Mr. Brian Choy, Acting Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
Central Pacific Plaza
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Choy:

Acceptance Notice for the Proposed
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project
Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS)

We are notifying you of our acceptance of the Final EIS for the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, as satisfactory fulfillment of the requirements of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes.

Pursuant to Section 11-200-23 (c), Chapter 200, Title 11 ("Environmental Impact Statement Rules") of the Administrative Rules, this acceptance notice should be published in the July 23, 1991 OEQC Bulletin.

We have attached our Acceptance Report of the Final EIS for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project. Should you have any question, please contact Verne Winquist at 527-6044.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

BENJAMIN B. LEE
Chief Planning Officer

BBL:ft

Attachment

cc: Dept. of Housing & Community Development
A. BACKGROUND

The developer, the City and County of Honolulu's Department of Housing and Community Development, proposes to develop the Smith-Beretania project with the following components:

1. Approximately 36,480 square feet is proposed for a passive public park. The public park will contain landscaping, a tot lot, benches and, possibly, fixed non-moving play apparatus;

2. An underground multi-level parking structure containing approximately 325 parking stalls is proposed for the project site;

3. A child care facility will be constructed near that portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street. The facility will contain approximately 10,000 square feet within the ground floor of a three-story building and exclusively use approximately 3,800 square feet of an adjoining 5,000-square foot open courtyard during its hours of operation. The total facility will be designed for approximately 150 preschoolers, toddlers and, possibly, infants;

4. The three-story building's ground floor will also contain approximately 10,600 square feet of commercial space for limited retail and office space use;

5. Above the child care facility and ground floor commercial/office spaces will be two floors containing approximately 27,000 square feet for City agencies and programs; and

6. A recreation center facility containing approximately 10,000 square feet of floor area will be located on the second floor of the 3-story structure above the child care center.

The project is bounded by Beretania Street, Nuuanu Avenue, Pauahi Street and Smith Street in Honolulu's Chinatown Special District—a portion of the Downtown Central Business District.
B. PROCEDURES

1. An EIS Preparation Notice (EISPN) for the proposed project was filed with the Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) on September 23, 1989. A revised EISPN was filed with OEQC on November 30, 1990. This Notice was published in the December 8, 1990 OEQC Bulletin. This Notice was then mailed to 40 Federal, State and County agencies, private organizations and interested community groups in early December 1990.

2. The 30-day consultation period expired on January 8, 1991. Twenty-four consultation letters were received during this period. The applicant responded to all substantive comments and included appropriate information in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

3. Notice of the Draft EIS was published in the April 8, 1991 OEQC Bulletin. The 45-day public review period expired on May 23, 1991. A total of 28 comment letters were received during this period. All substantive comments were responded to by the applicant, and both comments and responses have been included in this FEIS.


C. EIS CONTENT

The FEIS complies with the content requirements set forth in Section 11-200-18 of the Environmental Impact Statement Rules.

D. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

The applicant responded to significant environmental comments that were raised during consultation and the public review process. These comments and responses are found in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7, FEIS.

E. UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The following issues remain unresolved:

1. Acquisition of the unused properties located at the corner of Pauahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue.

2. Detail plans for design of the building facades in compliance with the Chinatown Special District guidelines.

3. Programs and activities for the proposed second-story Recreation Center are undetermined. Therefore, its impact on traffic, noise and specific community recreation needs remains unresolved.
4. The presence of historic or archaeological resources within the project site.

5. Funds for project construction.

F. DETERMINATION

The Department of General Planning of the City and County of Honolulu has determined this FEIS to be ACCEPTABLE under the procedures established in Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes.

APPROVED BY

BENJAMIN B. LEE
Chief Planning Officer
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Chapter 1. SUMMARY.

1.1 Summary Details:

Developer/Applicant: Department of Housing & Community Development, City and County of Honolulu.

Approving Agency: Department of General Planning, City and County of Honolulu.

Project Designer: KOP Hawaii, Inc.

Tax Map Key: TMK 1-7-04: parcels 1 and 4 (Smith Street between North Beretania and Pauahi Streets).

Project Name: Smith-Beretania Child Care, parking and street-level park, ground floor commercial uses, 2nd and 3rd floor offices and 2nd floor recreation center. (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "Smith-Beretania").

Project Location: Downtown Central Business District.
1.2 Proposed Action:

The developer, the City and County of Honolulu's Department of Housing and Community Development, proposes to develop the Smith-Berestania project with the following components:

1. **Public Park.** Approximately 36,480 square feet is proposed for a public park. Pursuant to the recommendation of the City Department of Parks & Recreation, this is to be a passive park which will accommodate low levels of activity. This recommendation is made because (1) the project site has a limited land area; and (2) a passive park would have less noise impacts on the adjacent apartment complex. The public park will contain landscaping, a tot lot, benches and, possibly, fixed non-moving play apparatus.

2. **Parking Facility.** An underground multi-level parking structure containing approximately 325 parking stalls is proposed for the project site. Some stalls may be reserved solely for use by the project's commercial tenants and City employees occupying other portions of the project site. A private parking service will be contracted to operate the garage. Some of the stalls within the new garage will replace parking stalls within the existing parking lot which are for commercial tenants of the adjoining Smith-Berestania Apartment Building.

3. **Child Care Facility.** A child care facility will be constructed near that portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street. The facility will contain approximately 10,000 square feet within the ground floor of a three-story building and exclusively use approximately
3,800 square feet of an adjoining 5,000 sq. ft. open courtyard during its hours of operation. The total facility will be designed for approximately 150 preschoolers, toddlers and, possibly, infants; the specific proportion of each group is undetermined at this time.

4. **Commercial Space.** The three-story building's ground floor will also contain approximately 10,600 square feet of commercial space for limited retail and office space use.

5. **City Offices.** Above the child care facility and ground floor commercial/office spaces will be two floors containing approximately 27,000 square feet for City agencies and programs, currently scattered in downtown locations; specific City agencies or programs to be relocated within the project have not yet been determined.

6. **Community Recreation Center.** A Recreation Center facility containing approximately 10,000 sq. ft. of floor area will be located on the second floor of the 3-story structure above the child care center. This will be a multi-use floor space which will contain in-door youth facilities (i.e. weight room, game rooms, etc.) for day- and night-time use by youths living in the neighborhood. Regular use of the center for elderly group activities is also expected.

Developing the proposed project requires the temporary removal of approximately 129 public metered and 15 other parking stalls on the project site and the demolition of a deteriorated and unused single-story commercial structure at the corner of Nuuanu Avenue and Pauahi Street.
1.3 Evaluation of Major Impacts:

1.3.1 Construction Impacts.

The project's construction will generate short term impacts from demolition, excavation, and construction. Impacts such as noise, dust, and construction vehicle emissions will be subject to many State and County standards, codes and regulations. Construction vehicles leaving and entering the project site may impact vehicular traffic on North Beretania, Smith and Pauahi Streets and Nuuanu Avenue and may be subject to County street usage restrictions. There will also be a temporary loss of public parking at the site during the relatively short project construction period.

1.3.2 Vehicular Traffic.

Traffic from employees, visitors and users of the various facilities within the project will have a slight impact on traffic conditions in the surrounding area according to the project traffic impact study summarized in this report. The project is expected to increase traffic delays slightly in the study area. Much of the traffic generated by the project is expected to come from users of the child care facility and City employees who presently work and park in the Downtown area. Significant traffic from users of the proposed recreation facility and the renovated Hawaii Theatre is expected but will occur mostly during non-peak traffic hours and, thus, should not
appreciably diminish the current levels of service of the nearby streets and intersection. Therefore, the project is not expected to add any appreciable new peak-hour traffic to the daily volume of traffic within the Downtown area.

The Primary Urban Center Development Plan Public Facilities Map shows a planned widening of Nuuanu Avenue as it passes along the southeasterly corner of the project site which contains the deteriorated and unused commercial structure and real property being acquired for inclusion within the project. Accordingly, project development must comply with a 20-feet street setback requirement along the subject portion of Nuuanu Avenue unless the requirement is deleted or modified or a waiver from such compliance is approved. Project development will comply with all applicable DP Public Facilities Map requirements or the terms and conditions of any approved waiver of such compliance.

1.3.3 Air Quality.

An air quality study for the project prepared in February, 1991 and revised in May, 1991 concluded that the major short-term air quality impact generated by the project will be the potential emission of significant quantities of fugitive dust emissions during project construction. After project construction, the study indicated that potential long-term air pollution impacts from the project will arise from potential increased levels of carbon monoxide emissions along
roadways leading to and from the project and within and venting from the underground parking structure.

The study concluded that existing emission concentrations along sidewalks near the project vicinity may occasionally exceed both State and Federal Air Quality Standards due to congested traffic conditions with maximum concentrations in 1993 potentially ranging from about 10% lower to 10% higher than existing (1991) levels. The study also concludes that, sometime beyond 1991 but before 1994, compliance with both the 1-hour and 8-hour Federal standards may be achieved due to the attrition of older model vehicles although State standards, which are set very low, will likely continue to be exceeded.

The study also concluded that carbon monoxide concentrations within the parking facility will be well within safe levels if a prescribed 1.5 cubic feet per minute of mechanical ventilation per square foot of floor space is provided.

As a mitigation measure, the study recommended strict compliance with State Air Pollution Control Regulations regarding control of construction emissions. It noted that, although carbon monoxide concentrations in the project area may occasionally exceed ambient air quality standards, the estimated air quality impacts from project-related traffic will be minimal.
1.3.4. Noise.

Noise increases attributable to the project are minimal. A noise study prepared for the project found that increases in traffic noise levels resulting from project-generated traffic are not considered to be significant due to low volumes of anticipated project traffic. It also found that the risk of adverse noise impact from the underground parking facility is also expected to be low due to the containment of tire squeal and door slam noise in the below-grade garage.

The study concluded that potential noise impacts from activities in the outdoor playground of the proposed child care center are possible and State Health Department noise limits may be exceeded if monitoring and administrative controls are not employed. It also noted that unavoidable but temporary noise impact will occur during project construction and may temporarily degrade the quality of the audible environment to unacceptable levels. However, the use of quiet equipment and adherence to State Health Department construction noise permit procedures will mitigate such temporary noise impacts.

1.3.5. Archaeological/Historic Resources.

Since the project site is located within the Chinatown Special District as well as the Chinatown Historic District which is listed on
the National Register of Historic Places, its redevelopment must be consistent with all related laws and regulations and receive approval from the State Department of Land and Natural Resources. A study conducted by Bishop Museum noted that subsurface deposits within portions of the site and associated with early house sites and businesses are predicted historical or archaeological resources which may be contained within the site. The presence of such resources must be confirmed by archaeological test pits and subsurface deposit testings and analysis which will take place at the time of removal of the parking lot pavement.

1.3.6. Economic Impacts.

Smith-Beretania is expected to generate both short- and long-term employment opportunities. The project is expected to generate an estimated 183 construction jobs. Long-term jobs will result from ground floor child care and commercial/office uses, and relocated City office activities on the second and third floors of a proposed 3-story structure. An estimated 43 long-term jobs will be established, including 23 new employees in the commercial/office uses, and 20 new employees at the child care center, 105 existing City employees will be relocated from other locations in Downtown Honolulu to the upper floors of the project. It is estimated that permanent jobs will be created for the management, operation and maintenance of the Recreation Center.
1.3.7. Social Impacts.

Smith-Beretania will not add housing units to the area and, therefore, will not impact the Downtown/Chinatown residential population.

The project will increase the amount of passive recreation space in the Chinatown/Downtown area by adding landscaping, open space, visual relief from the prevalent high density surrounding urban environment, and a gathering place for area residents and young children.

The project will have a positive impact on the availability of child care services for downtown employees.

The project will also address some of the recreational needs of residents who live in the neighborhood by providing them with space for indoor social and recreational activities; it will similarly benefit elderly residents and organizations within the neighborhood.

In the long-term, the proposed underground parking facility will increase the number of parking stalls accessible to the Downtown and Chinatown areas; however, a shortage of such parking stalls will be aggravated temporarily during project construction by the removal of 129 metered and 15 other parking stalls within the project site.
The Smith-Beretania project will complement and support the existing character and uses of the immediate locality by being consistent with existing Chinatown revitalization; providing open space; supporting the child care and convenience shopping needs of downtown residents and employees; and, in the long-term, providing additional public parking stalls.

1.3.8. Public Services.

Public facilities and services to the project site are adequate to serve the proposed project.

1.4 Mitigating Measures:

Project-related impacts on noise levels will be mitigated by several means, including the use of coarse driveway finishes to minimize tire squeals; quieting all on-site mechanical equipment to levels which comply with State Health Department noise limits; use of administrative controls and design features to maintain playground noise levels within State DOH noise limits; the use of properly muffled equipment; and the use of State DOH noise permit procedures during project construction.

Adverse air quality impacts will be minimized by strict compliance with State Air Pollution Control Regulations regarding establishment of a regular dust-watering program and covering dirt-hauling trucks to control fugitive dust during project construction.
Although carbon monoxide concentrations in the project area may occasionally exceed ambient air quality standards, estimated air quality impacts from project-generated traffic are minimal. Thus, no mitigation measures are recommended.

Carbon monoxide concentrations within the underground parking facility can be mitigated by providing adequate mechanical ventilation; venting exhaust air from such ventilation system away from pedestrian areas (i.e. from the project rooftops); and monitoring pollution concentrations. Also, the design of the facility's ingress/egress capacity is such that queuing will be avoided and, thus, air pollution impact from traffic within the facility will be further reduced.

When completed in 1993, Smith-Beretania will have only a slight impact on traffic conditions according to the project's traffic impact study. The project will increase traffic delays slightly in the study area. Thus, no major traffic impact mitigation measure is proposed.

Archaeological testing, including deed of transfer and document research, monitoring and analysis of core sample fill material, will be undertaken in coordination with site clearing activities. The project's archaeology/historic resource consultant will monitor the demolition of existing buildings and removal of the asphalt parking lot and conduct stratigraphic backhoe trenching within the project site to determine whether archaeological or historic resources are present. If such resources are found, during testing or construction, work will be temporarily
suspended, the State Historic Preservation Division will be notified, and appropriate survey and mitigation will be conducted.

1.5 Alternatives:

The Department of Housing and Community Development considered the following alternatives to the proposed action: (1) No project; (2) Development of alternative sites; (3) Private development of the project site; and (4) higher density site development and determined that these alternatives do not meet the project's objectives.

1.6 Land Use Considerations:

The project is consistent with State and County land use designations for the project site and policies encouraging the revitalization of Oahu's downtown and Chinatown areas. The project's use will support and be compatible with the surrounding area while stimulating its revitalization. The child care center will address a critical need for such services within the downtown area. The passive park will increase open space and passive recreational opportunities within the area. The proposed Recreation Center will address a strong and persistent interest within the community for facilities available for social and recreational programs and activities for young area residents as evidenced in comments received during the project's Draft EIS public review and comment phase and in the project's Social Impact Assessment study.
1.7 Other Considerations:

No commitment of natural resources will occur with project implementation. Building materials, labor, public property and public funds will be committed to the project.

