak hour for the proposed development shows the most dramatic decrease in traffic generation over the existing medical center.

On weekends, the hospital and clinic trip activity shows higher peak period conditions, except on Sunday, when the clinic is closed. The hotel and the condominium exhibit a more balanced entering and exiting traffic demand as opposed to what can be expected during a workday. On Saturday, the existing medical center's peak hour of generation is generally about midday. On the other hand, the hotel peak hour of generation should coincide with banquet activities, i.e., between 6:00 PM and 7:00 PM at the beginning of the festivities and between 9:30 PM and 10:30 PM at the end of these functions. However, the ITE trip rates generally show a higher trip generation potential during the average weekday's PM peak period than that on Saturday. Therefore, the PM peak hour in the average weekday, which has been shown to have the greatest decrease in traffic generation over the existing conditions, is
the more critical period. The proposed hotel/condomi-
num is expected to generate more daily traffic on
Sunday than the hospital/clinic due to the clinic
being closed. However, the peak period conditions
still show a net decline in total traffic demand for
the proposed development.

4. **Traffic Impact Summary**

Overall, the trip generation for the proposed hotel/
condominium shows a dramatic decrease in travel
demand over the existing hospital/clinic as was
hypothesized prior to undertaking this study.

**Conclusions**

1. Existing traffic conditions are generally heavy
throughout the afternoon and into the evenings.

2. The proposed hotel/condominium development should
result in a net decrease in traffic demand and
should not deteriorate the existing conditions.

3. The restricted access driveway to the condomi-
nium parking on Ala Moana Boulevard creates a
negative impact on the surrounding street sys-
tem and poses potential traffic safety problems.

**Recommendations**

1. The access driveway to the condominium
parking be relocated on Yacht Harbor Drive.
2. Further consideration be given to upgrading the intersections of Ala Moana Boulevard/Yacht Harbor Drive and Hobron Lane/Yacht Harbor Drive during the design phase of the development to facilitate bus turning movements.

3. Based upon the proposed development plan presented herein and the recommendations stated above, a comprehensive traffic impact report need not be conducted for the proposed hotel/condominium project on the existing Kaiser Medical Center site.

E. Air Quality

The information provided in this section is from Appendix II, "Air Quality Analysis for Proposed Hotel/Condominium Project on the Existing Kaiser Medical Center Site, Honolulu, Hawaii," prepared by Barry D. Root.

1. Present Air Quality

A summary of air pollutant measurements from State of Hawaii long term monitoring stations located nearest to the project is presented in Table 3. Data from several different sampling stations are included in the tabulation.

From the data presented in Table 3, it appears that the State of Hawaii 24-hour AQS for particulates is presently being exceeded in the Ala Moana/Waikiki area at a rate of not more than once per year. No values above Federal AQS have occurred during the
## TABLE 3

**SUMMARY OF AIR POLLUTANT MEASUREMENTS AT NEAREST MONITORING STATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICULATE MATTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SULFUR DIOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-13</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARBON MONOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>0-19.6</td>
<td>0-20.7</td>
<td>0-17.3</td>
<td>1.2-13.8</td>
<td>0-4.6</td>
<td>0-8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OXIDANT (OZONE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>4-61</td>
<td>10-84</td>
<td>10-80</td>
<td>10-104</td>
<td>10-104</td>
<td>0-151</td>
<td>0-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NITROGEN DIOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>6-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** See text for locations of monitoring stations. Carbon monoxide is reported in milligrams per cubic meter; other pollutants in micrograms per cubic meter. Carbon monoxide and ozone readings are daily peak one hour values; other pollutant values are for a 24 hour sampling period.

**SOURCE:** State of Hawaii Department of Health
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last seven years, and the last high particulate reading in 1980 was recorded during a January windstorm which created greatly increased levels of natural pollutants such as blowing dust and sea spray. A once-per-year particulate level of this nature is of no major regulatory concern and it seems reasonable to conclude that there are no present problems with particulate pollution in the project area. Table 3 also shows that sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide levels in the area are running well below allowable AQS.

On the other hand, Table 3 indicates that there could be a potential problem with carbon monoxide concentrations in urban areas of Oahu. During the years from 1975 to 1979 when carbon monoxide was measured at the Department of Health building (Kinau Hale) there were numerous violations of the State of Hawaii peak one-hour AQS for this pollutant. There was, however, an encouraging trend toward fewer violations each year and average peak hour values were steadily decreasing until the monitor was moved to Leahi Hospital in late 1979. The Leahi site is located in a low density residential district and the 1982 readings shown in Table 3 from that site are probably indicative of background levels of carbon monoxide at locations well removed from major highways and urban traffic.

In any case the data shows that carbon monoxide would be the primary pollutant of concern in evaluating the impact of new residential development on Oahu.
2. Direct Air Quality Impact of Project Construction

During the site preparation and construction phases of this project, it is inevitable that a certain amount of fugitive dust will be generated. Field measurements of such emissions from shopping center and apartment construction projects has yielded an estimated emission rate of 1.2 tons of dust per acre of activity per month of activity. This figure assumes medium level activity in a semi-arid climate with a moderate soil silt content. In fact actual emissions from this project can be expected to vary daily depending upon the amount of activity and the moisture content of the exposed soil in work areas.

It is also inevitable that construction equipment will emit some air pollutants in their exhausts as they are used at various points within or adjacent to the project site. The largest equipment is generally diesel-powered. Carbon monoxide emissions from large diesel engines are usually no more than those of the average automobile, but nitrogen dioxide emissions can be quite high. Fortunately, nitrogen dioxide emissions from other sources in the area should be relatively low and the overall impact of pollutant emissions from construction equipment should be minor compared to levels generated by normal traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard nearby.

3. Indirect Air Quality Impact of Decreased Traffic

Once construction is completed, the proposed project will not in itself constitute a significant direct source of air pollutants. By serving as an attraction for motor vehicle traffic in the area, however,
the project must be considered to be a significant indirect air pollution source. This project is somewhat unique, however, in that the hospital complex that currently occupies the site generates more traffic than the planned hotel/condominium is expected to produce. It is therefore expected that this project will result in a net reduction of automobile-related pollutants in the project area.

Air Impact Summary

Once completed, the proposed project is expected to have little direct impact on the air quality of the surrounding area. The only potential long term indirect impact will be in the form of vehicular air pollutant emissions from traffic entering and leaving the project. In this case, the proposed project is expected to generate less traffic than the existing Kaiser Hospital complex and the project itself can be viewed as a mitigative measure.

F. Noise Quality

The information provided in this section is from Appendix III "Evaluation of Potential Noise Impact and Mitigation Measures Related to the Proposed Hotel/Condominium Development, Kaiser Hospital Site," by Darby-Ebisu and Associates, Inc.

The proposed hotel/condominium project at the site of the existing Kaiser Hospital is not expected to produce noise impacts, except for short term construction noise impacts. The site, proposed tower design features, and the low traffic generation attributable to the project are all
favorable in minimizing future noise impacts on surrounding properties and on future project occupants.

Noise mitigation measures are not required since construction noise has been, and will continue to be, successfully regulated by the State Department of Health. Also, standard construction features can be implemented to control tire squeal noise and complaint risks. The proposal appears to be relatively problem-free in respect to adverse noise impacts, and optimally situated for minimizing noise exposure to future building occupants.

1. **Existing Noise Environment**

   In order to determine the existing noise levels in the area of the proposed hotel/condominium, continuous noise measurements were obtained from the 8th floor lanais at the mauka and makai ends of the Yacht Harbor Tower, Ilikai Hotel. The mauka location was selected to measure noise from traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard. The makai location was selected to measure noise from local traffic on the yacht harbor entrance road, from Ala Wai Heliport, and from transiting fixed-wing aircraft.

   The existing noise environment at the project site can be characterized with the following statements:

   Noisy to very noisy at setback distances of 100 ft. or less from the centerline of Ala Moana Boulevard, and with direct line-of-sight to the boulevard. Existing federal noise criteria for residences are exceeded by 2 to 5 Ldn units.
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Moderately noisy to quiet on the makai side of the buildings when direct line-of-sight to Ala Moana Boulevard is obstructed. Existing federal noise criteria for residences are not exceeded under these conditions.

The hourly noise pattern is typical of the Waikiki area, in that the traffic noise persists through the night and into the early morning hours.

2. Predicted Noise Impacts

Possible noise impacts associated with the project include the additional traffic noise generated by the hotel/condominium, tire squeal noise emanating from the proposed parking garage, environmental noise impacts on future residents/hotel guests, and short term construction noise impacts on adjacent properties. Possible noise impacts associated with traffic were evaluated thru use of the methodology of Reference 3, the traffic counts of Reference 4, and the traffic projection of Reference 5. Tire squeal noise and construction noise evaluations were based on previous work on similar projects.

a. Tire Squeal Noise From Parking Garage

Tire squeal noise in indoor parking structures has been the cause of complaints from persons residing in adjacent properties in Hawaii where year round open windows are the norm. Tire squeal is produced by high-frequency vibration of tire-tread elements when cornering a vehicle. The factors which influence the inception and
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intensity of tire squeal noise include: road surface texture, vehicle forward speed, vehicle weight, tire-tread design, and slip angle (difference between tire steering angle and direction of vehicle movement).

b. Aircraft Noise

Existing aircraft noise levels in the project area are below 55 L_{dn}, and are not anticipated to change significantly by the year 2000. As long as current traffic patterns of rotary and fixed-wing aircraft are maintained, serious noise impacts resulting from aircraft fly-bys are not anticipated. Mitigation measures for aircraft noise reduction are not considered necessary.

c. Construction Noise

Short-term noise impacts associated with construction activities will occur as a result of the proposed project. These impacts are unavoidable due to the general noisiness of heavy construction activities, and the proximity (within 100 ft.) of the site to adjacent residential/hotel structures. Noise exposure from construction activities at any one location will be intermittent during the construction period as the various phases are completed.

d. Project Generated Traffic Noise

The trip generation projections for the project,
when compared to existing hospital/clinic trip
generation characteristics, indicate that the
proposed hotel/condominium traffic should, at
worst, replace the existing traffic associated
with Kaiser Hospital operations. Total peak
hour traffic volume associated with the pro-
posed hotel/condominium is projected at ap-
proximately 350 VPH. Tour bus traffic is antici-
pated to be minimal at the proposed project due
to the type of clientele expected.

Because it is assumed that the project traffic
will essentially replace existing traffic
associated with present hospital operations, no
increase in traffic noise along Ala Moana Boule-
vard or Hobron Lane is predicted to be attribu-
table to the project. Along the yacht harbor
entrance road, hotel guest traffic will essen-
tially replace existing traffic associated with
hospital operations, and increases in traffic
noise attributable to the project are not expec-
ted. Because of the minimal traffic anticipated
from the proposed project, and the elimination
of current traffic associated with the hospital,
the noise impacts resulting from project-rela-
ted traffic are not considered significant.

e. Exterior Noise at Project Site

In order to predict the probable impact on
future guests/residents of the hotel/condomi-
nium, base year traffic noise levels were
calculated along the exterior walls of the
proposed building. Of interest was the pre-
dicted noise levels at the proposed living
Ala Moana Boulevard is required before the traffic noise predictions increase by 1 $L_{dn}$ unit.

Noise impacts on yacht harbor users and residents from the project's recreation deck will be consistent with Hotel-Resort Zoning. The ambient daylight noise levels are currently fairly high due to traffic and adjacent uses. The proposed project will offer shielding from mauka sources (Ala Moana Boulevard) therefore, recreation deck activities should not create any significant gains and may, in effect, lower noise levels. Evening noise sources are expected to primarily consist of traffic noise from theatre goers since pool use will be limited in the evening.

G. Public Utilities and Services

1. Water

Potable water is available to the site via 2-inch and 4-inch meters currently servicing the Kaiser Foundation Hospital. The projected water requirement for the proposed project is 237,700 gallons per day. The availability of additional water required for the project will be determined by the Board of Water Supply after the building permits have been submitted to BWS for approval. The additional water requested for the development will require that the developer cover costs for the water development charge for source, reservoir, and transmission facilities to serve the project. The water demands for
the proposed project will not require new source
development since the BWS source development limits
have not been exceeded.

The Board of Water Supply indicated in their letter
dated August 2, 1984 that "should additional water
requirements exceed 0.25 MGD, then the developer
should arrange to discuss source development with
us." The calculated daily requirement of 237,700
GPD should be accomodated within the limit indica-
ted. (Current usage + 0.25 MGD)

2. Sewer System

Sewer lines are available along the major streets
bordering the project site; however, the City and
County Department of Public Works has stated that
the 12-inch sewer in Ala Moana Boulevard from Kaiser
Hospital to Hobron Lane is inadequate to accomodate
the proposed development.

The developer will install at his expense, a 15 to
18 inch sewer relief line to join the existing Ala
Moana Boulevard main. The length of the sewer line
will be approximately 350 to 500 feet depending on
which existing sewer manhole it is connected to.
The sewage collected in this line is treated at the
Sand Island Sewage Treatment Plant in which the
treated effluent is discharged via outfall into the
ocean.

Plans for the sewer system will be coordinated with
and must be approved by the Department of Public
Works, City and County of Honolulu.
3. Site Drainage

The existing site is currently drained by an existing municipal system which directs runoff in the existing Ala Moana Boulevard drainage system and the Ala Wai Boat Harbor. The area is heavily developed and is dominated by buildings and parking structures which results in high impermeability. Slopes are slight and runoff reaches the street only where there is no curb to contain the flow.

Drainage along Ala Moana Boulevard flows into a drop intake or catch basin, both of which front the project site. The runoff is carried by 18" concrete pipe to a concrete box culvert on the mauka side of the street which discharges into the Ala Wai Canal.

Drainage on the makai side of the site flows onto the street that seperates the project site from the Harbor. The sidewalk curb on the makai side of the street prevents the runoff from flowing directly into the Harbor. The runoff then flows to one of the catch basins along the street which discharges into the Harbor. These catch basins are located approximately 150 ft. Ewa and 250 ft. Diamond Head of the site, with the other catch basin located opposite Parcel 6.

Proposed System

The drainage system planned for the project site will utilize existing drainage systems along Ala Moana Boulevard and into the Harbor. A State allowed quantity of runoff will flow into the Ala Moana
Boulevard system while the excess runoff will be discharged into the harbor.

Because the site is already highly developed, the new development is not expected to increase the quantity of runoff. Given the short distance, the runoff travels overland, impurities in the water will be minimal. The Ala Wai Boat Harbor is classified by the State's "Water Quality Standards" as an embayment and artificial basin (Class A and Class II for marine waters).

4. Other Utilities

Gas, electrical, and telephone lines are presently available at the project site. Prior to preparing the construction plans, the project's civil engineer will coordinate and get approvals from the respective utility companies to connect on to these existing utilities.

Roadway specifications including rights-of-way, minimum roadway and sidewalk widths will be subject to DOT review and approval; however, at this stage in the design phase, such specifications are not yet defined.

The proposed project will continue to need refuse collection services. It is anticipated that refuse collection by private contractor will continue to accommodate the proposed project.
H. Service Facilities

1. Fire Protection Services

The Fire Department, City and County of Honolulu, has stated that fire protection for the area is adequate and can accommodate the proposed development.

The developer will meet all fire codes and install the necessary fire protection devices and systems required.

Because fire protection is provided on an emergency basis, the demand for this service is unpredictable. The proximity of fire stations in the near vicinity assures that should a fire occur, immediate response will be taken.

2. Police Protection Services

The Honolulu Police Department provides service to the area and will be consulted as the project is developed.

Previous Police Department concerns for similar projects have included pedestrian safety during construction, vehicular traffic hazards, and security provisions for the completed project.

During construction, standard barriers and posted signs will be erected for pedestrian safety; if required, the contractor will retain off-duty policemen to direct traffic for large trucks and construction equipment moving in and out of the project site.
Entrances and exits have been located away from major intersections. Also, the entrance/exits provide for a uniform distribution of vehicles entering and leaving the site so that no one entrance will result in congesting the immediate public street. Finally, a security force will be provided for the protection of the building's occupants, property, and vehicles. Police calls to the project site are expected in emergency cases and little impact for police services is anticipated.

3. Hospital and Medical Care

Because of the nature of the proposed development, the need for hospital and/or medical care will likely be utilized only on an emergency basis. In these cases, several hospitals, including Kapiolani Hospital, Straub Clinic, and several ambulances (City and County), will respond in minutes to any medical emergencies.

4. Schools and Public Recreational Facilities

a. Lunalilo and Ala Wai Elementary, Washington Intermediate and Kaimuki High Schools are located in the area. The Department of Education will be consulted in the availability of primary to secondary educational facilities in the area. The project is not expected to create any significant demand for educational facilities.

b. Ala Moana and Ala Wai Parks are located within close proximity to the project site. The Department of Parks and Recreation, City and
County of Honolulu, has stated that the proposed action would have significant impact on public park facilities in the area.

The project plan has provided recreational facilities for both the condominium and hotel portions of the complex; however, compliance with Park Dedication Ordinance 4621 must be met. DPR will be consulted on all park dedication requirements. This requirement will be met by equitable cash dedication.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

There are no historic properties within the proposed project area listed either on the Hawaii Register or the National Register of Historic Places, nor are there any which have been determined Eligible for Inclusion on the National Register. However, in view of the recent archaeological findings in the Waikiki district, particularly at several localities along the beach front, the possibility that similar cultural/historical resources may still remain substantially intact within the subject property cannot be summarily dismissed. While it is true, as discussed in previous sections describing the existing land use, topography, and soils, that much of the property has been extensively modified in the past, approximately one-third of the property may still contain potentially significant material. Surface modifications have, of course, obliterated more readily observable or accessible evidence. But subsurface remains could include various fire pits, refuse pits, post holes, and similar features containing food refuse (midden) and other portable artifacts.
The present limitation on substantiating the presence or absence of such buried remains is the fact that most of the property not physically occupied by the existing structures is covered over by various surface modifications including concrete slabs and asphalt paving. This restricts any preliminary subsurface exploration to a few small lawn areas around the Pacific Insurance building which necessarily overlooks the entire opposite end of the property.

To overcome this limitation and yet obtain sufficient usable information for further planning as early into the proposed project as possible, the developer will contract with a reputable archaeological consultant to monitor the demolition phase of the project. Should the archaeologist identify potentially significant remains, work will cease until such time when the appropriate actions have been taken to adequately mitigate any adverse effect upon those remains. This will be done in coordination with the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Office.

J. Socio-Economic Characteristics

Waikiki is a highly dense urban area (Figure 14, Table 4) comprised primarily of hotel resort facilities, entertainment destinations, small retail stores and residential apartments.

As the primary and largest tourist destination in the state, Waikiki plays a major part in Oahu's economy.

Socio-Economic Impacts

As indicated previously, impacts can be classified as
**TABLE 4**
**WAIKIKI CENSUS DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>2774</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5413</td>
<td>3368</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>2186</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2399</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Census tracts bounded by the Ala Wai Canal and Kapahulu Avenue.
being of short-term or long-term nature. Short-term socio-economic impacts are generally business related impacts due to construction. Long-term impacts are often the result of relocation of outgoing and incoming services or population change.

The existing Kaiser Foundation Hospital will be relocated to a new medical center facility in Moanalua. A new 10-story out-patient clinic is also proposed for construction on Pensacola Street between King and Young streets. These two facilities will replace all functions currently housed at the Waikiki facility.

Impacts associated with the relocation of the hospital are not expected to be significantly adverse, and in all probability, should be beneficial overall. The new hospital proposed outpatient clinic will be able to provide a higher level of service with modern and expanded facilities. Service to Kaiser Foundation Health Plan beneficiaries should be improved with the newer, central locations.

Long-term impacts associated with the proposed hotel/condominium such as employment, and tax revenues have been mentioned earlier. Another positive impact that will be associated with the development is the potential increase in property values to adjacent properties due to the quality and gateway status of the proposed project.

Some short-term, construction related, economic impacts are expected. Only one structure is immediately adjacent to the project site. The Ilikai Marina hotel/condominium contains the Chart House restaurant and the Royal Marina theaters. Noise and fugitive dust as well as disruption
due to construction will impact these establishments. These impacts are unavoidable although standard construction mitigation procedures will be followed. Construction related noise will also affect the condominiums located across Ala Moana Boulevard. Some boats located in the Ala Wai Boat Harbor will also be affected by fugitive dust.

K. Demolition Impacts

Demolition of the existing structures will be accomplished, in all probability, by steel ball and crane. Noise, air, and water quality impacts during demolition must be within Department of Health requirements and will be regulated in the following manner:

1) A noise permit will be obtained from the Noise and Radiation branch to insure compliance of demolition noise impacts to Title II, Chapter 43 HRS.

2) If fugitive dust exceeds the property line or degrades air and surrounding water quality, the Department of Health will impose restraints on the demolitions contractor to limit fugitive dust impacts on adjacent properties (Title II, Chapter 60 HRS).

3) A rodent infestation survey will be conducted prior to demolition to determine the extent of infestation. If any infestation is evident, the extermination will be conducted to prevent rodents from moving into adjacent properties upon demolition commencement.

4) The demolitions contractor will also comply with OSHA requirements for public safety as per City and County Building Department permit requirements.
IV. RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE
IV. RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE, POLICIES, PLANS AND CONTROLS

A. The project site and surrounding area is designated urban by the State Land Use Commission.

1. The Primary Urban Center Development Plan designates one portion of the site as a public facility and the other as resort. When the existing hospital site is completely vacated, the public facility of the site will revert back to the underlying zoning.

2. Current zoning for the site is Resort Hotel (Figure 15) which allows building heights of 350 feet. The surrounding areas are zoned and have uses consistent with the resort hotel precinct. This includes the apartment precinct directly across Ala Moana Boulevard.

3. The preliminary project design utilizes portions of State-owned lands which are designated as Public Precinct (Exhibits 2 & 3). These areas include a narrow portion of the Ewa water feature and a portion of the parking island fronting the porte-cochere.

B. The project, which lies on the makai side of Ala Moana Boulevard, is within the Special Management Area, Ordinance No. 84-4. The shoreline has been determined to be at the mouth of the harbor (exhibit 1).

Several studies have been conducted to address concerns related to project area (SMA) and water
DEPARTMENT OF ACCOUNTING AND GENERAL SERVICES
SURVEY DIVISION
P. O. BOX 119
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810

July 27, 1984

FILE NO. _______

Mr. Sam O. Hirota
President
Sam O. Hirota, Inc.
345 Queen Street, Suite 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Hirota:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation on Wednesday, July 25, 1984, this is to advise you that the mouth of the harbor is the shoreline for any improvements related to Waikiki Yacht Harbor.

Very truly yours,

KAZUTAKA SAIKI
State Land Surveyor

EXHIBIT 1
December 5, 1984

Mr. Michael McElroy
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Yacht Harbor Plaza Environmental Impact
Statement-Waikiki, Oahu

Our comments of November 23, 1984 on the subject EIS were made in direct response to the contents of the document.

To help in clarifying the situation, we would like to inform you that the developer is presently discussing with the Department of Transportation for the use of the State lands adjacent to the development project. As part of these discussions the developer will need to address our expressed concerns. The areas which are being considered are designated on the enclosed map. In addition any decisions reached by the Department of Transportation would be subject to the results of any necessary hearings on this matter.

If you should have any questions, please contact the Harbors Division Planning Section at 548-2559.

Very truly yours,

Wayne J. Yamasaki
Director of Transportation

Enclosure

EXHIBIT 2
TO ALL PARTIES INTERESTED IN TITLE OF PREMISES SURVEYED:
THIS IS TO INFORM YOU THAT THE SURVEY WAS ACTUALLY
MADE ON THE GROUND; THAT THERE ARE NO ENCROACHMENTS
EITHER WAY ACROSS PROPERTY LINES.
APPROXIMATE AREA OF REQUESTED
EASEMENT = 22,552 SQ. FT.
quality impacts. Concerns expressed on the development have included: shadow impacts, wind impacts, and water quality impacts. The following studies and discussion have been provided in response to these specific concerns.

1. The shadow study (Figure 16), provided by the project architect, depicts shadow castings during the summer and winter solstices, the vernal and autumnal equinox for significant morning and afternoon hours. From these depictions, it can be assumed that shadows for all other dates will fall between these extremes.

Impacts anticipated from shadow coverage are expected to be insignificant or non-existent since only a relatively small portion of the surrounding area will remain in shadow for any significant length of time.

2. A wind impact study has been performed by Arthur N.L. Chiu, Ph.D., P.E. for the proposed project. Chiu has stated that in order to fully ascertain all possible wind effects, a detailed wind tunnel study of the surrounding area would have to be performed. However, the following information is offered by Chiu.

The proposed structure will be bounded by existing tall buildings on the mauka side of Ala Moana Boulevard and also on the Diamond Head side of the project site. There are no tall structures on the makai and Ewa sides because of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and the Ala Wai canal.
These existing tall buildings are in the path of the trade winds that blow from the NE/ENE directions and they will offer some sheltering effects to the lower portions of the proposed structure. The higher portions of the proposed structure may be subjected to strong buffeting trade winds. Overall effects from strong Kona winds impinging on the proposed structure will probably be more severe than trade wind conditions because of the open exposure of the terrain on the makai and Ewa sides.

The Ilikai Hotel Marina Tower balconies may be affected by the windflow patterns around the proposed structure.

The pedestrian wind environment on the mauka side (Ala Moana Boulevard) of the proposed structure may be affected from the "downwash" of the trade winds impinging on the face of the structure. This situation could probably occur during periods of very strong, gusty trade winds. These effects could be minimized by providing properly placed windbreaks and by planting adequate hedges and trees to divert and obstruct the wind flow patterns. The proposed structure is set back forty feet from its own property line along Ala Moana Boulevard. This space is likely to serve to some extent as a "diffuser" zone to mitigate the effects from wind downwash. A mauka parapet wall on the top deck of the proposed structure could also be helpful in this respect.

On the makai side, the downwash during strong Kona wind periods could cause an uncomfortable wind environment for recreational area and pedestrian uses.
However, the tower block is set back from the sidewalk, the parking decks are terraced and planted with trees and shrubs on the mauka side to diffuse the wind flow pattern, and the parapet walls at each level provide additional protective barriers to deflect the wind.

On the makai side, the bulkhead of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor is approximately 150 feet from the face of the tower block, and again there are trees as well as parapet walls at the makai edge of the recreational deck level to minimize the "downwash" effects at the pedestrian level. There will still be wind flowing around the makai side of the structure; it would not be a "dead calm" zone.

The wind impinging on the mauka and makai faces will also flow around the Ala Moana and Diamond Head (NW and SE, respectively) ends as well as over the top of the structure. At the Ala Moana end, the distance from the edge of the structure to the Ala Wai canal is approximately 400 feet. It is doubtful that the deflected wind from the proposed structure would cause too much changes to the wind environment than what exists currently at the entrance channel to the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

At the Diamond Head end, the distance between the proposed structure and the Marina Tower building is approximately 55 feet. The mauka portion of the Marina Tower building is low-rise (6 stories) and the tower portion is 18 stories.

There could be channeling of the wind flow between
CORRECTION

THE PRECEDING DOCUMENT(S) HAS BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY
SEE FRAME(S) IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING
These existing tall buildings are in the path of the trade winds that blow from the NE/ENE directions and they will offer some sheltering effects to the lower portions of the proposed structure. The higher portions of the proposed structure may be subjected to strong buffeting trade winds. Overall effects from strong Kona winds impinging on the proposed structure will probably be more severe than trade wind conditions because of the open exposure of the terrain on the makai and Ewa sides.

The Ilikai Hotel Marina Tower balconies may be affected by the windflow patterns around the proposed structure.

The pedestrian wind environment on the mauka side (Ala Moana Boulevard) of the proposed structure may be affected from the "downwash" of the trade winds impinging on the face of the structure. This situation could probably occur during periods of very strong, gusty trade winds. These effects could be minimized by providing properly placed windbreaks and by planting adequate hedges and trees to divert and obstruct the wind flow patterns. The proposed structure is set back forty feet from its own property line along Ala Moana Boulevard. This space is likely to serve to some extent as a "diffuser" zone to mitigate the effects from wind downwash. A mauka parapet wall on the top deck of the proposed structure could also be helpful in this respect.

On the makai side, the downwash during strong Kona wind periods could cause an uncomfortable wind environment for recreational area and pedestrian uses.
However, the tower block is set back from the sidewalk, the parking decks are terraced and planted with trees and shrubs on the mauka side to diffuse the wind flow pattern, and the parapet walls at each level provide additional protective barriers to deflect the wind.

On the makai side, the bulkhead of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor is approximately 150 feet from the face of the tower block, and again there are trees as well as parapet walls at the makai edge of the recreational deck level to minimize the "downwash" effects at the pedestrian level. There will still be wind flowing around the makai side of the structure; it would not be a "dead calm" zone.

The wind impinging on the mauka and makai faces will also flow around the Ala Moana and Diamond Head (NW and SE, respectively) ends as well as over the top of the structure. At the Ala Moana end, the distance from the edge of the structure to the Ala Wai canal is approximately 400 feet. It is doubtful that the deflected wind from the proposed structure would cause too much changes to the wind environment than what exists currently at the entrance channel to the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

At the Diamond Head end, the distance between the proposed structure and the Marina Tower building is approximately 55 feet. The mauka portion of the Marina Tower building is low-rise (6 stories) and the tower portion is 18 stories.

There could be channeling of the wind flow between
the two structures at the lower portions. However, as mentioned previously, there are many surrounding high-rise buildings in the vicinity so that wind speeds at the lower elevations will tend to be smaller, and it is doubtful if the channeling effects would be of major concern.

The curved plan configuration of the structure will tend to "streamline" the wind flow to some extent. This, of course, will help to minimize some of the turbulent flow patterns at the corners of the usual rectangular configurations of high-rise buildings.

There should not be any concern of the shielding effect, on the makai side of the structure, against the flow of trade winds. The existing surrounding high-rise structures already have caused some blockage to the free-field wind, and it is doubtful if there would be a "dead calm" area on the makai side of the structure. The boat harbor being much further away from the structure would of course continue to be affected by the trade winds and should not expect to find any major change to the wind environment that exists currently.

3. Additionally, in response to comments on the potential impact of wind effects, a study was also conducted by Dr. Karl H. Bather on potential water temperature changes and tube worm growth problems for Boat Harbor boat owners. Specifically, concern has been raised regarding a) the impact such a structure would have on local wind patterns and the attendant problems with small vessel navigation in the adjacent Ala Wai harbor; and b) a potential
change (increase) in water temperature and attendant problem of growth on vessels in the harbor. The basis of these comments for this report are derived from an analysis of historical Ala Wai harbor water temperature data, dating back to prior 1970, plus recent (1976 to 1984) Department of Health water temperature data taken adjacent to the Ala Moana bridge. In addition, several other historical references and studies of the Ala Wai canal, harbor and area water quality (biota, nutrient loading and bacteriology) were considered. These first hand observations of conditions in the harbor are by Bathan as a boat owner since 1969 and, as a resident-liveaboard owner.

(a): The impact on the Ala Wai harbor prevailing wind patterns have changed over the last 15 or more years. No long term specific historical wind data exists for the harbor (aside from sparse Oahu Water Quality Program data) but personal experience has noted that the increasing wall of structures landward of the harbor has permanently altered local wind patterns within the harbor. Such seems to have been the case since the early 1970's when most all the existing structures upwind of the harbor were in place. Since that prior construction boom period, relatively little local construction activity has ensued. Two notable exceptions occurred, however, with the addition of the Yacht Harbor Towers and Discovery Bay complexes.