Unresolved issues at this time include acquisition of the portion of the project site situated at the corner of Nuuanu Avenue and Pauahi Street and the specific details of the project's design.
CHAPTER 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.

2.1 Project Location:

Exhibit "A" shows the location of the Smith-Beretania project. It is bounded by North Beretania, Smith and Pauahi Streets and Nuuanu Avenue and is within the easterly portion of Honolulu's Chinatown Special District and near the Honolulu Central Business District. The 65,200-square feet site, which includes TMK: 1-7-04: Parcel 4 (57,865 square feet) and TMK: 1-7-04: Parcel 1 (7,335 square feet) currently contains 129 metered public parking stalls and 15 stalls reserved for Smith-Beretania Apartment tenants.

The project site abuts the former Empress Theater which is now used as a church; the Smith-Beretania Apartments, a 164-unit apartment building; and three 1-story buildings which contain two restaurants and two art galleries. The ground floor of the Smith-Beretania Apartments contains a U.S. Post Office, convenience store, a hair stylist shop, and a travel service office. Numerous small businesses and retail shops line Smith and Pauahi Streets across from the project.

The project is within the State Urban District and designated for Commercial Use on the Primary Urban Center Development Plan Land Use Map. The zoning designation for the project site is BMX-4, Central Business District, wherein mixed uses are permitted.

Exhibit "B" shows the existing zoning of the project site and surrounding area. The Chinatown Special District regulations impose a 200-foot
Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc., 1991

EXHIBIT "A": Project Location Map
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building height limit on most of the project site except for its makai (southerly) portion along Pauahi Street which is within a 40-foot building height limit set for the Historic Core Precinct of the Chinatown Special District.

Most of the project site is within the Special District's Mauka Precinct, which is intended to provide for a range of household incomes while supporting and contributing to Chinatown’s retail-commercial function – particularly at street level. A major function of the Mauka Precinct is to serve as a transition between Chinatown's Historic Core Precinct and the high density area of the Kukui urban renewal area.

The portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street is in the Historic Core Precinct, the objectives of which include the retention and renovation of historic buildings and the continuation and concentration of the long-established ethnic retail and light manufacturing activities (See. City Ord. No. 89-52.)

2.2 Surrounding Land Uses.

Within the Chinatown District, the dominant business activities are multi-cultural family/entrepreneurial enterprises. These include lei stands, bars, convenience stores, small markets, noodle factories, clothing and tailor stores for walk-in trade. Specialty meat markets, bakeries, and restaurants are located along Maunakea Street serving local, ethnic and
lunch hour business patrons. The restaurant cuisines feature Chinese, Thai, Vietnamese/Lao and Filipino foods.

In the surrounding Chinatown vicinity there is the following diversity of uses: small ethnic restaurants, local style and hostess bars, lei and flower shops, gift shops, ethnic convenience/trading company stores, liquor and beverages stores, video game centers, barber shops, several noodle factories, art galleries, several small privately-managed parking lots and City-initiated residential complexes.

Along Nuuanu Avenue and within the Downtown side of the project site there are a police substation, legal offices, architectural and planning services, medical and dental offices, the Chinatown Gateway project, the Hawaii Theatre Center and several art galleries.

Immediately mauka (northerly) of the project site are the high-density residential uses contained in the Honolulu Tower, Honolulu Park Place, Kukui Plaza, and Beretania North complexes.

The Downtown/Chinatown population grew from 4,666 persons in 1960 to 9,049 people in 1989. During the 1970s, the area grew at an annual rate of 8.3 percent.

Considerable residential and office growth is taking place within the Downtown area near the project site, addressing the existing need for market and affordable housing and the continuing low office vacancy rate.
within Downtown Honolulu. Table 1 provides estimates of potential residential units which are relatively close to the project site.

Table 1
Estimate of Potential Residential Units and Residential Population for the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Residential Units</th>
<th>Potential Residential Pop.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1989 Estimate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>9,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Park Place</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway Plaza (completed 1991)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River/Nimitz Project (completed 1991)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>10,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned and Proposed Projects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Nations Center</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highness Tower</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha Tower Redevelopment</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaahumanu Parking Structure</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Maunakea</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike Maunakea</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Gardens Estates</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>15,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Residential population based on study area 1989 household size of 1.84 persons which excludes people living in group quarters.

2.3 Project Background:

Smith-Beretania was initiated originally in 1981 as part of the then-proposed Honolulu Tower project which called for the development of a park, day care center and parking within the project site. (See. City Council Resolution No. 81-245.) In 1988, City Council Resolution 88-194 proposed the development of (1) a public park of maximum feasible size; (2) a child care facility; (3) a housing development containing about 200 units; (4) approximately 400 parking stalls; and (5) commercial space, as feasible, within the site. However, this Resolution was never adopted by the City Council.

In 1989, the above-noted housing component of the project was dropped in response to community concern. The Council adopted Resolution No. 89-62 which called for a (1) public park of maximum feasible size; (2) a child care facility; and (3) a public parking facility. As currently proposed, Smith-Beretania exceeds the scope of Council Resolution No. 89-62 with respect to the proposed limited commercial and office space uses within the site. However, the project is not inconsistent with the expressed scope and objectives of Resolution No. 89-62.

The acquisition of the parcel of land at the corner of Pauahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue enables the development of the same amount of park area contemplated under the above-cited Resolutions as well as enables the construction of the proposed 3-story complex containing ground floor commercial space, second- and third-floor City office spaces, a Recreation Center space on the second-floor and portions of the child care facility
within the proposed project. It is noted that the Resolutions never contemplated the addition of the Pauahi Street-Nuuanu Avenue parcel as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the development of the proposed 3-story complex on the parcel would not be inconsistent with the Resolution.

2.4. Citizen Participation:

Since 1988 there has been considerable citizen input and dialogue on the project in the form of meetings between Department of Housing and Community Development staff and the Downtown Neighborhood Board members and subcommittees; Chinatown Merchants Association; Downtown Improvement Association; Historic Hawaii Foundation; United Chinese Society and other interested community groups and individuals; public input on Council Resolution Nos. 88-94 and 89-62 during Council Committee meetings and hearings; dissemination of project information through this environmental impact statement preparation process and correspondences and meetings with interested individuals and groups. Such participation is expected to continue and flourish as the project moves through the EIS process, the Chinatown Special District permit process, and the City budgeting process.

Additional meetings with interested community groups and organizations are anticipated as the project proceeds.
2.5 Statement of Objectives and Need for Proposed Action:

DEVELOPMENT OF A PARK, CHILD CARE FACILITY, RECREATION CENTER AND PUBLIC PARKING FACILITY WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE.

Redevelopment of the project site has been a City objective since 1981 as expressed in Council Resolution No. 81-245 which expressly stated, with respect to the project site, that "the City desires to establish a park, day care center, and parking in the area. . . ." This expressed intent was reiterated in the most recent Council Resolution No. 89-62 which states in pertinent part:

'BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu that the Director of Housing and Community Development is authorized to expend not more than $75,000 on a feasibility study for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot with the study to follow these general guidelines:

(1) The project shall include the following:

(A) A public park of maximum feasible size.

(B) A child care facility.

(C) A public parking facility.

. . . .' (Emphasis added.)

The open-ended language used in Resolution 89-62 indicates that, while a public park, child care facility and public parking facility are expressed uses to be developed within the project site, they are not exclusive uses
permissible within the site. Therefore, the acquisition and development of the parcel at the corner of Pauahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue as proposed within the project are consistent with Resolution 89-62.

Although they are not expressly identified in Resolution 89-62, the proposed limited ground floor commercial uses and second and third floor City office spaces and Recreation Center are not inconsistent with the directives stated in the Resolution.

CONTINUE THE CITY'S REVITALIZATION EFFORTS IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT OF HONOLULU.

The City has completed major improvements in the vicinity of the project site in recent years, including the Hotel Street Transit Mall, the Chinatown Gateway Plaza, the River/Nimitz project, the Hale Pauahi parking structure and 396-unit rental project, Pauahi Kupuna Elderly Housing project and Pauahi Recreation Center. Pending and ongoing City projects include the redevelopment of the Kaahumanu, Maunakea Smith, Kekaulike, and Block J parking lots as well as the subject Smith-Beretania project.
2.6 General Description of the Action's Technical Aspects & Elements

2.6.1 Design Characteristics.

As illustrated in Exhibits "C" through "H", the project will contain the following components:

a. Public Parking Facility: (Exhibits "C" and "D")

Approximately 325 parking stalls will be constructed within the underground public parking facility and will replace 129 metered and 15 tenant parking spaces within the existing Smith-Beretania Parking Lot. Some stalls will be dedicated for use by tenants within the adjoining Smith-Beretania Apartments and by City employees relocated into the project. The remaining stalls will be available for use by the general public.

The parking structure's entrance/exit will be located on North Beretania Street. The parking structure's ingress and egress is designed to minimize conflicting movements between exiting and entering vehicles and to minimize queuing onto North Beretania Street of vehicles seeking to enter the facility.
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b. Limited Ground Floor Retail/Office Uses: (Exhibit "F")

Approximately 10,600 sq. ft. of ground floor space within a proposed 3-story structure fronting Pauahi Street are allocated for small scale commercial/business uses (i.e. convenience shops and minor business services). Specific tenants for this space cannot be identified in this early conceptual stage of the project. The ground-level location of these uses conforms to the prevailing character of existing retail and office uses throughout Chinatown. Exhibit "F" shows the location of the proposed ground floor limited retail uses.

c. Second Floor Recreation Center; Second & Third Floor City Offices: (Exhibit "G")

Approximately 27,000 sq. ft. of second- and third-floor space within the proposed 3-story structure will be devoted to City offices to consolidate City field offices or programs relocated from existing locations throughout downtown. The exact City programs and activities to be relocated into the project have not yet been determined. Exhibit "G" shows the location of the proposed City offices within the project site.

Exhibit "G" shows the location and some details of the proposed, 10,000 sq. ft. Recreation Center space within the second floor of the proposed 3-story building. A separate access to this space will be provided to avoid physical access to
the child care center space on the part of users of the Recreation Center facilities. The interior of the space will be designed to be adjustable and capable of accommodating day- and night-time in-door youth social and recreational programs and activities (i.e. weight room, meeting rooms, portable facilities, etc.) as well as regular daytime social events and activities of local elderly citizens and organizations.

d. Child Care Facility: (*Exhibit "E"*)

The proposed child care facility will be located within the ground floor of the 3-story structure; however, its design and child care activities will be oriented towards an adjoining open courtyard and public park rather than Pauahi Street. Internal barriers will avoid exposure of the facility and child care activities to vehicular and pedestrian activities occurring along Pauahi Street. A dash line on *Exhibit "E"* separates the proposed Courtyard area next to the Child Care Center and the rest of the proposed park and indicates that the Courtyard area will be used exclusively by the Child Care Center during operation.

The facility will occupy about 10,000 square feet of ground floor space and approximately 3,700 - 5,000 square feet of park area for its exclusive use during hours of operation as shown in *Exhibit "E"* by the hatched line separating the courtyard from the park. It will handle about 150 preschoolers,
toddlers and infants; the specific ratio of each category is undetermined at this time. The facility will be designed and constructed to meet the applicable licensing standards of the State Department of Human Services for group day care centers. Exhibit "E" shows the location of the propose child care facility.

e. Public Park: (Exhibit "E")

Approximately 36,420 square feet of ground level space within the project site will be developed into a passive recreational park. The park will be used frequently for child care activities.

The City Department of Parks and Recreation recommends development of the passive park, rather than an active park (i.e. a park containing play courts or ball fields), within the project because of the limited area and potential bothersome noise impact of recreational activities within an active park on the adjacent 164-unit apartment complex. The proposed park will contain a tot lot and some customary play apparatus normally contained within child care facilities. Exhibit "E" shows the location of the proposed passive park.
2.6.2 Economic Characteristics:

According to the *Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Social Impact Assessment*, prepared in February, 1991, and revised in May, 1991 by Earthplan and contained in Appendix I to this Report, the project will generate an estimated 183 short-term, construction and related jobs and about 148 long-term job broken down as follows:

23 employees in ground floor retail/office uses (based on commercial floor area absorption rates estimated by the City and County Department of General Planning, 1980).

105 City employees relocated from other downtown offices in the upper 2 levels of the 3-story structure (based on commercial floor area absorption rates estimated by the City Department of General Planning, 1980).

20 employees at the child care facility, including a director, two lead teachers, four teachers, six full-time aides, four part time aides, and clerical and maintenance personnel.

2.7 Commitment of City Resources, Funding and Phasing.

Funding for the project will come from several sources, including development premiums received from developers of the Honolulu Park Place project, together with City general obligation bond funds. Funding for the
project is contained in the Executive Capital Budget Ordinance for Fiscal Year 1990-91 and 1991-92. The total project cost is estimated to be around $24 million.

The project will be constructed in one phase anticipated to begin upon receipt of project construction funds and all required permits. With the required funding and permits, the project can be constructed in approximately 18 months.
CHAPTER 3. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROBABLE IMPACTS.

3.1 Geographic Characteristics:

3.1.1 Topography.

The project site is generally level and is approximately two feet higher than the ground elevation at North Beretania Street. The site slopes gradually downward and in a mauka direction from Pauahi Street towards North Beretania Street.

The surrounding area is intensively developed. There are no unique or unusual topographic features within or near the site. Minimal impact is expected from excavation of the site for a two-level underground parking structure.

3.1.2 Soils.

The soils within the project site and surrounding area are classified as Ewa silty clay loam (EmA), 0 to 2% slopes, moderately shallow. This soil has a profile like that of Ewa silty clay loam, 3 to 6% slopes, except that the depth to coral limestone is 20 to 50 inches. Runoff is very slow and the erosion hazard is slight. Minimal impact on the site's soil is anticipated as the soil has long been covered by buildings and pavement.
3.1.3 Flora and Fauna.

The site currently contains six large monkeypod trees along Smith and North Beretania Streets which will be removed and replanted at other public park areas. The site also contains paperbark trees which will be removed during project construction. These trees will be replaced at the project site with shade trees which, upon maturity, will give the type of expansive shading currently provided by the existing monkeypod trees.

Because most of the site has been occupied by buildings or covered by pavement for many years, no plants exist on such occupied areas.

Aside from birds, stray cats and mice typically found in inner city environments and likely also to reside within the project site, the site is otherwise devoid of most fauna species.

In responding to the project's Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN), the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service did not indicate the presence of any significant fish or wildlife resources within the project site.

The introduction of plant life into the project area through the development of the passive park facility and other landscaped areas within the project is expected to attract birdlife to the site.
3.1.4. Hydrological Characteristics:

In responding to the project's EISPN, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Planning Division, confirmed that the site is situated in the Flood Zone "X" as indicated in the official Flood Insurance Rate Map. Such areas are determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain. The site is not in a designated tsunami zone.

The Corps of Engineers also confirms that, since the project does not include work in waters of the United States or adjacent wetlands, no Department of the Army permit is required.

The project will be designed and engineered to include drainage features such as emergency sump pumps as necessary to insure that flooding within the project site will not occur.

3.1.5 Traffic Conditions.

The information summarized in this section is taken from Traffic Impact Assessment Report, Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment, June, 1991, prepared by Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc. for this EIS which is attached as Appendix II.
To determine the relative impact of the proposed project on local roadways, the traffic study analyzed five intersections along North Beretania and King Streets:

- Beretania Street and Smith Street.
- Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue.
- Beretania Street and the project ingress/egress way.
- King Street and Smith Street.
- King Street and Nuuanu Avenue.

Traffic was forecasted at these intersections by adding traffic expected to be generated from other proposed downtown projects, including those shown in Exhibit "I". The study assessed the impact on each intersection by determining the level of service (LOS) for three conditions: (1) existing conditions; (2) 1993 forecast without the project; and (3) 1993 forecast with the project traffic.

a. Existing Traffic Conditions:

The project site is served by a grid roadway system comprised of one-way streets as shown in Exhibit "J". Traffic signals at the study intersections are synchronized.

A review of 1989 State Department of Transportation (DOT) traffic count data indicated that the weekday commuter peak
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hours along Beretania Street near the project site occur between 7:00 to 8:00 am and 3:45 to 4:45 pm. These peak hours were used to determine traffic impacts of the project. 

Exhibits "K" and "L" show the present volume of traffic at the study intersections for the observed peak hours.

Observed traffic conditions during the study yielded the following findings:

**King Street:**

During the morning peak hours, King Street operated at congested traffic levels even though traffic flow was constant and there were no observed breakdowns in that flow. Field measurements at the study intersections indicated from 3 to 9 second stop-delay per vehicle.

During the afternoon peak hour, King Street was operating with the middle two lanes congested, the outer two lanes less congested. Measurements indicated about a 3 seconds delay per vehicle.

**North Beretania Street:**

During the morning peak hour, N. Beretania Street with the synchronized signal system operated with minimal delays to vehicles. During the afternoon peak hour, it was congested due to the downstream traffic conditions. Due to traffic seeking to reach Vineyard Boulevard the H-1 Freeway via Nuuau Avenue, vehicle queuing occurred along Nuuau Avenue, Maunakea Street and in the right turn lanes of N. Beretania Street.
Existing Morning Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit K

Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc., 1991
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Existing Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Exhibit L

Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc., 1991
b. Projected Traffic Conditions/Impacts:

Table 2 shows the increase in traffic volumes by movements at the various study intersections generated with and without the project. The differences in projected peak hour traffic volumes at the various intersections under study with and without Smith-Beretania are insignificant as shown in the last two columns of Table 2.

Table 3 shows the results of an analysis of the possible changes in LOS within North Beretania and King Street and the various intersections under study. Again, no significant deterioration in LOS within these roadways and intersections are expected to occur with as well as without the project.

Because Smith-Beretania, when completed in 1993, will have only a slight (and insignificant) impact on traffic conditions by slightly increasing delays in traffic within the surrounding area, no mitigation measures are proposed with respect to traffic conditions.
## Table 2
Project Generated Traffic at Study Intersections
1993 Forecast Peak Hour Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>1993 Without Project</th>
<th>1993 With Project</th>
<th>1993 Incremental Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North King Street with Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound TH</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>2285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound RT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound RT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound LT</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound TH</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North King Street with Bethel Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound LT</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound TH</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound TH</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound RT</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street with Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound LT</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound RT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound LT</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound TH</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound RT</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound TH</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound RT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street with Nuuanu Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound LT</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound TH</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound RT</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound TH</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound RT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc. 1991
### Table 3
**Arterial Analysis of King Street and Beretania Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1993 Without Project</th>
<th>1993 With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KING STREET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Between Maunakea &amp; Bethel Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound (to Honolulu)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERETANIA STREET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Between Maunakea &amp; Bethel Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound (to Ewa)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc. 1991
### Table 4: Operational Analysis for Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KING &amp; MAUNAKEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KING &amp; BETHEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound (Bethel)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERETANIA &amp; MAUNAKEA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERETANIA &amp; SMITH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound (Smith)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERETANIA &amp; NUANU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Nuuanu)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc. 1991
In response to comments from the City Department of Transportation Services and Downtown Neighborhood Board, the project's traffic study consultants reviewed the location of the proposed parking facility entrance/exit on Beretania Street and concluded:

With the project, the LOS (level of service) for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as the without project case. The LOS at study intersections will remain the same except for some minor street approaches which will drop from LOS C to LOS D. Vehicles exiting the project access onto Beretania Street will operate with little delays, LOS B, during the morning peak hour. During the afternoon, drivers exiting the project will experience very long delays, LOS E, especially if they attempt to get to Beretania Street's mauka (right) lane to turn right into Maunakea Street. The long delays are expected to occur only during the afternoon peak period. Due to the delays and weaving action caused by drivers attempting to (get) across Beretania Street to get to Maunakea Street, we recommend that left turns exiting the project be restricted from crossing Beretania Street to turn right into Maunakea Street, during the weekday afternoon peak period, using appropriate signage and/or striping.

The traffic assessment also noted that traffic delays arising from the proposed entrance/exit location would be experienced within the facility rather than on Beretania Street and that, as a result of the proposed entrance/exit location, "it is possible that the peak periods along Beretania Street and King Street will lengthen slightly as the LOS at the study intersections declines within increases in traffic ...."
The proposed location of the parking facility's entrance/exit on Beretania Street will also positively benefit traffic flows on other streets surrounding the project site (i.e. Pauahi and Smith Streets, Nuuanu Avenue, King and Maunakea Streets) by avoiding increases in their traffic loads which would result from locating the entrance/exit driveway on Nuuanu Avenue or Pauahi or Smith Streets.

Estimates of the potential traffic volumes that will be generated by the renovated Hawaii Theatre Center are not available. It is anticipated, however, that many Theatre patrons will use the project's parking facility and the heaviest usage therefrom would occur mostly during non-peak hours (i.e. weekends and evenings) when most Theatre events are expected to occur. Therefore, such non-peak hour traffic is not expected to significantly affect peak hour traffic flows within the nearby streets and intersections and Theater patrons are not expected to compete with daily customers of Chinatown businesses, downtown employees and visitors to the project for parking stalls within its parking facility. It is noted that the parking facility was initiated in large part to meet the existing and future customer or patron parking needs of Chinatown businesses, galleries, restaurants and theaters, including those of the Hawaii Theatre Center.
3.1.6. Air Quality:


a. Existing Air Quality Conditions:

Present air quality in the project area is mostly affected by air pollutants from vehicular, industrial and/or natural sources. North Beretania Street, adjacent to the project site, is a major arterial which carries substantial traffic volumes. Emissions from vehicles traversing North Beretania Street tend to be carried over and across the project site by the prevailing trade winds.

Several blocks to the southwest is the Honolulu Power Plant operated by the Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO). Emissions from the two chimneys associated with this facility may presently affect the air quality of the area including the project site occasionally; however, HECO plans to close the plant sometime between 1994 and 1995.

Natural sources of air pollution that may affect the air quality at the site include the ocean, plants, wind-blown dust and distant volcanoes.
The State Health Department operates a network of air quality monitoring stations around Oahu. Based on data from these stations, it appears likely that both State and Federal ambient air quality standards are being met at the project site except possibly for occasional exceedences of the more stringent State regulations pertaining to ambient ozone and carbon monoxide concentrations.

b. Project Air Quality Conditions/Impacts:

During project construction, noises from construction equipment and activities are anticipated but will be mitigated by customary construction noise mitigation actions.

If Smith-Beretania is constructed, some short- and long-term air quality impacts may occur. Short-term impacts from fugitive dust will occur during project construction. To a lesser extent, exhaust emissions from stationary and mobile construction equipment, from the disruption of traffic and from workers' vehicles may also affect air quality during project construction.

After project construction, long-term air quality impacts could potentially occur as a result of emissions from vehicular traffic visiting and leaving the project. To assess the potential impacts from such mobile emission sources, an air quality modeling study was undertaken to estimate current ambient
concentrations of carbon monoxide along roadways leading to/from the project site and to predict future air pollution levels both with and without the project.

Based on the modeling results, present carbon monoxide concentrations were estimated to be well within the national 1-hour ambient air quality standard but may occasionally exceed the 8-hour national limit as well as the more stringent 1-hour and 8-hour State standards during coincident adverse traffic and meteorological conditions. Because the State standards are stringent, it is likely that they are exceeded at many locations throughout the State that have even moderate traffic volumes.

In 1993, without the project, carbon monoxide concentrations were predicted to remain about the same or decrease slightly at most locations near the project site even though traffic is expected to increase. This is due to the effects of newer motor vehicles equipped with more efficient emission control devices. Worst-case concentration levels will continue to occasionally exceed the State standards and also the national 8-hour standard in small "hot spot" areas near congested intersections. The national 1-hour standard will continue to be met.

In 1993, with the project, maximum concentrations will likely be only a few percent higher than compared to the without-project case and vary from about 10 percent lower to about
10 percent higher (depending on location) compared to existing conditions. This assumes, per the project traffic impact assessment report, that no roadway improvements within the surrounding area will be undertaken.

After 1993, motor vehicle emissions will continue to decrease year by year on an average per vehicle basis due to older vehicles leaving the City's roadways. If the continued decrease in motor vehicle emissions exceeds the increase in traffic, air pollution levels could potentially improve in the future.

Carbon monoxide emissions from motor vehicles operating within the proposed parking facility could potentially accumulate within the structure. Areas adjacent to vents and doorways could also potentially be contaminated by these emissions.

c. Air Quality Impact Mitigation Measures:

To mitigate the effects of fugitive dust and equipment emissions arising from project construction, there will be compliance with applicable State Health Department regulations, including compliance with the State regulation that there be no visible fugitive dust emissions at the project site's property line. Other related mitigation measures include watering of active work areas, use of wind screens, preventing trucks from tracking dirt onto paved roads, covering open-bodied trucks,
paving and landscaping early in the construction schedule, and moving construction equipment and workers to and from the project site during off-peak traffic hours whenever practicable.

Due to the projected minimal air quality impacts from project generated traffic, no mitigation measures are proposed with respect to mitigating vehicle emissions.

Carbon monoxide within the underground parking areas will be controlled by mechanical ventilation equipment. Calculations indicate that the 1.5 cubic feet/minute of mechanical ventilation per square foot of floor space required by State design guidelines for enclosed parking garages will be more than adequate to sufficiently dilute motor vehicle emissions within the underground parking facility.

3.1.7. Noise Quality:

The information in this section is contained in *Noise Study For The Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment*, January, 1991 prepared by Y. Ebisu & Associates and attached hereto as Appendix IV.
a. Existing Acoustic Environment:

The existing acoustic environment is dominated by Downtown traffic noise along North Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. The existing traffic noise levels along the rights-of-way of North Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue are high, and in the "Significant Exposure, Normally Unacceptable" category at approximately 70 to 75 Ldn along the rights-of-way. Along Smith and Pauahi Streets, traffic noise levels are lower at 60 to 65 Ldn and in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category along the rights-of-way. Because the project is shielded from Nuuanu Avenue by the Smith-Beretania Apartment complex, traffic noise from Nuuanu Avenue is not greater than 65 Ldn and is in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category.

On the proposed park area portion of the redevelopment project, traffic noise levels decrease to the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category at approximately 120 feet or greater setback distances from North Beretania Street. Because the proposed child care facility is located along Pauahi Street and on the quieter side of the project site, it is considered to be optimally sited with respect to avoiding potential adverse impacts from traffic noise.
b. Future Acoustic Environment/Project Impacts:

During project construction, temporary construction noise will be generated and corresponding mitigation measures undertaken. The future traffic noise levels are not expected to change significantly as a result of the dominant noise sources in the project area. Increases in traffic noise associated with project generated traffic are predicted to be less than 0.5 Ldn, which is considered to be very low and difficult to measure.

Noise from mechanical equipment, an underground parking garage, and a playground are potential new contributors to the future acoustic environment. Because State Health Department noise regulations will limit future noise sources to levels at or below existing and future traffic noise levels, the future noise environment should not be significantly altered by these new sources. The future noise levels in the project environs after project completion in 1993 should remain in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category at receptor locations removed from North Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue.

c. Mitigation Measures:

Recommended noise mitigation measures include the use of coarse driveway finishes in the parking garage to minimize tire squeal noise; quieting of all on-site mechanical equipment
to levels which comply with State Health Department noise limits; use of administrative controls and design features to maintain playground noise levels within State Health Department noise limits; and the use of properly muffled equipment and the use of State Health Department noise permit procedures during project construction. These mitigation measures will be implemented.

3.1.8. Public Utilities and Services:

1. Water:

   In its response to the project's EISP and DEIS, the Board of Water Supply noted:

   - The City will be required to install a new 12-inch water main on Smith Street between Bernetania and Pauahi Streets to accommodate the proposed project.

   - Two water meters serve the site; one from Pauahi Street and one from Smith Street. The meter from Pauahi Street has been ordered off for two years. This meter should be ordered on before March 29, 1993, to receive applicable credits for the water system facilities charge (WSFC).
The availability of water will be determined when the building permit is submitted for the Board's review and approval.

If water is made available, the project will also be assessed the WSFC with credit given for all qualifying water services.

The construction drawings for the installation of 3-inch or larger water meters and for any off-site water main improvements should be submitted for the Board's review and approval.

An approved reduced pressure backflow prevention device should be installed immediately after each domestic water meter and after any meter for a fire system using chemicals.

The various applicable requirements indicated by the Board of Water Supply will be met during the process of project planning, design and construction as applicable.

Estimates of the project's impact on potable water use are provided below based on the Daily Consumption Guideline, Average Daily Demand, Water System Standards, Vol. I, 1985. The applicable guideline and resulting water use estimates are as follows on the next page:
Table 5
ESTIMATED DAILY PROJECT WATER USE DEMAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Project Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office*</td>
<td>120 gals./1,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>37,600 sq.ft.</td>
<td>4,512 gals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center</td>
<td>4,000 gals./ac.</td>
<td>10,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>920 gals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>4,000 gals./ac.</td>
<td>36,480 sq.ft.</td>
<td>3,360 gals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>60 gals./child</td>
<td>150 children</td>
<td>9,000 gals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Daily Water Use Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,792 gals.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Combines Commercial and City Office Space Floor Areas.