The result of completing the construction of the Yacht Harbor Towers has been an increase in winds funneled down Atkinson Drive between the twin tower
buildings and the Ala Moana Americana Hotel. Examining data for the statistically prevailing wind vectors shows that the tower buildings are aligned such as to deflect the prevailing trades approximately 10° to 30° clockwise, thereby causing the downwind conditions to shift the deflected tradewinds towards the Ala Moana park entrance and away from the harbor.

The numerous highrise structures now existing on the landward side of the harbor, effectively blocks the tradewind flow patterns except for localized wind funnelling effects between buildings on particularly windy days. Generally, buildings create a turbulent downstream wind condition extending five times the building height and disturbs more laminar like downwind flow conditions up to 25 times the structure height. These distances, when converted to horizontal distances indicate that most of the harbor slips already lie in the shade now of the predominantly turbulent wake.

An exception, however, is evident in the main Marina entrance channel, turning basin, and the navigational area extending up to the Ala Moana bridge. The prevailing tradewind vectors in these more open areas align west-southwest, angularly down and slightly across the Ala Wai canal. The open area of the Ala Wai canal creates somewhat more consistent winds across these open harbor areas. A curvilinear shaped 350' high structure located at the Kaiser Hospital site is thus a high structure located at one side of this open area. As such, the project is not expected to cause any statistically
significant change in wind patterns throughout the harbor slip area considering the already existing wind obstructions upwind of the slips. Further, an increase in winds across the harbor open area extending seaward from the Ala Moana bridge, would be expected, decreasing in effect seaward to the Magic Island breakwater. Winds in these navigational areas may become slightly stronger, particularly during strong tradewind conditions, and in the landward most portions of the harbor around the Ala Moana bridge; this is a condition similar to that presently observed at the Ala Moana Boulevard-Atkinson Drive intersection. Some boaters may view increased, more consistent, winds as a positive impact; others, as small day sailors, may take issue with the conditions.

(b): A potential increase in water temperature and biota growth on boats - an examination of Ala Wai harbor historical water temperature data shows widely varying surface temperatures have existed in the area since 1970. State Department of Health data does imply an increase, using a linear trend analysis, from 1976 to 1984, of 0.05° C. However, the data are widely scattered, showing a standard error of estimate of 1.59° C and poor correlation coefficient of 0.18. Analyzing these data for annual minimums (in February), maximums (in September) and annual averages for 1976 to 1983, shows a widely varying thermal envelope. In this case, a cooling trend is evident from 1978 to 1980. Most all significant high rise construction in the area was completed prior to 1976.
Thus, the cooling and warming trends implied in the data could be: real, or the result of normal secular fluctuations dependent upon the time of day and weather conditions during measurement. The other possibilities are that sampling tests were taken at different depths (as much as 0.5°C change can result in the first few cm); or the result of different operator technique or instrument error.

The historical data for 1978 to 1984 show an average annual thermal envelope of 3.6°C and therefore, (likely up to a 1.8°C year to year warming or cooling trend,) may not be statistically significant or meaningful.

In summary, the data base is simply too short and diurnally variable for a trend judgement in this case. Long term however, the existing upwind structures, the attendant increase in paved harbor boundaries acting as heat sinks, and the increase in boats in the Ala Wai harbor have impacted harbor conditions significantly. Nutrient concentrations have increased within the harbor and in the Moana stream and Ala Wai canal. These are the primary factors that have contributed to active and increased biota growth on boats. As a general rule, biota activity approximately doubles for a 10°C increase. However, the proper pH range and nutrients for growth of most biofouling organisms must also exist. The long term water quality degradation, already documented within the Ala Wai harbor since 1970, appears to be the predominant factor in biofouling increase.

4. In addition to the technical discussions on local
wind patterns and their potential impacts on small boat navigational problems in the Ala Wai Marina. Environmental Communications, Inc. discussed with two long time small boat owners, the concerns they would have in the event that the proposed project were to be implemented. These discussions were on a voluntary basis and both respondents do not have interests in the project. The discussions took place on August 20, 1984.

a. Gil Budar is the owner of a 43' sailboat since 1971 and has berthed his vessel at the Ala Wai Marina for that period of time. His comments represent his opinions and do not extend beyond the impacts on his own practice of yachting at the Ala Wai Marina. As the owner of a power operated sailboat, Budar does not experience difficulty in moving in and out of the Marina since he operates under power to reach the offshore waters. He did comment that there has already been negative impacts on the Marina basin area since the construction of the Ilikai Hotel and the Kaiser Hospital. The Marina basin is where small non-powered sailboats are most active. The addition of Discovery Bay, Westbury, Villa, Chateau Waikiki, and the other high rise condominium projects that ring the Ala Wai Canal and Ala Moana Boulevard have further created erratic winds for the non-powered sailboats.

b. Budar stated that he would consider the development of the hotel/condominium project as beneficial. Budar felt that dust problems would be reduced on his yacht since swirling winds that
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usually gust around the Hospital and blow on the yachts berthed immediately makai of the Hospital might be decreased or eliminated.

c. Budar also cited the beneficial sheltering effect that the proposed project would have on shielding his yacht from the gusty trade winds. This sheltering would extend the life of the awnings on his yacht. Before the Ilikai was built, an awning would last 6-12 months; now the awnings last up to four years.

d. Improved security will also be a benefit to the yacht owners closest to the hotel site.

The second small boat owner is Mike Doyle who is also a marine surveyor and owner of his own company, Mike Doyle, Ltd. Mr. Doyle’s concerns are primarily in small, non-powered boats since he has been involved in the Junior Sailing Program since 1972. He acknowledges that the wind patterns have been erratic and have deteriorated since the advent of high-rise development mauka of the Ala Wai Marina. We asked if these erratic wind patterns would either create navigational hazards to the small, non-powered sailing craft or affect their recreational use and he answered in the negative.

C. The project, which will contain residential condominium units, will be subject to Park Dedication Ordinance 4621.

D. Use of reflective glass on the project exterior will require compliance with Sunlight Reflection Regulation Ordinance 82-35.
While compliance with Ordinance 82-35 will be met by use of low reflectant glass, concerns were still expressed by some commenting parties; therefore, a reflective glare study was done for the project by the project architect. Special attention was given to peak reflectivity situations during solstice dates. Because of the curvilinear nature of the tower, the impact of reflectivity on off-site areas is diffused. These impacted areas are point specific; that is at any one time the affected zones are separated by large bands of unaffected zones. As such, no signle zone would be continuously impacted as the sun changes position during the day. This effect is further lessened by the low (27%) reflectivity of the building's exterior.

The glass proposed for the building's exterior is a 1/4" to 5/8" thick assembly made up of two layers of pink plastic laminate sandwiched between two pieces of clear float or heat-strengthened glass. Benefits of this product are the rose-copper color (a crucial design element in the building), its ability to insulate hotel guests or condominium residents from traffic noise and the fact that if broken, it will remain in place, thereby removing the possibility of broken glass falling on pedestrians below.

When required to help control heat gain within the building, the assembly can be mirrored. Since the creation of a reflectant building is not a driving force in the development of the design of the structure, the amount of coating specified for the glass has been kept to the minimum to meet energy conservation standards and mitigate as much as possible any potential impact on adjacent structures and pedestrian/vehicular traffic.
A gold reflectant coating of 27% reflectivity has been applied to the glass laminate throughout the tower. It has been used in both vision and spandrel glass areas to create a uniform appearance throughout the building's exterior (Figure 17). The ground/entry level elements however, have no mirroring, thereby allowing full visibility into as well as out of the public areas of the base. This approach to the building's exterior brings the average heat gain in the building into compliance with local energy conservation requirements, while maintaining in all locations a reflectivity of less than 30%. Ordinance No. 82-35, the sunlight reflection regulation, defines reflective surfaces as having reflectance of over 30 percent.

E. The project lies within the Waikiki Special Design District, Ordinance No. 4573 (Figure 18). It is zoned, consistent and compatible with the surrounding high-rise buildings in the immediate area. Portions of the preliminary design encroach beyond the property boundaries into the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and the Waikiki Special Design District's Public Precinct.

F. Governmental approvals required include:

Department of Land Utilization, City and County
Special Management Area
Waikiki Special Design District

Department of Transportation, Harbors Division
State Lands under negotiation

Board of Land and Natural Resources
State Lands under negotiation

City Council
Special MANAGEMENT PERMIT
RECEIVED AS FOLLOWS
FIGURE 17-A
SUN REFLECTION STUDY
JUNE 22, 6:30 A.M.
FIGURE 17-B
SUN REFLECTION STUDY
JUNE 22, 6:00 P.M.
F. Chronology of Design

The following chronology briefly summarizes the overall design development process for the proposed mixed-use development complex to be constructed at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard adjacent to Ala Wai Yacht Basin.

1. Welton Becket Associates, architects and engineers, were commissioned to work on a development plan which initially contemplated an even mix of 300 hotel guest rooms and 300 condominium units. Subsequent changes and refinement in the development plan, due primarily to zoning requirements and perceived market conditions, modified the initial development plan to a mix of approximately 406 hotel rooms and 174 condominiums (roughly a 2.3 to 1 ratio).

The site is a rectilinear parcel running parallel to the Ala Wai Yacht Basin. The parcel configuration lends itself to a design solution developed along the same parallel line. The initial design study concept, Figure 19, contemplated angular twin reflective silver glass towers. Certain design criticisms for this approach were noted and summarized as follows:

a. The natural waterfront location and the severe angular design seem to be incompatible;

b. The view orientation of the lodging units and guest rooms within two towers was not optimized; and

c. There was no perceived benefit in the two tower concept. Only sixty feet separated the two towers. There was concern about air currents between the towers and their impact at the recreation deck level of the hotel and condominium.
Some modification of the initial design approach outlined above was attempted but adjustments fell short of achieving the desired design effect.

2. The next primary design solution proposed by Welton Becket was somewhat similar to the first but, while the project was proposed to be two towers, the building lines were softened with curvilinear features in both towers combined with the angular form of the first design solution, Figure 20. For reasons that were largely summarized for the design proposed under the first concept, this approach was also rejected. An important result of this second effort, however, was a recognition of the values and feelings created with the softer curvilinear lines.

3. Three alternative design solutions in a single tower structure were developed from the second design solution proposed by Welton Becket. The first emphasized the curvilinear feature of the building, provided all condominium and hotel units with ocean views, but tended overall to create design problems aesthetically and functionally in connection with laying out unit interiors. The second alternative along these lines created two curvilinear features and a more elongated building. These softer features of two curvilinear themes blended the angular configuration under the first approach with the narrower streamline mass of the building under the second approach. This design effort began to achieve the desired result of combining dramatic, yet compatible architecture with the intended business development plan.

4. With an emphasis towards the smoother characteristics and softer feeling of a curved line, the architects developed
a plan and form, Figure 21 that, with still much refinement, would result in the design solution now being proposed. Working with the plan, as shown in Figure 21 the architect began integrating the entire structure into a base for the building which was complimentary to the structure and, at the same time, began to consider more on a pedestrian scale the impact of this proposed development. Terraced parking garages with landscape, water features, soft colors and landscape treatment all became part of the continued refinement in the design suggested under Figure 21. The architecture seemed to be embracing the elements. The winding curve of the building closely resembles the pattern of the winding curve and approach to Waikiki over the Ala Wai bridge. The form is harmonious with the nautical features of the Ala Wai Yacht Basin. All residential units and hotel guest rooms have unobstructed views of the ocean, yacht harbor and beach parks. All traffic ingress and egress began working more smoothly.

Several site study schemes were analyzed, Figures 22, 23, 24. Scheme 1 essentially canted the building on a line roughly diagonal to the site with a south-easterly orientation. Scheme 2 was essentially a reverse of Scheme 1 where the building was on a diagonal with a south-westerly orientation. Scheme 3, the one selected and proposed for approval, is running parallel to the Ala Wai Yacht Basin, Ala Moana Boulevard and the basic configuration of the combined parcels.

The architects selected a muted, mauve colored glass at low levels of reflectivity. The site's prominent visibility ensures that the overall impact and effect of the building's design will set this project firmly in the
SCHEME 3

FIGURE 24
observer's mind as a cornerstone and landmark development for an improving Waikiki.

Additionally, to address WSDD concerns, the architect has developed a view plane study (Figures 25, 26, and 27) which depict view corridor impacts to surrounding condominiums. Such impact is, unfortunately, unavoidable; however, the extent of this impact on the view corridor is not unreasonably large. Ocean views should not be lost from any public places in the vicinity. Pedestrian views from the sidewalks are presently obstructed by the existing Kaiser Hospital Building and the Pacific Insurance Annex, therefore, no significant view plane changes are expected.

An aerial view plan analysis and a ground level view plane analysis are provided in the pocket part of this document. These analyses show the project site in relation to greater Waikiki as viewed from the air and major scenic points.
VIEW STUDY

FIGURE 26
V. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS
V. ANY PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED AND MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE IMPACT

There are areas in which adverse environmental effects, both short-term and long-term, will occur. These include: (1) air quality during construction, (2) construction noise, and (3) impact on view planes. Each of these foreseeable adverse impacts are discussed below; mitigation measures that will be implemented are also discussed under that same topic.

1. **Air Quality Impact**. The proposed project will directly affect ambient air quality during the construction period.

Fugitive dust generated during construction will be mitigated through compliance with the State of Hawaii Department of Health Rules and Regulations (Chapter 43, Section 10) which stipulates that control measures be employed to reduce fugitive dust. Primary control consists of frequent wetting down of loose soil areas with water, oil or suitable dust retardant chemicals. An effective watering program can reduce particulate emissions on construction sites by as much as 50 percent. Other control measures include good housekeeping on the job site and possibly, the erection of dust-catching barriers if nearby local residents are being subjected to suspended particulate levels more than 150 micrograms per cubic meter above existing background levels.

2. **Noise Impact**. Adverse noise impact on the surrounding areas will occur during the construction period.
This will be especially evident during site clearing, demolition, and pile driving activities. Several enforceable regulations and standards require the reduction of construction related noise and these include: the Comprehensive Zoning Code, OSHA standards (for occupational safety), Public Health Regulations, 44-A and 44-B.

3. Impact on View Planes. The building will be highly visible from several surrounding high-rise buildings and from the major streets adjacent to the project site. This is unavoidable and no mitigation measures for this impact are possible without the alteration of project plans.
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

The developer has not considered another alternative to the proposed development as described in this EIS. Therefore, from the developer's standpoint, no other alternatives are feasible or desirable. The developer has the development rights for this parcel and no other sites in the vicinity are available for this type of development.

The alternative that would discuss the potential use of the project site in a 100% hotel use, was determined by the project architect on the basis of the lot size only; there has been no economic feasibility study conducted to state that this is viable or recommended.

The twin tower concept has been previously discussed in the project chronology section and rejected for design considerations as well as certain negative environmental considerations such as increased wind flow (Venturi effect) between the twin towers.
VII.
ENVIRONMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

It is anticipated that the construction of the proposed building will commit the necessary construction materials and human resources (in the form of planning, designing, engineering, construction labor, landscaping, and personnel for the sales, management, services, offices, and maintenance functions). Some of the construction material could be reused if and when the complex is demolished; however, at the present time and state of our economy, it is felt that the reuse of much of these materials is not economical. The human resources expended for this project also will not be retrievable. The primary human resource, labor, will be compensated during the various stages of the project by the developer, commercial and business offices, and the building's management.

In addition to construction material and labor resources, the services and merchandise sold in the building can also be considered resources, which will be utilized or consumed by the purchasers.

There will be some loss of view planes; as cited previously, the building will block certain views from some surrounding high-rise apartments. The principal view plane consists mainly of other buildings in Waikiki and the proposed development will not be incompatible with other high-rise buildings in the surrounding area.

The project development will result in a commitment of land for a long-term period. Once in a high density commercial use, it is unlikely that the land will be reverted to a lower usage in the distant future.
The project will, in the long-term, result in the availability of hotel and condominium space for tourists and residents of Hawaii. The revenue from the property and businesses operating on the premises will increase and result in a higher gross revenue for this property.
VIII. OFFSETTING INTERESTS
VIII. AN INDICATION OF WHAT OTHER INTERESTS AND CONSIDERATIONS OF GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES ARE THOUGHT TO OFFSET THE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The height, setbacks, and use of the proposed building have been determined largely by the use precincts and design control established by Ordinance 4573, Waikiki Special Design District. The determination of parking spaces and loading zones were based on complying with the Comprehensive Zoning Code. To this extent, it is felt that the compliance and mitigation measures within governmental policies are inherent in the initial project design.
IX. CONSULTED PARTIES
IX. ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONSULTED DURING THE EIS CONSULTATION PERIOD AND REPRODUCTION OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES MADE

The EIS Preparation Notice was officially filed with the State Environmental Quality Commission on July 16, 1984. Environmental Communications, Inc., the authorized agent for the EIS process, provided the Preparation Notice to thirty (30) governmental and private organizations. (These agencies are identified in Table 5). Review and comments on the Preparation Notice were requested on or before August 22, 1984. As of August 22, 1984, a total of twenty one (21) comments were received. Comments from three (3) agencies were received after the comment due date. Concerns from these agencies are addressed in the DEIS document. The following pages contain reduced copies of the comments; where a response was provided, a copy of that response follows the comments.

Review and comments on the DEIS document were requested on or before November 23, 1984. Table 6 lists all governmental and private organizations offering comments on the DEIS.
# Table 5

**Organizations and Agencies Consulted during the EIS Preparation Notice Comment Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
<th>Date of Comment</th>
<th>Date Comment Received</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Water Supply</td>
<td>8/2/84</td>
<td>8/8/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Fire Department</td>
<td>7/25/84</td>
<td>7/27/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of General Planning</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>8/27/84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>7/30/84</td>
<td>8/2/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Police Department</td>
<td>8/15/84</td>
<td>8/16/84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>7/31/84</td>
<td>8/6/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation Service</td>
<td>8/3/84</td>
<td>8/8/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Accounting &amp; General Services</td>
<td>8/24/84</td>
<td>8/27/84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>8/16/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services &amp; Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Taxation</td>
<td>7/30/84</td>
<td>8/02/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>8/14/84</td>
<td>8/16/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Environmental Quality Control</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>8/27/84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Planning &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>8/01/84</td>
<td>8/01/84</td>
<td>No Response Req.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resource Research Center</td>
<td>8/01/84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comments received after review period

**Federal**

| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers         | 7/23/84         | 7/25/84               | 9/10/84          |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Organizations</th>
<th>Date of Comment</th>
<th>Date Comment Received</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association</td>
<td>8/21/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Virginia Briggs</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodore N.P. Cavett</td>
<td>8/10/84</td>
<td>8/14/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Joan Hayes</td>
<td>8/18/84</td>
<td>8/24/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert M. Jewell</td>
<td>8/17/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tyrone Kusao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of the Land</td>
<td>8/21/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lily S.M. Lim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Francis Pearson</td>
<td>8/21/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Michael Porjes</td>
<td>8/21/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walldale Improvement Association</td>
<td>8/20/84</td>
<td>8/22/84</td>
<td>9/10/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walldale Neighborhood Board No. 9</td>
<td>10/4/84</td>
<td>10/5/84</td>
<td>10/5/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walldale Residents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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August 2, 1984

Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Gentlemen:

Subject: Your Letter on the Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium

Thank you for the opportunity to review the environmental assessment for the proposed development.

We offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. The availability of additional water will be determined when the building permits are submitted for our review and approval. If additional water is made available to the project, the developer will be assessed a water development charge for source, reservoir, and transmission facilities to serve the project. Should the additional water requirements exceed 0.25 mgd, then the developer should arrange to discuss source development with us.

2. The project site is presently served by a 2-inch and a 4-inch meter. The service holder is Kaiser Foundation Hospital.

If you have any questions, please call Lawrence Whang at 527-6138.

Very truly yours,

KAZU HAYASHIDA
Manager and Chief Engineer

---

September 10, 1984

Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Manager and Chief Engineer
Board of Water Supply
City & County of Honolulu
630 South Beretania
Honolulu, Hawaii 96843

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 2, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

1. The availability of potable water for the proposed project is under review by the retained engineering consultant and the architectural designer. These demand requirements will be cited in our draft EIS for your agency’s review and comments; also, we understand that if further water requirements are indicated, this will need to be discussed with your staff.

2. Present meter holder for the site is Kaiser Hospital and at the time they vacate the site, we will cover the transitional switchover from Kaiser Hospital to the new project with your office. Thank you for your comments and continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodriguez

---

FJR:is
July 25, 1984

Mr. F. J. Rodrigues, President
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. 0. Box 156
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodrigues:

Subject: Environmental Assessment and Preparation
Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard -
Hotel and Condominium

We have no objections to the proposed subject project, as fire protection for the area is adequate. However, we wish to review your construction plans for approval prior to its construction.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN M. NONAKA,
Fire Chief

September 10, 1984

Chief Melvin M. Nonaka
Honolulu Fire Department
City & County of Honolulu
1455 S. Beretania Street
Room 305
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Dear Chief Nonaka:

We acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated July 25, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

1. Fire protection for the proposed project area is adequate. Construction plans will be provided to your agency for review and approval at the appropriate time.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Gentlemen:

Preparation Notice for the Proposed
1497 Ala Moana Boulevard Project at Makiki

Our areas of interest based on the preliminary information
provided are as follows:

Project Description

-- Duration of the construction period.

-- A site plan showing location and placement of
structure with on-site traffic circulation pattern,
including egress and ingress points.

-- Description of the access road fronting the site
and the ability of the street facility to handle
construction-related and current traffic.

-- The number of parking spaces to be provided to
accommodate hotel guests, condominium owners
and other parking needs related to meeting/hallroom
activities, restaurant operations, etc.

Other

-- Estimates of additional sewage loads and water
requirements to be generated and, if necessary, the
on-site and off-site improvements to be installed
to handle new demands.

August 22, 1984

Sincerely,

Ralph Kawanoto
Planner

Approved:

Willard T. Chow
July 30, 1984

Mr. F. J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Subject: Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium - Waikiki

IHM: 2-6-10; 6 and 10

We have reviewed the Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for the 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium Project and offer the following comments and recommendations. The site of the proposed project would have a significant impact on our public park facilities in the subject area. It is important that adequate recreational amenities be provided to serve both the hotel users and residents of the condominium, respectively.

Since residential development is being proposed, compliance with the Park Dedication Ordinance No. 4621 will be required. Any proposed private park and facilities will be subject to compliance with Rule 10 of the Park Dedication Rules and Regulations. Although the report indicates that recreational facilities will be provided to serve the condominium residents, these facilities are located on upper decks. We wish to apprise the applicant that under Rule 10 of the Park Dedication Rules and regulations, areas proposed for private park credit are required to be located on ground level and shall be uncovered.

Under the Park Dedication Ordinance, a 19,140 s.f. private park would be required to be provided for the 174 residential units.

We recommend that the applicant contact Mr. Jason Yuem of our Advance Planning Section at 527-6315 to discuss the project's park dedication requirements.

Sincerely yours,

Emiko I. Kudo
(Mrs.) Emiko I. Kudo, Director

Environmental Communications, Inc.

September 10, 1984

Mrs. Emiko I. Kudo, Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mrs. Kudo:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 30, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

1. Compliance under the Park Dedication Ordinance No. 4621 is understood and will be reviewed by both the applicant developer and the retained architectural consultant, Design Partners Incorporated. As the final decision is subject to whether or not there will be utilization of living space for hotel or residential use, this decision is not yet final; pending that final decision, the need for compliance with Ordinance No. 4621 will be made at that time.

2. Please be assured that if compliance is indicated by the designation of living space for residential use, we will be in touch with your department to discuss the park dedication requirements. Thank you for your comments and continued interest.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodriguez

FJR:la
August 15, 1984

Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii  96809

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement
Preparation Notice for the proposed 1997 Ala Moana Boulevard
project and have no comment on it at this time.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS G. GIRD
Chief of Police

By
EDWIN P. FUKUOKA
Assistant Chief of Police
Administrative Bureau

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

AUG 16 1984
Mr. Fred Rodriguez  
Environmental Communications, Inc.  
P. O. Box 536  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Re: Environmental Assessment for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium (Tax Map Key: X-5-10; Vo. 6)

In response to your request, we submit the following comments on the proposed subject project.

The 12-inch sewer in Ala Moana Boulevard from Kaiser Hospital to Hobron Lane is inadequate to accommodate the proposed development.

Me ke aloha pua'ana,

MICHAEL J. CHUN  
Director and Chief Engineer

cc: Div. of Wastewater Management

---

Dr. Michael J. Chun  
Director and Chief Engineer  
Department of Public Works  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Dr. Chun:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 31, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

Availability of adequate sewage lines for the proposed project is acknowledged and duly noted. The final construction plans with all utilities and infrastructural improvements will be provided to your department for final review and approval at the appropriate time.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

---

AUG 6 1984
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Gentlemen:

Subject: Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium

Our review of the Preparation Notice indicates that access for the project will be off State Facilities. We suggest that the design of the access points be coordinated with the State Department of Transportation.

We thank you for providing us this opportunity to review and comment on the project.

If there are any questions, please contact Kenneth Hirata of my staff at 327-5003.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. BONNET
Director

---

Mr. William A. Bonnet, Director
Department of Transportation Services
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Bonnet:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 3, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

All traffic concerns are being discussed with the State Department of Transportation and as such, will be coordinated from the access and exit design considerations.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

F. J. Rodrigues
AUG 24 1984

Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. O. Box 136
Honolulu, Hawaii 96839

Gentlemen:

Subject: EIS Preparation Notice for the
Proposed 1697 Ala Moana Blvd.

We have reviewed the subject document and have no comments
to offer.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Zeahn Tominaga
Acting State Public Works Engineer

August 27, 1984
Environmental Communications, Inc.
Hawaii, Hawaii 96819

Environmental Communications, Inc.
August 14, 1984
Page 2

6. Demolition and construction activities for the proposed project must comply with
the provisions of Title II, Administrative Rules Chapter 43:
   a. The contractor must obtain a noise permit if the noise levels from the
      construction activities are expected to exceed the allowable levels of the
      regulations.
   b. Construction equipment and on-site vehicles or devices requiring an exhaust of
gas or air must be equipped with mufflers.
   c. The contractor must comply with the conditional use of the permit as
      specified in the regulations and conditions issued with the permit.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Deputy Director for
Environmental Health

Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium, Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii

Dear Sirs:

Subject: Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium, Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject environmental assessment. Our staff wishes to make the following noise comments:

Noise

1. The following noise-related concerns should be considered during the preparation of the environmental impact statement:
   a. Increase in vehicular traffic volume, including tour buses.
   b. Activities relating to deliveries of goods and services, including commercial refuse collection.
   c. Activities relating to maintenance work.
   d. Open air-type entertainment.

2. Mitigative measures to minimize noise disturbances from the above activities should be considered and initiated.

3. Any proposed parking structure or multi-level garage should be designed to control noise, specifically towards tire squeals and vehicular emissions.

4. Through facility design, noise from any equipment, such as air conditioning/ventilation units, heat pumps, water pumps, and exhaust fans, must be attenuated to meet the allowable levels of Title II, Administrative Rules Chapter 43, Community Noise Control for Oahu.

5. On page 9, Section IV, A(3), reference is made to Public Health Regulations Chapter 8[81]. This regulation was revised and is now referred as Title II, Administrative Rules Chapter 43, Community Noise Control for Oahu.
September 10, 1984

Mr. Melvin R. Kulaum;
Department of Health;
P.O. Box 3378;
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801

Dear Mr. Kulaum:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 16, 1984 with your comments on the proposed project at 1677 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

1. a-d Those specific references to noise as a pollutant will be covered in the appropriate section on noise. There has been a study conducted by Darby-Steele & Associates for this purpose.

2. As discussed above.

3. Coordination with the acoustical engineer and the traffic consultant will be provided to evaluate the problems of tire squeal and vehicular emissions.

4. The architect and structural engineer will discuss the concerns and compliance with Title 11, Administrative Rules Chapter 43, Community Noise Control for Oahu.

5. We will correct the reference to Title 11, Administrative Rules Chapter 43.

6.a-c. All requirements as mandated during the construction phase for compliance with Title 11, Administrative Rules Chapter 43 will be made known to the general contractor constructing the building.

Thank you for your comments and continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

President
Mr. F. J. Rodrigues, President
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodrigues:

Preparation Notice, Hotel and Condominiums
1697 Ala Moana Blvd., TMC: 2-6-101; 10, 6

We concur with the need for an environmental impact statement and look forward to reviewing the traffic analysis now being prepared.

Very truly yours,

Wayne J. Yamasaki
Director of Transportation

September 10, 1984

Mr. Wayne J. Yamasaki
Director of Transportation
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
889 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Yamasaki:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 30, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

We will include as an exhibit, the traffic study prepared by Austin, Tasto and Associates for this project. All references in impacts attributed to traffic will be from this document.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

AUG 2 1984
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed the "Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice" (EA) for the 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard hotel and condominium. We have a number of comments to offer.

Historic Sites

Our records indicate this project does not occur on historic properties listed on the Hawaii Register or the National Register of Historic Places, or determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

Due to the lack of archaeological surveys in the vicinity, we are unaware if significant resources exist in the project area. If any previously unidentified sites or remains (such as artifacts, shell, bone, or charcoal deposits, human burials, rock or coral alignments, pavings, or walls) are encountered, the developer should stop work and contact our historic sites office at 548-7660 immediately. Work in the immediate area should be stopped until the office is able to assess the impact and make further recommendations for mitigative activity.

Recreation and Aesthetics

Although the proposed project does not adjoin the Magic Island/Ala Moana Park complex, it is relatively close and is expected to have an impact on these parks. Some estimate of visitor impact and visitor needs from the proposed project should be addressed. We are also concerned about the possible aesthetic impact and glare from the proposed use of reflective glass.

Sincerely,

Chairperson
State Historic Preservation Officer
September 10, 1984

Mr. Susumu Ono
Chairperson and State Historic
Preservation Officer
Department of Land and Natural
Resources
P.O. Box 601
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Ono:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 14, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond to the comments as follows:

1. We will comply with the recommendation to stop work and advise the State Historic Preservation Office in the event that there are any historical or archeological sites or remains uncovered.

2. There will be a discussion on the need for recreational activities from either the hotel or condominium occupants of the project. Also, compliance with the applicable City Ordinance on reflective glass will be discussed.

3. Our engineering consultant will be discussing potable water requirements with the Board of Water Supply and close coordination is assured.

Thank you for your comments and continued interest.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodriguez

P. J. Rodriguez
Mr. Fred J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Subject: 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium, Waikiki

We have reviewed the environmental assessment for the subject project and offer the following comments with respect to the relevant objectives and policies of the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program.

Recreational Resources: Provide adequate, accessible, and diverse recreational opportunities in the coastal zone management area by providing and managing adequate public access, consistent with conservation of natural resources, to and along shorelines with recreational value. (Chapter 155A-2(b)(1)(i), 1985)

While the project will not directly affect coastal recreational resources, such as the marina and surfing, swimming and fishing sites in its vicinity, the HZM should discuss potential impacts on public access to these resources and the additional recreation demands that will be placed on them by the project. With respect to public access, vehicular and pedestrian traffic circulation and availability of parking in the general area should be covered in the HZM Also, since the project is at the gateway of Waikiki, it is crucial in enhancing the development of continuous access along the shore from Ala Moana to the rest of Waikiki Beach. Thus, public access along the Waikiki Sides of the parcel has particular interest.

Scenic and Open Space Resources: Insure that new developments are compatible with their visual environment by designing and locating such developments to minimize the alteration of natural landscapes, and existing public views to and along the shoreline; preserve, maintain, and, where desirable, improve and restore shoreline open space and scenic resources. (Chapter 155A-1(13)(b) and (c), 1985)

An analysis of the public views to and along the shoreline should be provided in the HZM. In conjunction with this, proposed building setbacks to enhance valuable waterfront open space for public use should also be discussed.

Very truly yours,

Kent M. Keith

cc: Office of Environmental Quality Control
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment and Preparation Notice for the proposed 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Project, Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii, July 1984

We have reviewed the subject environmental assessment and preparation notice and have no comment to offer. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. This material was reviewed by WEQ personnel.

Sincerely,

Edwin T. Murakayash
Edwin T. Murakayash
EES Coordinator

NO RESPONSE REQUIRED

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

AUG 1 1984
Mr. Fred Rodrigues  
Environmental Communications, Inc.  
P.O. Box 536  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodrigues:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the EIS preparation notice for the proposed 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Project at Waikiki, Oahu. The following comments are offered:

a. The Department of the Army permit requirements are not applicable.

b. Page 6. According to the Flood Insurance Study Rate Map, Panel 130 B shows the area to be in an "AO" Zone where the average depth of flooding is 2 feet. The site is also not in a designated tsunami zone.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Klaus Cheung  
Chief, Engineering Division

Enclosure

Mr. Klaus Cheung  
Chief, Engineering Division  
Department of the Army  
Pacific Ocean Division, Corps of Engineers  
Ft. Shafter, Hawaii 96858

Dear Mr. Cheung:

We acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated July 23, 1984 commenting on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard and we respond in the following:

1. No Department of the Army permit is required is duly noted.

2. In accordance with the Flood Insurance Study Rate Map, the proposed project is located in an "AO" Zone, and is also not in a designated tsunami zone.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

F. J. Rodrigues
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
P. O. Box 536
Honolulu, HI 96809

Gentlemen:

RE: 1967 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium

The above-named project will have a negative social impact on the people of Hawaii. The site has the unique potential for Ala Wai Yacht Harbor expansion and establishment of a facility for public instruction in sailing. I cite the following for your consideration:

1. Ala Wai Yacht Harbor is unequalled in the United States for its clean, temperate water, protected location, congenial climate, dependably favorable sailing conditions and proximity to the center of population density of one of the nation's largest cities. There is a 10-year waiting list for mooring space. Feasibility of the land's being acquired and developed as a harbor addition and public training center is presently under government study. Use of the land for harbor expansion could provide 400 additional moorings. There is a negative social impact on the recreational life of our people if this property is used for hotel and condominiums.

2. There is no other harbor in the State of Hawaii set aside for recreational use which is so protected or so well-situated for training the beginning sailor as Ala Wai Yacht Harbor. Use of the property for hotel and condominiums has a negative social impact on the safety of future participants in a recreational education program which could serve hundreds for unlimited generations.

3. The joy of mastery of winds and water was an important part of the lives of the developers of our State who came here from Tahiti, Japan, the Philippines, Azores, Great Britain and the Isles of the world. The use of this potential harbor land for hotel and condominiums would have a negative cultural impact on the people of Hawaii in the lost opportunity to reignite the sailing traditions of their forebears.

I request that the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared for the 1967 Ala Moana Boulevard Hotel and Condominium project reflect that the proposed use of this property adjoining Ala Wai Yacht Harbor would have a negative social impact in Hawaii in the areas of recreation, safety, education, and cultural tradition.

Virginia B. Briggs

September 10, 1984

Dr. Virginia B. Briggs
1676 Ala Moana Boulevard, #1105
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Dr. Briggs:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 21, 1984 with your comments on the proposed project at 1967 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

1. We do not dispute the description of the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor or the demand for mooring space. Unfortunately, the purchase of the site from Kaiser Hospital has been accomplished by the applicant and to have the uses you describe implemented at this stage by government, would mean that government would have to purchase the land from the applicant. This is unlikely in view of the costs involved and the low priority of funding availability for purchases of this magnitude.

2. There are no planning documents currently under review by both the State and the City of Honolulu, planning for extensive marina development at Ewa Marine and also in the future, at the West Beach Resort. As to how many mooring spaces these projects can satisfy, this is difficult to determine at this time.

3. Again, we do not dispute the comments of how early settlers of Hawaii played an important role in the development of these islands; we would feel that the arguments put forth in your comment are unfortunately, late in timing, and best directed to the Harbors Division of the State Department of Transportation. Their long range future planning for increased mooring spaces to meet the demands of future sailing enthusiasts would benefit from support of this type.

Your comments are duly noted and will be reflected in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

You're very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR/IA

AUG 22 1984
22 August 1984

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is in regards to the condominium-hotel planned for the Kaiser Hospital site in the Ala Moana area.

Please be advised that the membership of the Hawaii Yacht Club is against any such building, as it will change the wind patterns even further in the Ala Moana area. Quite a few sail boats do not have motors and could not possibly get into their slips with the wind pattern changed.

The traffic would be horrendous in that there is only one street in and out of the harbor. The congestion, at present, is more than the street can bear.

Boat owners would find parking even more at a premium than it is at present. Kaiser workers, hotel tenants, Tahitian Loyal patrons all use the harbor, as well as the surfers. With the amount of money that boaters pour into the State and City coffers via purchases, sales tax, excise tax, income tax, etc., it hardly seems fair to penalize them to this extent.

Please let the record show that the membership of the Hawaii Yacht Club is against any more high rises in the harbor area of the Ala Moana area.

Sincerely,

N. P. Cavett
Vice-Commodore
NPC

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS INC.

September 10, 1984

Commodore N.P. Cavett
Hawaii Yacht Club
1739-C Ala Moana Blvd.,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Commodore Cavett:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 22, 1984 containing your comments on the proposed project at 1497 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

The prevailing wind patterns for yachting purposes in the Ala Moana area has been the subject of serious discussion with both government as well as members of the Waikiki Yacht Club who are familiar with the problem. These discussions will be included in the draft EIS currently under preparation.

A traffic impact study is also being prepared and finalized which will discuss the impacts of traffic impacts transfer from a hospital use to a hotel use. This will also be included in the final EIS for review.

Regarding the parking and availability of parking which is at a premium along the Ala Moana Harbors, taxes generated by the proposed hotel and condominium project are also worthy of discussion and this will be covered in terms of the full time job equivalencies that will be provided by the development of this project. This is not to say that tax contributions by the boating community is unimportant; on the contrary, all of us pay taxes for services that we use or in most cases do not use, but we still pay taxes.

Thank you for your comments and concerns.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR
August 10, 1984

Mr. F. J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

I am writing to request that I be a consulted party in the proposed hotel-condominium project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Hayes

August 14, 1984

Mr. F. J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Subject: 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Project, Waikiki, Oahu.

I wish to be considered as a consulted party for purposes of the EIS concerning the above cited property currently under preparation by your office. As such, please forward me copies of all material related to the project to include the preparation notice.

Your assistance in this matter is sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Tyrone T. Kusao
Robert H. Jewell  
PO Box 353  
Honolulu HI 96809-0353  
(808) 944-8651  
Telex RJM 7431794

August 18, 1984  
Office of Environmental Quality Control  
State of Hawaii

Gentlemen:

I am writing in regard to the proposed condominium project for the site of the present Kaiser Hospital on the Ala Wai Boat Harbor, by developer Jack Myers.

I have the following concerns which indicate an adverse effect if the proposed project is allowed:

The higher building (39 stories) will cause further deterioration of safe wind conditions for boats navigating the Ala Wai channel. Boaters who were here before the time of Yacht Harbor Towers, Discovery Bay, etc., claim that conditions have worsened due to effects of high structures on winds.

The temperature of the air and water in the Ala Wai Boat Harbor will rise due to restricted air movement from a higher building. Air movement assists in circulating and thus clearing the water in the harbor. Already the unusual conditions cause growth of tube worms on boat bottoms and propellers, necessitating monthly paid divers to keep them clear. Such action does not occur in Lahaina, etc. Reduced air circulation will cause even higher apparent air and boat temperatures in the harbor, especially in close to shore, which are already uncomfortable in summer months.

Traffic on the roadway bordering the harbor near the site is already heavily congested during rush hours. It is only single lane each way, and when the beer truck and garbage trucks arrive at the same time (as happens often), traffic is totally stopped.

I understand that the developer is attempting to have the permit for lease of Ala Wai Marine, Ltd. terminated so he can acquire that land for still further development. The Ala Wai Marine Ltd. boatyard is conveniently located for the 100's of boats in the harbor. Further, it maintains emergency vessels that can get to special problems almost immediately; which would not be possible if AWM Ltd. were forced to locate to some other harbor.

Any redevelopment of AWM Ltd. property would amplify the same harmful environmental effects as the primary project proposed.

Presently the parking area between Kaiser and the harbor is very heavily used, not only for Kaiser, but for other visitors to the harbor and to the restaurants, etc. From the published drawings, it appears that the proposed project would result in greatly reduced availability of public metered parking.

On balance, then, my opinion is that this proposed project would indeed have severe adverse effects on the environment for not only its own area, but on much of the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Jewell  
P.O. Box 353  
Honolulu, HI 96809

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL  
STATE OF HAWAII  
550 HIKAKAWEA ST,  
PO BOX 94973  
HONOLULU, HI 96820
September 10, 1984

Mr. Robert H. Jewell
P.O. Box 353
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809-0353

Dear Mr. Jewell:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 18, 1984 which was received at The Office of Environmental Quality Control and forwarded to our office for response. We respond to your comments in the following:

The subject of impacts on the Ala Wai Marina due to wind current impairment resulting from the construction of a proposed hotel/condominium project has been the subject of serious discussion. There is no doubt that there exists already, a deteriorated condition due to existing buildings and that this deteriorated condition commenced when the Ilikai Hotel and the Kaiser Hospital were built. The condition has been aggravated with the advent of further high rise buildings being built adjacent to the hotel and hospital. We have discussed this situation with members of the Waikiki Yacht Club who have been active sailing members at the Ala Wai Marina since 1971 and their comments will be included in the draft EIS currently under preparation.

Traffic has been recognized as a serious consideration and is the subject of a traffic impact study that will also be included in the draft EIS.

As to the acquisition of the Ala Wai Marine, Ltd., land area by the applicant, this is under consideration but not finalised. It is not essential to the development of the project proper but would improve the aesthetics of the project in that development of the site would be for a gateway park that would be in keeping with the Waikiki Design District requirements as provided for by the City & County of Honolulu.

The draft EIS is designed to bring forth all of these various impacts positive and negative that the project will impose on the site as well as adjacent areas. We look forward to your review of the document and your comments.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR,Inc
August 17, 1984

Mr. F.J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Subject: 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard Project, Waikiki, Oahu

Thank you for your prompt reply to my request of August 14, 1984. I have reviewed the assessment and find that items H.I.-4, and I on page 11 of your report of considerable interest.

I trust you will address these matters thoroughly in your EIS and look forward to receiving a copy of your study.

Very truly yours,

Tyron T. Kusao

TTK:afk

September 10, 1984

Mr. Tyrone T. Kusao, A.I.G.P.
City Planning Consultant
936 Bethel Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Kusao:

Thank you for your letter dated August 17, 1984. We will be providing full disclosure of the items as noted in the draft EIS. We look forward to your comments on our document.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigue
Subject: Development of the Kaiser Hospital Site

Dear Mrs. Lim:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 21, 1984 with your comments regarding the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

The subject items of your concerns (view, reflective glare/heat, shadows, and ventilation) will be discussed in the draft EIS which we are preparing for the applicant. It is regrettable that the view plane will be impacted, but as the underlying zoning permits building height to 350', the compliance controls exist with the City Department of Land Utilization. As a developer of high-rise buildings in Honolulu, you are aware that view impairment is a risk to both the developer and potential occupant and as such, is an excellent demonstration of "Buyer Beware".

Thank you for your comments and we look forward to your review of our EIS.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR:s

Sincerely,

LILY S. M. LIN

Hand Delivered Aug 22, 1984
Environmental Communications, Inc.,
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii, 96809

Conteinen:

The owners of the 140 apartments in the Harbor View Plaza Condominiums wishes to express their opposition to the construction of a high rise hotel-condominium complex on the Kaiser hospital grounds for the following reasons:

1. The beaches of Waikiki are highly crowded and over used at the present time. This complex not having any beach will have to use other Waikiki beaches.
2. The traffic along Ala Moana-Kalakaua and any other Waikiki Streets are already passed any reasonable peak of traffic.
3. For pedestrian the sidewalks are all ready over crowded.
4. The water use on Oahu is already strained to its breaking point.
5. The sewer disposal lines are over flowing from Kaiser hospital use. This will have to be corrected if a new condominium complex is approved.
6. Under the Waikiki Design Plan that has been well thought out over the years allows a certain number of hotel rooms. This number has already been exceeded and a new hotel complex will only add to the legal violation.
7. Your buses have become a problem to the area and Waikiki. A new hotel-condominium would only add to the congestion.

Unless the City and County of Honolulu protects the jewel that they have in Waikiki which is being tamished they will end up with another Miami which will kill off the tourist trade a lot faster than it is being developed.

We understand that it is to be a glass constructed building. Other similar buildings have cast off heat reflections which annoy the entire neighborhood.

We in Harbor View Plaza located directly across the street from the proposed construction would get the direct rays from the morning sun.

We would appreciate your consideration of the problems that presently exist.

Very truly yours,

Board of Directors of Harbor View Plaza

Francis Pearson, President
Muriel Fischer, Vice President-Secretary
Tour bus traffic for this proposed hotel is not considered to be a serious factor since the market that this hotel is seeking to attract, will not be prime users of tour buses.

Finally, the subject of reflective glare from the use of glass exterior wall panels is to be analyzed in a study being conducted by the architectural firm responsible for the design. This data will be provided to the City Department of Land Utilization for their consideration under the Waikiki Special Design District requirements. Thank you for your comments.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

[Signature]
To: Environmental Communications, Inc.
   1112 Bishop #407
   Honolulu, Hawaii

From: Michael and Aida Porjes
   2131 Kalakaua #132
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96815
   Telephone 948-2333

Gentlemen:

This letter is written to register our concern about the building of a large single building on the site of the present Kaiser Hospital next to the Ala Moana Yacht Harbor.

We ask the responsible authorities to grant permission to build only a thin twin tower development with ground level views remaining to the ocean and yacht harbor from Ala Moana Boulevard. A development such as the KukuiHale Gardens twin towers on the Ala Moana would be wonderful!

If you allow the developers to build a single building the Kona wind will be blocked, the heat glare will be tremendous, the trade wind pattern will be destroyed and, worst of all, the view of the ocean and yacht harbor will be lost to our children, our children's children and to ourselves, the citizens of Hawaii for the next seventy or eighty years.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Porjes
August 21, 1984

Aida Porjes
August 21, 1984

Mr. & Mrs. Porjes
2131 Kalakaua #132
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Porjes:

We are in receipt of your letter dated August 22, 1984 containing your comments on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

The areas of concern that you have expressed both in your letter and verbally in our office will be discussed in the draft EIS which we are preparing at the present time. As we discussed, there will be compliance with the appropriate building design and construction ordinances that are applicable to the development of this project. Also, the impact of the view from your unit across the Ala Moana Boulevard is negligible but due to the underlying zoning that prevails for the Kaiser Hospital site, there is little that can be done. There will be a view pleasant corridor analysis provided in the draft EIS, but for an analysis that would relieve a 4th floor view from this project site, there is not much to hope for.

We appreciate your comments and concerns.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR:ls

AUG 22 1984

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS INC.

September 10, 1984
August 20, 1984

Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 594
Honolulu, HI 96809

Subject: 1697 Ala Moana Blvd., Hotel and Condominium

Gentlemen:

Our Board is vitally interested in this project and wants to keep informed on all developments. Hereewith are some our major concerns:

1. The proposed hotel project would exceed the Waikiki Hotel limit as established in Ordinance 82-53.
2. There is insufficient information on the proposed shoreline setback area.
3. This project would require a change in the Primary Urban Center Development Plan Map.
4. We need more information on tour bus and traffic pattern plans.
5. We need to know cost ranges for the various units.
6. We will need a clear reflectivity study, and what impact this glass building will have on adjacent or other condominiums and apartments.

Thank you for keeping us informed.

Sincerely,

John W. Stunkard
Chairman

cc: Councilmember Marilyn Barnhart
Representative Joan Haynes
Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9 Members
Neighborhood Commission

Mr. John W. Stunkard, Chairman
Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9
C/O Waikiki/Kapahulu Library
480 Kapahulu Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

September 10, 1984

Mr. John W. Stunkard, Chairman

We are in receipt of your Board's letter dated August 20, 1984 containing comments on the proposed project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard. We respond in the following:

1. Ceiling limits as prescribed in Ordinance No. 83-25 for visitor units in Waikiki will need to be reviewed in terms of compliance and applicability. This information will be included in the draft EIS.

2. The shoreline setback area boundary line is being determined at the present time by a survey conducted by applicant. The placement of the shoreline setback boundary line will be dictated by the surveyor and certified by the State Surveyor's office.

3. All current land use designations including the Primary Urban Center Development Plan Map will be clearly identified in the draft EIS, and any changes will be provided for.

4. A traffic impact statement has been prepared and will be included in the draft EIS with specific references to bus and traffic plans.

5. Cost ranges for the various units are subject to change but the anticipated price ranges in 1984 dollars will be included in the draft EIS.

6. Reflective glare and heat from the use of reflective glass on the building's exterior will be the subject of analysis by the applicant's architectural design team and will be included in the draft EIS.

Thank you for your comments and continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR

1100 FORT STREET 4TH FLOOR • P.O. BOX 206 • HONOLULU, HI 96813 • TELEPHONE 541-8781

AUG 22 1984
Mr. F. J. Rodriguez  
Environmental Communications, Inc.  
P.O. Box 2296  
Honolulu, HI 96809

October 4, 1984

Dear Mr. Rodriguez,

Because of summer vacations and other interruptions, we are slow in thanking you for your material in regard to an Environmental Impact Statement for 1697 Ala Moana Blvd. We do appreciate the data.

In addition we should like to be considered as a consulted party in the proposed hotel-condominium development.

Sincerely,

Georgia E. Miller  
President Waikiki Residents Association

---

October 5, 1984

Ms. Georgia E. Miller  
1720 Ala Moana, Suite 84A  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Ms. Miller:

We are in receipt of your letter of October 4, 1984 regarding notification of your interest in the matter of the proposed hotel-condominium project at 1697 Ala Moana Boulevard. Please be advised that your organization will be included in the review process which we are planning to commence effective October 23, 1984. We look forward to the comments received from your group and please feel free to contact our office if there is anything of a specific nature that we may provide for your use.

Thank you for your continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodriguez

FJHL:
cc: Jack E. Myers  
Department of Land Utilization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City &amp; County</th>
<th>Date of Comment</th>
<th>Date of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Water Supply</td>
<td>11/19/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>11/24/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>11/16/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of General Planning</td>
<td>11/15/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land Utilization</td>
<td>11/23/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>11/13/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation Services</td>
<td>11/08/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>11/01/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Reference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>11/18/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Accounting &amp; General Services</td>
<td>11/13/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>10/30/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health</td>
<td>11/13/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Land &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>11/21/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Planning &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>10/23/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPED Library</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Services and Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>11/21/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Archives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Energy Office</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Center</td>
<td>11/20/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Research Center</td>
<td>11/15/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date of Comment</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th ABW/DEE, Hickam Army-DAFE (Facilities Eng. USASCH)</td>
<td>10/31/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>10/24/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation Service U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>11/14/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>11/15/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Lung Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Electric Company</td>
<td>11/16/84</td>
<td>NRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Star-Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Advertiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Virginia Briggs</td>
<td>11/19/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Arapoff</td>
<td>11/20/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Earl R. Hinz</td>
<td>11/19/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ruth R. Ball</td>
<td>11/18/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles H. Dole</td>
<td>11/16/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Peter Okada</td>
<td>11/16/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Hawaiian Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative Joan Hayes</td>
<td>11/21/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David McFaul</td>
<td>11/18/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkili Neighborhood Board No. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert N. Jewell</td>
<td>11/20/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye Kennedy Daly</td>
<td>11/19/84</td>
<td>12/07/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bernice R. May</td>
<td>11/15/84 (Petition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick J. Daly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. E. Fernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert J. Ireues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. V. D. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Issac Aoki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Robert Kawamoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Aoki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lydela Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.M. Belcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Belcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ferne Whetmon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Organizations</td>
<td>Date of Comment</td>
<td>Date of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Lonnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ronald E. McCain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. M.J. McCain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rose Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Elbert Crapps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. Rothschild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James W. Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John C. Laughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Ernest Pendleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Don Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Francis Rehman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Illegible (Apt. 409)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***NO RESPONSE NEEDED = NRN***
November 9, 1984

TO: MICHAEL M. MCILROY, DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: KAZU HAYASHIDA, MANAGER AND CHIEF ENGINEER
      BOARD OF WATER SUPPLY

SUBJECT: LETTER OF OCTOBER 19, 1984 FROM THE OFFICE OF
         ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL
         IMPACT STATEMENT FOR YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA

We have no objections to the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza
Hotel/Condominium.

The developer should contact the Board to arrange the
availability of water for the proposed project. The
developer may be required to participate in the development
of a source to ensure water for the proposed project.

If you have any questions, please contact Lawrence Whany at
527-6126.

Kazu Hayashida
Manager and Chief Engineer

F. J. Rodriguez
October 24, 1984

TO: MR. MICHAEL MACEDO, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: ROY H. TANJII
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
for the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza and have no comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft EIS.

ROY H. TANJII
Director and Building Superintendent

cc: Environmental Communications, Inc.
J. Harada

OCT 26 1984
MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael M. McElroy, Director  
Department of Land Utilization

FROM: Joseph K. Conant  

SUBJECT: Yacht Harbor Plaza  
Waikiki, Oahu  

05-10-16: 6 and 10  
Area: 2.53 Acres

The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) has reviewed the information regarding the proposed Yacht Harbor Plaza, Waikiki, for consistency with the Department's Housing Assistance Plan (HAP) and has determined that the project location is not consistent with the priority areas identified in the HAP. In addition, the Department's Housing Location Model does not target the Waikiki area for the development of publicly-assisted housing.

We note that the primary urban center development plan designates one portion of the site as a public facility use (Parcel 6) and the other as resort use (Parcel 10). The latter parcel is in conformance with the Development Plan but the former parcel, we understand, requires a Development Plan amendment. Significant impacts can occur when large sites occupied by public facility uses are redeveloped for some private use. The current zoning for the site is resort hotel which allows building heights of 350 feet.

We will retain this report for our files.

JOSEPH K. CONANT  
Original Signed  
JOSEPH K. CONANT

Environmental Communications, Inc.

November 16, 1984

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS INC.

Mr. Joseph K. Conant  
Department of Housing and Community Development  
City and County of Honolulu  
695 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Conant:

We are in receipt of your comment dated November 16, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond to your comments as follows:

1. Your department's position regarding the suitability of the proposed project with the Housing Assistance Plan is noted, with emphasis on the fact that Waikiki is not a targeted area for the development of publicly assisted housing.

2. The question of whether or not the proposed project site will require a Development Plan amendment was raised earlier by the City Council Chair. This question was raised due to the reasons you have cited in your letter; both directors for the DLU and DGP have responded to the specific inquiry in the negative and we quote from their response dated September 28, 1984:

"The site lies within the Resort Hotel Precinct of the Waikiki Special Design District (WSDD); together with other applicable provisions of the WSDD, this constitutes its zoning. On the Development Plan (DP) Map, a portion of the site is designated "resort" and another portion is designated "Public Facility" in recognition of its current use. Since the Comprehensive Zoning Code (CZC) provides no zoning district specific to public facilities, the site may be developed according to underlying zoning."

We appreciate your comments on this project.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

P. J. Rodrigues

FJR

NOV 23 1984
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
    Department of Land Utilization

VIA: Mr. Andrew I. T. Chang, Managing Director

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium, Waikiki

November 15, 1984

Mr. Willard T. Chow
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Chow:

We are in receipt of your department's comments dated November 15, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond to them as follows:

1. Drainage — The existing system that services the project site and the Kaiser Hospital complex will be utilized in terms of available capacity. In the event that the capacity is not adequate, the system will expand in compliance with applicable County requirements. The outlets for the drainage discharge at the Ala Wai Canal and the Ala Wai Boat Harbor are existing and being used at the present time.

2. School population — There are no estimates for school population due to the fact that the final configuration for a hotel or a combined hotel/condominium has not been determined. In the event that a condominium mixed-use is selected, the school age children would not be of a significant number.

Thank you for your comments and continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJRLs

APPROVED:

WILLARD T. CHOW

Chief
Community Development Division

CC: GEOC
    Mr. F. J. Rodrigues,
    Environmental Communications, Inc.
Mr. Fred J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium

We have reviewed the Draft EIS for the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium, and offer the comments which follow. For convenience, we have organized our comments according to the various sections of the Draft EIS.

Section I. Summary

1. This section will have to be revised to reflect revisions in the body of the EIS.
2. The description of the exterior should indicate the use of reflective glass (page 1-2).

Section II. Project Description

1. A comparison of Figures 6, 7 and 8 suggests that the project will incorporate a silver of State land on the wai side of the Kalakaua property. A new illustration is needed showing land ownership, the boundaries of the project site, and the footprint of the structure.
2. Figures 8 and 10 indicate a change in the configuration and number of public parking spaces along Yacht Harbour Drive. In addition, the Draft EIS indicates a pedestrian bridge connecting the recreation deck of the structure with an elevator/stairway access structure situated on Yacht Harbour Drive's waike, dockside sidewalk. The EIS should specify all lands to be acquired, leased, or jointly developed from or with the State. Proposed improvements to State lands, such as paving and landscaping, should also be discussed.

Mr. Fred J. Rodriguez
Page 2

3. In the letters and replies in Section IX, Consulted Parties, there is also an indication that the developer is attempting to acquire the State-owned parcel currently leased to Ala Wai Marine, Ltd. (consultant's reply, dated September 10, 1984, to letter from Robert R. Jewell). The proposed use of this property and its specific relation to the proposed hotel/condominium project, including any possible use to meet open space or floor area ratio requirements, should be disclosed.

4. It appears from the text and figures (a) that there will be a decrease in the number of public parking spaces available on Yacht Harbour Drive and (b) that the public restroom and showers on Yacht Harbour Drive will be eliminated. These aspects of the project should be described.

5. This section should specify the project's total floor area and the amount of floor area to be devoted to various uses, including hotel guest rooms, condominium apartments, retail shops, food and beverage facilities, meeting facilities, and back-of-the-house facilities. The proposed number of parking spaces should also be disclosed.

6. There is a discrepancy between Figure 7 and Figure 8 regarding vehicular access to and from Ala Moana Boulevard. This should be clarified.

7. Will any of the condominium units be operated as transient vacation rentals and/or be managed as part of a resort condominium pool?

8. What is the basis for the statement, "The potential for guest rooms at this quality level is nearly 800 rooms" (page 11-17)? Has a market study been performed for this project?

9. The first paragraph on page 11-18 suggests that an alternative to the proposed project is the construction of 800 hotel rooms, with reduction in or elimination of the condominium units. If this is indeed an alternative under study, it should be stated as such and fully discussed in Section VI.

Section III. Environmental Setting and Probable Impacts

1. The discussion of climate on page III-3 should also address southerly, or Kona, winds.
2. According to page III-9, the hospital PM peak period occurs between 2:00 and 4:00, while the Ala Moana Boulevard peak occurs between 4:00 and 6:00, coinciding with a projected hotel peak between 4:00 and 6:00. This means there may be a decrease at the time of the existing hospital peak, the proposed project will cause an increase in Ala Moana peak period traffic. Because the PM peak periods for existing and proposed uses do not coincide, the comparison offered in Table 2, "Trip Generation Summary," appears to be misleading, as does the statement on page III-11, "The PM peak hour for the proposed development shows the most dramatic increase in traffic generation over the existing medical center." Can this apparent inconsistency be explained? If not, then the traffic study should be revised. This would also necessitate a revision of the "Traffic Impact Summary" statement on page III-11.

3. The discussion of traffic impacts in Section III fails to reflect the conclusions and recommendations of the Traffic Report (Appendix I). These should be addressed, with particular attention to the recommendations for mitigating traffic impacts and the proposed ingress and egresses on Ala Moana Boulevard.

4. The Draft EIS should address possible noise impacts on yacht harbor users and residents from use of the project's recreation deck for open-air entertainment.

5. The EIS should provide information about the collection and discharge of stormwater run-off from the project. If it is proposed to discharge drainage into the municipal system, the availability of adequate capacity should be verified with the appropriate agency. Any effects on coastal waters should be discussed.

6. The EIS should state the means by which compliance with park dedication requirements (Ordinance No. 6021) will be achieved (Reference: page III-25 and page IV-11).

7. The discussion of construction impacts (including the noise and air quality studies) fails to address demolition of the existing buildings. What method of demolition will be used and what impacts will it have with regard to noise, air quality, and the waters of the yacht harbor? What mitigation measures will be taken?

8. A map depicting the FIRM AO designation should be provided. A discussion of this designation and its implication should also be provided.

9. Project plans indicate the removal of some public parking spaces and public restroom facilities. What impacts will these actions have on harbor residents and users?

Section IV: Relationship to Land Use Policies, Plans and Controls

1. How many hours of the day, during different seasons, will the project cast a shadow across Ala Moana Boulevard? Will the section of the boulevard abutting the project be constantly in shadow? What effect would increased shadows have on public use of the boulevard?

2. On page IV-5, the Draft EIS states that wind flow patterns caused by the project will affect Ilikai Hotel Marina Tower balconies. What impacts will occur?

3. The Draft EIS presents information on wind patterns developed by two individuals, apparently working independently. Each provides information on various localized wind patterns. These predicted impacts should be mapped showing (a) prevailing and (b) Kona wind patterns. In addition, a conclusion should be provided which synthesizes and relates their separate findings (pages IV-4 to IV-8). The EIS should state the qualifications of persons having expertise regarding wind impacts and distinguish their findings from others.

4. Reference page IV-12.

*Note: The analysis of the reflective glare study was done for the project site by the project architect. Figures 14-A to 14-D illustrate sunlight reflectivity found during peak reflective situations during solstices. As the study indicates, impact areas are point specific rather than widespread. It should also be noted that as a specific reflective source, no single area would be continuously impacted.*

What was the methodology for the reflective glare study described above? What is a "point specific" impact area? What is a "point specific reflective source"? Would it be possible to identify the specific buildings, etc., that contribute to the impact area? Would it be possible to estimate the impact on glare at various points in the harbor? What would be the impacts of this glare to people living aboard boats or navigating the harbor?
5. To afford analysis of view impacts, the proposed project silhouette should be superimposed on the various view perspectives represented in the "Ground Level View Plane Analysis" (large sheet folded in jacket pocket). The EIS should state whether there will be any loss of view from public places, as defined in the Waikiki Special Design District (WSDO) Ordinance.

The view plane analysis should consider impacts upon views along the Ala Moana Boulevard - i.e., from the Ala Wai Bridge towards Waikiki - and upon coastal views from Ala Moana Boulevard.