2. Sewer System:

In its response to the EISPN, the City Public Works Department indicated that it had no objection to the project; that a sewer connection to service the project should be made to an existing 8-inch sewer main within Smith Street; and that, in conformance with City Ordinance No. 2412, street improvements along Nuuanu Avenue should be constructed. All these requirements of the DPW shall be met during the process of project planning, design and construction as applicable. It is noted that the aforementioned 8-inch sewer main and the Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant have adequate capacity to accommodate the wastewater generated from the project. The Department had no additional comments on the DEIS.
3. Site Drainage:

The existing site is drained by the municipal system which directs runoff to catch basins along North Beretania Street. The drainage system improvements required for the project consist of directing runoff from the roof of the proposed 3-story building and public park to existing catch basins via surface and subsurface conduits. Installation of all drainage improvements for the project will be coordinated with the City Public Works Department and will comply with its applicable drainage standards and requirements.

4. Streets, Sidewalks, Curbs and Driveway Construction:

The Department of Public Works has determined that, in conformance with Ordinance No. 2412, street improvements along Nuuanu Avenue should be constructed. It is expected that all applicable requirements of the Ordinance will be met by the project.

In commenting on the project's Draft EIS, the Department of Transportation Services (DTS) suggested that vehicular access to the project should be limited to Smith and Pauahi Streets. In reviewing this suggestion, the project's traffic consultants stated noted that vehicles exiting the project onto Beretania Street will operate with little delay (LOS B) during morning peak hours and very long delays (LOS E) during
afternoon peak hours and that, with the project, the level of service (LOS) for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as it would without the project. The response to the DTS comments noted that placement of the project's parking facility exit/entrance on Beretania Street will not significantly affect existing traffic flows on Beretania Street, but would affect the flow of traffic within the facility as noted above. Placement of the exit/entrance driveway on Smith or Pauahi Street could begin to affect traffic flows within the nearby, one-way Downtown streets which are relatively narrow whereas this impact will be avoided by placing the exit/entrance on Beretania Street, a major arterial roadway.

5. Other Utilities:

Gas, electric and telephone lines can be made readily available at the project site. Project engineers will coordinate hook up with the respective utility companies. No electrical transmission lines are planned in the project area.

Commercial refuse generated from activities within the site will be collected by a private contractor.
3.1.9. Service Facilities:

1. Fire Protection Service:

The project can be served by existing fire protection services and is not expected to negatively impact such services. The site would be served by the Central Fire Station, an engine company located 1-1/2 blocks away on Beretania Street and capable of immediate response to any fire within the site. In addition, the Kakaako and Kuakini Fire Stations, both of which are engine and ladder companies, respond to an initial fire alarm in the Downtown area. Backup can be provided by the Kalihi Kai and other fire stations within the perimeter of the downtown area. The Fire Department had no comment on the project's EISPN or DEIS.

2. Police Protection Service:

In its response to the project's EISPN, the Police Chief stated that "the proposed development should not have a significant impact on (its) facilities or services in the area." The Police Department had no comment on the DEIS.

The project area and immediate surrounding neighborhood are in Beats 40 through 48 of District 1 of the Honolulu Police Department. The project site is in Beat 41.
The nearest police facility is the Downtown Substation located at the corner of Nuuanu Avenue and Hotel Street and one block away from the site. At any given time, a total of six to eight officers patrol the study area in Cushman vehicles, automobiles and on foot.

The study area has no special or distinct crime problems, nor does it have any recent trends in these areas.

3. Hospital and Medical Care:

   The project site will have adequate access to medical services from the following nearby facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Approx. Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queens Hospital</td>
<td>Punchbowl Street</td>
<td>0.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straub Clinic</td>
<td>King and Ward</td>
<td>0.9 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuakini Hospital</td>
<td>Kuakini Street</td>
<td>1.0 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Hospital</td>
<td>Puunui</td>
<td>1.5 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Fire Station</td>
<td>N. Beretania Street</td>
<td>0.1 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu</td>
<td>Pawaa</td>
<td>2.0 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the existing roadway system, each of these medical facilities or medical support facilities (i.e. ambulance station) is
only 3 to 10 minutes away from the site. They provide a full range of services, including 24-hour emergency service in some instances.

The City has ten ambulance units and three contractual ambulance units in close service proximity to the project site.

4. Parks & Recreational Facilities:

In responding to the DEIS, the Department of Parks and Recreation stated:

We have determined that the EIS for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot project is acceptable. The public park to be developed on the parking lot site and its impact on the Downtown/Chinatown district have been adequately addressed.

Existing parks in the Chinatown/Downtown area include Kamalii Park (0.68-acre, benches and walkways); Queen Emma Square (0.56-acre, no facilities or structures); and Kamamalu Playground (5.3 acres, ball courts and field, play equipment). In addition, the Pauahi Community Service Facility, a two-story, 6,000 sq. ft. multipurpose recreation building, is used primarily by senior citizens. The area also contains a number of urban or mini parks, including Fort Street Mall Mini Park, the Wilcox Park, and the Chinatown Gateway Park.
Just Ewa (west) of the project site are parks within the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board area including Aala Park and the Beretania Community Park.

The overall park system within the Chinatown/Downtown area has not kept pace with the needs of the existing and near future population of the area.

The proposed park within Smith-Beretania will improve the Chinatown/Downtown park situation by adding another recreational resource to the area. Similar to existing Downtown urban or mini parks, the project park will (1) add attractive open space, (2) provide visual and psychological relief from the prevalent high-density urban environment, and (3) provide a passive gathering area for the resident population and, a play area for young children.

The project park is limited in terms of area (36,420 square feet area). Alone, the proposed park clearly cannot address the existing and projected Chinatown/Downtown recreational needs, even if the entire project site were used only for park purposes.

Limited available land continues to be a major constraint against increasing park space in the Downtown/Chinatown area. Therefore, a long-range recreational planning effort for the area should consider high-density indoor recreational
facilities such as a gymnasium, indoor interchangeable courts and community meeting rooms. The limited area of the Smith-Beretania site precludes it from being a feasible location for active recreational facilities and activities which require much greater land areas. Accordingly, the proposed Recreation Center is included within the project to assist in addressing the need for recreational facilities within the community.

The proposed park will contribute, however, to the recreational park needs of the surrounding community by providing additional park space for passive recreational activities for residents and workers in the Chinatown/Downtown area. In this respect, the project will have a beneficial impact on existing and projected recreational conditions within the area. As such, no mitigation measures are proposed with respect to the project's parks and recreation impacts.

3.1.10. Historic and Cultural Resources:

The project site is located within the Chinatown Historic District which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, redevelopment of the project site must be consistent with the historic character and architectural theme of the surrounding area. Such consistency must be achieved by project compliance with the procedures and regulations of these Districts.
governing the design, ambience, scale, uses, maintenance and other details of land uses therein. The State Department of Land and Natural Resources determines whether a project development is consistent with Chinatown Historic District requirements.

The Public Archaeology Section, Applied Research Group, Bishop Museum, conducted a survey entitled *Historical Literature and Documents Search Archaeological Testing and Subsequent Procedures for the Proposed Redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot, Downtown Honolulu, Oahu Island, May, 1990*, which is contained in attached Appendix V. The information in this section reflects portions of that survey.

The survey cites two previous and pertinent archaeological excavations in the areas immediately south of the project site which were undertaken in 1984 and 1988. The 1984 investigation at a parking lot at the Nuuanu Avenue and Hotel and Bethel Streets intersection, conducted by Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii, reported 8 to 10 feet of fill at that site which was determined to be imported backfill and excavations were not continued.

The 1988 excavation at the northeast corner of Hotel and Bethel Streets conducted by Bishop Museum documented a fill of historic materials underlain by volcanic ash with a coral substrate.

Prehistoric features and/or materials were not noted from either investigation. The survey reports that reconstruction of buildings
along Beretania Street in 1869 occurred, including the reconstruction of five structures reported located within the project site which could have been a mixture of residences and early Chinese businesses. Other historical information contained in the survey identifies other similar structures which occupied parts of the project site along Nuuanu Avenue, Smith and Pauahi Streets.

Historical Fire Insurance Maps which were obtained and reviewed as part of the survey for the project included Exhibit "M", a 1914-1927 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map identifying then-existing uses of the project site and Exhibit "N", a 1927-1951 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of the project site, also shows the more recent historical uses of the site.

The history of the park, with respect to its park use is illustrated in Exhibits "M" and "N" and described in the survey in its discussion regarding "Block 10":

**Block 10 Interior**

The southern part of the interior of the Smith-Beretania block was settled as housesites in the 1820s. Between 1869 and 1900 the area within the project boundaries became the largest and most densely populated of the Chinatown district (citation omitted). In 1897 this specific area is mapped as having over twenty buildings and sheds which are noted as 'Native and Chinese Shanties'. 'More quarters were being constructed for inhabitants when Block 10 was burned' on January 12, 1900...

The major portion of Block 10 was developed into a playground area in 1911 and uses until relocated for the Smith-Beretania parking lot in 1952.
Subsurface deposits associated with early housesites, businesses, and Chinese residences are predicted historical archaeological resources contained within the project site. Potential historical remains are features and foundations of early buildings and sheds, remnants of coral walls, and filled privies.

Layered privy deposits provide dating time frames in which accidental loss and deliberate disposal of artifacts are confined within a small area. These layered resources indicate the activities, economic and health of a community. Associated with building foundation and feature remnants, documentation of the overall early settlement, and the growth and development of this section of the Chinese community exists.

Impacts of the demolition of the block by fire in 1900 and subsequent leveling indicate major mixing and charring of upper subsurface deposits. Possible prehistoric activities, such as agriculture, early in-situ historical structural remains, and intact privies are resources likely to be encountered during redevelopment.
Because of the diversity and density of land uses and known historical sites within the project area, three areas of archaeological testing will be undertaken in conjunction with project development:

- Deed of Transfer and document research to locate exact locations and perimeters of early housesites and structures.
- Monitoring and analysis of core sample fill material (to coral substrate) to determine depths of fill deposits, historical contents, and identification of features.
- Two archaeological test pits beneath the building currently at the corner of Pauahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue prior to structure removal, or after removal of floor boards and subflooring.

Archaeological monitoring will be conducted during surface clearing activities, including the removal of the parking lot. Subsequent archaeological excavations will be conducted as needed to determine the presence or absence of significant subsurface deposits. Below grade construction may commence if no subsurface sites are found. If significant subsurface deposits are present, further archaeological excavations and analysis may be needed to reach a "no effect" determination. Below grade construction will not commence until the termination of such excavation.

In addition, if any items of apparent historic or archaeological interest are uncovered during construction, the project contractor
will be directed to stop work immediately and the State Historic Preservation Officer will be notified for examination of such items and further instructions. If significant historic sites are present, then the preparation and implementation of an acceptable mitigation plan will be required.

3.1.11. Socio-Economic Characteristics:

The information in this section summarizes the socio-economic assessment conducted for the project by Earthplan, entitled *Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Social Impact Assessment*, February, 1991, and revised May, 1991, which is attached as Appendix I.

a. Existing Community:

*Population & Employment Characteristics:*

The Socio-Economic Assessment Study reviewed the project's social impacts within a larger area encompassing the project site and immediate surrounding area. The study area which included (1) the Downtown sub-area made up of Census Tracts 40 and 42; and (2) the Chinatown sub-area made up of Census Tracts 51 and 52. An estimated 45,584 people work within the study area, although most of them live outside the study area. In 1985, Chinatown contained 4,653 jobs while 38,000 people worked in the Downtown sub-area. The jobs in
Chinatown were evenly distributed throughout the subarea with the largest job category being in retail (28%) followed by service jobs (25%). Downtown's strongest job categories were service and finance, insurance and real estate.

Over the past thirty years, the study area's net population grew from 4,666 persons in 1960 to 9,049 persons in 1989. During the 1970s the study area grew at an 8.3% per year rate and continues to grow at rates higher than the rest of Oahu.

The project site is in the makai portion of Chinatown, or Census Tract 52. This area had modest population increases in the 1960s followed by a decline in the 1970s. In the 1980s, growth in this area has been accelerating; between 1985 and 1989 it grew at a rate of 27% per year.
## Table 6
Study Area Average Annual Growth Rates: 1960 to 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY AREA TOTAL</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Sub-Area</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka (CT 42)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makai (CT 40)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Sub-Area</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka (CT 51)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-33.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makai (CT 52)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 1980 Census showed that people in the study area were relatively older when compared to the islandwide population. In the Downtown sub-area, the population is relatively well-educated and affluent. Median family incomes were well above Oahu's average in 1980 in the makai portion of the Downtown area. Most families did not have children in the household in 1980. The proportion of the population who had lived in the same house five years previously was low, mostly because of the then new residential units.

In the Chinatown sub-area, most residents were much less affluent in 1980. The proportion of both family and non-family
households below the poverty line in Census Tracts 51 and 52 was well above the Oahu averages.

The 1980 Census showed that residents in the Downtown sub-area were likely to have relatively high-status and well paid occupations. Laborers and service workers were numerous in the Chinatown sub-area. Labor force participation was high among Downtown sub-area residents while many more adults in the Chinatown area were not in the labor force. Unemployment was relatively high in the Chinatown area.

b. Changes in the Community Without Smith-Beretania II:

Plans & Guidelines Affecting Project Area.

The project site is in the Chinatown Special District which was established to preserve the historic significance, architecture and characteristic uses of the area, and to meet community needs. Most of the project site is in the District's Mauka Precinct which is to provide for a range of household incomes while supporting and contributing to Chinatown's retail-commercial functions, particularly at the street level. A major function of the Mauka Precinct, including the project site, is to create a transition area between Chinatown's Historic Core Precinct and the high density area of the Kukui area.
The entire portion of the project site fronting on Pauahi Street is in the Historic Core Precinct. The objectives of this Precinct include the retention and renovation of historic buildings and the continuation and concentration of the long-established ethnic retail and light manufacturing activities.

Projects Under Construction.

There are two construction projects near the project site. Located across from the project site on the mauka side of North Beretania Street is the Honolulu Park Place, a residential fee simple condominium containing 437 units. The Liberty Theater site and the adjacent gas station across Nuuanu Avenue have been demolished and will be developed temporarily as a parking lot.

Planned and Proposed Changes.