6. The EIS should demonstrate how the project complies with the WSDO ordinance with regard to floor area ratio (FAR), setback, building height, open space, and parking requirements. As noted in our letter to Mr. Owen Chock, a representative of the developer (July 9, 1984), the project does not appear to meet WSDO and Comprehensive Zoning Code requirements.

7. The elevator/stairway access structure and the pedestrian bridge are proposed to be located within the Public Precinct of the WSDO. Will these be open to public use? Note that under Section 4.8.4. of the WSDO ordinance, only public uses are permitted in the Public Precinct.

8. Given its location in the Resort Hotel Precinct, the EIS should justify why approximately one-third of the project is being proposed for condominium apartments.

Section V. Alternatives

This section should be revised to reflect at least the following: (a) the functional alternative of 100% hotel use; and (b) the design alternative of two towers.

Other Comments

The EIS should present a list of governmental requirements required for the project and the corresponding approving agencies. This should include any approvals for the acquisition or use of State land.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Robin Foster at 327-5027.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL M. MCKEOWN
Director of Land Utilization

Mr. Rick K. Rodriguez
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Mr. Michael H. McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Thank you for your comments of November 23 on the subject document. We respond to your comments, as follows:

Section I. Summary

1. This section will be revised to reflect revisions in the body of the EIS.

2. The project no longer utilizes reflective glass, as defined by Ordinance No. 82-35, on the exterior design of the structure. However, a statement will be included to describe the covering as low reflectivity glass (see response for Section IV., comment 4).

Section II. Project Description

1. A new illustration showing land ownership, boundaries of the project site, and the footprint of the structure will be included in the final EIS. The site diagrams will include both plans ( Proposed plan using State Lands, and the alternative plan using Kalaeloa Hospital lands only.)

2. Figures 6 and 10 are depictions of the conceptual landscape plan and are in no way meant to represent the actual project design. The elevated walkway and pier from the proposed hotels have been deleted as a design feature. The final EIS will specify all lands to be used for improvements.

3. A status letter on the possible acquisition of portions of the State-owned lands to be used for the Water Feature and Hotel entry and sidewalks, will be included in the Final EIS. (See Figures 2 & 4 for new footprint of project site.) The Ala Wai Marina, Ltd. leased lands are not under current negotiations.

4. The public parking spaces and public restrooms along Yacht Harbor Drive are currently under negotiation between the State Department of Transportation, Harbors Division and the applicant. Any changes due to these
possible acquisitions will be provided as the negotiations are completed. At this time the impact from loss of these facilities is not expected to be significant. The agreement between the applicant and the DOT Harbors Division will address the replacement or substitution of facilities as indicated or appropriate.

5. The specifications requested on floor areas and parking spaces will be provided by the design architect as soon as negotiations between the State DOT, Harbors Division and the developer have been finalized.

6. Thank you for pointing out this discrepancy. Figure 7 is incorrect as there is no entrance for condominium parking at the e.wa end of the building. This will be corrected in the final EIS.

7. At this time, no condominium units are planned for transient vacation rentals or resort condominium pools. The target market for the condominium units is not expected to be vacationing visitors but, rather, full or part time residents. The agreement with the State for use of State Lands will include a condition that the property will not have any time sharing concepts employed in the applicant's marketing program.

8. The basis for this comment was simply that the architects determined that if the property were developed only as hotel, the available density would permit the development of approximately 800 guest rooms.

While an economic analysis has been prepared for the proposed project of 408 hotel guest rooms, an analysis has not been prepared for an alternative of 800 hotel guest rooms.

9. The construction of a 800 hotel room structure is a physical possibility; however, this alternative is not presently being given serious consideration.

Section III. Environmental Setting and Probable Impacts

1. Kona or Southerly wind conditions were not examined in great detail by Dr. Arthur Chiu. Beyond the impacts that result at the present time to the high rise structures during these periods of on-shore winds, the impacts that would be attributed to the development of this project are not considered to be significant. If anything, there would be a sheltering effect to the buildings maska of the project site.

2. The Traffic Report shows the trip generation in two forms. The "peak hour of generation" trip generation comparisons are intended to show the decreases in traffic in absolute terms. The more relevant characteristics in terms of traffic operation are the "peak hours of adjacent street traffic", which occur between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM for both the existing and the proposed developments. These peak periods obviously coincide since they both pertain to Ala Moana Boulevard. As Table 2 of the EIS shows, the "peak hour of adjacent street traffic" shows a significant decrease in the PM peak hour resulting in a negligible change in the overall traffic demand. Therefore, the conclusions in both the "Traffic Impact Summary" of the EIS and the "Traffic Report" are consistent with the findings of the study.

3. The conclusions and recommendations of the Traffic Report will be reflected in the Traffic Impact Summary.

4. Noise impacts on yacht harbor users and residents from the project's recreation deck will be consistent with Hotel-Resort Zoning. The ambient daylight noise levels are currently fairly high due to traffic and adjacent uses. The proposed project will offer shielding from mauka sources (Ala Moana Boulevard) therefore, recreation deck activities should not cause any significant gain in noise levels and may, in effect, lower noise levels. Event noise sources are expected to primarily consist of traffic noise from theatre goers since pool use will be limited in the evening.

In all instances, noise levels will be subject to applicable noise regulations. All such regulations shall be complied with.

This information will be reflected in the EIS.

5. The EIS will include a new section titled Site Drainage which will address all drainage concerns. The proposed system will utilize the existing system since no increase in runoff is expected.

6. This requirement will be complied with by cash payment method.

7. Although this portion of the project has not been planned in detail, demolition of the existing structures will be accomplished, in all probability, by aerial ball and crane. Noise, air, and water quality impacts during demolition must be within Department of Health requirements and will be regulated in the following manners:

a) A noise permit will be obtained from the Noise and Radiation Branch to insure compliance of demolition noise impacts to Title II, Chapter 43 HRS.

b) If fugitive dust exceeds the property line or degrades air and surrounding water quality, the Department of Health will impose restraints on the demolitions contractor to limit fugitive dust impacts on adjacent property (Title II, Chapter 69 HRS).
c) A rodent infestation survey will be conducted prior to demolition to determine the extent of infestation. If any infestation is evident, the extermination will be conducted to prevent rodents from moving into adjacent properties upon demolition commencement.

d) The demolitions contractor will also comply with OSHA requirements for public safety as per City and County Building Department permit requirements.

8. A copy of the Flood Insurance Rate Map will be included and discussed in the EIS.

9. The public parking spaces and public restroom facilities mentioned in the comments are located on State Land currently under negotiation between the applicant and the Department of Transportation Harbors Division. Should this land be made available to the developer, parking spaces and restroom facilities will be lost. New parking may be made available by the developer within the project complex.

Section IV. Relationship to Land Use Policies, Plans and Controls

1. As shown in the shadow study, the project will cast a shadow across Ala Moana Boulevard during the afternoon hours. Ala Moana Boulevard is presently affected by shadows cast by the existing Kaiser Hospital building on the makai side, and the Harbor View Plaza, Big Surf, and Weatherby on the mauka side. As indicated, Ala Moana Boulevard will be under the proposed project shadow for only a portion of any given day and no impacts are expected to occur on public use of the boulevard.

2. At the Diamond Head end, the distance between the proposed structure and the Mauka Tower building is approximately 55 feet. The mauka portion of the Mauka Tower building is low rise (6 stories) and the tower portion is 18 stories.

There could be channelling of the wind flow between the two structures at the lower portions. However, there are many surrounding high-rise buildings in the vicinity so that wind speeds at the lower elevations will not be significant. It is doubtful if the channelling effects would be of major concern.

3. The two individuals who provided comments on the significance of the wind patterns on the Ala Wai Boat Harbor due to the proposed project contributed their expertise to this analysis. Dr. Arthur Chiu, professor of civil engineering at the University of Hawaii, is presently involved with Japanese scientists from Kyoto and Osaka on a wind study designed to determine the effects of strong winds on glass windows and turbulence at the pedestrian level.

4. Figure 14 shows that the spancoel and vision glass is 2% reflective. Thus, all glass noted may be labeled the same and is under the 3% reflectivity threshold factor of Ordinance No. 82-35. (Certain existing glass sheathed buildings in Honolulu are in the 4% reflectivity range we understand.) We suggest that the first paragraph on page IV-12 be revised as follows:

A reflective glare study was done for the project by the architect. Special attention was given to peak reflective situations during solstice dates. Because of the curvilinear nature of the tower, the impact of reflectivity on offshore areas is diffused. These impacted areas are point specified that is at any one time the affected zones are separated by large bands of unaffected zones. As such, no single zone would be continuously impacted as the sun changes position during the day. This effect is further lessened by the low (2%) reflectivity of the building's exterior.

Dramatic changes in air temperature due to the reflective glass is not anticipated to be a significant factor. Unlike the Harbor Square Condominium/Greenbrier Tower situation, the boating community is not considered to be similar in that the height differential is not comparable.

To afford analysis of view impacts, the proposed project silhouette has been superimposed on the various view perspectives represented in the hand overlay view plane analysis blueprint. There should not be any significant loss of view from any public places in the vicinity due to this proposed project. The existing pedestrian level view plane is obstructed by the Kaiser Hospital and Pacific Insurance Annex.
Mr. Michael M. McElroy  
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6. Preliminary design plans utilize portions of State Lands for Planning considerations. FAR and unit counts are provided on the preliminary and alternate site plan figures.

7. The elevator/stairway access structure and the pedestrian bridge are no longer part of the proposed project plan.

8. The use mix formula of 2.3 hotel units to 1 dwelling unit is based on the CZC definition for Hotel (Section 21-1.10, which provides the following:

Hotel - a "Hotel" is a building or group of attached or detached buildings containing dwelling or lodging units, in which 50% or more of the units are lodging units.

Section V. Alternatives

The alternative that would discuss the potential use of the project site in a 100% hotel use, was determined by the project architect on the basis of the lot size only; there has been no economic feasibility study conducted to state that this is viable or recommended.

The twin tower concept has been previously discussed in the project chronology section and rejected for design considerations as well as certain negative environmental considerations such as increased wind flow (Venturi effect) between the twin towers.

This will be reflected in the EIS.

Other Comments

Governmental approvals and corresponding approving agencies will be listed in the EIS.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJRilts
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
660 SOUTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

November 10, 1984

TO: MICHAEL M. MCELROY, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: ENILO I. KUO

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA - WAIKIKI
TIME: 2-6-10: 10 AM & 6

We have no comments to offer on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Yacht Harbour Plaza to be developed in Wai'kiki. The applicant is aware that compliance with the Park Dedication Ordinance No. 4621 is required.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the EIS.

(Mrs.) ENILO I. KUO, Director

ENILO I. KUO

cc: HONU F. M. Rodriguez, Environmental Communication
HUMORANDUM

TO:  MICHAEL M. MCKELROY, DIRECTOR
     DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM:  WILLIAM A. BONNET, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT:  EIS FOR YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA - WAIKIKI, OAHU

We have no comments on the Environmental Impact Statement.

Since the project has access off Yacht Harbour Drive and Ala Moana Boulevard, which are State facilities, this EIS should be transmitted to the State Department of Transportation for their review and comments.

WILLIAM A. BONNET

See:  Mr. F.J. Rodriguez

NOV 13 1984
November 1, 1984

TO: MICHAEL McNEELY, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: THOMAS C. BLONDIN, ACTING FIRE CHIEF

SUBJECT: EIS FOR THE PROPOSED YACHT HARBOR PLAZA - TMK 2-6-1010, 8

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above subject project.

We have no comments to offer at this time.

THOMAS C. BLONDIN
Acting Fire Chief

cc: F. J. Rodrigues
Environmental Communications, Inc.

MSK:1c

NOV 5 1984
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
   Department of Land Utilization
   City and County of Honolulu

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Yacht Harbour Plaza
   Environmental Communications, Inc.
   THCs: 2-6-102, 6 and 10
   Acres: 2.539

The Department of Agriculture has reviewed the subject
EIS and does not have any comments to offer. We are returning
the document for your further use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

JACK E. ENA
Chaiman, Board of Agriculture

Attachant
cc: Mr. F. J. Rodriguez
   Environmental Communications, Inc.

"Support Hawaiian Agricultural Products" NOV 5 1984
Mr. Michael McIlroy  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
City and County of Honolulu  
455 S. King Street, 7th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. McIlroy:

Subject: HIS for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza  
Hotel/Condominium, Waikiki, City and County  
of Honolulu

We have reviewed the subject document and have no comments to offer.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

TITIKA TOMINAGA  
Acting State Public Works Engineer

CT: [J]  
CC: "Mr. F. J. Rodrigues,  
Environmental Communications, Inc."
Mr. Michael Medly, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Medly:

Yacht Harbour Plaza

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review your proposed project, "Yacht Harbour Plaza" Environmental Impact Statement.

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

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Name]
Major, BAO
Communications Officer

OCT 31, 1984
November 13, 1984

Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City & County of Honolulu
650 S. King St., 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Subject: Request for Comments on Proposed Environmental Impact Statement
(EIS) for Yacht Harbour Plaza, Waikiki, Oahu

Thank you for allowing us to review and comment on the subject proposed EIS. We submit the following comments:

Noise

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Yacht Harbour Plaza should include mitigation measures for the potential noise problems which were noted in our August 15, 1984 memorandum in response to the EIS Preparation Notice. Noise from stationary equipment as well as noise from the operation and maintenance of the project must be addressed in the final EIS.

Drinking Water

We would like to stress the need for appropriate backflow prevention devices at all interconnections between the potable water supply and nonpotable uses such as irrigation or chilled water systems.

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]

DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

cc: Mr. F. J. Rodrigues

NOV 1 9 1984
Honoroble Michael M. McIvoy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King St.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McIvoy:

We appreciate the opportunity to review the environmental impact statement for the Yacht Harbor Plaza project.

Because the project lies in a groundwater control area, we have recommended that the project be closely coordinated with the Board of Water Supply. The statement has addressed this concern.

If during construction any previously unidentified sites or remains (such as artifacts, shell, bone, or charcoal deposits, human burials, rock or coral alignments, pavings, or walls) are encountered, the developer should stop work and contact our historic sites office at 548-7460 immediately. Work in the immediate area should be stopped until the office is able to assess the impact and make further recommendations for mitigative activity.

Sincerely,

Susumu Ono
Chairperson
State Historic Preservation Officer

December 7, 1984

Mr. Susumu Ono
Chairperson and State
Historic Preservation Officer
Department of Land and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 821
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Dear Mr. Ono:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 21, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond in the following:

1. Potable Water - We have received advice from the Board of Water Supply regarding the availability of drinking water for the proposed project. Your reference to the groundwater control area has been accepted.

2. Archaeological Impacts - The developer has reviewed the recommendations contained in the comments provided by the Environmental Center-University of Hawaii and will be considering the option of having a reputable archaeologist onsite at the time of excavation. Your directive to cease work immediately in the event that unidentified remains or sites are encountered during excavation is understood and will be complied with.

Thank you for your continuing interest and concern.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues
Dear Reviewer:

Attached for your review is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was prepared pursuant to Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes and the Rules and Regulations of the Environmental Quality Commission.

TITLE: Yacht Harbour-Plaza

LOCATION: Waikiki, Oahu

CLASSIFICATION: Applicant Action

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

Mr. Michael McIlroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization, City and County of Honolulu
660 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

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

Mr. F. J. Rodrigues
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 538
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Your comments must be received or postmarked by: November 27, 1984.

If you have no further use for this EIS, please return it to the Office of Environmental Quality Control.

U.S. 93, 1984
No Comments

Thank you for your participation in the EIS process.

OCT 26 1984
ATTACHMENT

CONCISE STATEMENT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE YACHT HARBOR PLAZA HOTEL/CONDOMINIUM
MAKFII, OAHU

I. GENERAL COMMENTS

The contents of this Environmental Impact Statement need
to be expanded in scope to recognize and address several
major impacts of the project on the adjacent Ala Wai Boat
Harbor and its users. Please note that the proper name of
the harbor facility is Ala Wai Boat Harbor, not Ala Wai
Yacht Harbor. The impacts/issues which should be addressed are:

A. The proposed project is not confined within the
private developer's property boundaries of
TIR 3-6-1910, 6, but extends into State-owned
property at Ala Wai Boat Harbor, TIR 3-3-37:12. The
"site boundaries" illustrated in Figure 2, page 11-3
do not reflect the following encroachments into State
Harbors property:

1. An internal harbor road is transformed into the
principal access road for the proposed project
("Yacht Harbor Drive").

2. Proposals for an elevated walkway across the
harbor roadway, and a stairway from the walkway
down to street level extend into State Harbors
property (Figures 3 and 4, page II-5 and II-6).

The proposed elevated walkway will adversely
affect the access of emergency, construction, and
maintenance equipment into the boat harbor
since an existing elevated walkway along Haban
Lane already restricts the allowable height for
cranes, emergency vehicles, and other equipment.

The proposed stairway tower descending into
Harbors property will interfere with harbor
users along the sidewalk.

3. Landscaping is proposed within Harbors property,
particularly on our internal harbor roadway
("Yacht Harbor Drive") and along the sidewalk
next to the boat slips (Appendix II, Exhibit J
and Figure B, page II-12).

Items 1, 2, and 3 noted above will displace
existing revenue-generating parking stalls
intended for harbor users. In addition, the
landscaping near the boat slips will interfere
with pedestrian movement along the sidewalk
(there are gear boxes along this area) and will
increase maintenance costs with the presence of
tree roots damaging the sidewalk and basin
retaining wall and the presence of tree litter
on the ground and in harbor waters.

II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Mr. Michael M. McKibby
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McKibby:

Yacht Harbour Plaza Environmental Impact
Statement, Makiki, Oahu

We have reviewed the subject Environmental Impact
Statement (EIS). The comments presented here reflect the
concerns of the Harbors Division. Additional comments on
highway traffic are forthcoming under separate cover.

We have a number of serious concerns which are detailed
on the attached list of comments. My staff is available to
discuss this project. Telephone inquiries may be directed to
the Harbors Planning Section at 548-2559.

Very truly yours,

Wayne J. Yamashita
Director of Transportation

Attachment
II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Specific sections of the EIS are noted below, along with our comments.

I.A. (pg. I-2, par. 4) Public Access to Project.

Information should be provided on ownership of roadway (State), original intent of roadway (internal harbor road for harbor users), and the nature of the change in the roadway caused by the project.


A statement should be added that portions of the resort project will extend into the Public Precinct.


The impact of the proposed project on the Ala Wai Boat Harbor should be identified and summarized as major impacts (more comments on this later).

I.C. (pg. I-4) Alternatives.

Alternatives to the proposed project should be considered. These alternatives should include: contentment of all features of the project within the boundaries of the developer's private property (eliminate elevated walkway and stairs over and on Harbors property, eliminate landscaping of Harbors property for the benefit of hotel/condominium users), eliminate changes to the harbor's internal roadway and harbor parking stall areas for the benefit of hotel/condominium users and the determination of harbor's users.

I.D. (pg. I-4) Land Use Considerations.

Disagree that the project is consistent with governmental land use designations, and that the project is compatible with the surrounding area.

The extension of the hotel/condominium into the Public Precinct is considered a non-conforming use by the City and County of Honolulu Department of Land Utilization.

I.E. (pg. I-5) Other Considerations.

Disagree with the statement "At this time, there are no known unresolved issues". As noted previously and in pages to follow, the unresolved issues are:

- Encroachment of the project beyond the developer's private property onto public property;
- Encroachment of the project into the Public Precinct;
- Conversion of an internal harbor roadway into the project's major roadway causing continued traffic congestion at the roadway's intersection with Roberts Lane, and displacing parking stalls for harbor users;
- Effect of the project on wind refraction, wind shadow, and the Venturi effect;
- Continued access to the harbor by emergency, construction and operational equipment and vehicles which need substantial height clearances;
- Impact of project on harbor use and operation.

II.A. (pg. II-1, par. 1) Project Location.

Ala Wai Boat Harbor lies southwest of the project, not south. The project's orientation affects later references to wind direction.

II.A. (pg. II-4, par. 1) The project also lies within the Public Precinct.

II.C.1. (pg. II-4, par. 1) Design Characteristics.

The "extensive park-like landscaping (Figures 3 and 4)" which will be incorporated into the project are depicted on Harbors Division property. We are opposed to the planting of any trees along the sidewalk or on the internal harbor roadway within our Harbors property.

II.C.1. (pg. II-7, par. 3) All public access is designed for the use of an internal harbor roadway under the ownership of the Harbors Division.
II.C.2 (pg. II-11, par. 2) Landscaping Plan.

The conceptual landscape plan showing proposed landscape elements within Harbor's property is unacceptable and should be deleted or included within the private developer's property (Figures 8, 9, 10).


This item is misnumbered.

II.D. (pg. II-18) Funding and Phasing.

EIS states that "No State or County monies will be involved in the construction of the proposed building". However, the use of State property (Ala Wai Boat Harbor internal roadway and sidewalks) is involved without State Harbors Division support or consent.

II. Additional Impacts

The following impacts should be included in the EIS:

- The loss of harbor parking stalls represents not only a reduction in parking facilities available for harbor users, but it also represents a significant loss of revenue to the State Boating Special Fund.
- The loss of revenue with the expected project is anticipated at $1,100 per year for each parking stall that is eliminated.
- The changes in wind patterns at the harbor may significantly affect the junior sailing programs sponsored by the Waikiki and Hawaiian Yacht Clubs, which are located within the harbor premises.
- Should the Venturi effect be significant, damages to vessels moored or maneuvering within the harbor may occur. On a typical day, there are about 255 vessels moored in the harbor, ranging in value from $10,000 to $250,000 per vessel.
- When construction and operational activities require cranes or other large vehicles or equipment, increased costs will be incurred if they must be barged in to the harbor site due to the height restriction imposed by the proposed project's elevated walkway along "Icy Harbor Drive".
- Based on the EIS, we cannot yet assess whether the proposed "Icy Harbor Drive" will infringe upon our parcels TKK 2-6-10;3 and 5.

III.A.1 (pg. III-1, par. 1) Topography.

The natural boundary of the site is erroneously stated to be "located approximately 90 feet from the edge of Ala Wai Yacht Harbor". The natural boundary of the site is contiguous with the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and lies approximately 90 feet from the water's edge within the harbor.

III.D.1 (pg. III-7, par. 1) Traffic Count Data.

The description of traffic patterns in sentence 2 needs clarification.

III.D.1 (pg. III-11) The traffic study does not address the impact on harbor users.


Roadways should be added to this section. Information to be provided should include required rights-of-way, minimum roadway and sidewalk widths.

IV.B.2 (pg. IV-4, par. 1) Wind Impact Study.

Additional information is desired on the wind refraction, wind shadow, and Venturi effect caused by the project. Wind conditions in a harbor and channel affect the safety of using the harbor from a boating perspective; they affect the potential damage to vessels moored at the harbor.

IV.B.4.d (pg. IV-11).

Portions of Mr. Doyle's statements are missing.

Figures 14-A and 14-D (ppgs. IV-14 and IV-17) Sun Reflection.

The reflection of the afternoon sun into the harbor and in waters near the harbor will blind boaters approaching the harbor.

IV.E. (pg. IV-18) Zoning.

The EIS misleadingly stated that the project is zoned, consistent and compatible with the surrounding high-rise buildings in the immediate area. The extension of the project beyond its private property boundaries into the Ala Wai Boat Harbor will create a non-conforming use of the hotel (elevated walkway and stairway tower) into the Waikiki Special Design District's Public Precinct.
V. (pg. V-1) Adverse Impacts and Mitigating Measures.

The EIS' list of adverse impacts which cannot be avoided appears incomplete. Additions to this section may be necessary after our concerns are recognized.

Mr. Wayne J. Yamasaki, Director
Department of Transportation
850 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Yamasaki:

We are in receipt of your department's comments dated November 21, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. The comments as prepared by your staff establish their position and interpretation as to the planning and design work that has been done to date by the applicant's architect on State of Hawaii lands. In terms of the sections in the Environmental Impact Statement which incorporate the use of State Lands as part of the total project, these sections will be revised to reflect the development of the project within the boundaries of the property owned or under the control of the applicant.

Negotiations are under way between the applicant and the Department of Transportation, Harbors Division for use of these portions of State Lands which were depicted in the Draft EIS. The Harbors Division has advised the applicant of this situation in their letter dated December 5, 1984 (See Exhibit 3).

We respond to the specific comments as follows:

1. General Comments:

   A.1. The Boat Harbor service road (unnamed), will become the major access and egress road for the proposed project. As such, it will need to be designed to conform to State Department of Transportation requirement for road width, curbs, sidewalks, etc. This design work for improvements to the service road will be done when negotiations for use of the State Lands have been finalized.

2. Elevated walkway and pier has been deleted.

3. All landscaping on the Boat Harbor bulkhead which will interfere with pedestrian access, storage, and other boat owner usage will be deleted. Any landscaping or other improvements proposed for areas outside those properties owned or controlled by the applicant will be subject to the approval of the DOT, Division of Harbors and/or other appropriate government agencies. Some parking meters may be removed subject to the negotiations of the agreement permitting the applicant's use of State Lands.
B. It is understood that the State Lands are designated Public Recipient In the Waikiki Special Design District; uses within the Public Recipient are non-conforming for Hotel-Resort use. The applicant intends to use State properties for primarily aesthetic and practical purposes. The aesthetics are largely in the form of landscaped buffer, planters, ingress and egress to the development and water features. No significant physical structures will be constructed on State Lands.

II. Specific Comments:

Public Access to Project

Ownership of the Internal Harbor road is understood to be the State of Hawaii. All changes to this road for purposes of the proposed hotel/condominium project, will be subject to the review and approval of the State Department of Transportation. At the present time, the use patterns as designed, have not been finalized for approval by State DOT.

Zoning - Land use maps will be corrected to reflect the Public Recipient designation for State owned lands.

The harbor roadway and the specific issues raised concerning ownership, intent, and nature of changes proposed by the applicant will be detailed in the Final EIS.

Evaluation of Major Impacts - These impacts are identified and discussed on an individual basis by subject matter in following sections of this response.

Alternatives - The alternatives to the proposed project as described in the Draft EIS include keeping the project within the setbacks and boundaries of the project site as under the control of the applicant. This would eliminate the design features as described which include the elevated walkway/plier, the landscaping features which would infringe on the boaters' use of the pier space area on the bulkhead side of the board harbor, eliminate the need to alter the internal road system and the attendant parking spaces, and affect the potential use of the harbor for non-harbor uses.

Land Use Considerations - We will revise the Final EIS to reflect the inconsistency of land use designations for the adjacent lands, and their non-conformance with permitted uses.

Other Considerations - The reference to "no known unresolved issues" will be revised to reflect the negotiations between State and applicant for use of State Lands. In other items that deal with wind patterns and their impacts on the Boat Harbor, the further analysis by Dr. Arthur Chiu addresses that subject specifically in his memorandum dated December 4, 1984 (Copy attached).

Mr. Wayne J. Yamashita
Page 3
December 7, 1984

Reflective Glass

Figure 14 should show that the spandrel and vision glass is 27% reflective. Thus, all glass noted may be labeled the same and is under the 30% reflectivity threshold factor of Ordinance No. 82-31. (Certain existing glass-wheated buildings in Honolulu are in the 47% reflectivity range we understand.) We suggest that the first paragraph on pages IV-12 be revised as follows:

A reflective glare study was done for the project by the project architect. Special attention was given to peak reflectivity situations during solstice dates. Because of the curvilinear nature of the tower, the impact of reflectivity on offsite areas is diffused. The impact areas are point specific that is at any one time, the affected areas are separated by large bands of unaffected zones. As such, no single zone would be continuously impacted as the sun changes position during the day. This effect is further lessened by the low (27%) reflectivity of the building's exterior.

Project Location - This will be revised in the final section dealing with the EIS.

Reference to the Public Recipient will be covered under negotiations between the applicant and the DOT, Harbors Division.

Design Characteristics - All landscaping to take place within the areas of State lands under negotiations will be determined for final approval at the conclusion of the negotiations.

The service road is owned by the State of Hawaii.

Landscaping Plan - Landscaping plans on State Lands will be resolved subject to the negotiations between the applicant and DOT, Harbors Division.

Social Characteristics - Will be revised to show correct numbering.

Funding and Phasing - All State Lands designated for use by the applicant will be finalized subject to the negotiations between the applicant and the DOT, Harbors Division.

Additional Impacts - The loss of parking stalls and meters will be subject to negotiations between the applicant and DOT, Harbors Division.

The deletion of the elevated walkway and pier will resolve the problem of construction and operational activities heavy equipment movement.
Final decision on the impacts on State parcels (TMK 2-4-10:1, 5) is not
determined at this time due to the ongoing negotiations between appli-
cant and the DOT, Harbors Division. There is no taking of lands on
this parcel in the negotiations.

Topography - All references to location of the project's boundaries will
be revised.

Traffic Data - The traffic report address the impact of traffic on the
existing traffic conditions which presumably includes harbor residents.

Roadways - All improvements to the Service Road will be subject to
State DOT review and approval prior to construction. The review
would include the width, final finish grade, curbs, sidewalks, etc.

Wind Impact Study - We have provided in full the response to the con-
cerns on Wind patterns prepared by Dr. Arthur Chiu as an attachment
in an earlier section.

Mr. Mike Doyle's comments are complete.

Sun Reflection - The project architect has provided a response to this
comment and is provided in an earlier section.

Zoning - It is understood that those portions of State Lands are not
appropriately zoned.

Adverse impacts and Mitigating measures - In view of the concerns
expressed by your Harbors Division staff, this list of adverse impacts
will be revised.

We appreciate your comments on our Draft EIS and will make the necessary
changes and corrections.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJ:la
Enclosure
We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this otherwise generally well written document.

November 20, 1984

Yours truly,

Dwak C. Cox
Director

Attachment

Mr. F.J. Rodriguez
George Curtis
Elmer Botsel
Berrell Davis
Jacqueline Miller
Juliane Manum

Mr. Michael McElroy

The proposed project, for which this EIS is being prepared, involves the construction of a mixed-use hotel and residential condominium on the site of the present Kaiser Foundation Hospital and Clinic, in the Wahihi area of Oahu.

The Environmental Center has conducted a review of the above cited document with the assistance of George Curtis, Hawaii Natural Energy Institute; Berrell Davis, Anthropology; Elmer Botsel, Architecture; Jacqueline Miller and Juliane Manum, Environmental Center. In general, our reviewers have found that this EIS adequately addresses most of the environmental issues of concern and is a well prepared document. There are, however, two significant concerns not adequately addressed in the EIS, which we wish to bring to your attention.

The first concern relates to the potential for archaeological remains on the site and the methods proposed in the EIS to cope with this potential. Our archaeological reviewer, after a site visit, has drafted a detailed report and has made some excellent recommendations with respect to the address of this concern for inclusion in the Final EIS. Because his comments were so extensive, we have appended them to this review for your consideration in their entirety.

A second concern relates to the proposed extensive use of reflective glass for the exterior of the building. We have noted in the Sun Reflection Study Figures 14A-D that depending on the time of day (and also season), significant sun reflection will seriously impair motorists on Ala Moana Boulevard. For example, note particularly Figure 14-C. Given the recognized generally heavy traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard (Appendix 1) it appears that the use of the proposed reflective glass may well create a serious driving hazard along that crowded thoroughfare. Architectural consideration should be given to other less reflective exterior materials to mitigate this potential hazard and liability.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

NOV 23 1984
2. Minimal [topographic] impact is anticipated. Some excavation for the basement parking and utilities will be required; however, the existing structure is currently upgraded for the existing basement/garage. (See page 11-11.)