Proposed changes for the Chinatown sub-area are mostly City initiated. The City is developing the (1) Kekaulike Parking Lot Redevelopment (154 rental units, 15,000 sq. ft. of ground level commercial space, parking and a pedestrian mall; (2) the redevelopment of the Smith-Maunakea parking lot (234 residential units and ground floor commercial uses); (3) the Foster Garden Estates (1,600 residential units); and (4) the rehabilitation of Pauahi Hale and Winston Hale. Recently, the Chinatown Gateway Project (200 units, 25,000 sq. ft. commercial,
275 parking stalls) and the River Nimitz Project (90 units, 8,961 sq. ft. commercial, 139 parking stalls) were completed. Near the project site on the Downtown side will be the proposed Highness Tower with 150 residential units and commercial uses.

c. Community Issues - Smith-Beretania:

As part of its Socio-economic Assessment for the project, Earthplan conducted community interviews to identify salient issues with respect to the development of Smith-Beretania. The results of that survey are as follows:

General Community Issues and Concerns:

**Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13.** The Board's central theme is the need to create a more livable environment for residents in high density and mixed use areas. The Board advocates more open space, more recreation areas and more resident-oriented public services and facilities and supports efforts to increase the safety and efficiency of Downtown vehicular and pedestrian systems.

**Other Organizations:** A number of business-oriented organizations in Chinatown, including the Chinatown Merchants Association, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown River Pauahi Merchants Association share the
common goals of promoting and enhancing the Chinatown business climate.

PACE (People Against Chinatown Evictions) works on outreach and advocacy services for low- and middle-income Chinatown families. The United Chinese Society and the Association of Chinese from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are culturally oriented.

The Downtown Improvement Association (DIA) is a business organization dedicated to the development of Downtown as the State's premier business headquarters. None of these organizations have taken a formal position on the proposed project.

Individual Survey Interviews: Interviews with 44 people who (1) live, conduct business or own property near the project site, (2) have a regional interest in the proposed project, or (3) would be able to provide specific information on how the site might affect the neighboring community were conducted as part of the study. Respondents felt that the Chinatown area offered the following positive attributes:

- Socially heterogeneous and comfortable -- Respondents liked Chinatown's ethnic and cultural diversity.
Final Environmental Impact Statement
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

- Convenience and affordability -- This was a major plus for respondents. Resident respondents liked being close to open markets, restaurants, doctors' offices and banks. Business operators felt that Chinatown offers the dual advantages of having low rents and accessibility.

- Revitalization efforts -- Respondents generally liked the improvements in Chinatown. They felt that Chinatown is slowly losing or has lost its dubious reputation. There was, however, disagreement as to Chinatown's future. Business interests preferred strengthening and increasing the business/commercial atmosphere. Residents want to see more resident- and family-oriented facilities and services.

Among respondents, there were major differences in perspectives between business and resident respondents regarding Chinatown's concerns and problems:

- Lack of resident -- oriented recreation facilities -- The biggest problem cited by resident respondents was the lack of active park space.

- Housing -- Resident respondents wanted to see more housing in the area. Some felt that more affordable housing is appropriate; others wanted more market housing units.
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☐ Business disruptions -- Business respondents were concerned about traffic, insufficient parking and construction. These activities disrupted their operations.

☐ Regulating Chinatown’s development -- Some business respondents felt that there should be less regulation so than the area can flourish economically.

☐ Presence of undesirable elements -- Respondents wished to see crime and loiterers eliminated from the area.

With respect to Smith-Beretania, the Downtown Neighborhood Board has consistently advocated an active park on the site and does not favor prior or existing plans for the site. The Smith-Beretania Apartment Tenants Association has also voiced concern about the project. However, the Board of Directors of the Kukui Plaza Owners Association voiced no objection to the project. While the City is unaware of any formal position on the project on the part of the Association of Apartment Owners of Honolulu Tower, it is known that the Association has agreed to support the Neighborhood Board's preference for an active park within the site.

Individual resident respondents either mildly favored or strongly opposed the project. Some of their comments are as follows:
Maximize park area and potential -- Respondents consistently expressed the need for resident-oriented parks in Chinatown/Downtown. To some respondents, the project does not address immediate or long-range needs for resident-oriented park areas.

Need for active parks -- Neighborhood Board members and Smith-Beretania Apartment tenants prefer an active park on the project site.

Revitalization -- Respondents noted that the project site and peripheral sidewalks were the scenes of illegal (criminal) activities and believe that the project will clean up the area.

Specific project components -- The project's commercial and office components are seen as competing for needed park space. The additional parking stalls are favored and the child care facility generally accepted.

Business respondents located within the surrounding area expressed the following on Smith-Beretania:

Generally good for business -- The project is seen as good for business because it would attract people, revitalize the area and offer convenient child care.
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- Short-term parking shortage: construction activities --
  There was concern that many customers would be deprived of parking during project construction. Concern was also expressed about construction noise and dust impacts.

- Long-term project effects -- Respondents were concerned about the project's physical and circulation impacts.

3.1.12. Project Social Impacts:

a. Recreation Impact:

Existing parks within the Chinatown/Downtown area include Kamalii Park (0.68 acres, benches and walkways); Queen Emma Square (0.56 acres; no facilities or structures); and Kamamalu Playground (5.3 acres; ball courts and field, play equipment). Additionally, the Pauahi Community Service Facility, a 2-story, 6,000 sq. ft. multipurpose recreation buildings, is used primarily by senior citizens. The area also contains several urban or mini parks, including Fort Street Mall Mini Park, the Wilcox Park and the Chinatown Gateway Plaza. Just Ewa of the project site are Aala Park and the Beretania Community Park.
The project will improve the Chinatown/Downtown park situation by adding another recreational resource to the area which will provide open space, visual and psychological relief from the prevalent high-density environment, a passive gathering place for the resident population and a play area for young children. Due to its small size, the project site cannot effectively address the perceived immediate and long-range need for active park space. However, in response to a strong, continuing community interest in such a facility, the proposed Recreation Center will help to address some of the recreational and social program needs of local residents which can be fulfilled in-doors.

b. Impacts on Child Care:

Statewide, there is potential demand for 6,000 additional full-time slots for infants and toddlers and for 3,300 full-time slots for preschool children care. It is estimated that 28,000 parents would like to work but cannot afford child care.

In a 1989 survey, the City found that the cost of child care was a moderate to major problem for 55% of the survey respondents and location was a moderate to major problem for 48% of the respondents. PATCH (People Attentive To Children) indicates that there is a high demand for child care services in the Chinatown/ Downtown area from both residents and
employees living outside the area. The only facility offering infant care is the YWCA Day Care Program.

All existing caregivers interviewed in this project's social impact assessment study indicate a waiting list; the greatest demand is for infant care and the least demand is for care of 3-5 year olds.

The proposed child care facility will positively impact on the need for more child care services in the Chinatown/Downtown area; therefore, no mitigation measure is needed or proposed herein. Special attention need to be given to finding ways to financially assist Chinatown residents who may want to enter their children into the child care facility but cannot afford to do so on their own.

The proposed child care facility will be designed and constructed to meet all State Department of Human Services licensing requirements.

c. Population/Employment Impacts:

Smith-Beretania will generate both long-and short-term employment (183 estimated construction jobs; 43 estimated long-term jobs; and a few jobs associated with the operation of the Recreation Center and the programs and activities expected to occur therein) but will not add housing units to the area and,
thus, will not generate any population impacts. Accordingly, no mitigation measure with respect to project population and employment impacts are proposed due to such positive project impacts.

d. Impacts on Public Parking:

Based on recent (May 22, 1991) figures from the City, the Chinatown/Downtown area had about 2,072 parking stalls. The current supply of stalls in the area is 2,249 stalls due to redevelopment. At various times during the period January 1992 through June 1993, there will be from 108 to 343 less stalls, due to the construction of several projects (Smith-Beretania, Alakea-Richards, Smith-Maunakea, Kekaulike and Kaahumanu parking lots). Upon completion of all the projects sometime in 1994, the total amount of stalls in the area will increase to about 2,689 stalls. The project will increase parking within the project site from an existing 129 stalls to 325 stalls.

To mitigate the temporary reduction of public parking stalls, sequential project construction of the five projects noted above with respect to parking stalls should be considered. Temporary public parking arrangements with private parking facilities should also be explored (i.e. "public parking passes" within such facilities).
e. Impact on Uses and Character of Immediate Area:

In Chinatown there is a large diversity of uses including small ethnic restaurants; local style and hostess bars; lei, flower and gift shops; convenience/trading companies and stores; barber shops; noodle factories; a theater and art galleries. The project site abuts the Smith-Beretania Apartments and ground floor commercial tenants, Calvary Chapel, a travel agency and two art galleries to the east. A proliferation of art galleries and professional services establishments are located just south of the site. Mauka of the site are high-density residential uses (Honolulu Tower, Honolulu Park Place, Kukui Plaza and Beretania North).

The project site's redevelopment will complement and support the existing land use character and activities within the immediate surrounding vicinity in the following manner:

- **Consistent with area revitalization** -- Smith-Beretania will support and implement public and private efforts to revitalize Chinatown.

- **Provision of open space** -- The project will provide open space amidst intensive commercial and residential buildings and provide a convenient recreational space for local residents and employees.
Uses consistent with existing and proposed uses -- The proposed child care facility supports the area's residents and employees. The project will bring about 183 temporary employees and 148 permanent employees to the area and, thus, will help to increase walk-in business for local businesses.

Parking facilities -- While the project will temporarily reduce on-site public parking, it will increase the number of parking stalls within the site from 129 to 315 stalls upon project completion.

Recreation Center -- The proposed Recreation Center will provide a much needed indoor space for youth social and recreational programs and activities and for regular use by local elderly citizens and organizations and, thus, will complement the existing high density residential uses nearby.

Given these potential impacts within the surrounding area, no mitigation measures appear necessary and none are proposed.
CHAPTER 4. RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES AND CONTROLS.

This section discusses relevant State and county plans, policies and controls which affect the proposed development. No federal controls were found except those concerning air quality. Previous discussions on the project's impact on air quality noted that federal air quality standards will be met even with project construction.

4.1 Hawaii State Plan:

The Hawaii State Plan was enacted as Chapter 226, Hawaii Revised Statutes, to serve as a guide for the future long range development of the State; identify the goals, objectives, policies and priorities for the State; provide a basis for determining and allocating limited resources and improve coordination of State and county plans, policies, programs, projects and regulatory activities. The proposed Smith-Beretania project implements the following objectives and policies of the State Plan:

Sec. 226-13, (b)(7): Encourage urban developments in close proximity to existing services and facilities.

Comment: The proposed Smith-Beretania project can be considered an "urban redevelopment infill" project which revitalizes the project site and helps to stimulate further Chinatown revitalization and takes full advan-
tage of existing services and facilities located in close proximity to the project site.

Sec. 226-22(b)(1): Provide adequate services, facilities, and resources within the State's fiscal capacities to assist in alleviating hardship conditions of Hawaii's people.

Comment: The project's child care facility will provide a much-needed child care center within the Downtown area to meet the needs of working parents for such services close to their places of work. The development of the facility, using City land and financial resources, is consistent with the directive within this State planning policy with respect to using public resources to assist in alleviating hardship conditions (lack of available and accessible child care) of Hawaii people.

Sec. 226-23(b)(2): Provide a wide range of activities and facilities to fulfill the recreation needs of all diverse and special groups.

Sec. 226-23(b)(5): Ensure opportunities for everyone to use and enjoy Hawaii's recreational resources.

Comment: The project's passive park space component addresses and implements this State planning policy by providing opportunity for passive recreation activities during the workday for Downtown employees and for nearby Downtown and Chinatown residents.
4.2 State Functional Plans:

State Historic Preservation Plan:

Policy: Encourage the maintenance and preservation of State and County owned historic properties.

Comment: The proposed project will conform to and implement this State Functional Plan policy by assuring that required historic preservation and design guidelines contained in Chapter 6E, Hawaii Revised Statutes and the Chinatown Special District's Historic Precinct which apply to the project site will be satisfied in the development and design of the project.

State Education Functional Plan:

Policy: Develop resources and programs for early childhood education.

Comment: It is expected that part of the daily child care activities within the project site will include basic early childhood awareness and education activities. As such, the establishment and operation of the proposed child care facility will implement this State Functional Plan policy.

State Recreation Functional Plan:

Policies: Emphasize the scenic and open space qualities of physical resources and recreation areas.

Ensure that intended uses for a site respect community values and are compatible with the area's physical resources and recreation potential.
Comment: The open space character of the proposed park as well as the proposed Recreation Center facility within the subject site will conform to and implement these State Functional Plan policies. The passive recreation design of the proposed park space will complement and provide visual and physical relief from the intensive surrounding land use pattern. The Recreation Center will provide indoor space for youth and elderly residents' social and recreational programs and activities.

4.3 City General Plan:

Smith-Beretania conforms to and implements a number of City General Plan objectives and policies:

*Physical Development, Objective A, Policy 5: Provide for more compact development and intensive use of urban lands where compatible with the physical and social character of existing communities.*

*Comment:* As discussed above in this report, the various proposed uses and activities within Smith-Beretania are intended to meet several different planning needs currently existing within the Downtown/Chinatown area, including the need for more parking stalls, the need for a convenient child care facility, the need for additional park space, the need for a Recreation Center facility within the neighborhood and the need to revitalize the Chinatown area. Therefore, the proposed project conforms to and implements this General Plan policy.
Physical Development, Objective A, Policy 8: Locate community facilities on sites that will be convenient to the people they are intended to serve.

Comment: The proposed park space, child care facility, Recreation Center facility and parking structure will be located within walking distance from employees and residents living and working in the Downtown and Chinatown areas who are their intended users.

Physical Development, Objective D, Policy 3: Encourage distinctive community identities for both new and existing district and neighborhood.

Comment: The proposed project, with its significant open space-park component will provide physical, visual and psychological relief from the prevailing high density and high intensity land uses within the surrounding Downtown areas and will help to give this portion of the Downtown/Chinatown area a distinctive physical identity marked by the project's centrally located open space park.

Physical Development, Objective D, Policy 8: Preserve and maintain beneficial open space in urbanized areas.

Comment: The existing Smith-Beretania, ground level parking lot provides some open space relief within an otherwise built up urban environment. The proposed project, with its open space-park component, will continue to provide such open space relief and will permit recreational use of the project site which is not now available within the site because it is used for vehicle parking.
Physical Development, Objective E, Policy 1: Encourage new construction to complement the ethnic qualities of the older communities of Oahu.

Comment: The proposed project is part of the City's Chinatown revitalization effort and will be designed to conform to all applicable design requirements and standards which are set forth in the Chinatown Special District Ordinance. Therefore, the project conforms to and implements this General Plan policy.

Culture and Recreation, Objective A, Policy 4: Encourage the protection of the ethnic identities of the older communities of Oahu.

Comment: As stated directly above, the project is part of the revitalization of Chinatown and will be designed to meet the historic preservation objectives of the Chinatown Special District.

Culture and Recreation, Objective D, Policy 3: Develop and maintain urban parks, squares, and beautification areas in high density urban places.