As I have already noted, the existing upgrading accounts for less than 6,500 square feet of the subject property. The nearly 32,000 square feet remaining is reasonably rather less disturbed, at least in terms of depth. The above claims that "some excavation" for the new facility will be required seems insignificant at first glance; however, it does not correlate with the typical sections of the proposed basement as illustrated on pages 11-12 and 11-13. These sections show the lowest basement level (Concrete Pavement) extending practically to boundary mains/mains to more than 5 feet below sea level. The landscape concept illustrated on page 12-14 further indicates that the area of the presumably less disturbed portion of the project area will be incorporated into this excavation. Thus any subsurface cultural/historical remains which may have survived to date are certain to be destroyed.

3. The project site was once part of a swamp-type environment which existed in Waikiki until the early 1920's when the Ala Wai Canal was built and drainage was provided. This allowed lands adjacent to be filled. Consequently, the soil is classified Fill land. (See page 11-12.)

First of all, reference to Hesper Bishop's Waikiki survey of 1881 shows that the subject parcel was at least in part a portion of the beach front property held by one W.L. O'Brien under Grant 42769. This and other L.C.O. lands in and around Waikiki may have been regraded to a "swamp-like environment" by the early decades of the twentieth century. But originally these lands formed one of the most productive irrigated agricultural and associated aquaculture systems on the entire island of Oahu. The fact that the subject property is quite probably a part of this former system is a point of historic importance which will be regretted for further research.

Secondly, although much or perhaps even all of the subject property may be covered will fill dredged from the Ala Wai Canal, this does not support the possibility of intact subsurface cultural remains as discussed above. By correlating, albeit approximately given the available project map in the EIS, the location of the subject property with Bishop's map, it would initially seem that the original Fill was part of the previous beach front. But this may not appear to be a favorable location for finding significant archaeological materials. But in fact it is free of these kinds of localities that many of the significant finds are recovered. At the Hilahele site Hawaiian burials and other significant remains were excavated within 50 feet and less of the surf.

4. Minimal impact on the site's soil is anticipated. Presently the soil is covered with buildings and pavement. The proposed action will not significantly alter this condition.

For the various reasons I have outlined above, this claim is perhaps valid only so far as the soils themselves are concerned. But the assertion is most definitely valid for any cultural/historical resources which may still be contained by those soils. Although this particular heading or topic as presented...
In the EIS may not be the most appropriate for discussing the potential archaeological significance of the subject area, the relationship between cultural/historic resources and their potential topographical and sedimentary contexts is integral. This is particularly pertinent when presumptions regarding "intensive development" and the nature of filled land and just what that means in historic perspective leads to assertions such as the following: 

In view of the fill land on which the site is located, it is highly unlikely that cultural resources (tualuas, prehistoric artifacts) will be encountered (page III-25).

This may well be true, but to date this has not been substantiated in the draft EIS. Given what has been learned concerning cultural/historical resources in previously-developed beachfront property in Waikiki, it seems to me that the operative rule should be to presume these resources are in fact present until demonstrated otherwise.

5. The State Historic Preservation Officer, Departments of Land and Natural Resources has indicated that there are no historic properties on the site listed on the Hawaii Register or the National Register of Historic Places, nor are any determined Eligible for Inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (page III-25).

Again, given the events at the Makahiki site, at the Rainbow Tower of the Hilton Hawaiian Village, at the Hale Koa on Fort Derussy, and at the Liliuokalani Gardens, it is not sufficient in my opinion to merely state that the proposed development area contains no previously identified cultural/historical sites. Rather it should now be required to substantiate the presence or absence of these sites if at all physically feasible. In the present circumstance this may not be entirely possible. But more reasonable alternative can be given than the current draft EIS proposes with the following (one such alternative is offered below):

...Should archaeological artifacts be encountered during construction, work should stop and the DMO be immediately informed for impact assessment and mitigative activity. Features that might be found would probably consist of discarded trash in midden deposits (page III-25).

What this says is that untrained, non-professionals are apparently as capable of identifying potentially significant cultural/historical resources as are the professional archaeologists. This may well be true to a limited degree. But clearly, in my experience and in the experience of many other archaeologists, this is the exception not the rule...particularly when it comes to what are often the faintest traces of these sites which nevertheless can yield new and significant insights to the past.

In conclusion I would like to offer the following as a suggested alternative to the section on Historical and Archaeological Sites as presented in the draft EIS.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

There are no historic properties within the proposed project area listed either on the Hawaii Register or the National Register of Historic Places, nor are any determined Eligible for Inclusion on the National Register. However, in view of the recent archaeological findings in the Waikiki district, particularly at several localities along the beachfront, the possibility that cultural/historical resources may still remain substantially intact within the subject property cannot be summarily dismissed. While it is true, as discussed in previous sections describing the existing land use, topography, and soils, that much of the property has been extensively modified in the past, approximately one-third of the property may still contain potentially significant material. Surface modifications have, of course, obliterated more readily observable or accessible evidence. But subsurface remains could include various fire pits, refuse pits, post-holes, and similar features containing food refuse (wasted) and other portable artifacts.

The present limitation on substantiating the presence or absence of such buried remains is the fact that most of the property not physically occupied by the existing structures is covered over by various surface modifications including concrete slabs and asphalt paving. This restricts any preliminary subsurface exploration to a few small lawn areas around the Pacific Insurance building which necessarily overlooks the entire opposite end of the property.

To overcome this limitation and yet obtain sufficient usable information for future planning as early into the project as possible, the developer will contract with a reputable archaeological consultant to monitor the demolition phase of the project. Should the archaeologist identify potentially significant remains, work will cease until such time as the appropriate actions have been taken to adequately mitigate any adverse effect upon these remains. This will be done in coordination with the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Office.

Seriate D. Davis
Archaeologist
20 November 1984

cc: Society for Hawaiian Archaeology
State Historic Preservation Office
Dr. Duak C. Cox, Director
Environmental Center
University of Hawaii at Manoa
2550 Campus Road, Crawford 317
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Dr. Cox:

We are in receipt of your comments on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project dated November 20, 1984. We respond to them in the following:

1. Archaeological Impacts - The concerns expressed by Dr. Davis have been provided to the applicant for his review. The recommendation of having a reputable archaeological consultant onsite during excavation is a reasonable one. There is more than adequate time to develop an acceptable program of onsite monitoring that can be coordinated with the State Historic Preservation Office since the site cannot be altered until Kaiser Hospital vacates the premises.

2. Reflective Glass - Your concerns over the use of reflective glass are well taken and there have been extensive deliberations on this subject between the Department of Land Utilisation and the project design team. Ordinance No. 81-28 was developed to meet the concerns of potential traffic hazards and other concerns as you have described. Buildings completed prior to the Ordinance are considered reflective in the sense that they are more mirror-like in their degree of reflectiveness. All glass materials reflect in one form or another and the Ordinance now provides for specific limits of reflectance. Figure 14, p. IV-13 provides the reviewer with a detailed analysis of the building exterior and the use of the glass.

At the present time, the extent of reflectivity has been reduced from what had been an unacceptable level exceeding allowable limits of 33% to the reflectance level for the areas using this architectural design feature is at 27%. It should also be noted that the Department of Land Utilisation is concerned that energy conservation within the structure be maximized in practicable limits, and one of the means that this can be accomplished is through the use of reflective glass to direct or deflect the sun away from the building exterior wall. Your comments on traffic hazards caused by glare are well taken.

Thank you for your comments and we hope that we have adequately responded to them.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR:ia

1964 FORT STREET #1120-30
F. J. RODRIQUEZ
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
TELEPHONE 848-0101
Mr. Michael McIlroy, Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
City & County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street, 7th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McIlroy:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza, Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii, October 1984

We have reviewed the subject DEIS and offer the following comments:

1. Are there adequate provisions for storm runoff and other drainage considerations?
2. Are there any coastal zone management or similar provisions involved?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. This material was reviewed by WREC personnel.

Sincerely,
Edwin T. Murabayashi  
EIS Coordinator

EIR: jm  
cc: Env. Communications, Inc.

December 7, 1984

Mr. Edwin T. Murabayashi  
EIS Coordinator  
Water Resources Research Center  
Holmes Hall 283  
2540 Dole Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Mr. Murabayashi:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 15, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond to your comments as follows:

1. Storm drainage will be provided as required and will be incorporated into the existing City & County drainage system which serves the project site at the present time. There is an existing transmission and drain out system which calls for two outlets into the Ala Wai Canal and also the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

2. There are no coastal zone management provisions beyond the concerns which are also covered and specified in the City & County's ordinance on Special Management Area. The project will be in compliance with those ordinance provisions.

Thank you for your comments and continuing concerns.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR/a
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 15TH AIR BASE WING (PACAF)
HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII 96851-5000

ATTN: OEEV (Mr Fujimoto, 449-1833)  OCT 31 1984

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza, Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii

TO: Ms Letitia H. Uyehara, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
550 Kekauoha Street, Room 301
Honolulu, HI 96813

1. This office has reviewed the subject 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. The EIS is returned for your file.

THOMAS FUJIMOTO, Major, USAF
Deputy Chief of Engineering, Civil Eng Div
Directorate of Civil Engineering

1 Atch

cc: City & County of Honolulu, wo Atch
Department of Land Utilization
ATTN: Mr Michael McElroy, Director
650 Sp. King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Environmental Communications, Inc, wo Atch
ATTN: Mr F. J. Rodriguez
P. O. Box 500
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

NOV 2 1984
Mr. Michael McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Environmental Impact Statement
Yacht Harbour Plaza

The EIS for the Yacht Harbour Plaza has been reviewed and the Navy has no
comments to offer. As this command has no further use for the EIS, the EIS is
being returned to the Office of Environmental Quality Control, by copy of this
letter.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the EIS.

Sincerely,

H. J. PERNERT
CAPTAIN, CCG, U.S. NAVY
FACILITIES ENGINEER
BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMANDER

Enclosure

Copy to:
Mr. P. J. Rodriguez
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P. O. Box 516
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Office of Environmental Quality Control

OCT 26 1984

REPRODUCED AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE
November 14, 1984

Mr. Michael McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilisation
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Subject: Draft EIS for the Proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza
Waikiki, Oahu, Hawaii

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

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

Francis C.H. Lam
State Conservationist

cc:
Mr. F.J. Rodrigues
Environmental Communications, Inc.
P.O. Box 536
Honolulu, HI 96809
Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
City Department of Land Utilization
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Res: Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condominium,
Neikiki, Oahu

Dear Mr. McElroy:

We have reviewed the referenced Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and offer the following comments for your consideration.

It is unclear from the DEIS where storm water runoff will be collected and/or discharged. Storm water runoff from urban areas is contaminated with petroleum products, heavy metals, and other toxic materials. The DEIS should include a section on the proposed discharge and drainage patterns for the project.

Demolition and construction activities should be conducted to minimize the potential for the accidental discharge of spoil material into the adjacent waterways.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest Kosaka
Project Leader
Office of Environmental Services

cc: Environmental Communications, Inc.
EPA, San Francisco

Save Energy and You Serve America! NOV 16 1984
November 16, 1984

Mr. Michael McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

Subject: Yacht Harbor Plaza Environmental Impact Statement

We have reviewed subject impact statement and have no comments to submit.

Sincerely,

Brenner Mungan
Brenner Mungan, Ph.D., P.E.
Manager, Environmental Department

cc: F. J. Rodriguez
Environ. Communications, Inc.

APPROVED BY:

November 21, 1984
November 21, 1984

Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
Dept. of Land Utilization, City and County of Honolulu
650 King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condo

Dear Mr. McElroy,

I request that you accept my letter of November 19, 1984. It addresses the social impact of the proposed hotel condominium in a way that the Environmental Impact Statement does not do.

The attachment substantiates the ways in which the environment would be negatively impacted, using the state's and the City/County's own standards for evaluation of social impact. The ordinances cited are in these documents.

Yours very truly,

Virginia B. Briggs, Ph.D.

Attachment

November 19, 1984

Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
Dept. of Land Utilization, City and County of Honolulu
650 King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Yacht Harbour Plaza Hotel/Condo

Dear Mr. McElroy,

I expect that you are as interested as I in evaluating the impact of the above-named development by the standards of the Development Plan and the Hawaii State Planning Act. I call to your attention two goals expressed in Act 226: "To foster recognition of the importance and value of land, air, and water resources" (13.3.b.(8)) and "to preserve and enhance Hawaii's significant natural environmental and scenic sites" (102.3.b.(5)). In the light of these words I hope you will agree that the most important things about this property is its contiguity to Ala Wai Yacht Harbor.

The harbor is widely enjoyed by our people. It is a premier destination of sailing boats from all over the world. Hawaii's warm weather and seas and consistent breezes were praised by skipper John Andre of the winning team, 1984 Pan-Pacific Clipper Club Series, in the words, "This is the very best place to sail!" At present, Hawaii ranks near the bottom of states of the U.S. in per capita boat registrations. There is the potential for an important new industry here in boatbuilding and maintenance when the joys of boating are extended to more of the island's people. The Ala Wai Harbor will always be a very important recreational center for sailing.

Please make the preservation and enhancement of the harbor a special concern in evaluating the above proposal. The structure as presently designed would block out winds and prevent easy access. It would foreclose the options of expanding sailing through alternative uses of the property. I cite the words of Act 226: "To ensure opportunities for everyone to use and enjoy Hawaii's recreational resources" (23.b.5), and "to assure the availability of sufficient resources to provide for future recreational needs" (23.b.6).

As proposed, the structure inhibits the goals of the State Plan. It disregards density ordinance, adversely affects the neighboring community, blocks out Ala Wai Yacht Harbor winds and views, would reduce shoreline access and protection, and disregards open space and park dedication requirements. There is some question that the 27th reflectivity of its exterior would focus a barrage of reflective glare on the entrance to Ala Wai Yacht Harbor which would be a hazard to navigation.

The site plan shows usurpation of littoral and access rights, and perpetual easements in favor of the State which must be disallowed. Please require the developer's conformance to the existing statutes and ordinances, some of which I cite in the attached.

Respectfully,

Virginia B. Briggs

Attachment
ORDINANCES RELEVANT TO YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA HOTEL/CONDONIMIUM PROPOSAL EVALUATION

DENSITY AND OPEN SPACE ORDINANCES

Discourages further high density development in Waikiki
Limits Waikiki resort visitor units. (10/94 number 3,192 in excess of limit)
Any high-density development shall be discouraged
Justification for removing 3 20'-40' monkeypod trees and 40' banyan required
Ground level open space required to be greater or equal to 50% of site
4621/Art.7.22-7.5(3) requires 110 sq.ft. per dwelling or lodging unit in public park dedication

SETBACK ORDINANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance</th>
<th>Yard Setback</th>
<th>Requirement Add'l required for height &gt; 40'</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proposed Development's Plot plan setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.B.2.a(1)*</td>
<td>Front 20'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>51'</td>
<td>11' to 63.8' (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.C.2.b(2)</td>
<td>Diamond Head Side 10'(5') landscaped</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td>(No parking, driving per V.C.2.b(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.C.2.b(3)</td>
<td>Eva side 20'</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>51'</td>
<td>0 - 13.2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.B.2.a(1)*</td>
<td>Rear (Ala Moana) 20'-30' (50% 30')</td>
<td>31'</td>
<td>51' - 61' (50%)</td>
<td>12.1' - 31'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requires City Council approval (V.R.9.a.(91)

Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director, Dept. of Land Utilization, November 19, 1984 Attachment, p.2

OTHER SITING DEFECTS

Adverse environment effects

226.11.a.(2) Protects Hawaii's unique and fragile environmental resources
83-25.15.2.b.(4) A development shall not adversely affect property values of existing homes
226.11.15.1.a Preserves view of Ala Wai Yacht Harbor
226.15.5.b.5 Preserves view from pedestrian corridors
4573.1.b.c. Legislative intent to protect safety, value of private investment, control hotel density in Waikiki, provide greater access to shoreline and provide additional open spaces and vistas
226-6(5) Ensures developments be "sensitive to existing neighboring communities and activities"

View Corridor Problems

83-25.15.2.b.g.(1) View corridor of Ala Moana Blvd. shall be preserved and enhanced
4573 Exhibit 3 Special consideration for open space and architectural treatment for Waikiki gateways
83-25 Sec.15.2.b.(5) Views of ocean of neighbors shall not be obstructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Number of condos obstructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ala Wai Terrace - 1684</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Surf</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateau Waikiki</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Bay</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftwood</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor View Plaza</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohonu</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilikai</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradewinds West</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradewinds East</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachts Harbor Towers</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84-4.Sec.4.C(4) May not detract from line of sight toward sea from State Highway 1,068
Pedestrian Enjoymnt

83-25.11.15.b.10  Public pedestrian access to shoreline shall be increased
83-25.11.15.b.11  Pedestrian enjoyment shall be given special consideration
93-25. Sec.15.2.b.7  Maintain view of Ala Wai Boat Harbor from Ala Moana pedestrian corridor
4621. Art.7. Sec.22-7.6.3(1)  Requires public park = 110 sq. ft per dwelling or lodging unit
States policy to improve visitor destination areas

SHORELINE ACCESS AND PROTECTION

226-12.b.(3)  Promotes visual and aesthetic enjoyment of ocean vistas
226-13.b.(3)  Promotes greater accessibility and prudent use of shoreline for public recreational use
226-103.b.(3)  Regulates hotel areas to provide adequate shoreline setbacks and beach access
226-105.(1)  Gives priority to preserving and improving shoreline open spaces and scenic resources
226.11.b.(6)  Ordinances to pursue competitive relationships among facilities and natural resources, especially shoreline
226.105.(2)  Sets priority guidelines to insure availability of shoreline and other limited resources for future generations
226.103.a.(7)  Encourages use of energy and cost-efficient transportation systems (sailing?)
226.11.a(1)  States objective of ensuring "prudent use of Hawaii's shoreline"
83-25.11.15.b.10  Public pedestrian access to shoreline shall be increased
4573.1.B.C.2  Legislative intent to protect safety . . . provide greater access to shoreline

Act 1376  Protects shoreline
84-4.5.b.1.(f)  Requires applicant to file shoreline survey if parcel abuts the shoreline
84-4.5.4  Special management area permit required
4573.1.B.C.2  Ordinance to protect safety . . . provide greater access to shoreline
56615  Territory of Hawaii gives title to Ala Moana Properties except for Lot 55
56615  Lot 5-b-2 litoral rights: "so long as said area be used for the purposes of public recreation and/or roadway"

ALA WAI YACHT HARBOR PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT

226.11.b.9  Encourages incentives to protect significant natural resources from degradation
226.11.b.9  Promote greater accessibility and prudent use of shoreline for public recreational use
226.11.b.(1)  Enhance Hawaii's scenic assets
226.11.b.(1)  Promote preservation of significant natural resources
226.11.b.(5)  Maintain and enhance scenic amenities
226.104.c.(5)  Given priority to growth destruction, especially where it affects water bodies, scenic and recreational shoreline resources, particularly areas sensitive to reduction in water and air quality and scenic resources
83-25.11.15.b.7  Ala Wai Yacht Harbor view shall be preserved and enhanced
84-4.5.1  Purposes to provide adequate public access to recreation area-Ala Wai Yacht Harbor
84-4.5.4.4.(1), (2)  Ordinance to minimize adverse effect on water resources and recreational amenities
84-4.5.4.(3)  May not reduce public access to shoreline
83-25. Sec.15.2.b.9  Maintains view of Ala Wai Boat Harbor from Ala Moana pedestrian corridor
84-4.5.4.(5)  Protects water quality and existing areas of open water free of visible structures
226-4.(15)  Promotes and protects intangible resources in Hawaii . . . scenic beauty
226-10.(3)  States policy to encourage marine-related activities
226-107  Promotes Hawaii's geographical advantages
226.2  Ensures compatibility between land-based and water-based activities
226.b.4  Improve accessibility to docks
226.17.b.(3)  Increase capacity of harbor systems
226.17.b.(6)  Ensure that Oahu Civil Defense be able to respond to major war-related disturbances. Ala Wai Yacht Harbor access is important in the event of war-related need to evacuate Oahu by boat to other islands
December 7, 1984

Dr. Virginia Briggs
1576 Ala Moana
Suite 1305
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Dr. Briggs,

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 29, 1984 commenting on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond to your comments as follows:
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Mr. Michael McElroy, Director  
Department of Land Utilization,  
City and County of Honolulu  
600 South King Street, 7th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Sir,

Our concerns as a neighboring business to the proposed Yacht Harbor Plaza project are that we do not lose any area, function, parking, or accessibility and that any loss of business due to construction be compensated for.

Notes:
Area: Figure 6, p.11-9 of the E.I.S. shows the area that we now occupy as public access. A glance at the aerial photo will show how integral all of the space now of Harbor View Drive is to the boatyard.

Function: We are now a full-service boatyard. No new project should interfere with our long-standing operations.

Parking: Parking is vital to our business. Any loss of public Harbor parking will affect us adversely. (See aerial photo)

Accessibility: Ninety percent of our customers come by vehicle via Ala Moana Blvd. or Harbor View Drive. Also, large trailer trucks deliver boats and supplies. Any diminishing of the turning area or change in access from either direction or blockage of vehicle access to our dock will be detrimental.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our concerns.

Mahalo,

Peter Aropeff

[Signature]

Nov 20, 1984

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS INC.  
December 1, 1984

Mr. Peter Aropeff  
Ala Wai Harbor, Ltd.  
Ala Wai Harbor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Mr. Aropeff:

We are in receipt of your comments to the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project dated November 20, 1984 and we respond to them in the following:

1. Area: The shaded area indicated on p.11-9 (Figure 6) delineates the public access portion of adjacent lands to the project site. It does not in any way indicate that there will be infringement of the lands you are currently leasing from the State of Hawaii. The final EIS will provide a map clearly showing the ownership of land parcels and the current use of these parcels.

2. Function: The interference that you state in your letter is not designed to affect your boat repair facility insofar as implementation of the proposed project. There are discussions between the State of Hawaii and the applicant for portions of the State-owned lands that are immediately adjacent to his property. These lands under discussion are to provide space which would permit certain architectural features (fountain, elevated walkway, etc.) to be included. There has been no final decision reached as yet on the disposition of the State owned lands.

3. Parking: Once again, there is no firm agreement on the taking, if any, of public parking spaces beyond those metered stalls that fringe the project site. In the event that public parking stalls are withdrawn through negotiation with the State, these stalls will be replaced by the applicant. At the present time, the preliminary indication is to provide secured, under cover replacement stalls within the parking structure of the hotel.

4. Accessibility: Your concerns on the turning area capacity for your repair facility are also considered beyond the proposed project's impact area. This is due to the fact that the taking of State-owned lands would not exceed to the extent you express. All decisions on State lands to be exchanged is still under discussion and negotiation with the State Harbors people and no final decisions have been reached.

Thank you for your concerns and comments.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FIRs:

[Signature]
To Whom It Should Concern:

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Yacht Harbour Plaza,
1697 Ala Moana Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, October 1979

The proposed use of this project implies one of the primary business activities is the presence of a small boat harbor and the activities that go on there. Yet, in its present form, the plan negatively impacts on the small boat harbor and the Draft EIS only superficially addresses them. It was noted that the Draft EIS had no input from the Small Boat Harbor Division of the State Department of Transportation. It was also noted that it had minimal input from the people that reside in and/or use the Ala Moana Boat Harbor.

There are a number of issues that need to be addressed in the planning of this project. High rise building itself is the most obvious fact that another high rise building on the Ala Moana shoreline further decreases the attractiveness of an area already lighted by concrete monoliths. In particular, I would like to bring to the attention of those who should be concerned with basement planning, the following problems with the subject plans:

Traffic - There are only one road in and out of the small boat harbor and that is Hobron Lane. Twice in the three years that we have been residents in the area, we have been trapped either inside the harbor or outside of it due to emergencies at the Hilton Hotel. These emergencies caused Hobron Lane, Yacht Harbor Drive and the Illilikai alley to be closed off by city vehicles answering the emergencies. This poses a major safety issue in case of a hurricane, tsunami or other disaster.

During the normal course of a present day, the Yacht Harbor Drive becomes blocked by traffic servicing the Illilikai Marina building and the concentration of traffic coming from or to the Kaiser hospital. There is no reason to believe that a 250 unit condominium with stores and other businesses plus four buses would ameliorate this problem.

Another problem exists on Ala Moana Boulevard where the Hobron Lane traffic signal backs up traffic far to the far side of the Yacht Harbor Drive entrance. Any additional entry driver, as for instance, planned in the subject project, would further cause traffic backups. Only a large off-street driveway similar to that at the Illilikai Hotel could possibly alleviate this problem. Having all of the project entry drives to the Makai side of the project would bottle-up Yacht Harbor Drive for certain.

Parking - There is a serious parking problem now along the beach area and in the boat harbor which remains unsolved. At the Hōlakū-Oahu Woman’s Canon Race finish at Fort DeRussy Beach, the Master of Ceremonies remarked to me that the race there was far superior to the race at the Hōlakū-Oahu Woman’s Canon Race finish at Fort DeRussy Beach, the Master of Ceremonies remarked that the reason there were not more “native Hawaiians” in the audience is that there was no place for them to park their cars. Perhaps he was joking— but maybe not. One has only to visit this area on a weekend or a holiday to find that there is no place to park a car in order to enjoy either the beach or harbor, both of which are acknowledged to be fundamental attractions to local residents as well as visitors.

One can turn into the Draft EIS a possible solution to the whole Yacht Harbor Drive traffic and parking problem and that is to widen the drive by either eliminating parking or a number of boat slips, or both. This would not be an acceptable solution and the project design should not be approved until one is found.

Reflective Glass Windows – This has to be bad news for all neighbors— sailors or others. The curvilinear nature of the proposed building assures that sun reflections will at some time during the season and day strike just about anyone within sight of the building. And those that are unfortunate enough to be caught at the focus of the concave elements of the building may find the reflections intolerable. One has only to get “stared in” by the Century Center building to become cognizant of the problem.

Wind Shadow – The Draft EIS used information from the Honolulu Airport location to show that winds were mostly from the north and east when actually they are from southeast to southwesterly. The difference is in winds at the Honolulu Airport tend more northerly because they sweep over the Ko‘olau Mountains and down the central plain of O‘ahu. At the Ala Moana Harbor they tend a bit more southerly being influenced by their sweep around the eastern end of the island. This northeastern to southwesterly wind pattern presents a far different impact on the harbor. A large square building will affectively block the average wind at the far end of the harbor which is the only location still enjoying a natural airflow.

Less wind means higher temperatures of both air and water. The latter is already playing hob with fiberglass boat hulls by causing blisters on the bottom gelcoat. Boating industry research has already concluded that high water temperature is a major factor in this boat problem.

There are few locations left on this island where small boats (6 to 10 ft.) can safely sail and be used in youth training programs. Small boat builders were crated, among other things, for water sports education in safe boat handling and sailing of boats. To block the wind from this harbor area is to take away the last sailing area suitable for this purpose and to deprive Honolulu youth of essential education in living with their water environment. Even before the boat basin was dredged, the lagoon inside the reef served this purpose and the small boat harbor continued it, but now that is threatened.

NOV 20 1984
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNICATIONS INC.

Mr. Earl R. Hins
1750 Kalakaua Avenue, 82-782
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Mr. Hins:

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 19, 1984 which comments on the proposed Yacht Harbor Plaza project. We will respond to the various comments you have made which are germane to Ordinance No. 84-4 and which were discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

1. The development of this project utilizes efficiently, the view amenity of the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor. As such, it is consistent with the underlying Hotel-Resort zoning which was provided by the City & County of Honolulu prior to the current use of Hospital. We do not say that your contention of impact on the marine proper is inappropriate; we do, however, state that the proposed use is consistent with established land use planning ordinances.

2. Traffic - A professional traffic study was performed for this project and was provided to both governmental and private reviewers for their review and comment. We should stress that the study is a best educated estimate of anticipated traffic impacts when the proposed project is implemented. It is not reliable and there will be those instances as you have described when extraordinary traffic jams take place due to a single major event such as inter-island canoe race, the Honolulu Marathon, or a combination of service trucks and emergency vehicles operating from the hospital.

To develop a road facility completely traffic-free would not be cost effective and not in the best interest of the community at large. Your comments on traffic improvements will be provided to the traffic consultant for his evaluation.

3. Parking - Most of the parking problems at the project site are due to the current use of the site as a hospital which generates tremendous volumes of short-term visitor traffic and employee shift change traffic (3 work shifts/day). In the proposed hotel-condominium use, the volume would not be as significant due to the nature of the operation when compared to the hospital use. The availability of parking spaces within the hotel parking structure is under consideration and discussion with the applicant and the owner of the parking spaces (State of Hawaii). Final resolution of this subject is vital to the final design plans for the proposed project.

Mr. Earl R. Hins
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Reflective Glass Windows - We must assume that your references to reflective glass windows in negative comment are based on experiences with those buildings that were built prior to adoption of Ordinance No. 82-35. This ordinance governs and establishes reflectivity level limits for buildings proposed after the earlier buildings had been completed. We must agree in certain instances reflectivity can be unacceptable if it is not designed to reduce the heat and glare factors. The glass for the proposed project is planned to be in compliance with Ordinance No. 82-35 and the levels of reflectivity will fall below ordinance limits.

Wind Shadow - We would refer you to section IV and specifically, pages IV-4 to IV-7 which fellow yachtspersons were consulted on this subject. Data analysis and interpretation was done on a specific yacht harbor impact basis and it was concluded that wind patterns began to deteriorate when the hospital, Wailikai Hotel, and other initial high-rise buildings were built. Reading further, the development of the Yacht Harbor Towers created additional wind impact conditions by tunneling winds down Atkinson Drive when these buildings were combined with the Ala Moana Americana hotel. In short, we do not state that the proposed project will not create an impact on the marina and the practices of non-powered sailing; we do state that there is a historic deterioration of over 15 years and that the proposed project will add to that condition.

Summary - We regret that your comments reflect an adversary position to the proposed project. The applicant is attempting to develop the project within the limits of the underlying zoning as provided by the City & County of Honolulu. This EIS document is also within the jurisdictional limits of the Special Management Area Ordinance No. 84-6 which requires full review and comment by all affected parties, with response by the applicant in a disclosure format. The comments in your summary section would involve actions by government of a nature different than those being reviewed in this document.

We appreciate your comments and hope that we have responded to them adequately.

Yours very truly,

F. J. Rodrigues

FRils
December 7, 1984

Ms. Ruth R. Ball
Realtor Associate
Marina Towers
1745 Ala Moana Apt. 982
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Ms. Ball:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 18, 1984 on the proposed project Yacht Harbour Place. We respond in the following:

The proposed project as designed at the present time is preliminary in the sense that certain land boundaries have not been finally established. These are the portions of lands presently owned by the State of Hawaii which are adjacent to the project site. Your concerns over the loss of view planes and reduction in land values are valid in the sense that it is possible but not confirmed at this time.

Decisions to purchase residential units within the Waikiki District are tenuous at best since development permitted under land use policies legislated for Waikiki are the controlling factors which in turn can affect existing residents such as those you have described. As a realtor, you are aware that Waikiki is an extremely desirable location for resort use as well as residential use; the conflicting policies that occur often have resulted in the Waikiki Special Design District Ordinance that provides for controls through land use policies. This is not of great help to you and your clients, but it is the prevailing policy that is required to be met by the applicant developer. I cannot say much more than this since the comments you have voiced did not address themselves to specific items in our EIS.

We appreciate your comments and hope that we have responded adequately to your concerns.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJRod
Mr. Michael W. Elery, Director
Dept. of Land Utilization, City and County of Honolulu
650 S. King St., 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Dr. Elery:

I have read the statement concerning the impact of wind on the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and the proposed Kaiser Hospital development. I have been sailing in Hawaii for over 50 years and at Waikiki since 1940.

There is no question but that the high rise development of Waikiki has drastically affected the wind patterns in the ocean and at the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor. In the ocean, even a mile from shore, the winds swirl in strange ways, as much as 50 degrees, as a result of the eddies created by the various high rises.

In the Ala Wai Harbor, although the winds are gusty, there is usually enough wind to sail a boat up the Ala Wai channel and in to the Waikiki or Hawaii Yacht Club slips. However, as soon as a boat without an engine tries to sail to the State slips in the harbor it is subject to calm and gusts of wind from opposite directions, making it very difficult to navigate the narrow waterways. This effect is due, primarily, to the massive Ilikai complex which completely blocks the true wind and, secondarily, to the high rises on the mauka side of Ala Kea, which turn the wind but don’t block it completely.

The present Kaiser Hospital also contributes to the squally winds in the harbor but, if another as yet unmentioned hospital property, adjoining the Ilikai, would completely block off the trade winds from the front of the harbor. The result would doubtfully be the same as in the State slips, with heavy, gusty winds down the channel and into the Waikiki Yacht Club docks. This could be dangerous to boats without engines coming in the channel.

It is too late to do anything about the massive high rises that have already been built, but it would be the citizens of Hawaii, a big favor of high rises could be to arous the water in the future.

I have also read John Hayes' letter to the governor, mentioning the purchase of the Kaiser property by the State and an extension of the Ala Wai Harbor. This would be an ideal solution and a boon to the boating public. Although initial expenses would be heavy, it should pay for itself in the long run with greatly increased income to the State.

Hawaii is surrounded by water and our people are "water" people, and yet our water facilities are grossly inadequate to serve the public. I hope that the government will take a good look at the overall picture to determine what development will best serve Hawaii.

Sincerely,

John H. Trimble, Sailing Coach, Univ. of Hawaii

F. J. Rodrigues

December 7, 1974

Mr. Charles H. Dole
2335 Kapahulu Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Mr. Dole:

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 14, 1974 commenting on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond in the following:

Your comments on the impacts to the sailing community at the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor due to the development of high rise buildings marks of the Harbor proper are accurate in their context. I happen to be personally familiar with your long history as a sailing enthusiast, having grown up in the Ala Wai long before Kaiser Hospital was built. This goes back to when P.Y. Chong was still there on that site, and the U.S. Army Air Corps had an air rescue base at the Ala Wai Boat Harbor.

While your position and those of others like yourself who are concerned with the sailing program, oppose projects of this type, the land planning that exists for this parcel as well as others that have preceded it, have permitted development of high rise buildings that have created the impacts on the consistent trade winds so necessary for true sailing craft. These impacts to the sailing community as well as the Ala Wai Boat Harbor as a recreational resource need discussion as a requirement of the Ordinance which governs the permit process for this project.

We cannot and do not deny that there will be impacts to the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and the sailing program the question as to whether or not it will deter or cause the sailing program to be stopped is unresolved. We have asked long time supporters of the sailing program if this would be the case, and the answer was in the negative. It would affect the quality of the prevailing trade winds, but it would not cause the sailing program to stop. I hope that this response indicates to you that there is understanding of the problem, but as to how the solution to solve the impacts, this decision would be left to the governmental agencies who will be reviewing the Final EIS and also the permit process, should the project proceed to that point.

Thank you for your comments.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR/In
December 7, 1984

Mr. Peter Okada
5005 102 Lane N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Mr. Okada:

We are in receipt of a copy of your comments dated November 15, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond in the following:

Your comments are based on Ordinance No. 83-25 which is the planning document for the City and County of Honolulu's Development Plan process which deals specifically with the Primary Urban Center. We do not dispute the mandate as expressed in the Ordinance, but we are required by law to comply with ordinances of a more specific nature which have established zoning land use policies for the proposed project site. These zoning ordinances establish both the land uses as well as the permitted height for buildings within the Resort-Hotel designation. The policies as expressed in the Ordinance No. 83-25 have been established as recommended guidelines which in turn would be translated into specific zoning ordinances. As an example, the Waikiki Special Design District Ordinance No. 4573 was established in 1975 which identifies specifically, the legislative intent, the land use control system, the public uses and structures, design control system, height, setback, and density regulations, restrictive conditions and certificate of conformance processes, and finally, the maps of the specific zoning districts that permit the various land uses within Waikiki.

I would urge you to review this ordinance so that you will be familiar with the specific zoning document that mandates the compliance factors which this proposed project must adhere to. It has gone through due process at public hearings within the community and also at the City Council before signature by the Mayor.

I realize that this will not help you in your position of opposing the proposed project, but it is the governing land use policy which the applicant developer must comply with.

Thank you for your concerns and comments.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodriguez

PETER OKADA

5005 102 Lane N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Mr. Okada:

My wife and I own 2 apartments (1101 and 1105) in the Big Surf which is directly opposite the above proposed development and another in the Yacht Harbour Condo at the corner of Atkinson and Ala Moana.

We strongly oppose the proposed development because it would seriously affect the values of our investment, contrary to City and County Ordinance 83-25 Sec. 10.2.a.(2).

My family comes to Hawaii yearly and the proposed building would not leave any open space contrary to Sec. 15 (2.b.5) which specifically states that the "Existing views of the mountains, ocean and Diamond Head from streets, pedestrian corridors and major public places shall be preserved through more stringent development controls in terms of height, bulk, sitting, and setback."

We request that your department not approve the project as it is and work with the developers in using the original twin tower idea similar to the Liliuokalani Gardens.
It is in fact quite possible that cultural resources that are still substantially intact will be encountered. There is no reason to assume a priori that these will consist only of hidden deposits, although such features are in themselves important and may yield significant information about Hawaii’s past. Other sites in Waikiki have also contained fire pits, post holes, burials, and buried agricultural fields. Burial in beach front sand deposits is a common Hawaiian practice, and burials have been encountered at numerous beach sites in Waikiki. Waikiki previously included an important and extensive agricultural system, and remains of irrigated fields may be present beneath the fill on the site. At least part of these parcels was included within a 19th century land grant (#2789), one recorded on E. P. Bishop’s 1881 Waikiki survey map.

Archaeological investigation of the parcel in its present condition, covered with asphalt paving, buildings, and other surface modification is clearly not possible. However, we recommend that an archaeologist be present at the site immediately following demolition of the existing structures to inspect the site in order to determine if any archaeological features are then visible and to assess their significance. An archaeologist should also be present to monitor all subsurface excavation on the site. We feel that it is inappropriate for construction personnel who are untrained as archaeologists to be responsible for the identification and assessment of cultural resources. Experience at other sites in Waikiki and elsewhere has shown that excessive adverse impacts to archaeological deposits has frequently occurred prior to the holding of construction activities and the notification of the State Historic Preservation Officer.

Therefore it is the recommendation of the Society for Hawaiian Archaeology that the subject draft EIS be modified to incorporate the changes suggested above in terms of the assessment of the potential for archaeological and historic resources on the property and to provide for the presence of an archaeologist as monitor following demolition of existing structures and during all subsurface excavations.

Tours,
David J. Welch
Chairman, Peer Review Committee
Society for Hawaiian Archaeology

cc: Environmental Communications, Inc.
State Historic Preservation Office
December 7, 1984

Mr. David Welch, Chairman
Peer Review Committee
Society for Hawaiian Archaeology
P.O. Box 22911
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Mr. Welch:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 21, 1984 on the proposed project Yacht Harbour Plaza. We respond in the following:

The concerns provided in your letter echo those presented by Bertell Davis in his review conducted on behalf of the Environmental Center on November 20, 1984. We concur with the recommendations contained in both comments and these recommendations have been forwarded to the applicant for his review and approval.

Thank you for your comments and continuing concern.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR Inc.
November 21, 1984

Mr. Michael M. McElroy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 S. King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. McElroy:

I am writing in response to the Environmental Impact Study on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza. It seems to me that the impact statement is most deficient in its failure to address the many City Ordinances requiring protection of views and of off-shore activities.

It is not sufficiently large to permit that the proposed use of wind or to rely on two carefully chosen witnesses, one on the lack of serious impact of the wind deflection and the other on water temperature. There are too many experienced sailors who tell me that the erection of the proposed high rise will "kill" the harbor, making it "dead" so far as sailing winds are concerned, and uncomfortably hot, both air and water, due to the lack of trade winds. This is because some damage has already been done in no reason to construct the high rise that will finish the job.

I note with some skepticism as to the motive the refusal to "high rise" across the street from the proposed site. Most of the buildings on Ala Moana facing the Kaiser hospital are 12-16 stories. That might have been "high rise" when they were put up, but they aren't now, particularly in contrast to the proposed 40-story Harbour View Plaza.

The State/City & County of Honolulu have a substantial vested interest in the preservation of a usable harbor. I think the potential damage far outweighs the job creation of the Harbour View Plaza. There are other harbor-related industries which might well be encouraged to start up if the harbor was expanded by dredging of the filled land which makes up most of this site.

I attach a copy of a letter recently received from the Director of Transportation indicating that my suggestion to the Governor that the State acquire this property for this purpose is getting serious consideration. Furthermore, I have assurances from Senator Matsunaga that once the property is acquired by the State and plans have been drawn up, he feels confident he could obtain Federal funds for the necessary work.

I feel very strongly that the City should deny the application to construct this high rise right now, before the developer exercises his right of first refusal and purchases the land.

Sincerely,

Joan Hayes

JHhp

etc.
The Honorable Joan Hayes
Representative, 16th District
The Twelfth State Legislature
State Capitol, Room 321
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Representative Hayes:

Your letter of September 13, 1984, regarding the acquisition of the Kaiser Hospital site for the expansion of the Ala Moana Harbor, which was addressed to Governor George R. Ariyoshi has been referred to me for follow-up action.

The site consists of very desirable land and will be very expensive to acquire; however, we are working on a thorough analysis of acquisition and construction cost. You will be contacted as soon as we have more positive information.

In the meantime, if you have any additional information or questions, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Mayor of Honolulu
Chief of Transportation

CC: The Honorable George R. Ariyoshi
December 7, 1984

Representative Joan Hayes
House of Representatives
The Twelfth Legislature
State of Hawaii
State Capitol
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Representative Hayes:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 21, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond in the following:

Your concerns as stated, regarding our impact statement document as not fully disclosing the impacts on the view corridors and recreational resources as required under the appropriate Ordinance No. 84-4 (City & County of Honolulu) and Chapter 343, HRS. We would not agree with the position that you have adopted on this basis and we would also take issue with the use of language describing the qualified undirected comments from Gil Buder and Mike Doyle as "carefully chosen witnesses."

Further, it is not the intent or the treatment taken in the EIS document that because there is already existing high-rise buildings existing in Waikiki, one more will have no significant impact. There has been qualified study and analysis conducted by competent and qualified experts in the specific fields of interest (Dr. Arthur Chin, Dr. Karl Batten) and to hint at their ability to discuss the potential problems that would be attributable to the proposed project as being less than qualified is unfortunate.

There is no statement in the EIS that in so many words says there will be no significant impact if this project is developed. On the contrary, there has been a sincere effort to describe the project's impacts in an analytical and technical manner, supported by research and data provided by competent, qualified experts in their field.

There is no doubt that there will be view plane impairment with the development of this project and the impacts could be evaluated from both a ground level perspective as well as an aerial view perspective. For residents who are most closely adjacent to the project site, there will be significant view plane impacts. At the present time, the existing structures on the site block views for ground level (pedestrian) as well as lower floors of buildings on Ala Moana Boulevard directly masks of the project site.

Finally, the possible acquisition of this parcel by the State for expansion of the Ala Wai Marina goes beyond the limits of this document's required review of alternatives. There would be an Environmental Impact Statement conducted specifically for this potential use as it would be a use totally different from the Resort-Hotel zoning that prevail at the present time.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

F. J. Rodrigues

THE FORT STREET HALL, HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813 · TELEPHONE 521-5151
Je also have a great demand for mooring space that is not, at the present time, being adequately accommodated by the State Government. The proposal to extend Ala 'iwi Harbor and create more space is consistent with the governments' obligation to encourage greater recreational use of our State's tremendous ocean resources.

Je don't need more hotel/condos in this area for they are only going to increase an already bad traffic congestion.

I also understand that the Yacht Harbor Plaza proposal contravenes a number of existing ordinances.

Let's ensure preservation of the quality of the Harbor area and not allow special vested interests to exploit无理人 resources.

David N. McPaull
Vice Commodore, Hawaii Sailing Cat Association

David McPaull
109 Palama Place
Honolulu, Hawaii
96814

David Parkins
4400 Marina Drive
Long Beach, California
90803
December 7, 1984

Mr. David McFaul
Vice Commodore, Waikiki Yacht Club
109 Poolea Place
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Mr. McFaul:

We are in receipt of your comments dated November 18, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour East project. We respond in the following:

Your comments on further deterioration of existing wind patterns at the Ala Wai Marina due to implementation of this project are accurate in their content and historical setting. The deterioration of winds, according to Mike Doyle and others who have depended on consistent wind patterns to power their non-motorized craft, have been an ongoing situation since the development of the first building of consequence back in the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Land planning has been postulated in the interests of the community at large at the expense of recreational resources such as you describe at the Ala Wai Marina. This is regrettable however, an existing condition of land use policy permits Resort-Hotel development on the project site. Situations such as you describe at Marina Del Ray and Alanta Bay are on the drawing boards at Waikiki and also at West Beach. At those locations, the potential for preserving prevailing trade wind patterns are within the abilities of the land use policy planners since, in those plans, the marina sectors will permit direct access to the open ocean and not limit sailing within the marina basin.

This does not give you the relief I know you are seeking, but the applicant-developer has planned his project based on prevailing land use policies which when adhered to, permit development of the nature he is seeking. The concept of having the marina expanded to increase the size and capacity of the Ala Wai Marina and extend the open space parameters has not been considered by the applicant-developer since the underlying zoning on the parcel is designated for Resort-Hotel use. We cannot comment on the feasibility of having the site purchased by government since the decision and planning for this use would be beyond our required compliance.

Thank you for your comments and concerns on this meritorious issue.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR 16

#180 FORT STREET, HAWAII 808-441-5000 * HONOLULU PHONE 808-537-9000 * TELEPHONE 808-537-9000
November 20, 1984

Michael M. McKinley, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 S. King St.
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. McKinley:

Subject: Environmental Impact Study, Yacht Harbor Plaza Hotel and Condominium, 1697 Ala Moana Blvd. Present site of Kaiser Hospital.

We understand that responses to the subject E.I.S. are due no later than November 22, 1984. This is our response. This response is made possible thanks to your kindness in furnishing the writer with a copy of this Environmental Impact Study.

As a part of our presentation we attach a copy of a letter directed to us on this subject. This letter was prepared by Wright Blatt (Col. USA Ret.) and Vice-Chair of our Neighborhood Board. Col. Blatt is well qualified in the engineering field and currently active as a consultant engineer.

In addition to the above, there is attached a copy of a letter from Virginia B. Briggs dated November 2, 1984 on this subject. Mrs. Briggs presents some interesting data which merits attention, consideration, and resolution before approval is given for the development.

We feel that the objections and comments by Col. Blatt and Mrs. Briggs are well founded and meritorious.

This feeling is unanimously supported by our Neighborhood board and we want the record to reflect that we are vigorously opposed to the granting of a permit for this project. Residents of Waikiki have been unmercifully subjected to unwarranted development projects in the past few years and this seems to be supported in the Waikiki and Kaimuki cases. The Kohana, for example, continues to be a strong factor in established traffic patterns, and yet the proponents of the Harbor Plaza project would have us believe their traffic impact would be from minimal to none.

Sincerely,

John V. Stanford
Chairman

CC: Mayor Eileen H. Anderson
    Senate Sect. Robertanai
    Senator-Elect Maryjane Machado
    Representative-Jim Hadley
    Representative-Elect Kaye Kanaliali
    Councilmember Marilyn DeBedrosian
    F.J. Rodriguez, Chair
    Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9 members
    Neighborhood Commission
    Peter Aroozoff, President, Ala Wai Marine Ltd.

NOV 23 1984
November 17, 1984

Mr. John W. Stankard
Chairman
Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9
1717 Ala Moana Blvd., #1004
Honolulu, HI 96815

SUBJECT: YACHT HARBOUR PLAZA HOTEL R-1.S.
1957 ALA MOANA BOULEVARD

Dear John:

I have reviewed the final "Environmental Impact Statement" on the subject project.

In the Board's earlier correspondence, based on the preliminary draft E.I.S., we raised serious questions concerning compliance with the Federal Shoreline Management Act and setbacks, traffic, access and ingress to the project (particularly with respect to truck and bus parking and turnaround) and the necessary changes in the present development plan map for the Primary Urban Center. These questions have either not been answered or answered unsatisfactorily, in the final E.I.S.

We now note that the proposed project is located within the expanse zone, and subject to flooding to a depth of 2 feet. We also note that the questions raised by the State Department of Transportation, Planning and Economic Development, as well as the City Departments of General Planning, Public Works, and Transportation Services, have not been satisfactorily answered.

In our opinion the E.I.S. is basically defective, as it fails to consider alternatives to the development, of which there are several. It is also deficient in economic detail. To amortize an investment of $124,000,000 in a reasonable period would require annual payments, which, with the annual taxes, would make the project's economic viability subject to serious question. And we are not convinced that the "market potential" will fully absorb the construction investment in 15 to 2 years. That judgment is based on the recent financial histories of the "Revolution, Mandarin" and "Kiholo Bay" projects in that area of Waikiki.

Based on the above, we should not endorse this project. We recommend that further effort be devoted to the identification of economically viable alternative developments.

Very truly yours,

Waite Hiatt
Vice Chairman
Neighborhood Board No. 9

November 22, 1984

To Condominium Owners, Ala Moana-Honolulu Area

Re: Proposed Yacht Harbor Plaza Development

November 22, 1984 will be the last date to write to the Department of Land Utilization to express your concerns about the present form of the proposed hotel-condominium on the Kaiser Hospital land.

"City and County of Honolulu Development Plan, approved 6/8/83, is the result of our City/County government's concern that neighbors of any project in this area be protected from negative social impacts. The stated purpose of the Plan is to allow the people of Oahu to live and work in harmony." (Population Objective C, Ordinance No. 83-25). While the land is zoned for hotel use and 350' height limit, the Ordinance mandates that any project be compatible with neighboring land uses (Sec.2(6),4).

The City and County and the Department of Land Utilization are obliged to examine proposed projects in the light of the principles of the Ordinance. They are to consider whether a development will:

1. Change the character or culture of the neighborhood (Sec.10.(2),a(3)).
2. Affect the diversity of employment (Sec.10(2)(b)).
3. Affect property values of existing homes (Sec.10.(2),a(4)).
4. Affect recreational facilities (Sec.10.(2),d(3)).
5. Affect existing scenic views, open space and the aesthetic quality of the area (Sec.10.(2),a(2),b,(3), and (4)).

In the part of the Ordinance that is concerned directly with Waikiki, a particular emphasis is placed on the control of open space.

The viability, preservation, enhancement and accessibility of public open space, as defined in Section 9 of this development plan, shall be given high priority in the design for adjacent and nearby development in the Primary Urban Center. These areas include, but are not limited to the steep slopes of valley and ridge areas, beaches and the shoreline areas, Diamond Head, Punchbowl, Ala Moana Canal, Kaimuki Basin, and Ala Moana Yacht Harbor.

(Ordinance 83-25, Sec. 15, (2), b, (1).)

Ordinance 83-25, Sec. 15 (2) b (3) limits the number of visitor units in Waikiki to 30,000. The Waikiki Visitors Bureau statistician reports the present figure is 23,192. Yacht Harbor Plaza project as presently designed would add 408 hotel and 174 condominium units. They state there is an alternate plan "to go up to 800 rooms by reducing or eliminating the condominium portion" of the plan.

The City/County will apply the following principle in evaluating projects:

In general, resort and related commercial activities shall be concentrated in the area marked as Hotel and in the "Red Line" area. (Sec. 15, (2), b, (1).)

NOV 23 1984
Section 15, (2), (a), (3) states "Any additional high-density development shall be discouraged."

Importantly, the Ordinance affirms that the 360° view from the sidewalk to Ala Wai Yacht Harbor along the space between Kapiolani Park and the hospital is protected by the following paragraphs:

Existing views of the mountains, ocean and Diamond Head from streets, pedestrian corridors and major public places shall be preserved through more stringent development controls in terms of height, bulk, siting, and setback. Such views shall be enhanced by appropriate landscaping requirements for private developments along view corridors and the appropriate landscaping of related streets. (Sec. 15 (2), b, (5).)

The present open space nature and character of dominant physical features along the perimeter of this area (Kapiolani) shall be preserved and enhanced. These features directly contribute to the present attractiveness and quality of the area as well as to the surrounding communities. They include the Ala Wai Canal, Ala Wai Field, Ala Wai Golf Course, Kapalama Park, Honolulu Zoo, Ala Wai Yacht Harbor, the views of Diamond Head and the ocean.

All public and private developments or improvements shall be designed to preserve and enhance the visual and physical access to these features. (Sec. 15, (2), b, (7).)

The project as presently proposed does none of these things, nor does it enhance pedestrian access to the shoreline, as required in the following Section:

Public pedestrian access to the shoreline shall be increased in number, size and attractiveness. (Sec. 15, (2), b (10).)

The pedestrian traffic network within the area shall be substantially improved to recognize the unique visitor destination area requirements. Special consideration shall be given to pedestrian safety, comfort, and enjoyment since walking constitutes a major activity for the visitor, within this area. (Sec. 15, (2), b (11).)

Preservation of the 360° width of space is also addressed by the Ordinance where it gives special consideration to Ala Wai Boulevard "because of its function as the major ingress and egress route of visitors and as a major thoroughfare for residents."

The preservation and enhancement of views from this corridor shall be the major determinants of development controls along this corridor. (Sec. 15, (2), b, (11).)

Appropriate measures to enhance the attractiveness of this corridor and the public and private responsibilities to implement and maintain such improvements shall be adopted. (Sec. 15, (2), b, (13).)

Following is a partial count of condominiums whose residents will lose their view of Ala Wai Yacht Harbor if the project is permitted to eliminate the present 360° view along the Ala Wai pedestrian corridor:

Ala Wai Terrace-1444  28
Big Surf  12
Discovery Bay  271
Driftwood  60
Harbor View Plaza  78
Harmon  134
Ilulani  90
Tradewinds West  65
Tradewinds East  121
Villa  62
Westbury  11
Yacht Harbor Towers  35

I urge residents to be enlightened by the concern shown in the Ordinance quoted above by our City/County government. They have expressed their desire to preserve the scenic views of existing neighboring residents (Sec. 15, (2), b, (10) and property values (Sec. 15, (2), c, (4)).

I urge those concerned to study the Environmental Impact Statement now on file at regional libraries and to express their wishes before the November 22 deadline:

Mr. Michael McKinley, Director
Department of Land Utilization, City and County of Honolulu
650 S. King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

The developer has not bought the property, nor has his architect created working plans. His representative, Environmental Communications, Inc., has responded to an earlier complaint from one of the residents who would be losing the ocean view as follows, "Let the buyer beware," saying nothing could be done.

I believe the City and County of Honolulu is ready to stand behind their Development Plan. They need to hear from the residents whom they are pledged to protect. Please make this information available to your owners and residents.

Yours very truly,

Virginia B. Briggs
December 7, 1984

Mr. John W. Stunkard
Chairman
Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9
1717 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Mr. Stunkard:

We are in receipt of your comments on behalf of the Waikiki Neighborhood Board No. 9 dated November 28, 1984 which discusses the proposed Yacht Harbour Project. The attached comments from Col. Wright Hart and Dr. Virginia Briggs were reviewed and we respond to them as follows:

1. It should be pointed out that the provisions governing land use controls over this project are Waikiki Special Design District Ordinance No. 4572 which designates specific land use policies for density, height, use, circulation, setbacks, and Floor Area Ratio. The Waikiki Urban Center Development Plan Ordinance provides guidelines for enabling legislature of the type as Ordinance No. 4572.

2. Comments on the flood hazard aspects of the project site are identified in the final EIS.

3. Regarding the economics of this proposed project and other projects cited in Col. Hart’s critique, the examples that he cites are not hotels and have not been designed as such. Further, it would remain to lending institutions to examine the project’s feasibility. In terms of operations, construction costs, and yield on investment before lending the amount of money that would be required to start this project.

We realize that the basic position of the Board is not in support of the project, but it behooves us to respond to the comments made and correct any misunderstandings that may exist.

4. Dr. Briggs’ comments have been directed to her as a response to her comments which were duplicated throughout the 30-day review period.

Thank you for your comments and continuing interest.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

[Signature]

FJ:RiS

1640 FORT STREET, HAU HAU, H H O L D A Y, HAWAII 96815 • TELEPHONE (808) 521-8831
Robert M. Jewell  
PO Box 353  
Honolulu HI 96809-0353

November 19, 1984

Mr. F. O. Rodriguez, President  
Environmental Communications, Inc.  
PO Box 536  
Honolulu HI 96809

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Since the time of my earlier letter of August 10 to  
The Office of Environmental Quality Control, I have  
reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
of October, 1984 pertaining to the proposed Yacht  
Harbor Plaza project.

In addition to the concerns outlined in my earlier  
letter, I note the following:

The proposed use of reflective glass seems to  
me to be quite unacceptable. As I recall,  
there have already been problems in the  
downtown area with heat reflections. The DEIS  
notes the already deteriorated condition  
wherein (cooling) winds in the harbor are  
blocked by existing high rise buildings. To  
compound this by erecting in effect a giant  
mirror with an area of 10’s of thousands of  
square feet to reflect additional heat into  
the harbor area is obviously adverse to the  
comfort of persons using their boats and to  
the water temperature. Therefore, I believe  
that any ruling on this project should include  
a prohibition in use of reflective glass.

On the drawings of the area, a portion of the  
land adjacent to the Ala Wai Marina Ltd property is shown as public  
access. However, that land is currently  
under lease to AMI Ltd and is necessary for  
their operations, customer parking, etc. Most  
significantly, it is an area for crane use  
without which AMI Ltd would not be able to  
service boats such as the Clipper Cup  
Series. Therefore, I believe that area  
should be removed from public access  
classification and any related area  
calculations.

It is unclear from my reading of the DEIS  
exactly the impact on metered public parking,  
but the impression I get continues to be a  
significant reduction. Those spaces are  
currently useable on a monthly sticker basis  
($15/month I believe) for harbor slip users  
who need some place to park when visiting  
their boats. I am opposed to the project in  
its entirety, but in any event I believe that  
any ruling on this project should include a  
provision that harbor slip holders shall have  
a right to obtain sufficient and convenient  
parking inside the structure for no more than  
the monthly harbor fee now available.

I find unpersuasive the suggestions in the  
DEIS that negative sun shadow impact and or  
negative sun reflection impact on the harbor  
can be overlooked because they affect only one  
part of the harbor at a time.

I am unpersuaded that the existence of other  
high rise structures makes this proposed one  
satisfactorily "consistent" when in fact the  
negative environmental impacts of those  
earlier buildings is acknowledged.

I disagree with the thought in the DEIS that  
the negative impact on view corridors from  
existing buildings is satisfactorily  
"unavoidable" or is ok because there are tax  
revenues. The negative impacts are  
avoidable...by not allowing this project.

I agree with the DEIS observation that there  
would be a negative noise impact from tire  
smell in the parking garage area.

I agree with the DEIS observation that there  
would be an impact on surface winds; that  
there could be severe downwash wind effects,  
etc.

I am given to understand that there are some  
legal conditions attached to the site  
requiring no interference with "the view of  
the ocean". It seems clear to me that the  
proposed structure would reduce or interfere  
with view of the ocean for anyone not standing  
on the Hauka side of this large structure.

NOV 2 1 1984
Based on information cited by Mrs. Joan Hayes, I am given to understand that the land has a restriction for use for public recreation and/or a roadway. I do not see that a hotel/condo would meet that requirement. In contrast, I believe returning the land to water use and creation of an expansion of Ala Wai Boat Harbor by up to 400 more slips would have a far more favorable impact on recreation facilities in Hawaii than one more condo.

In view of these and my previous comments, I continue to find that this proposed project would have an unacceptably high negative impact on the Ala Wai Boat Harbor and other adjoining areas.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Date]
DECEMBER 7, 1984

Mr. Robert M. Jewell
P.O. Box 353
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809-0353

Dear Mr. Jewell:

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 19, 1984 on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We would like to respond to your comments which are germane to Ordinance No. 84-4 and which were discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The proposed project will not use any reflective surface material as defined by Ordinance No. 82-25. This ordinance governs and establishes reflectivity level limits for building materials. As you had mentioned, there had been problems in the downtown area with heat reflection, hence, it was these problems which invoked the need for Sunlight Reflectivity Regulations Ordinance No. 82-25.

The public access classification for the area parcels of the Ala Wai Marine Ltd. site is made by the Department of Transportation, Harbors Division. The site, as it is used now, is leased from the DOT for use by AWM Ltd. for their operations. Any land use classification changes for the area in question lie outside of the scope of this project and are not addressed by the EIS; however, current use of the site is not expected to change in the near future.

Negotiations are currently underway between the project developer and the State Harbors Division for lands around the project site. Parking availability impacts are not known of those negotiations, however, there is still expected to be ample parking in the project area after the hospital site is vacated. The hospital generates tremendous volumes of short-term visitor traffic and employee shift change traffic. In the proposed hotel-condominium use, the volume of traffic and parking demand would not be as significant due to the nature of the project. The availability of parking spaces within the hotel parking structure is under consideration and discussion with the applicant and the State of Hawaii.

Your comments on shadow and reflection impacts are noted and appreciated.

The development of this project utilizes the site efficiently and is consistent with the underlying hotel-zoning provided by the City and County of Honolulu prior to it's current hospital use. It is unfortunate that additional negative environmental impacts may occur with the construction of this project, however, impacts are likely to occur in any use and therefore, should be weighed against all positive aspects as well.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJails

Mr. Robert M. Jewell
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Your comments on view corridors, noise and wind impacts are noted and appreciated.

The legal restrictions mentioned in your last comment are unclassified, however there is some confusion on the site land use. The project site is zoned for hotel and public facility use and, as mentioned earlier, the proposed project is consistent with these land use designations.

F. J. Rodrigues
Dear Sir:

As resident owners at Harbor View Plaza, my husband and I are greatly disturbed by the announced plans for the current site of the Kaiser Hospital.

In view of the current noise level on the boulevard and the existing traffic conditions, the only property value of our condominium lies in the privacy. If this is removed, all privacy, aesthetic appeal and comfort will become null and void along with its market value.

We are deeply concerned about adherence to the City and County Amendement development plan and the principle therein. We have already suffered for (one)

November 15, 1989

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
(Patrick K. O'Leary)
Mr. Michael McElroy, Director
Dept of Land Utilization,
City of Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Sir:

Re: Proposed Yacht Harbor

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed hotel-condo on Kapiolani Blvd. and Ala Moana Blvd.