Comment: As stated above, the project's open space-park component will provide physical, visual and psychological relief to Downtown residents and employees within an otherwise high density and high intensive urban environment. It will also help to "clean up the area" of loitering and other criminal activities by encouraging new people to enter the community and new businesses and activities to occur there.
The proposed Recreation Center will provide a convenient and centrally located facility for young residents within the area to interact in organized social and recreational events and activities. Currently, the area lacks such facilities.

4.4 Primary Urban Center (PUC) Development Plan:

The PUC Development Plan (DP) Land use Map designates the project site for Commercial Development while the PUC DP Public Facilities Map designates the site for "GB/M-Government Building Modification". Smith-Beretania, a proposed Mixed Use project which emphasizes limited commercial use of the site combined with City office space, a child care center, an urban park space and an underground parking facility, conforms to and implements these various PUC DP map designations.

The PUC DP Special Provisions (Ord. No. 81-79, as amended, Sec. 32-2.2(b)(1)(D) states:

"The Chinatown District shall be redeveloped with emphasis on historic preservation, architectural character and adaptive re-use. The retail-commercial function shall be strengthened."

Smith-Beretania conforms to and implements this directly applicable land use policy by facilitating and being a part of the Chinatown revitalization in a manner consistent with the Chinatown Special District's historic preservation objectives and standards.
PUC DP Special Provision, Sec. 32-2.2(b)(1)(G), states that

"urban park-like amenities, such as downtown malls, private walkways, landscaping and open space shall be encouraged".

The proposed project, with its open space-park component, conforms to and implements this land use policy."

The PUC DP Public Facilities Map indicates that the portion of Nuuanu Avenue adjoining the project site is planned for additional street right-of-way within the next six (6) years. Therefore, redevelopment of the project site must comply with a required 20-feet street setback requirement along Nuuanu Avenue. The project will comply with applicable street setback requirements of the PUC DP Public Facilities Map at the time of project construction unless a waiver from such compliance is granted.

4.5 City Land Use Ordinance:

The current zoning for the project site is "BMX-4, Central Business District Mixed Use" (See. Exhibit "B") which encourages commercial development. The ground level commercial space within the project's proposed 3-story complex fronting Pauahi Street conforms to and implements this BMX-4 zoning designation. However, the design, land use intensity, scale and character of the project are being formulated primarily to conform to and implement the design objectives and standards of the Chinatown Special District Ordinance.
Specifically, the project's facade along Pauahi Street will conform to the 40 feet building height limit and be consistent in design with the existing facade of other Chinatown structures fronting Pauahi Street, Nuuanu Avenue and other local streets within the surrounding area. This conforms with design guidelines expressed in Sec. 7.60-8, *Historic Core Precinct Objectives*, of the Land Use Ordinance.

The ground floor of the project's 3-story structure facing Pauahi Street and, in part, Nuuanu Avenue, will be used for commercial uses that are compatible with the rehabilitation objectives for Chinatown and will comprise a continuous street-block facade. As such, this aspect of the project will comply with Sec. 7.60-9. B. and C., *Historic Core Precinct Development Standards*, of the Land Use Ordinance.

Building materials, colors and textures within the proposed 3-story structure will present a street facade which will harmonize with the prevailing wood, brick, stone masonry and plaster finishes of other ground-level structures in the immediate surrounding vicinity and will incorporate representative architectural features (i.e. arches, lintel columns, cornices and varied parapets) within the area. As such, the project will comply with Sec. 7.60-12, *Street Facade Guidelines*, of the Land Use Ordinance.

4.6 Chinatown Special District Ordinance:

The project site is largely within the 200 foot building height limit area comprising the Mauka Precinct of the Chinatown Special District and
within its Historic Core Precinct. The building height limit is 40 feet for that portion of the site located within the Historic Core Precinct and 200 feet for that portion within the Mauka Precinct. Exhibit "B" shows the project site boundaries and the various precincts within the District as indicated in the City Land Use Ordinance.

A Special District Permit for the project from the City Department of Land Utilization is required. The Chinatown Special District calls for the preservation of historic structures; preservation of "human scale of development"; insuring that new developments are compatible with the character of the area and with existing structures of historic and archaeological significance; economic revitalization of the Chinatown area; and promotion of the health, safety and welfare of the residents. As described in Sec. 3.1.12.e above and in Appendix I, the social impact assessment on the project prepared by Earthplan, the proposed project substantially meets these Chinatown Special District policies. Special attention will be given to assuring that the project's exterior appearance is consistent with the character of Chinatown and complies with the Special District Guidelines wherever such consistency and compliance are required within the project site.
The project site is located entirely within the City's Chinatown Special District which has as its primary objective the preservation of Chinatown's historic significance and architectural characteristics which were dominant during the 1880s - 1940s. Most of the site is located within the District's Mauka Precinct and are subject to its development standards including:

- A 200 feet building height limit and building height setback requirement (1 foot setback/1 foot of building height exceeding 40 feet);
- Required roof gardens where there are low-level roofs;
- Landscaped interior courts;
- Required street trees along Beretania Street to maintain a human-scale orientation at the ground level;
- Required entryways at ground levels;
- Parking within the interior of the project site;
- Building finishes comprised of wood, brick, stone, masonry and plaster;
- Colors of natural materials;
- Building facades which incorporate representative architectural features, such as arches, lintel columns, cornices and varied parapets;
- Above ground, a regulated "rhythm" to the building facades; and
Final Environmental Impact Statement
SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

- Streetscapes which include planters, benches, street lights, lamp posts, sidewalk paving and covered shelters which complement the design of older facades.

The makai portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street is located within the District's Historic Core Precinct and are subject to that Precinct's development objectives and standards. In the Historic Core, the design new structures must be compatible with historic structures through low building heights, continuous street frontages and characteristic street facade elements and the continuation and concentration of long-established ethnic retail and light manufacturing activities at the ground level are encouraged.

Because it is within the Historic Core Precinct, the makai portion of the project site (which includes the proposed 3-story structure) are subject to the following Precinct development standards:

- Small scaled interior landscaped courtyards and interior pedestrian walkways are encouraged;

- Buildings which form a continuous street facade except for necessary pedestrian entryways and small open space pockets;

- Ground floor spaces used for retail commercial use, or light manufacturing of an ethnic nature, compatible with Chinatown's objectives; and

- The building and street facade guidelines cited above for developments within the Mauka Precinct.
4.7 Government Approvals.

Government approvals which may be required for the proposed project include but are not limited to the following:

1. **City Department of Land Utilization**, Special District Permit. This permit is required because the project site is located within the Chinatown Special District.

2. **State Department of Land & Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Office**. The project will comply with all applicable requirement in Chapter 6E, Hawaii Revised Statutes and the requirements of the DLNR as the project site is located within the Chinatown Historic District, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Should on-site testing for historic or archaeological sites or excavations during project construction uncover historic or archaeological sites, permission to proceed with further construction will be subject to the findings and recommendations of the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the protection and preservation of such remains. The presence of significant archaeological or historic site will require the preparation and implementation of a mitigation plan acceptable to DLNR.

3. **Other Governmental Permits**. City building and grading permits will be required to prepare the site for construction and to construct the proposed parking facility, child care facility and 3-story commercial/office space structure. Noise permit from the State Health Department will be required if project construction noise exceed applicable noise level standards of the Health Department.
CHAPTER 5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS & EVALUATION.

5.1 Probable Unavoidable Adverse Project Impacts:

a. Air Quality:

Short-term effects on air quality will occur during project construction. These impacts will be mitigated by compliance with the State Health Department Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 60, Air Pollution Control. Control measures to reduce fugitive dust during construction include frequent wetting down of loose soil areas with water, or suitable dust retardant chemicals. Other measures include good housekeeping on the job site and, possibly, the erection of dust catching barriers.

The long-term effects on air quality posed by the underground parking facility will be largely mitigated by providing mechanical ventilation and appropriately designed exhaust vents.

The long-term effects on air quality near intersections in the project area as a result of the increase in project-related traffic will be minimal. Some mitigation will occur by concentrating the vehicle entry and exit points to and from the proposed parking facility only on North Beretania Street. Another long-term mitigation of such air quality effects is the implementation of the proposed rapid
transit system which may attract users who would normally drive to the Downtown/Chinatown area.

b. Noise Quality:

Short-term noise effects on the surrounding areas will occur during project construction and will be minimized by compliance with State Health Department Administrative Rules on Vehicular Noise Control for Oahu, Title 11, Chapter 42, and Community Noise Control for Oahu, Title 11, Chapter 43.

Long-term noise effects will not arise as a result of the project. Relocation of the existing street level parking lot underground should eliminate existing public notice of vehicular-generated noises within the site. Child care activities are located away from the Smith-Beretania Apartment Complex and noise from the child care facility will occur only during daytime hours of operation. Trees and landscaping at the passive park on the project site should absorb much of the noises generated from activities occurring within the project site throughout the daytime and evening hours. Noise from parking lot ventilation equipment should be limited due to the underground location of such equipment and sound attenuation features within the equipment.
c. Traffic Impacts:

The proposed Smith-Beretania project, when completed in 1998, will have only a slight impact on traffic conditions. The project will likely increase traffic delays slightly within the nearby surrounding roadways.

With the project, the Level of Service (LOS) for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as under a future development scenario for the area without the project. The LOS at various signalized study intersections as part of the traffic impact assessment for this project will remain the same except for some minor street approaches which will drop from LOS C to LOS D.

For signalized intersections, under an LOS C situation, delays per vehicle range from 15 to 25 seconds per vehicle. The number of vehicles stopping at the intersection is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping. At LOS D, delays per vehicle range from 25 to 40 seconds per vehicle. The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Many vehicles stop at the intersection, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines.
5.2 Alternatives to Proposed Action.

The City and County of Honolulu considered the following alternatives to the proposed action:

Retain in Present Use - No Project.

The continued use of the City-owned property as a municipal off-street parking lot will continue to benefit the Chinatown merchants and tenants in the Smith-Beretania Apartments (and their guests) who use the parking lot. However, none of the important benefits of the project would be realized. These benefits include:

1. Addition of an attractive open space within the community which will provide visual and psychological relief from the prevalent high-density urban environment.

2. Provision of a conveniently located child care center accessible to Chinatown and Downtown employees and residents where no such facility presently exists.

3. Creation of approximately 183 construction and related jobs during project construction; creating 43 long-term jobs upon project completion; and relocation of 105 City jobs within the site.

4. Increase in parking stalls from 129 to 325 stalls, many of which being accessible to public use.

5. Support and implement the goal of Chinatown revitalization.
6. Consolidate fragmented City offices within the Downtown area to provide more convenient services to the public and cost savings to the City.

7. Remove the incidences of crime and other public nuisance problems which have been associated with the project site and some nearby areas through project site redevelopment.

9. Provision of landscaped open areas providing passive recreational opportunities for the residents and daily visitors to the project site.

10. Provision of recreation center for youth, elderly and other groups.

Alternative Sites.

Since the City and County of Honolulu is considering and pursuing the redevelopment of all of its parking lots in the Central Business District, including the Kaahumanu, Block J, Maunakea Smith and Kekaulike parking lots, this alternative is not considered a feasible alternative. Moreover, because the project site is relatively level, its development, as proposed, is easy to implement.

Given the City's scarce resources with which to acquire new development sites, the lack of large development sites in the downtown area and the expected escalation of land values within the Downtown area, there is continuing and growing pressure to redevelop City-owned sites.
Private Development of the Project Site.

This alternative is rejected for the following reasons. First, the inability of private owners to benefit from property tax exemptions and other tax breaks associated with the land in question inevitably would force such owners to seek high-density urban redevelopment of the project. This would conflict with the expressed goals and objectives of the Chinatown Special District and other pertinent City development policies applicable to the site and surrounding area.

Second: There is no incentive for private development of a public or quasi-public child care facility within the project site. Hence, a critical public need within the Downtown/Chinatown area would likely be ignored in any private redevelopment of the project site. The same would apply for development of a passive public park within the site as well as the proposed underground public parking facility.

Third: It is likely that the building height restrictions applicable to the project site would discourage private redevelopment of the site since the necessary densities which would be needed within the site to offset development and operating costs, property taxes and financing costs simply could not be achieved.
Higher Density Development Of The Site.

This alternative was rejected because of a continuing community preference for more open space, recreation areas and resident-oriented public services and facilities within the area. This preference has been expressed by the Downtown Neighborhood Board. The 40 feet building height limit of the Historic Precinct of the Chinatown District also precludes intensive development of a substantial portion of the site.

Because these alternatives do not meet the City's objectives of revitalizing this portion of the downtown area in a manner which addresses critical existing public land use needs within the area, they are not considered viable.

5.3 Relationship Between Local Short-term Uses Of Man's Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-term Productivity and the Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.

Construction of the project 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 materials could be reused if and when the project is demolished; however, such reuse of materials is probably 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 project development by its developer, commercial and business offices, and the management of the various enterprises or operations occurring within the project site.

Project development will result in a commitment of the land in question for a long-term period. Once the project is completed, it is unlikely that the land will revert to a less intensive use in the distant future.

In the long-term, the project will result in the provision of passive recreational opportunities for nearby residents and the general public; opportunities for some small businesses; additional City revenues generated from the underground parking facility; child care services for nearby residents and Downtown/Chinatown employees; the consolidation of City agencies or programs within new City offices; and a revitalization of a significant portion of the Chinatown area. Revenues from commercial lease rents and the parking structure will retire the construction debt and, thereafter, provide additional revenues for the City.

5.4 Unresolved Issues.

Acquisition of the unused properties located at the corner of Pauahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue remain an unresolved issue at the present time although procedures for such acquisition have been initiated. Detailed design features of the project have not yet been determined.
Although the facade of the proposed 3-story structure along Pauahi Street will comply with the detailed architectural design provisions contained in the Chinatown Special District (as described above), detailed plans depicting the actual proposed building facade of the structure must still be prepared.

The design details of the proposed second-story Recreation Center and the actual educational, recreation and social programs and activities expected to occur within the Center have not yet been determined. Therefore, the Center's impact on traffic, noise and specific recreational needs within the community remain unresolved issues.

Since the presence of historic or archaeological resources within the site will be determined during archaeological testing conducted in conjunction with project development, the presence of such resources remains an unresolved issue.

Finally, funding for project construction is not yet available.
CHAPTER 6. CONSULTED PARTIES AND PARTICIPANTS IN THE DEIS PREPARATION PROCESS.

6.1 Consulted Parties:

An EIS Preparation Notice (EISPN) was filed with the State Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) on September 23, 1989.

A revised EISPN was filed with the OEOC on November 30, 1990. The Notice was mailed to 40 governmental and private organizations and interested community groups early December, 1990, requesting comments by mid-January, 1991. The comments received from these organizations and groups are contained in this Chapter.