Waikiki already has more visitor units than are approved by ordinance 83-23, Dec. 15. This huge new project would totally monopolize the shoreline area, listing thousands of rooms from long established hotels in the area. The Yacht Harbor area is beautiful - the most attractive part of Waikiki - and it should be blocked off.

Please, let's keep the property open and prevent it to serve as an exclusive area to Waikiki instead of just another mediocre hi-rise which in the face of it would violate so many of the terms of the ordinance.

Yours sincerely,

Belle R. May
(Owner/President #1303, 1676 Ala Moana Blvd.)
2114 Manoa Road
Hawaii, HI 96822
November 12, 1984

Dept. of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
850 S. King St., 7th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

RE: Proposed Yacht Harbor Plaza Development

ADMIN: Michael McElroy, Director

Dear Mr. McElroy:

I wish to state my opposition to the above proposed development as it is not within the perimeters of the City and County of Honolulu's Development Plan.

The scenic views of existing neighboring residents, property values, open space for the public, preservation of views from Ala Moana for the visitors, and the limit of number of visitor units in Waikiki would all be affected contrary to Ordinance 83-25, Sec. 15,(2).

The Dept. of Land Utilization is requested to seriously consider the public view of this project while not jeopardizing the owners right to develop the property within the Development Plan.

My husband and I are in serious financial difficulties and 17 3 and 2 bedroom units directly across from the project now on the market would be seriously affected in sales price (valued over $2,000,000) and property value. (see 83-25, Sec. 10,(2), (3),(4) and Sec. 16,(2),(4).

Sincerely,

LILY P. M. LIM
Co-owner of 20 units in the Big Surf
Dear Mr. Wasting:

The above proposed development is contrary to ordinace 32-31, Sec. 15, (ii) h. 11.11, Sec. 15, (ii) h. 11.11.3

Dept. of Land Utilization
City of Honolulu, Hi 96813

1600 Ala Moana Blvd., 1401
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814
November 12, 1984

Mr. Wasting,

We trust that you will not approve the project as described. We will work with you to preserve the scenic views and open space.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
November 12, 1984

1690 Ala Moana Blvd. 1405
Honolulu, HI 96815

Dear Mr. McElroy:

The undersigned objects to the proposed project as it now stands because it completely takes away the open space and does not preserve, enhance or leave accessible the existing open space we now enjoy. This is contrary to Ordinance 83-25, Sec. 15, (2), b, (1).

Sec. 15 (2), b, (5) specifically states the "Existing views of the mountains, ocean and Diamond Head from streets, pedestrian corridors and major public places shall be preserved through more stringent development controls in terms of height, bulk, siting, and setback."

It is hoped that your department will not approve the project as it is now proposed and urge more open space for the public.

Sincerely,

Evan Coop

Owner of Apt. 1405
November 15, 1984

Mr. William Clancy, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 7th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Sir,

Your department will be considering a proposed hotel-condominium on the Kaiser Hospital land called, Yacht Harbor Plaza Development. After thoroughly reading the related elements of the Honolulu Development Plan and Ordinances, it is hard for us to see how a developer can produce such a massive project.

As neighbors to this land we appeal to you and your department to strenuously enforce these existing development plans and ordinances:

Ordinance 83-25

- Sec. 2, (4), a
- Sec. 10, (3), b, (2)
- Sec. 11, (3), c, (4)
- Sec. 12, (2), a, (2), (3) and (6)
- Sec. 15, (2), b, (1), (2), (3), (5), (7), (10) and (11)
- Sec. 16, (1), e, (1) and (2)

The number of visitor units in Waikiki is now limited to 30,000, according to the Hawaii Visitor Bureau. The existing number is presently 33,192. Yacht Harbor Plaza would add 408 hotel and 174 condominium units as a minimum for up to 800 rooms as a maximum. Before you decide to give their plan any consideration, take a drive into Waikiki on any Friday or Saturday night on Ala Moana Boulevard; then try Kalakaua Avenue. You will have to agree that enough is more than enough already!

There are more than 1,000 units of existing condominiums that would be adversely affected by the approval of any high rise development of the Kaiser Hospital land. Each of those has one or more tenants who will be observing the proposal with interest. There are other uses of this land that would enhance, rather than detract from quality of life for us, the whole population of Oahu and all the visitors that we depend on.

The following residents who have signed this letter are appealing to you and your department to do your duty as public servants to uphold the spirit and letter of the law as now on the books.

Sincerely,

NAME

ADDRESS

APT.

Re: Yacht Harbor Plaza Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>APT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan McEwen</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Knight</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Turner</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Smith</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>APP #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Max Foret Pollock</td>
<td>1674 Ala Moana</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric A. Chubb</td>
<td>1674 Ala Moana</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan A. Edwards</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry O. Briggs</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul C. Cohoon</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert S. Kid</td>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva C. Yip</td>
<td></td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. L. Kessen</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel B. Know</td>
<td>1676 Ala Moana Blvd</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward H. Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan S. Silverman</td>
<td></td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. M. Fischer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. W. S.中信</td>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. H. Rehman</td>
<td></td>
<td>1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. H. H. Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 7, 1984

Mr. & Mrs. Patrick J. Daly
1726 Ala Moana Blvd.
Apt. 1405
Honolulu, Hawaii 96815

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Daly:

We are in receipt of your letter dated November 15, 1984 commenting on the proposed Yacht Harbour Plaza project. We respond to your comments as follows:

Your citing of Ordinance No. 83-15 outlines the development plan guidelines for the Primary Urban Center. It should be noted at this point that these are guidelines that are in turn translated into specific zoning legislation such as the Waikiki Special Design District, Ordinance No. 4573 which was enacted in 1976. In this ordinance, the requirements governing height, building mass, setbacks, circulation patterns, use, and other criteria are specifically described. I can sympathize with your problem since I have lived on Hohonu Lane at Chateau Waikiki and watched other high rise buildings come up before my eyes and block my view plane towards Waikiki and Diamond Head. There was little I could do to stop this from happening.

I regret that this project will affect your views of the ocean and also create other impacts that are associated with high density development. Waikiki is both home to residents such as yourself and also the prime vacation destination resort area for Hawaii's largest industry, and in this sense it is conflicting by design.

I realize that this response will not change your individual position, but it does provide you with the fact that there is understanding that these impacts will negatively affect you and your location in relationship to the proposed project. You can be assured that decision makers who are faced with this project and other projects will take into consideration your respective position on the project.

Thank you for your comments and I hope that I have responded adequately.

Very truly yours,

F. J. Rodrigues

FJR (illegible)
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TRAFFIC REPORT

FOR THE

PROPOSED HOTEL/CONDOMINIUM PROJECT

ON THE EXISTING

KAISER MEDICAL CENTER SITE

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this traffic study is to assess the impact of the trips generated by the proposed hotel/condominium located on the existing Kaiser Medical Center site. This assessment is preliminary in nature and is intended to make a determination whether or not a comprehensive traffic impact study is warranted.

The scope of this study includes developing the traffic generation characteristics of the existing medical center facility and the proposed hotel/condominium complex. Traffic counts were obtained on roadways adjacent to the proposed project. Field observations during the morning and afternoon peak periods were conducted during the investigation.

This study will not analyze the existing traffic conditions, nor will it quantify the impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding street system.
B. Location

The hotel/condominium project is proposed to be built on the existing Kaiser Medical Center site. The 2.54 acre property, shown on Exhibits 1 and 2, is identified as Tax Map Key: 2-6-10:6, 10 and 12. It fronts both Ala Moana Boulevard and the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and what will be called, for purposes of this study, Yacht Harbor Drive. The site is located between Hobron Lane and the Ala Wai Canal.

C. Project Description

The proposed development, shown on Exhibits 3 and 4, consists of a hotel and a residential condominium located "under the same roof", but functioning as separate entities with separate facilities and operations. The hotel is proposed to consist of 406 guest rooms and offer a full range of hotel facilities including meeting and banquet facilities, a fine restaurant, lounge, discotheque, lobby bar, health club, and pool facilities. Access to the hotel is proposed off Yacht Harbor Drive via its intersections with Ala Moana Boulevard and Hobron Lane. Access for service vehicles is proposed directly off Ala Moana Boulevard.

The condominium is proposed to consist of 174 one- and two-bedroom units and its own separate recreational facilities. Access to the condominium is proposed off both Ala Moana Boulevard and Yacht Harbor Drive. The lobby entrance and dropoff/pickup point are located on Yacht Harbor Drive and the entrance/exit for the parking lot is located on Ala Moana Boulevard.
II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

A. General

The project site is the current location of the Kaiser Medical Center housed in two structures, the 216,953 square foot hospital and the 33,193 square foot Pacific Insurance Building containing some administrative and clinic facilities. The Medical Center employs some 1,080 workers composed of 601 hospital employees and 479 clinic employees.

The Kaiser Medical Center consists of a 174 bed hospital and a clinic providing both in-patient and out-patient health care services, respectively. Their operations are separate and distinct; however, they are integrated. Their proximity provides mutual benefits of convenience and shared facilities.

The project site is located along the airport-to-Waikiki corridor at the entrance to Waikiki. The proposed hotel extends the chain of hotels along the Waikiki shoreline, of which the Ilikai Hotel is its immediate neighbor to the east (Diamond Head). Mauka of Ala Moana Boulevard lies a high-rise residential area, while to the west (Ewa) and makai of the proposed development lies recreational areas including the Ala Wai Yacht Harbor and Ala Moana Beach Park.

B. Roads

Ala Moana Boulevard is a 120-foot right-of-way, six-lane divided arterial, providing the eastern half of the airport-to-Waikiki highway corridor. Ala Moana Boulevard is signalized at Atkinson Drive/Ala Moana Park Drive, Hobron Lane and End Road/
Kalua Road. These four-legged intersections consist of six-phase coordinated signals.

Hobron Lane, makai of Ala Moana Boulevard, is a 60-foot right-of-way, two-way, five-lane local street connecting to Yacht Harbor Drive.

The Yacht Harbor Drive is a two-way, two-laned road running along the edge of the harbor basin. It forms a stop-controlled T-intersection with Hobron Lane and continues past the Ilikai to the Hilton Hawaiian Village, becoming a four-laned roadway leading to the marina parking. Perpendicular parking stalls are also provided on both sides of the roadway along the project site frontage. At the west end, Yacht Harbor Drive connects to Ala Moana Boulevard, providing right-turn-in and right-turn-out movements only. This access point will be maintained and will serve as the primary entrance along with Hobron Lane, to the proposed hotel/condominium complex.

C. Traffic

1. Traffic Count Data

Traffic counts were taken on Hobron Lane and Yacht Harbor Drive at Ala Moana Boulevard on July 5-6, 1984 (Thursday-Friday). Twenty-four hour count totals show 12,138 vehicles per day (vpd) on Hobron Lane with a 50/50 directional split and 2656 vph with an 80/20 directional split, makaibound. The afternoon peak hour occurs roughly between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM with 871 vehicles per hour (vph) and 251 vph on Hobron Lane and Yacht Harbor Drive,
respectively. There was no apparent morning peak period of traffic.

Additional traffic counts on Ala Moana Boulevard at the Ala Wai Canal Bridge were obtained from the State Department of Transportation. The January 11-12, 1983 (Tuesday–Wednesday) counts show 47,487 vph with a 55/45 split, westbound. The morning peak hour occurs between 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM with 3,222 vph, total for both directions. The afternoon peak hour occurs between 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM with 3,824 vph, total for both directions.

These counts were obtained for the purpose of documenting the existing baseline condition. No further analysis was performed at this preliminary stage.

2. Field Investigation

Field investigation during the morning and afternoon peak periods showed queueing in the right lane of Ala Moana Boulevard in the eastbound direction up to the Yacht Harbor Drive intersection. Because of the upstream signal control at Atkinson Drive/Ala Moana Park Drive, the vehicular platoons arrive in regular intervals and volumes. The traffic congestion during the morning peak period is not as heavy as in the afternoon peak period due primarily to the relatively light side street demands. The eastbound lanes clear on most signal cycles. However, while the through lanes clear, the left turn lane stores vehicles for the next signal cycle. During the afternoon peak period,
the left turn lane is usually full and sometimes queues into the through lane.

During the afternoon peak period, Hobron Lane queues in the mauka-bound direction back to Yacht Harbor Drive. Yacht Harbor Drive experiences occasional congestion when vehicles turning into the Kaiser Medical Center parking lot queue back onto the roadway, blocking both directions of traffic.

The existing traffic conditions are generally heavy during the peak periods and throughout most of the afternoon. Traffic is generally heavy on weekends during the afternoons and evenings.

III. TRIP GENERATION
A. General

The proposed hotel/condominium project is a redevelopment of an existing hospital and clinic. In terms of traffic generation, a hospital and a clinic are considered higher land use intensities than a comparable hotel and condominium development. Therefore, a net reduction in traffic demand can be expected with the redevelopment of the existing Kaiser Medical Center site into the proposed hotel/condominium development. Based upon this premise, this preliminary study was conducted to assess the net impact on traffic demand resulting from the proposed project.

Comparative trip generation rates for both the hospital/clinic facility and the hotel/condominium development are based upon generally accepted methods developed by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and published in a report entitled
"Trip Generation, Third Edition - 1982". These empirical rates are developed by correlating traffic demand with various independent variables commonly used to define the magnitude of land development in terms of trip generation potential.

B. Existing Conditions

The Kaiser Medical Center consists of integrated hospital and clinic functions. However, in terms of trip demand, each is represented as a distinct traffic generator. In order to separate this facility in terms of these two operations, a common independent variable was used to estimate trip generation. The number of employees for each facility was the most readily available information useful in separating the trip demand.

As of March 31, 1984, the hospital employed 601 workers and the clinic employed 479 workers. Table 1 shows the trip generation rates and demand for each generator under various conditions.

C. Proposed Development

The trip generation rates for the proposed hotel and condominium are derived using occupied rooms and dwelling units, respectively. Table 2 shows the trip rates and corresponding traffic demand for each generator under various conditions.

D. Discussion

The trip generation totals for the existing development and for the proposed development are shown in Table 3. The hospital/clinic and the hotel/condominium have different trip generating characteristics; the first being a destination and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use or Bldg. Type</th>
<th>HOSPITAL</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>KAISER HOSPITAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>TMK: 2-6-10:6, 10 &amp; 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVE TRIP RATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>Between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>7 and 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT</td>
<td>P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>Between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC</td>
<td>4 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR</td>
<td>P.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR OF</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR OF</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1 - EXISTING TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS (CONT'D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use or Bldg. Type</th>
<th>MEDICAL CLINIC</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>630</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>KAISER HOSPITAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>TMK: 2-6-10:6, 10 &amp; 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVE TRIP RATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEAK</strong> A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUR</strong> Between</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF 7 and 9 Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADJACENT</strong> P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREET</strong> Between</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC</strong> 4 and 6 Total</td>
<td>1.11*</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEAK</strong> A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUR</strong> Exit</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OF</strong> Total</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERATOR</strong> P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>_</strong> Exit</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>_</strong> Total</td>
<td>1.30*</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEAK</strong> Enter</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUR OF</strong> Exit</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERATOR</strong> Total</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEAK</strong> Enter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUR OF</strong> Exit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERATOR</strong> Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RATES DERIVED FROM OTHER TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS*
### TABLE 2 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use or Bldg. Type</th>
<th>HOTEL</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>310</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>KAISER HOSPITAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>TMK: 2-6-10:6, 10 &amp; 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>OCCUPIED ROOM</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Ratio</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVE TRIP RATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>3410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Between Exit</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF 7 and 9 Total</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET Between Exit</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC 4 and 6 Total</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF Total</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>2631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR OF Exit</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR OF Exit</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS (CONT'D.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use or Bldg. Type</th>
<th>CONDOMINIUM</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>230</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>KAISER HOSPITAL PROPERTY</td>
<td>TMK:2-6-10:6, 10 &amp; 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>DWELLING UNIT</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Ratio</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Between Exit</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF 7 and 9 Total</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET Between Exit</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC 4 and 6 Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF Total</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR P.M. Enter</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RATES DERIVED FROM OTHER TRIP GENERATION CHARACTERISTICS*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3 – TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVERAGE WEEKDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Between Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF 7 and 9 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJACENT P.M. Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET Between Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC 4 and 6 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK A.M. Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR P.M. Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SATURDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUNDAY VEHICLE TRIP ENDS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUR Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATOR Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
latter being an origin. The proposed development shows significant decreases in traffic demand over the existing development, especially during the peak hours of generator.

On the average weekday, the morning peak period of a hospital or clinic is relatively low, primarily consisting of employees. The afternoon peak hour of generator generally occurs between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM during the afternoon employee shift change which coincides with the after-work hospital visitation and out-patient trips to the clinic. On the other hand, the hotel and condominium will exhibit two distinct peak periods between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. The proposed project shows an increase in exiting traffic during the AM peak hour, as can be expected by an origin trip generator; however, the overall demand shows a net decline. The PM peak hour for the proposed development shows the most dramatic decrease in traffic generation over the existing medical center.

On weekends, the hospital and clinic trip activity shows higher peak period conditions, except on Sunday, when the clinic is closed. The hotel and the condominium exhibit a more balanced entering and exiting traffic demand as opposed to what can be expected during a workday. On Saturday, the existing medical center's peak hour of generator is generally about midday. On the other hand, the hotel peak hour of generator should coincide with banquet activities, i.e., between 6:00 PM and 7:00 PM at the beginning of the festivities and between 9:30 PM and 10:30 PM at the end of these functions. However, the ITE trip rates
generally show a higher trip generation potential during the average weekday's PM peak period than that on Saturday. Therefore, the PM peak hour in the average weekday, which has been shown to have the greatest decrease in traffic generation over the existing conditions, is the more critical period. The proposed hotel/condominium is expected to generate more daily traffic on Sunday than the hospital/clinic due to the clinic being closed. However, the peak period conditions still show a net decline in total traffic demand for the proposed development.

Overall, the trip generation for the proposed hotel/condominium shows a dramatic decrease in travel demand over the existing hospital/clinic as was hypothesized prior to undertaking this study.

IV. PROPOSED ACCESS

Access for the hotel is primarily off Yacht Harbor Drive, with a service entrance on Ala Moana Boulevard. This confines the hotel traffic circulation on Yacht Harbor Drive and separates it from service vehicle traffic. The intersections of Yacht Harbor Drive with Hobron Lane and Ala Moana Boulevard may require curb widening to facilitate bus turning movements. Generally, the hotel entrance on Yacht Harbor Drive removes the frictional effects associated with driveways off Ala Moana Boulevard and onto a local road.

The proposed access for the condominium, however, is split between the lobby access on Yacht Harbor Drive and parking access on Ala Moana Boulevard. The parking access driveway for the condominium is restricted to right-turn in/right-turn-out movements. Therefore,
eastbound motorists on Ala Moana Boulevard, bound for the proposed condominium, must turn left at Hobron Lane, circle around Yacht Harbor Drive, and turn onto Ala Moana Boulevard once again to enter the condominium parking. Motorists circulating between the parking and the lobby area must perform a similar driving pattern. The right lane on Ala Moana Boulevard, eastbound, is already queued back across the proposed driveway location during the peak periods, making access and egress difficult. The additional traffic load on Ala Moana Boulevard resulting from the condominium traffic circulation will further aggravate this situation. Furthermore, westbound motorists exiting the parking lot will have difficulty crossing three lanes of through traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard, to maneuver into the left turn lane at the Hobron Lane intersection to make a U-turn and head westbound on Ala Moana Boulevard. The proposed driveway is located opposite the beginning of the left turn storage lane which is often full. During congested conditions, this maneuver would be almost impossible. These westbound motorists would have to continue in the easterly direction on Ala Moana Boulevard, then make a U-turn at the Kalia Road/Ena Road intersection and finally proceed westbound on Ala Moana Boulevard. This, in effect, doubles the traffic impact at the intersection of Ala Moana Boulevard and Hobron Lane by requiring condominium motorists to approach the intersection first in the eastbound direction, then backtrack to the intersection in the westbound direction. Finally, the unrestricted access and egress to and from the proposed condominium off Hobron Lane is more convenient to the future residents of the development.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

1. Existing traffic conditions are generally heavy throughout the afternoon and into the evenings.

2. The proposed hotel/condominium development should result in a significant decrease in traffic demand and should not deteriorate the existing conditions.

3. The restricted access driveway to the condominium parking on Ala Moana Boulevard creates a negative impact on the surrounding street system and poses potential traffic safety problems.

B. Recommendations

1. The access driveway to the condominium parking be relocated onto Yacht Harbor Drive.

2. Further consideration be given to upgrading the intersections of Ala Moana Boulevard/Yacht Harbor Drive and Hobron Lane/Yacht Harbor Drive during the design phase of the development to facilitate bus turning movements.

3. Based upon the proposed development plan presented herein and the conclusions and recommendations stated above, a comprehensive traffic impact study is not required for the proposed hotel/condominium project on the existing Kaiser Medical Center site.
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1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Kaiser Medical Center and construction of a hotel/condominium on the site. Project location, street plan, site plan, and elevation diagrams are shown in Exhibits 1 through 4.

2. AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

State of Hawaii and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards (AQS) have been established for six classes of pollutants as shown in Table 1. An AQS is a concentration not to be exceeded over a specified time period which varies for each pollutant depending upon the type of exposure that has been associated with adverse effects. Each of the regulated pollutants has the potential to cause some form of adverse health effect or to produce environmental degradation when present in sufficiently high concentration.

Federal AQS for some pollutants have been divided into Primary and Secondary levels. Primary AQS are designed to prevent adverse health impacts while Secondary AQS refer to welfare impacts such as decreased visibility, diminished comfort levels, damage to vegetation, animals or property, or a reduction in the overall aesthetic quality of the atmosphere. State of Hawaii AQS have been set at single levels which for most pollutants are significantly more stringent than comparable Federal limits.
3. PRESENT AIR QUALITY

A summary of air pollutant measurements from State of Hawaii long term monitoring stations located nearest to the project is presented in Table 2. Data from several different sampling stations are included in the tabulation.

The sampling station for particulates and sulfur dioxide was originally located at the sewer pumping station in Ala Moana Park, but in February, 1977, it was moved to the park's McCoy Pavilion, and then in December, 1979, it was moved again to Fort DeRussy in Waikiki. The Ala Moana Park monitoring stations were less than one mile west of the project site while the Waikiki location is less than one mile east of the project. In 1983 sulfur dioxide monitoring at the Fort DeRussy site was discontinued and the nearest sulfur dioxide monitoring site to the project became the Department of Health building at Punchbowl and Beretania Streets in urban Honolulu, about 1.7 miles northwest of the project site.

Carbon monoxide concentrations were monitored at the Department of Health building until September 1979. During 1981 carbon monoxide was monitored at Fort DeRussy in Waikiki, but during 1982 the only carbon monoxide monitoring station was located at Leahi Hospital in Kaimuki, about 2.6 miles east southeast of the project. In June 1983, carbon monoxide sampling was resumed at the Department of Health building.

Ozone levels were also measured at the Department of Health building until December, 1980, when the monitor was relocated to Sand Island (about 2.7 miles west of the project site). During 1981 nitrogen dioxide was also monitored at the Sand Island location.

Lead measurements collected at the Department of Health Building are summarized in Table 3. Data for 1982 and 1983 are not available but measurements for the first quarter of 1984 show an average of 0.3 micrograms per cubic meter.
From the data presented in Table 2 it appears that the State of Hawaii 24-hour AQS for particulates is presently being exceeded in the Ala Moana/Waikiki area at a rate of not more than once per year. No values above Federal AQS have occurred during the last seven years, and the last high particulate reading in 1980 was recorded during a January windstorm which created greatly increased levels of natural pollutants such as blowing dust and sea spray. A once-per-year particulate level of this nature is of no major regulatory concern and it seems reasonable to conclude that there are no present problems with particulate pollution in the project area. Table 2 also shows that sulfur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide levels in the area are running well below allowable AQS.

On the other hand, Table 2 indicates that there could be a potential problem with carbon monoxide concentrations in urban areas of Oahu. During the years from 1975 to 1979 when carbon monoxide was measured at the Department of Health building there were numerous violations of the State of Hawaii peak one-hour AQS for this pollutant. There was, however, an encouraging trend toward fewer violations each year and average peak hour values were steadily decreasing until the monitor was moved to Leahi in late 1979. The Leahi site is low density residential and the 1982 readings shown in Table 2 from that site are probably indicative of background levels of carbon monoxide at locations well removed from major highways and urban traffic.

In any case the data in Tables 2 and 3 show that carbon monoxide would be the primary pollutant of concern in evaluating the impact of new residential development on Oahu.
4. DIRECT AIR QUALITY IMPACT OF PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

During the site preparation and construction phases of this project it is inevitable that a certain amount of fugitive dust will be generated. Field measurements of such emissions from shopping center and apartment construction projects has yielded an estimated emission rate of 1.2 tons of dust per acre of activity per month of activity. This figure assumes medium level activity in a semi-arid climate with a moderate soil silt content. In fact actual emissions from this project can be expected to vary daily depending upon the amount of activity and the moisture content of the exposed soil in work areas.

The major generator of fugitive dust is heavy construction equipment moving over unpaved surfaces. This problem can be mitigated to a certain extent by completing and paving work areas as early in the development process as possible. Given that some areas adjacent to the project site are already in residential use, dust control will have to be an item of special concern.

It is also inevitable that construction equipment will emit some air pollutants in their exhausts as they are used at various points within or adjacent to the project site. The largest equipment is generally diesel-powered. Carbon monoxide emissions from large diesel engines are usually no more than those of the average automobile, but nitrogen dioxide emissions can be quite high. Fortunately nitrogen dioxide emissions from other sources in the area should be relatively low and the overall impact of pollutant emissions from construction equipment should be minor compared to levels generated by normal traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard nearby.
5. INDIRECT AIR QUALITY IMPACT OF DECREASED TRAFFIC

Once construction is completed the proposed project will not in itself constitute a significant direct source of air pollutants. By serving as an attraction for motor vehicle traffic in the area, however, the project must be considered to be a significant indirect air pollution source. This project is somewhat unique, however, in that the hospital complex that currently occupies the site generates more traffic than the planned hotel/condominium is expected to produce. It is therefore expected that this project will result in a net reduction of automobile-related pollutants in the project area.

Motor vehicles, especially those with gasoline-powered engines, are prodigious emitters of carbon monoxide. They also produce measurable quantities of nitrogen dioxide. Those burning fuel which contains lead as an additive contribute some lead particles to the atmosphere as well. The major control measure designed to limit lead emissions is a Federal law requiring the use of unleaded fuel in most new automobiles. As older cars are removed from the vehicle fleet, these lead emissions are expected to exhibit a steadily decreasing rate. Federal control regulations also call for increased efficiency in removing carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide from vehicle exhausts. By 1995 carbon monoxide emissions from the vehicle fleet then operating are mandated to be just a little more than half the amounts now emitted.

In order to quantitatively evaluate the expected air quality improvement resulting from replacing the Kaiser Hospital complex with the proposed hotel/condominium a detailed carbon monoxide modeling study has been carried out. This study was designed to yield carbon monoxide concentration values which could be directly compared to allowable State and Federal Air Quality Standards.
6. CARBON MONOXIDE DIFFUSION MODELING

Three critical receptor sites (shown on Exhibit 2) were selected for analysis. Expected worst case concentrations of carbon monoxide were computed at these receptor sites as described below for the afternoon peak hour period with and without the proposed project.

The traffic study for the project shows current traffic generation rates for the existing hospital complex and for the proposed hotel/condominium. It was assumed for the purposes of this study that these generation rates would be valid for the year 1985 and that year is taken as project completion date. Peak hour traffic volumes on Ala Moana Boulevard and Hobron Lane were determined by a peak hour traffic count conducted on Friday, September 7, 1984. Peak hour was determined to be between 4 and 5 P.M. as stated in the traffic study. Traffic volumes on these roadways for 1995 and 2005 were estimated using a growth factor of 10 percent for each 10 year period.

Vehicular carbon monoxide emission rates for the years studied were determined using the EPA's computerized Mobile Source Emissions Model (MOBILE 2). The existing mix of vehicles on Ala Moana Boulevard during afternoon rush hour was observed to be approximately 83% gasoline-powered automobiles, 12% gasoline-powered light duty trucks (pickups and vans), 0.5% heavy duty gasoline-powered trucks, 1% diesel-powered automobiles, 3% heavy duty diesel-powered trucks and buses, and 0.5% motorcycles and mopeds. It was assumed that this vehicle mix would not change substantially over the years studied.

An ambient temperature of 68 degrees F was used to simulate worst case emissions for a winter afternoon rush hour. About 20 percent of all traffic was assumed to be operating in the less efficient cold start mode.
Green to cycle ratios for each direction of traffic movement at the Ala Moana/Hobron signalized intersection during the afternoon rush hour were determined by observation. It was assumed that these ratios would not change substantially in future years either.

The EPA computer model HIWAY-2 was used to calculate carbon monoxide concentrations at the selected receptor sites under existing and proposed project site usage. Stability category D (4) was used for determining diffusion coefficients. This stability category represents the most stable (least favorable) atmospheric condition that is likely to exist in an urban area such as this.

To simulate worst case wind conditions a uniform wind speed of one meter per second was assumed with the worst case wind direction for site 1 from the east; site 2 from the west; and site 3 from the south.

At each receptor site concentrations were computed at a height of 1.5 meters to simulate levels that would exist within the normal human breathing zone.

Background concentrations of carbon monoxide from sources or roadways not directly considered in the analysis were assumed to be zero.

Results of the peak hour carbon monoxide analysis with either the proposed project or the existing hospital complex are presented in Table 4. At all three of the critical receptor sites concentrations of carbon monoxide are predicted to be within allowable State and Federal AQS under both alternatives even under the worst case traffic and meteorological conditions considered in this analysis.
Predicted worst case eight hour carbon monoxide levels at these same receptor sites are presented in Table 5. These values are based on the results of the peak hour analysis as modified by the application of a 'meteorological persistence factor' of 0.6 as recommended in EPA guidelines to account for the fact that meteorological dispersion conditions are likely to be more variable (and hence more favorable) over an eight hour period than they are for a one hour period.

For this time period the State of Hawaii AQS would be slightly exceeded by either alternative during the early years of the study period, but well before 1995 predicted levels of carbon monoxide would fall to levels within allowable standards because of the increasing effectiveness of Federal emission controls. As was the case for the peak hour period, all projected carbon monoxide concentrations for the eight hour period are well within the allowable Federal AQS.
7. MITIGATION MEASURES

A. SHORT TERM

As indicated by the foregoing analysis, the only direct adverse air quality impact that the proposed project is likely to create is the emission of fugitive dust during demolition and construction. State of Hawaii Department of Health Administrative Rules stipulate the control measures that are to be employed to reduce this type of emissions. Primary control consists of wetting down loose soil areas with water or suitable chemicals. An effective watering program can reduce particulate emission levels from construction sites by as much as 50 percent. Other control measures include good housekeeping on the jobsite and pavement or landscaping of bare soil areas as quickly as possible.

B. LONG TERM

Once completed, the proposed project is expected to have little direct impact on the air quality of the surrounding area. The only potential long term indirect impact will be in the form of vehicular air pollutant emissions from traffic entering and leaving the project. In this case the proposed project is expected to generate less traffic than the existing Kaiser Hospital complex and the project itself can be viewed as a mitigative measure.
C. DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Exhibit 3 shows that the only planned access to condominium parking is via direct connection to Ala Moana Boulevard. The traffic study for the project recommends that this design be changed for safety reasons. The computations in this study assume that condominium traffic will enter or exit the project via Yacht Harbor Drive and Hobron Lane. If condominium traffic were allowed to exit directly onto Ala Moana Boulevard, then those exiting motorists who wanted to go in the Ewa direction would have to pass through the Ala Moana/Hobron intersection once in the Diamond Head direction in order to execute a turn to reverse direction at some downstream connecting street and then pass through this intersection again in the desired direction, thus unnecessarily increasing traffic congestion in Waikiki and doubling their contribution of vehicular pollutants in the immediate project area. Project design should be changed to avoid this undesirable impact.

It should be noted in this regard that the existing Kaiser Hospital complex at one time had a direct access to Ala Moana Boulevard, but this access has been chained off for the last several years at least partly to avoid the problems described above.
8. SUMMARY

1. The proposed project involves demolition of the existing Kaiser Medical Center and construction of a Hotel/condominium on the site.

2. Present air quality in the project area is estimated to be acceptable for all regulated pollutants with the possible exception of carbon monoxide.

3. Except for short term dust emissions during the construction phase of the project no significant direct air quality impacts are expected.

4. Traffic generated by the project will contribute to emissions of carbon monoxide in the project area, but the proposed project is expected to generate less traffic than does existing use of the site. Computer modeling of carbon monoxide levels under existing or proposed site usage indicate that State of Hawaii eight hour standards for that pollutant are likely to be exceeded under worst case traffic and meteorological conditions in the years immediately following construction, but well before 1995 carbon monoxide concentrations are predicted to decrease to levels within all allowable State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards.

5. Adequate control measures are available to limit emissions of fugitive dust from construction activities. Because forecast traffic generation by the proposed project is lower than existing traffic levels, the project itself could be considered to constitute an air pollution mitigative measure, but it is recommended that the existing design be changed to avoid the potential increase in air pollution levels that could be associated with direct access of condominium parking traffic onto Ala Moana Boulevard.
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VICINITY MAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLLUTANT</th>
<th>SAMPLING PERIOD</th>
<th>PRIMARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particulates</td>
<td>Annual Geometric Mean</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 24-Hour Average</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 24-Hour Average</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 3-Hour Average</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>Maximum 1-Hour Average</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>Maximum 8-Hour Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum 1-Hour Average</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Carbon Monoxide Standards are in milligrams per cubic meter.
### TABLE 2

**SUMMARY OF AIR POLLUTANT MEASUREMENTS AT NEAREST MONITORING STATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTICULATE MATTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SULFUR DIOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;13</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5-&lt;16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARBON MONOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>0-19.6</td>
<td>0-20.7</td>
<td>0-17.3</td>
<td>1.2-13.8</td>
<td>0-4.6</td>
<td>0-8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OXIDANT (OZONE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>4-61</td>
<td>10-84</td>
<td>10-80</td>
<td>10-84</td>
<td>10-104</td>
<td>0-151</td>
<td>0-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NITROGEN DIOXIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Samples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Values</td>
<td>6-77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State AQS Exceeded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** See text for locations of monitoring stations. Carbon monoxide reported in milligrams per cubic meter; other pollutants in micrograms per cubic meter. Carbon monoxide and ozone readings are daily peak one hour values; other pollutant values are for a 24 hour sampling period.

**SOURCE:** State of Hawaii Department of Health
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Project Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>High Volume Emission Spectra</td>
<td>ug/m³</td>
<td>Department of Health Bldg. 1250 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813</td>
<td>Quarterly Composite</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Air Quality Data Summary for Lead
State of Hawaii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>Year Average</th>
<th>Maximum Quarterly Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

National Primary and Secondary Ambient Air Quality Standard: 1.5 ug/m³ maximum arithmetic mean averaged over a calendar quarter.
### TABLE 4

RESULTS OF PEAK HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE ANALYSIS  
(milligrams per cubic meter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE OF HAWAII AQI: 10  
FEDERAL AQI: 40

**NOTE:** See Exhibit 2 for location of receptor sites.
TABLE 5

RESULTS OF EIGHT HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE ANALYSIS
(milligrams per cubic meter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE OF HAWAII AQS: 5
FEDERAL AQS: 10

NOTE: See Exhibit 2 for location of receptor sites.
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I. SUMMARY

The proposed hotel/condominium project at the site of the existing Kaiser Hospital is not expected to produce adverse noise impacts, except for short term construction noise impacts. The site, proposed tower design features, and the low traffic generation attributable to the project are all favorable in minimizing future noise impacts on surrounding properties and on future project occupants.

Noise mitigation measures are not required since construction noise has been, and will continue to be, successfully regulated by the State Department of Health. Also, standard construction features can be implemented to control tire squeal noise and complaint risks. The proposal appears to be relatively problem-free in respect to adverse noise impacts, and optimally situated for minimizing noise exposure to future building occupants.
II. NOISE DESCRIPTORS* AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

A general consensus has developed for using the Day-Night Sound Level \( L_{dn} \) in describing environmental noise in general, and for relating the acceptability of the noise environment for various land uses. The Day-Night Sound Level represents the 24-hour average sound level for a given day, with nighttime noise levels (10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.) increased by 10 decibels prior to computation of the 24-hour average.

TABLE 1, extracted from Reference 1, categorizes the various \( L_{dn} \) levels of outdoor noise exposure with severity classifications. TABLE 2, extracted from Reference 1, presents the general effects of noise on people in residential use situations. FIGURE 1, extracted from Reference 2, presents suggested land use compatibility guidelines for residential and non-residential land uses. A general consensus among federal agencies has developed whereby residential housing development is considered acceptable in areas where exterior noise does not exceed 65 \( L_{dn} \). This value of 65 \( L_{dn} \) is used as a federal regulatory threshold for determining the necessity for special noise attenuation and abatement measures.

Federal agencies (HUD, DOT, and EPA) recognize 55 \( L_{dn} \) as a desirable goal for exterior noise in residential areas for protecting the public health and welfare with an adequate margin of safety. Although 55 \( L_{dn} \) is significantly quieter than 65 \( L_{dn} \) (see FIGURE 2), the lower level has not been adopted for regulatory purposes by federal agencies due to economic and technical feasibility considerations.

In Hawaii, where open-living conditions prevail throughout the year, and where natural ventilation is a prevalent characteristic of residential housing, the more conservative levels of 55 \( L_{dn} \) and 60 \( L_{dn} \) should be used to evaluate potential noise impacts at single and multi-family residences respectively. These values of 55 \( L_{dn} \) and 60 \( L_{dn} \) are consistent with the "Compatible" designations of FIGURE 1 for single and multiple family, and multi-story land use categories.

*A brief description of the acoustic terminology and symbols used are provided in Appendix A of this report.
### TABLE 1
EXTERIOR NOISE EXPOSURE CLASSIFICATION
(RESIDENTIAL LAND USE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Exposure Class</th>
<th>Day-Night Sound Level ($L_{dn}$)</th>
<th>Federal Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Exposure</td>
<td>Not Exceeding $55 L_{dn}$</td>
<td>Unconditionally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Exposure</td>
<td>Above $55 L_{dn}$, But Not Exceeding $65 L_{dn}$</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Exposure</td>
<td>Above $65 L_{dn}$, But Not Exceeding $75 L_{dn}$</td>
<td>Normally Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Exposure</td>
<td>Above $75 L_{dn}$</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Federal Housing Administration, Veterans Administration, and Department of Defense Agencies.

Source: Reference 1
TABLE 2
EFFECTS OF NOISE ON PEOPLE
(Residential Land Uses Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day-Night Average Sound Level in Decibels</th>
<th>Effects 1</th>
<th>Hearing Loss</th>
<th>Speech Interference</th>
<th>Annoyance 2</th>
<th>Average Community Reaction 4</th>
<th>General Community Attitude Towards Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 and above</td>
<td>May Begin to Occur</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Very Severe</td>
<td>Noise is likely to be the most important of all adverse aspects of the community environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Will Not Likely Occur</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Noise is one of the most important adverse aspects of the community environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Will Not Occur</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Noise is one of the important adverse aspects of the community environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Will Not Occur</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Noise may be considered an adverse aspect of the community environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and below</td>
<td>Will Not Occur</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>Noise considered no more important than various other environmental factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. "Speech Interference" data are drawn from the following tables in EPA's "Levels Document"; Table 3, Fig. D-1, Fig. D-2, Fig. D-3. All other data from National Academy of Science 1977 report "Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements on Noise, Report of Working Group 69 on Evaluation of Environmental Impact of Noise."

2. Depends on attitudes and other factors.

3. The percentages of people reporting annoyance to lesser extents are higher in each case. An unknown small percentage of people will report being "highly annoyed" even in the quietest surroundings. One reason is the difficulty all people have in integrating annoyance over a very long time.

4. Attitudes or other non-auditory factors can modify this. Noise at low levels can still be an important problem, particularly when it intrudes into a quiet environment.

NOTE: Research implicates noise as a factor producing stress-related health effects such as heart disease, high-blood pressure and stroke, ulcers and other digestive disorders. The relationship between noise and these effects, however, have not as yet been quantified.

Source: Reference 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>YEARLY DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL IN DECIBELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single Family,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Outdoor Use</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multiple Family,</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Outdoor Use</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi Story Limited Outdoor Use</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Classrooms, Libraries,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, Clinics, Nursing Homes,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Shells</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Golf Courses, Riding Stables,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Rec., Cemeteries</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Personal Services,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Professional</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail, Movie Theaters,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Wholesale, Some Retail, Ind.,</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfg., Utilities</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Except Livestock)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Natural Wildlife and Recreation Areas</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compatible
- Marginally Compatible
- With Insulation per Section A.3
- Incompatible

FIG. 1. Land use compatibility with yearly day-night average sound level at a site for buildings as commonly constructed. [For information only; not a part of American National Standard for Sound Level Descriptors for Determination of Compatible Land Use S3.23-1980.]

II-4
FIGURE 2
RANGE OF EXTERIOR BACKGROUND AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>OUTDOOR LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY NOISE (DOWNTOWN MAJOR METROPOLIS)</td>
<td>50 FT from curb of H-1 Freeway at Campbell Industrial Park Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY NOISY</td>
<td>Lanai of Waikiki Hi-Rise on Kuhio Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISY URBAN</td>
<td>50 FT from centerline of Punchbowl St at Queens Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>Kalahi, Hickam Housing Areas, Camp Catlin, Halsey Terrace, Ft. Kamehameha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN</td>
<td>Ewa Beach to Iroquois Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL TOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILENT SUBURBAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Darby-Ebisu & Associates, Inc.
For commercial, industrial, and other non-noise sensitive land uses, exterior noise levels as high as 75 $L_d$ are generally considered acceptable. Exceptions to this occur when naturally-ventilated office and other commercial establishments are exposed to exterior levels which exceed 65 $L_d$. Interior noise levels of typical naturally-ventilated establishments are approximately 9 $L_d$ units below noise levels exterior to the units. Interior noise levels of typical air conditioned establishments are approximately 25 $L_d$ units below exterior noise levels.
III. EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT

In order to determine the existing noise levels in the area of the proposed hotel/condominium, continuous noise measurements were obtained from the 8th floor lanais at the mauka and makai ends of the Yacht Harbor Tower, Ilikai Hotel. The mauka location was selected to measure noise from traffic on Ala Moana Boulevard. The makai location was selected to measure noise from local traffic on the yacht harbor entrance road, from Ala Wai Heliport, and from transiting fixed-wing aircraft.

The hour-by-hour noise data collected are summarized in TABLE 3. On July 19 - 20, from 12:00 noon until 11:34 AM at the lanai of Rm. #870, measured traffic noise was 65.3 $L_{eq(h)}$ during the PM peak hour, and 69.1 $L_{dn}$ for the 24-hour measurement period. Dominant noise sources were sirens, horns, and buses on Ala Moana Boulevard. As is typical of the Waikiki area, nighttime traffic noise (between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM) is a significant contributor to the total daily noise, and as such, the measured $L_{dn}$ was 3.8 units higher than the measured peak hour $L_{eq}$ of 65.3 dB. Slant distance from the 8th floor lanai to the traffic lane was approximately 115 ft.

From 12:00 noon until 11:52 AM on July 21, noise measurements were obtained from the lanai of Rm. #856 on the makai side of the hotel. Due to shielding effects of the hotel structure, traffic noise was reduced significantly (approximately 7 $L_{dn}$ units). The hourly noise data is shown in TABLE 3, with the PM peak hour $L_{eq(h)}$ of 58.1, and with 62 $L_{dn}$ for the 24-hour period. The relatively high noise levels during the 5:00 to 6:00 PM period on July 20, and during the 9:00 AM to 11:00 AM period on July 21 were attributable to an auto horn and an aerobic dancing class (at pool side). Traffic noise was the dominant noise source on the makai side, with approximately 50 percent (or 59 $L_{dn}$) attributable to Ala Moana Boulevard traffic, and 50 percent (of 59 $L_{dn}$) attributable to local traffic along the yacht harbor entrance road.

Aircraft noise was audible on the makai side due to the lower traffic noise, but was generally below 65 dB ($L_{max}$) and below 55 $L_{dn}$. Tour helicopters operating from the Ala Wai Heliport generally remained makai of the shoreline, and were barely audible above the background noise. Aircraft noise was not considered to be a dominant noise source on the makai side of the hotel.

III-1
In summary, the existing noise environment at the project site can be characterized as follows:

- Noisy to very noisy at setback distances of 100 ft. or less from the centerline of Ala Moana Boulevard, and with direct line-of-sight to the boulevard. Existing federal noise criteria for residences are exceeded by 2 to 5 L_{dn} units.

- Moderately noisy to quiet on the makai side of the buildings when direct line-of-sight to Ala Moana Boulevard is obstructed. Existing federal noise criteria for residences are not exceeded under these conditions.

- The hourly noise pattern is typical of the Waikiki area, in that the traffic noise persists through the night and into the early morning hours.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME (HRS)</th>
<th>$L_{99}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{90}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{50}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{33}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{10}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{\text{max}}(\text{dB})$</th>
<th>$L_{\text{eq}}(\text{dB})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-0100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100-0200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200-0300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300-0400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400-0500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500-0600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600-0700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700-0800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-0900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1800</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100-2200</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-2400</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$L_{dn} = 69.1$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME (HRS)</th>
<th>( L_{99}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{90}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{50}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{33}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{10}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{\text{max}}(\text{dB}) )</th>
<th>( L_{\text{eq}}(\text{dB}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-0100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100-0200</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200-0300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300-0400</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400-0500</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500-0600</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600-0700</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700-0800</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-0900</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-1000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1134</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1800</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100-2200</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-2400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( L_{dn} = \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME (HRS)</th>
<th>L_{99}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{90}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{50}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{33}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{10}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{max}(dB)</th>
<th>L_{eq}(dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000-0100</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100-0200</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0200-0300</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0300-0400</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0400-0500</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0500-0600</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0600-0700</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700-0800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0800-0900</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-1000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1152</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500-1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100-2200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200-2300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300-2400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ L_{dn} = 62.0 \]
IV. PREDICTED NOISE IMPACTS

Possible noise impacts associated with the project include the additional traffic noise generated by the hotel/condominium, tire squeal noise emanating from the proposed parking garage, environmental noise impacts on future residents/hotel guests, and short term construction noise impacts on adjacent properties. Possible noise impacts associated with traffic were evaluated thru use of the methodology of Reference 3, the traffic counts of Reference 4, and the traffic projection of Reference 5. Tire squeal noise and construction noise evaluations were based on previous work on similar projects.

A. Tire Squeal Noise From Parking Garage

Tire squeal noise in indoor parking structures has been the cause of complaints from persons residing in adjacent properties in Hawaii where year round open windows are the norm. Tire squeal is produced by high-frequency vibration of tire-tread elements when cornering a vehicle. The factors which influence the inception and intensity of tire squeal noise include: road surface texture, vehicle forward speed, vehicle weight, tire-tread design, and slip angle (difference between tire steering angle and direction of vehicle movement).

Tire squeal noise at the perimeter of the proposed parking garages could range from 75 to 83 dB ($L_{\text{max}}$). At these sound levels, and because of the distinctive nature of the source, tire squeal noise may be audible at adjoining properties and across Ala Moana Boulevard. Because of the valet parking proposed for the hotel guests, administrative controls may be adequate to prevent high-speed cornering of vehicles and subsequent tire squeals. The restriction of condominium vehicles to the underground level will minimize tire squeal emanations from building openings. The potential tire squeal impact does exist, and mitigation measures are recommended.

B. Aircraft Noise

Existing aircraft noise levels in the project area are below 55 $L_{dn}$ and are not anticipated to change significantly by the year 2000. As long as current traffic patterns of rotary and fixed-wing aircraft are maintained, serious noise impacts resulting from aircraft fly-bys are not anticipated. Mitigation measures for aircraft noise reduction are not considered necessary.

IV-1
C. Construction Noise

Short-term noise impacts associated with construction activities will occur as a result of the proposed project. These impacts are unavoidable due to the general noisiness of heavy construction activities, and the proximity (with 100 ft.) of the site to adjacent residential/hotel structures. Noise exposure from construction activities at any one location will be intermittent during the construction period as the various phases are completed.

Noise levels of diesel-powered construction equipment typically range from 80 to 90 dB at 50 ft. distance (see TABLE 4). Pile driving, which may be required, results in impulsive noise levels in excess of 100 dB at 50 ft. FIGURE 3 depicts the anticipated range of construction noise at various distances from operating diesel equipment. Peak noise levels from pile driving may be 15 dB higher than the values shown in FIGURE 3. Construction noise levels at existing structures mauka and Diamond Head of the site will intermittently exceed 75 dB when site preparation, pile driving, and pouring work is being performed.

State Department of Health Regulations (Reference 6) currently regulate noise from construction activities under a permit system. Noise levels from construction activities could exceed 95 dB at the project boundary lines. Under current DOH permit procedures, noisy construction activities which exceed 95 dB at the project boundary line will be restricted to the hours between 9:00 AM and 5:30 PM, from Monday through Friday, and excluding certain holidays. These restrictions would minimize noise impact on surrounding residents and hotel/condominium guests during noisy construction operations such as earth moving, jack hammering, pile driving and concrete pouring, but will not mitigate noise impact on commercial or business operations. Under the present permit procedures, high noise levels in excess of 95 dB at the project boundary line are permitted to occur during hours when fewer residents and guests are anticipated to be exposed. The current state regulations and enforcement procedures have generally been successful in minimizing adverse noise impacts from construction activities. It is anticipated that current procedures will be continued, and additional mitigation measures are not required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Sound Level (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactors</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loaders</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Tampers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoes</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollers</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenchers</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressors</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklifts</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Trucks</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Crane</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammers</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Project Generated Traffic Noise

The trip generation projections for the project, when compared to existing hospital/clinic trip generation characteristics (Reference 5), indicate that the proposed hotel/condominium traffic should, at worst, replace the existing traffic associated with Kaiser Hospital operations. Total peak hour traffic volume associated with the proposed hotel/condominium is projected at approximately 350 VPH. Tour bus traffic is anticipated to be minimal at the proposed project due to the type of clientele expected.

Because it is assumed that the project traffic will essentially replace existing traffic associated with present hospital operations, no increase in traffic noise along Ala Moana Boulevard or Hobron Lane is predicted to be attributable to the project. Along the yacht harbor entrance road, hotel guest traffic will essentially replace existing traffic associated with hospital operations, and increases in traffic noise attributable to the project are not expected. Because of the minimal traffic anticipated from the proposed project, and the elimination of current traffic associated with the hospital, the noise impacts resulting from project-related traffic are not considered significant.

E. Exterior Noise at Project Site

In order to predict the probable impact on future guests/residents of the hotel/condominium, base year traffic noise levels were calculated along the exterior walls of the proposed building. Of interest was the predicted noise levels at the proposed living units, and the relationship of these exterior noise levels to existing compatibility guidelines and criteria. The results of the July 19-21 noise measurements, and the most recent (Reference 4) traffic counts for Ala Moana Boulevard were used to predict the traffic noise levels. The traffic noise predictions apply for the 1984 time period (base year), since future traffic projections were not performed. In any event, a 25 percent increase in base year traffic volume along Ala Moana Boulevard is required before the traffic noise predictions increase by 1 Ldn unit.*

* Assuming current average speed (17 MPH) and traffic mix (92% auto, 4% medium truck and 4% heavy trucks & buses) do not change.
FIGURE 4 depicts the variation in exterior noise with building floor levels in the vicinity of Condominium Unit B. On the mauka side of the unit, traffic noise from Ala Moana Boulevard will range from 65 to 67 \( L_{dn} \) (except at the lowest floor where shielding effects will occur). FIGURE 5 depicts the predicted traffic noise levels at the 8th floor elevation and along the exterior walls. FIGURE 5 also depicts the base year traffic noise contours of 70 \( L_{dn} \) and 65 \( L_{dn} \) at the 8th floor elevation. Due to shielding effects, exterior noise levels along the makai walls of the proposed tower is predicted to be approximately 60 \( L_{dn} \) or less.

Referring to FIGURE 5, it can be seen that the major portion of the mauka walls adjoin a corridor, lobby, or elevator shaft. These non-noise sensitive spaces will serve as a noise buffer for the majority of the hotel/condominium units. Except for 1 hotel and 1 condominium unit, base year exterior noise levels should not exceed the federal criteria level of 65 \( L_{dn} \). Also, the majority (approximately 75 percent) of the units will not be exposed to base year noise levels above 60 \( L_{dn} \).

The proposed design of the hotel/condominium appears to be near optimum in respect to minimizing traffic noise at hotel/condominium units. The majority of the units will meet the more stringent recommendations of 60 \( L_{dn} \) (see FIGURE 1) exterior noise exposure for multi-family and multi-story dwellings. The majority of the hotel units (93 percent) will also meet the 65 \( L_{dn} \) recommendation for transient lodging units (see FIGURE 1). Because of these results, and the probable availability of airconditioning, mitigation measures are not considered necessary.
FIGURE 4
BASE YEAR TRAFFIC NOISE LEVELS ($L_{dn}$)
AT VARIOUS ELEVATIONS OF
PROPOSED HOTEL/CONDOMINIUM

SECTION DIAGRAM

[Diagram showing various levels and sections of a proposed hotel/condominium, with noise level indications at different elevations.]
V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of minimal noise impacts associated with the proposed project, mitigation measures beyond standard design practices are not required. The project as envisioned is compatible with the existing noise environment.

Risks of complaints from tire squeal noise exist. In order to minimize the risks of complaints resulting from tire squeal noise, high speed cornering (in excess of 10 MPH) should be discouraged by controlling the width and turning radius of the cornering rights-of-way in the circulation paths and/or by the introduction of speed bumps. The use of two-way circulation paths will also contribute towards reducing speeds. Rough textured concrete surfaces (coarse brush finish) or asphaltic concrete can be used throughout the vehicular circulation paths to prevent tire squeal generation at low vehicle speeds. Circular down ramps should be avoided if possible. If these design features are not adequate for control of vehicle speeds, or if excessively noisy vehicles use the garage on a regular basis, administrative controls could also be implemented to minimize the risks of noise complaints from the neighboring dwelling units.
REFERENCES
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Excerpts from EPA's Acoustic Terminology Guide

Descriptor Symbol Usage

The recommended symbols for the commonly used acoustic descriptors based on A-weighting are contained in Table I. As most acoustic criteria and standards used by EPA are derived from the A-weighted sound level, almost all descriptor symbol usage guidance is contained in Table I.

Since acoustic nomenclature includes weighting networks other than "A" and measurements other than pressure, an expansion of Table I was developed (Table II). The group adopted the ANSI descriptor-symbol scheme which is structured into three stages. The first stage indicates that the descriptor is a level (i.e., based upon the logarithm of a ratio), the second stage indicates the type of quantity (power, pressure, or sound exposure), and the third stage indicates the weighting network (A, B, C, D, E, ...). If no weighting network is specified, "A" weighting is understood. Exceptions are the A-weighted sound level and the A-weighted peak sound level which require that the "A" be specified. For convenience in those situations in which an A-weighted descriptor is being compared to that of another weighting, the alternative column in Table II permits the inclusion of the "A". For example, a report on blast noise might wish to contrast the L_{CDN} with the L_{A,Adm}.

Although not included in the tables, it is also recommended that "L_{PN}" and "L_{PN}^e" be used as symbols for perceived noise levels and effective perceived noise level, respectively.

Descriptor Nomenclature

With regard to energy averaging over time, the term "average" should be discouraged in favor of the term "equivalent". Hence, L_{eq} is designated the "equivalent sound level". For L_d, L_{dn}, and L_{eq}, "equivalent" need not be stated since the concept of day, night, or day-night averaging is by definition understood. Therefore, the designations are "day sound level", "night sound level", and "day-night sound level", respectively.

The peak sound level is the logarithmic ratio of peak sound pressure to a reference pressure and not the maximum root mean square pressure. While the latter is the maximum sound pressure level, it is often incorrectly labelled peak. In that sound level meters have "peak" settings, this distinction is most important.

Background ambient should be used in lieu of "background", "ambient", "residual", or "indigenous" to describe the level characteristic of the general background noise due to the contribution of many unidentifiable noise sources near and far.

With regard to units, it is recommended that the unit decibel (abbreviated db) be used without modification. Hence, dBA, PNdB, and ENL are not to be used. Examples of this preferred usage are: the Perceived Noise Level (P_{DN} was found to be 75 dB; P_{DN} = 75 dB.)

This decision was based upon the recommendation of the National Bureau of Standards and the policies of ANSI and the Acoustical Society of America, all of which disallow any modification of bel except for prefixes indicating its multiples or submultiples (e.g., decil).

Noise Impact

In discussing noise impact, it is recommended that "Level Weighted Population" (LWP) replace "Equivalent Noise Impact" (ENI). The term "Relative Change of Impact" (RCI) shall be used for comparing the relative differences in LWP between two alternatives.

Further, when appropriate, "Noise Impact Index" (NII) and "Population Weighted Loss of Hearing" (PHL) shall be used consistent with CHABA Working Group 69 Report Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements (1977).

Table I: A-Weighted Recommended Descriptor List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>L_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Weighted Sound Power Level</td>
<td>L_{WA}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>L_{max}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>L_{Apk}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Exceeded x of the time</td>
<td>L_x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Sound Level</td>
<td>L_{eq}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Sound Level over Time (T)</td>
<td>L_{eq(T)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Sound Level</td>
<td>L_d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_{dn}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_{dn(y)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Exposure Level</td>
<td>L_{eq}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Unless otherwise specified, time is in hours (e.g., the hourly equivalent level is L_{d(1)}). Time may be specified in non-quantitative terms (e.g., could be specified L_{eq(WASH)} to mean the washing cycle noise for a washing machine.)
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TABLE II: Recommended Descriptor List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>A-WEIGHTING</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE(1)</th>
<th>OTHER WEIGHTING (2)</th>
<th>UNWEIGHTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sound (Pressure) Level</td>
<td>L_A</td>
<td>L_pA</td>
<td>L_B, L_pB</td>
<td>L_p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sound Power Level</td>
<td>L_WA</td>
<td>L_MB</td>
<td>L_W</td>
<td>L_W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Max. Sound Level</td>
<td>L_max</td>
<td>L_Amax</td>
<td>L_Bmax, L_pmax</td>
<td>L_pmax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peak Sound (Pressure) Level</td>
<td>L_Apk</td>
<td>L_Bpk</td>
<td>L_pk</td>
<td>L_pk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level Exceeded x% of the time</td>
<td>L_x</td>
<td>L_Ax</td>
<td>L_Bx, L_pX</td>
<td>L_pX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equivalent Sound Level</td>
<td>L_eq</td>
<td>L_Aeq</td>
<td>L_Beq, L_pEq</td>
<td>L_pEq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Equivalent Sound Level Over Time(T)</td>
<td>L_eq(T)</td>
<td>L_Aeq(T)</td>
<td>L_Beq(T), L_pEq(T)</td>
<td>L_pEq(T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Day Sound Level</td>
<td>L_d</td>
<td>L_Ad</td>
<td>L_Bd</td>
<td>L_pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_n</td>
<td>L_An</td>
<td>L_Bn</td>
<td>L pn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_dn</td>
<td>L_Adn</td>
<td>L_Bdn, L_pdn</td>
<td>L_pdn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Yearly Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>L_dn(y)</td>
<td>L_Adn(Y)</td>
<td>L_Bdn(Y), L_pdn(Y)</td>
<td>L_pdn(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sound Exposure Level</td>
<td>L_S</td>
<td>L_SA</td>
<td>L_SB, L_Sp</td>
<td>L_Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Energy Average value over (non-time domain) set of observations</td>
<td>L_eq(e)</td>
<td>L_Aeq(e)</td>
<td>L_Beq(e), L_pEq(e)</td>
<td>L_pEq(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Level exceeded x% of the total set of (non-time domain) observations</td>
<td>L_x(e)</td>
<td>L_Ax(e)</td>
<td>L_Bx(e), L_pX(e)</td>
<td>L_pX(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Average L_x value</td>
<td>L_x</td>
<td>L_Ax</td>
<td>L_Bx</td>
<td>L_pX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate symbols may be used to assure clarity or consistency.
Only B-weighting shown. Applies also to C, D, E, .... weighting.
The term "pressure" is used only for the unweighted level.
Unless otherwise specified, time is in hours (e.g., the hourly equivalent level is L_eq(h)).
Time may be specified in non-quantitative terms (e.g., could be specified as L_eq(WASH) to mean the washing cycle noise for a washing machine).
Ground Level View
Plane Analysis

1. Ground level view towards Project Site taken from Magic Island Beach Park. Project Site located in front of TV antenna tower.

2. Ground level view towards Project Site taken from Keaau Point area.

3. Ground level view towards Project Site taken from Kapiolani Avenue breakwater. Sheraton Waikiki Hotel is dominant feature.


5. Ground level view from Punchbowl towards Project Site. Aia Moana Center and 1441 Kapiolani Boulevard building in center of photo.

6. Ground level view towards Project Site from Sand Island Beach Park. Diamond Head on left corner.

Aerial View Plane Analysis

1. Aerial view towards Ewa and Downtown Honolulu, Kapiolani Avenue and Kakaako Avenue Junction in foreground.
2. Aerial view of Waikiki, with Kapiolani Avenue in foreground, Ala Wai Canal on right, and beach frontage on left.
3. Aerial view from behind Magic Island towards Waikiki, Ala Wai Marina in foreground, Ala Moana Boulevard in left-center, and Koko Head in background.
4. Aerial view of Project Site with Ala Wai Marina in foreground. Magic Island is at bottom of picture.
5. Aerial view towards Project Site from Mauka direction towards Ewa, Kakaako Avenue-Ala Moana Boulevard intersection in middle of picture, Pt. DeFreluzy in left-center, and Magic Island in background.
6. Aerial View from Waikiki-Punchbowl towards Waikiki. Diamond Head at upper left corner and Ala Wai Marina at upper right corner.
Ground Level View
Plane Analysis

1. Ground level view towards Project site taken from Magic Island Beach Park. Project Site directly in front of TV antenna tower.

2. Ground level view towards Project Site taken from Hilo Port area.

3. Ground level view towards Project Site taken from Kapalua Avenue breachwall. Sheraton-Waikiki Hotel is dominant feature.


5. Ground level view from Punchbowl towards Project Site. Ala Moana Center and 1441 Kapiolani Boulevard building in center of photo.

6. Ground level view towards Project Site from Sand Island Beach Park. Diamond Head on left corner.