The responding agencies' concerns are addressed in the Draft EIS. Agencies and organizations which responded to the Notice are listed below. Copies of their substantive comments and responses thereto follow.

**Federal Agencies:**

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Department of Interior - Fish & Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
State of Hawaii:

Department of Health

Department of Land & Natural Resources

Department of Business and Economic Development

Office of State Planning

Department of Transportation

Environmental Center, University of Hawaii

Office of Environmental Quality Control

Department of Education

Land Use Commission

City & County of Honolulu:

Board of Water Supply

Department of General Planning

Department of Land Utilization

Department of Public Works

Department of Transportation Services

Building Department

Department of Parks & Recreation

Department of Human Resources

Fire Department
Police Department

Department of Finance

Interested Community Organizations:

Hawaiian Electric Company
GTE Hawaii Tel
The Gas Company
American Lung Association
Department of Land Utilization
Design Advisory Committee
Downtown Improvement Association
Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13
Chinese Chamber of Commerce
American Institute of Architects
People Against Chinatown Eviction
Smith-Beretania Apartments Tenants Association
Hawaii Theater Center
Chinatown Merchants Association
Honolulu Tower Board of Directors
American Institute of Architects, Hawaii Society
Chinese Chamber of Commerce
Historic Hawai'i Foundation MainStreet
6.2 Participants in the Draft EIS Process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>AREA OF EXPERTISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael T. Okada</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOP Hawaii, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Osato</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KOP Hawaii, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick A. Ribellia</td>
<td>Attorney at law</td>
<td>Urban Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoichi Ebisu</td>
<td>President, Y. Ebisu &amp; Assoc.</td>
<td>Acoustical Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Higashiona</td>
<td>Associate, Pacific Planning &amp; Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>Traffic Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berna Cabacungan</td>
<td>Principal, Earthplan</td>
<td>Community Planning/Social Impact Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry D. Neal</td>
<td>Principal, B.D. Neal &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Paul Cleghorn</td>
<td>Bishop Museum Research</td>
<td>Historic/Archaeological Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OEQC Bulletin is a semi-monthly publication. The publication dates of the bulletin are the eighth and twenty-third of each month. Applicants should deliver an appropriate number of Draft and Final EISs to the accepting authority before submitting copies to OEQC for distribution and publication. Environmental Assessments should be submitted to the accepting authority directly. Based on the assessment, the accepting authority will submit to OEQC a determination of a Negative Declaration or a Preparation Notice for publication in the bulletin. Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements must be received by the fifth and twentieth days of the month for publication in the respective issue. Negative Declarations and Preparation Notices must be received at least five working days prior to the publication date. All documents submitted for publication in the OEQC Bulletin should be delivered to the Office of Environmental Quality Control, 465 South King Street, Room 104, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813. To ensure proper processing of documents, please attach OEQC Bulletin Publication Form with all submittals. These forms can be obtained by calling OEQC at 548-6915.
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NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS

The following actions have been determined to have little or no impact upon the environment. Environmental Impact Statements are not required for these projects. Those who wish to contest this determination have a 40-day period, from this publication date, in which to institute litigation. Any questions regarding the following project(s) should be directed to the listed contacts.

HAWAII

HONOKOHU BOAT HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS
Location: Kona, Hawaii
TMZ: 74-0830, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45

Proposing Department of Transportation
Agency: Harbors Division
Contact: Isidro Aquilar (548-2505)

The Department of Transportation, Harbors Division, is proposing to construct an administration building, comfort station, south parking lot, north access road and washdown area, concrete wall and walkway, and provide electrical outlets at the pier and along the harbor perimeter at the Honokohau Boat Harbor. The administration building and comfort station will include plumbing, electrical and wastewater systems, and paving. The north access road and washdown area involve paving, striping and installing lighting systems. No dredging will be done in this project.

The proposed improvements will facilitate the incremental construction of support facilities needed to develop Honokohau Boat Harbor as a prime commercial, recreational and resort center.
KAUHOU SHOPPING VILLAGE, PHASE II
EXPANSION
Location: North Kona, Hawaii
TMO: 7-6-10:40, 86, 87, 88
Permitting Agency: County of Hawaii
Contact: Anna Smith (961-8284)
Applicant: Royal Hawaiian Shopping Center, Inc. c/o Belt Collins & Associates

The applicant proposes to develop Phase II and to upgrade Phase I of the Kauhoul Shopping Village. The 13.6 acre site for the Phase II expansion is located to the north of the existing 7.6 acre shopping center at the corner of Alii Drive and Kamehameha III Road.

The project will involve the construction of seven one- and two-story commercial build- lings totaling up to 194,200 square feet of leasable floor space. Maximum height of the structures would be 50 feet. The upgrade of Phase I would involve modifications of building facades, rearrangement of building spaces, provision of accessory facilities and landscaping. Parking areas will include below-grade parking garage and will accommodate an additional 1,357 stalls.

HONOKAUAHAI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Location: South Kona, Hawaii
TMO: 8-3-13:21
Proposing Agency: Department of Accounting and General Services
Contact: Gordon Sam (548-3921)

The Department of Accounting and General Services is proposing the construction of a new concrete and masonry, one-story, four classroom building, approximately 5,100 square feet in size, a 300,000 gallon reservoir, a septic tank and leaching field, fire lanes, service roads and parking spaces on Honokaa School campus. The project will provide the school with a much-needed facility to implement its program in accordance with Educational Specifications. Since the project will be constructed within the existing school campus, no land will be removed from the tax base. The estimated cost of the project is $3,567,000.

MAUI
POLLIO ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENT
Location: Kula, Maui
TMO: 2-2-06
2-2-07
Proposing Agency: Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife
Contact: Carl Makani (548-8860)
The Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Forestry and Wildlife, is proposing a road improvement project which upon completion will provide greater ease and safety for vehicular access to the Kula and Kahikinui Forest Reserve/Game Management Area. Specifically, the proposed project provides realignment of 2.9 miles of the lower section of Pollio Access Road. The primary objectives of the project are to provide safe driving conditions and to salvage the original road base.

MOLOKAI
KAUNAKAKAI WASTEWATER RECLAMATION FACILITY
Location: Kaunakakai, Molokai
TMO: 5-3-05:02
Proposing Agency: Department of Public Works
Contact: David Wimmer (243-7417)
The County of Maui, Department of Public Works, is proposing the installation of an effluent filter system at the Kaunakakai Wastewater Reclamation Facility (WWRF). The filter system to be installed consists of an influent pump station with variable speed pumps and two traveling bridge effluent filter units operating in parallel. The system will occupy approximately 0.2 acres adjacent to the existing treatment plant facilities. All work will be done within the existing fenced area.

The purpose of the filter system is to improve the performance of the Kaunakakai WWRF to consistently produce high quality effluent for underground injection. The higher quality effluent will extend the life of the one existing injection well and will provide the potential for effluent reclamation for irrigation purposes. Two on-site injection wells have experienced clogging, and the County is presently able to depend on the use of a third on-site well. The filter system will protect the one good on-site well and may allow some use of the two on-site wells.

OAHU
AIRCRAFT RESCUE FIRE FIGHTING STATION NO. 2 - PHASE II IMPROVEMENTS
Location: Honolulu, Oahu
TMO: 1-1-03:01
Proposing Agency: Department of Transportation
Airports Division Contact: Michio Nishi (336-6692)
The Airports Division, of the Department of Transportation, is proposing to renovate and expand the Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting Station No. 2 (ARFF No.2). The project site is located at the end of Lagoon Drive near the reef runway. The proposed project will consist of:

1. Station expansion and interior renovation. The station will be expanded to accommodate newer and larger rescue vehicles, to enlarge the dormitory area, to separate the dining and classroom area and kitchen.

2. New truck re-service facility. The truck re-service facility will allow the rescue vehicles to refill the water and aqueous foam tanks rapidly. The facility will also have new fuel pumps and fiberglass storage tanks to replace existing steel storage tanks. The new fuel tanks will meet EPA regulations.

3. Parking area expansion. Employee parking is limited and under the new FAA regulations, the station personnel cannot park their private vehicle within the AOA. The new parking lot will permit the employees to park next to their station.
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AIRPORT CENTER HOTEL
Location: Honolulu, Oahu
TMX: 1-15:13, 14
Permitting Agency: Department of Transportation
Contact: Wally Nishiga (836-6407)
Applicant: Airport Industrial Park Associates
/c/o R.M. Towill Corporation

Airport Industrial Park Associates is proposing a hotel development with a total of approximately 185,000 gross square feet of floor area. The subject property is located at 530 Palaie Street, and is bounded by Kepapa Street, Palaie Street, Aisole Street and Rodgers Boulevard. The design consists of a 411 guest room, 16-story hotel tower and a three-story parking structure. The hotel tower is 83 feet wide, 234 feet long, and 156 feet high. This specific project is part of the ongoing improvement of the property owned by Loyalty Development Corporation.

AKUMU STREET BELLE STAIRS
Location: Kakaako, Oahu
TMX: 4-2-50
Proposing Agency: City and County of Honolulu
Contact: Ed Sakamoto (323-4325)

The City and County of Honolulu, Department of Public Works, is proposing to construct a new force main from the Kakaako Land Estates Wastewater Pump Station to the Kool Drive trunk sewer. The objective of the project is to stop sewage overflows within the Akumu Street Area. This will require approximately 1800 linear feet of 10-inch pipe and new manhole constructed in Kool Drive. A portion of the existing gravity sewer that serves Akumu Street (between the pump station and Akalei Place) will be replaced with new 10-inch gravity sewer. The existing pumps and standby generator at the pump station will be replaced.

MAALAEA HARBOR FOR LIGHT-DRAFT VESSELS
Location: Maalaea, Maui
TMX: 3-6-01
Accepting Authority: Governor, State of Hawaii
Proposing Agency: Department of Transportation
Contact: Harbors Division

Please send your comments to:
Preparer: Commander, Honolulu District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Attn: CEPOD-ED-PV/Lenada Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96825-5440
Deadline: January 8, 1991

The Honolulu District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, sponsored by the State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Harbors Division is proposing to improve the existing light-draft harbor at Maalaea, Maui. Harbor improvements for the Federal portion of the project are as follows:
- an extension to the existing south breakwater 620 feet long;
- the addition of a reversed breakwater 400 feet long on the seaward side of the existing south breakwater for additional parking;
- a new entrance channel, 610 feet long, varying in width from 150 feet to 180 feet and varying in depth from 12 to 18 feet;
- a 1.7 acre turning basin, 12 feet deep;
- approximately 80 feet of existing east breakwater would be removed.

These features may be modified as a result of the analysis to be performed as part of the EIS process.

As funds are provided by the Hawaii State Legislature the local sponsor (OHT) will incrementally provide the following:
- an interior revetted breakwater and a berthing area 8 feet deep adjacent to the existing east breakwater;
- parking, water, electricity, fuel and restroom facilities;
- an increase of approximately 150 berths.

The proposed Federal improvements are estimated to cost $9,250,000 and would be cost shared, 70% Federal funds and 30% State of Hawaii funds.

UPCOUNTRY MAUI HIGH SCHOOL
Location: Makawao, Maui
TMX: 2-3-09:07, 13
2-3-07:01, 08
2-4-01:03
Accepting Authority: Governor, State of Hawaii

Please send your comments to:
Proposing Agency: Department of Accounting and General Services
Attn: Charles Iwamoto
1150 Punchbowl Street
Kalaniohu Building, Room 430
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
with a copy to:

Consultant: Mr. Earl Matsumura
c/o Wilson Okamoto and Associates, Inc.
1150 South King Street,
Suite 800
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96814

and a copy to OEQC.

Deadline: January 8, 1991

The Department of Education is proposing to construct a new high school with a design enrollment of 1,740 students in the Uwao area on Oahu. The school service area will also be modified as well as the feeder system from the intermediate schools. Students who live in the region are currently bused to Mauka High School in Ahuimanu and represent approximately 72% of that school's enrollment. The project will ease overcrowding at Mauka and Baldwin High Schools, both of which are experiencing major growth due to an increasing student population within their own immediate service areas. The estimated cost of the project is $46,301,000.

Based on criteria established by the Department of Education, five sites were identified and evaluated in the Site Selection Report: Site 1 is located along Haeleakala Highway immediately makai of the Pukalani residential area; Site 2 is located near the junction of Haeleakala Highway and Lower Kula Road; Site 3 is on the makai side of Makawao Avenue between Pukalani and Makawao subdivision; Site 4 lies on the makai side of Makawao Avenue along Apana Road; and Site 5 is located a short distance from the Maui Veterans Cemetery along Baldwin Avenue. All of the sites area situated on cultivated pineapple lands.

The proposed high school will be comprised of approximately 70 classrooms as well as athletic, dining room, administrative, and library facilities, and will be located on approximately 34 acres.

OAHU

CAMPBELL DRAINAGE CHANNEL - SUPPLEMENT TO KAPOLI BUSINESS INDUSTRIAL PARK EIS (Erroneously printed as a Negative Declaration in the October 23, 1990 OEQC Bulletin)

Location: Ewa, Oahu
TIMT: 9-1-14-04

Please send your comments to:

Accepting: City and County of Honolulu
Authority: Department of General Planning
Attn: Matthew Higashida
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

with a copy of your comments to:

Applicant: The Estate of James Campbell
c/o Ken Ishiiaki, Engineering Concepts, Inc.
250 Ward Avenue, Suite 206
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Deadline: December 10, 1990

The applicant is proposing a drainage channel within the future Kapolei Business Industrial Park site. The channel extends in a northeast-southwest direction from the OR & L Railroad right-of-way to Makakilo Road. A 100-foot wide parcel has been set aside. Beyond the Kapolei Business Industrial Park site, the proposed drainage channel extends in an east-west direction from Makakilo Road to the ocean. A 150-foot wide parcel has been set aside for this portion of the drainage channel. At the coastline, Camp Makakilo borders the channel to the north, with Chevrons USA located to the south.

The proposed channel will be trapezoidal in shape, with a bottom width of approximately 100 feet at the coast and 75 feet further inland. It is anticipated that the channel will be excavated in hard coral and will not require concrete lining. The channel excavation will intersect at the coastline at an approximate elevation of (4) 5 feet mean sea level.

Storm runoff generated from Kapolei Business Industrial Park will be intercepted and transported by an underground drainage system consisting of catchbasins/manholes and pipe culverts. Runoff will be collected and conveyed to the proposed drainage channel for ultimate disposal into the ocean. All on-site drainage improvements will be designed in accordance with the City and County standards. Maintenance roads and chain link fencing/gate will be located along both banks of the drainage channel for the length of the channel to the ocean.

PAIL-LIKELIKE SHOULDER LANE AND CONTRAFLow PROJECT

Location: Honolulu, Oahu
TIMT: various

Accepting Authority: Governor, State of Hawaii

Please send your comments to:

Proposing Agency: Department of Transportation
Attn: Albert Ng, Planning Branch
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

with a copy of your comments to:

Consultant: Mr. Chester Koga
R.M. Towill Corporation
420 Waldamore Road,
Suite 411
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

and a copy to OEQC.

Deadline: January 8, 1991

The State of Hawaii, Department of Transportation, Highways Division, is proposing a combination Shoulder Lane and ContraFlow Plan for the Pail Highway and Likelike Highway and Koolau Highway trans-Koolau corridors. The proposed projects consist of the two existing trans-Koolau highway corridors identified as State Routes 61 (Pail Highway) and 63 (Likelike Highway). The entire project will be within the existing highway right-of-way and will not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. Both corridors are owned by the State of Hawaii.

Shoulder lanes are proposed to be constructed within the Pail and Likelike Highways right-of-way. The proposed shoulder lanes for each of the highway corridors are as follows:

- Pail Highway. The shoulder lane along the Pail Highway will be constructed along the shoulder of the Honolulu-bound segment of the highway starting at the exit of the Honolulu-bound tunnel. The shoulder lane will be constructed along the Pail Highway from the tunnel to Waiakamilo Street.

- Likelike Highway. The shoulder lane along the Likelike Highway will be constructed along the shoulder of the Honolulu-bound segment of the highway starting at the exit of the Honolulu-bound tunnel. A third lane (shoulder) will then be constructed to the intersection of Likelike Highway and Kula Koa Drive in Kula Valley.
Contralflow lanes are proposed to be implemented on both Pali and Lilikoi Highways. The proposed contralflow lanes for each of the highway corridors are as follows:

- Pali Highway. The contralflow lane along the Pali Highway will be implemented along the Honolulu-bound segment of the highway starting at the intersection of Pali Highway and Kalanianaole Highway and terminating at the exit of the Honolulu-bound tunnel. The Kalana-bound segment of the highway will remain as a two-lane facility from Wai'anae Valley Road to the Pali Tunnel.

- Lilikoi Highway. The contralflow lane along the Lilikoi Highway will be implemented along the Honolulu-bound segment of the highway starting at Anahola Road and ending at the exit of the Honolulu-bound tunnel. The Kaeohe-bound traffic lanes will continue as a two-lane facility from the intersection of Lilikoi Highway and Kalalau Drive in Waialua Valley.

The contralflow segments of the highway corridors will be operational during the morning peak periods (Honolulu-bound) only, approximately between 6 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. The contralflow operations will be controlled through a combination of traffic signals and signs to direct motorists. Certain traffic movements ( ingress and egress) will be controlled along both corridors in order to provide for the safe movement of vehicles.

---

SMITH-BERENTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT

Location: Honolulu, Oahu
TMK: 1-7-04-01, 04
Accepting Authority: Planning
Proposing Agency: Department of Housing and Community Development
Mr. Michael Scarfone, Director
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

with a copy to:

Consultant: Mr. Patrick A. RibeIia
900 Fort Street, Suite 1505
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

and a copy to OEJC.

Deadline: January 8, 1991
The Smith-Berentania Parking Lot Redevelopment project involves the use of City land and the expenditure of approximately $10 million in City general obligation bond funds. An additional $6.2 million paid as a development premium for the Hooloulou Park Place (Honolulu Tower III) project of Berentania Street and Nuuanu Avenue will also be used for development costs. Parking revenues will repay the general obligation bonds over the long term. The proposed project is located on the block bounded by Berentania, Smith and Punahou Streets on the fringe of Honolulu's Chinatown Special District.

The components of the proposed project are as follows:

1. Parking - approximately 315 stalls of public parking within an underground parking facility containing two levels of parking with a single entrance/exit driveway near South Berentania Street.

2. Child Care - approximately 10,000 square feet of ground-level indoor facilities and outdoor (courtyard) space to serve an estimated 150 children each day.

3. Public Park - a passive public park will be provided atop the parking structure possibly including a tot lot, landscaping, benches and other passive play apparatus.

4. Limited Retail Shops and Offices - ground floor, small-scale commercial uses (i.e. convenience shops and minor business services) along Puna Street and a small portion of Smith Street with city and private offices within the second and third floors of a three-story structure fronting on Puna Street. The retail uses will primarily be pedestrian-oriented. Proposed City offices will permit some consolidation of City offices presently scattered within the downtown area.

---

LIHI LANI RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY - MAUNALI AND PUPUKA

Location: Koolauloa, Oahu
TMK: 5-9-05:34
5-9-06:16, 24

Please send your comments to:

Accepting Authority: Department of General Planning
Agency: Arlen Morimaki
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

and a copy to OEJC.

Deadline: January 8, 1991

The applicant is proposing to develop an integrated recreational community composed of the following elements: a 18-hole golf course, and equestrian ranch, a tennis center, 120 one-acre residential lots, 180 affordable housing units, hiking and horse riding trails, campground and a community facilities complex.

A Development Plan Land Use Map Amendment is requested for the Golf Course (212 acres from Agriculture to Park), Affordable Housing (28 acres from Agriculture to Residential) and Community Facilities (11 acres from Agriculture to Park). A Development Plan Public Facilities Map Amendment is requested for the Wastewater Treatment Facility (one acre from Agriculture to Public Facility).

---

KALUA ELDERLY HOUSING

Location: Koolauloa, Oahu
TMK: 4-3-55:11

Please send your comments to:

Accepting Authority: Department of General Planning
Agency: Arlen Morimaki
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

A 45-day review period commences with the initial publication of these projects in the bulletin (see deadline dates). EISs listed in this section are available for review at the following repositories:

- Office of Environmental Quality Control
- Legislative Reference Bureau
- Municipal Reference and Records Center (Oahu EIS)
- University of Hawaii Hamilton Library
- State Main Library (Housed at Kapiolani Community College)
- Kalani Regional Library
- Ko'olute Regional Library
- Pearl City Regional Library
- Hilo Regional Library
- Wailuku Regional Library
- Lihue Regional Library
- Branch Library in closest proximity to the project

Please send your comments to the accepting authority by a copy to the applicant or proposing agency (see listed contacts). OEQC would also appreciate a copy of your comments.

HAWAII

WAILEA AFFORDABLE HOUSING

MASTER PLAN

Location: South Kona, Hawaii
TMK: 6-6-0231, 26

Please send your comments to:

Accepting Authority: County of Hawaii

Proposing Agency: Department of Planning

Address: Diane Kanaha
25 Aupuni Street
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

with a copy of your comments to:

LANAI

MAMULU GOLF COURSE AND GOLF RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

Location: Makena, Maui
TMK: 4-2-0201

Please send your comments to:

Accepting Authority: County of Maui

Proposing Agency: Planning Department

Address: Mr. Phillip Oba
200 South High Street
Wailuku, Hawaii 96793

Deadlines:

Hawaii: January 7, 1991

The Office of Housing and Community Development of the County of Hawaii is proposing an affordable residential development at Wailuku Village, in the South Kohala district of West Hawaii. This master planned development is proposed to contain approximately 1,200 single- and multi-family housing units all of which will be available for rent or sale in the affordable price ranges, as defined by federal, state and county standards.

The project site is currently undeveloped and is located at the north end of the existing Wailuku Village. Ownership of 279 acres of the 340-acre site is being conveyed from the present land owner, Wailuku Land Company to the County of Hawaii through an agreement between the two parties.

Envisioned is an approximately 1,200 dwelling unit mix of single family and multi-family units on finished lots. This project will also include an 8.6 acre parcel for churches and a small commercial area near the Paniolo Drive entrance. A community park of approximately 9 acres will be located next to the commercial/church area at the entrance to the development at Paniolo Drive. A 36-acre school is planned for convenance to the State Department of Education by the Wailuku Land Company at the southeastern edge of the project site near the Ho'okipa and Paniolo Drive intersection.

The major roadway network consists of 50-foot and 66-foot rights-of-way, with curbs, gutters and sidewalks, and dry wells for drainage. Roadway grades were maintained at a minimum slope of eight-percent, with a few exceptions where ten to twelve-percent was used because of the steep character of the area.
with a copy of your comments to:

Applicant: The Lanai Company  
Attn: Mr. Thomas C. Lepeil  
650 Iwilel Road, 3rd Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

and a copy to:

Consultant: Belt Collins & Associates  
Attn: Anne Mapes  
680 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 200  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

and a copy to OEQC

Deadline: January 7, 1991

The applicant is proposing a Community Plan Amendment to the Lanai Community Plan by expanding the existing Lanai Project District 2 - Manele to include an additional 456 acres of land for purposes of developing a golf course and resort residential development. The additional acreage includes 265 acres currently designated State Rural District and 191 acres parcel in the State Agricultural District.

Features of the project include an 18-hole golf course, golf clubhouse, 425 single family residences and 100 multi-family residences to be sited over the entire 866 acres of the existing Project District and the expansion area. Only golf and large lot single family homes surrounded by open space will be sited outside of the existing Project District boundary. None of the multi-family units are planned in the expansion area.

Construction activities will include the following:

- Grading and clearing about 200 acres of land and approximately 70 acres in the existing Lanai Project District 1 - Manele.
- Construction of a 200-acre golf course, clubhouse, and driving range.
- Construction of the infrastructure for the golf course: irrigation water supply and distribution system, roadway network, water reclamation system, drainage facilities and all coordinated offsite support facilities for the golf course infrastructure.
- Landscaping for the golf course and roadway right-of-way.
- Construction of the golf in a target course concept thereby requiring irrigation of approximately 100 acres.

- Construction of the infrastructure for residential: roadways, water distribution lines, water storage, sewer pump stations, expanded wastewater treatment facilities, sewage collection and pumping facilities, and effluent distribution lines.
- The residential development would be constructed in phases depending on the demand in the market.

The infrastructure development will be coordinated with ongoing plans for the existing Lanai Project District 2 - Manele. Roadways are being constructed and new connectors will be made to accommodate traffic with the resort. The electrical power system is an on-site generation unit that supplies the Manele Bay Hotel and with additional underground distribution lines will be sufficient to serve the entire golf and residential project. Communications and drainage system improvements will be coordinated with the ongoing infrastructure work for the Lanai Project District 2 - Manele.

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS**

The following EIS’s have been submitted for acceptance. All comments received by the applicant or proposing agency, and corresponding responses, should be contained within the Final EIS. Those who wish to contest the acceptance of an EIS have a 60-day period in which to initiate litigation. The 60-day litigation period starts from the date of publication of an EIS’s acceptance.

**HAWAII**

**LILUOKALANI TRUST KAUIHOU LANDS OF KAIIJU KONA**

**Location:** North Kona, Hawaii  
**TOLL:** 7-4-00-02, 12

**Accepting Authority:** State Land Use Commission

**Applicant:** Liluokalani Trust

**Status:** Currently being processed by the State Land Use Commission

The applicant, Liluokalani Trust Estate, is proposing to lease for development 1,135 acres of its land immediately north of Kailua town. This land is part of a 4,000-acre ocean to mountain top ahuwai left to the Trust by Queen Liluokalani in her will for the purpose of assisting orphaned Hawaiian children.

The proposed project consists of the four principal elements, an Urban Expansion Area, a Residential Community, a Business Expansion Area, and a Regional Transportation Network. The Trust intends to retain ownership of the Urban Expansion Area and the Business Expansion Area, sell the Residential Development Area to the State of Hawaii, and participate with the State, County, and other land owners in the construction and dedication of regional infrastructure, including the Regional Transportation Network. For those areas retained by the Trust, developers will be selected to construct the individual projects according to specifications established by the Trust.

Restrictive covenants will be established to guide the development, operation and maintenance of buildings and facilities developed on Trust property. Lease rents derived from the various projects will provide the Trust with a major source of new revenue to support its beneficiaries.

The following is a summary of the proposed development:

- The 465-acre Urban Expansion Area is proposed as the central element of urban expansion in the North Kona region. It will provide a variety of land uses which combine to create a new region-serving activity center for Kailua.

  - Included in this area are the following proposed uses: a 145-acre Regional Shopping Center; a 20-acre Financial Plaza; a 35-acre Regional Hospital; a 25-acre Professional Plaza including medical offices; a 20-acre Business Hotel; a 30-acre civic and Cultural Center; as well as 68 additional acres of commercial land, 95 acres for Office expansion, and 34 acres of Open Space, Park, and an Historic Reserve which contains numerous archaeological sites.

- A 465-acre area including all of that portion of the project mauna of the center line of a planned MD-Level Roadway, which creates the eastern boundary of the Urban Expansion Area, is proposed for sale to the State of Hawaii. The land uses for this mauna area will, subsequently, be determined by the State of Hawaii. A number of alternative uses have been considered including...
affordable and market housing, a West Hawaii university campus, and a regional sports facility. However, it is anticipated for the purposes of this study that the entire 459 acres will be developed as a residential community.

The third component consists of approximately 229 acres of land located makai of Queen Kaahumanu Highway between Kealakehe Industrial Subdivision and the Kona Conservation District land, and the Kona Industrial Subdivision 100-acre expansion area. This parcel is proposed for long-term development as a mixed-use expansion area for retail, commercial and wholesale businesses, and recreational uses. It includes the Kona Children’s Center which presently occupies a small parcel within the proposed expansion area and has leased an adjoining parcel to a privately-owned aquaculture project. Because the Business Expansion Area is proposed for development in a later phase of the project, the activities of the Kona Children’s Center will not be disrupted in the foreseeable future.

Finally, the Trust proposes a Regional Transportation Network to be implemented in coordination with development projects proposed by landowners throughout the area. The Regional Transportation Network is designed to relieve major traffic problems, especially in the area of Palani Road and Queen Kaahumanu Highway. The components of this system include the following:

1. A 300-foot wide setback for Queen Kaahumanu Highway to provide space for the eventual expansion of Queen Kaahumanu Highway and/or a frontage road along the makai side of the highway.
2. A new mauka-makai roadway extending through the subject property, tentatively called the Queen Liliuokalani Boulevard. It will consist of a 128-foot right-of-way and provide access to the proposed project including the proposed Regional Shopping Center and help to reduce traffic congestion on Palani Road.
3. A Mid-Level Roadway separating the proposed urban expansion from the proposed Residential Development on the 459 acres to be purchased by the State. This roadway would consist of a 120 foot right-of-way with two lanes generally paralleling Queen Kaahumanu Highway.

5. Waena Drive, a 65-foot right-of-way depicted by the Housing Finance and Development Corporation in its Kealakehe Planned Community Concept Plan and by the County of Hawaii in its Kealakehe Planned Community Concept Plan and by the County of Hawaii in its Kealakehe Planned Community Concept Plan and by the County of Hawaii in its Kealakehe Planned Community Concept Plan. It provides a link from Palani Road to the proposed Kealakehe development.

MAUNA LANI COVE - FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL EIS
Location: South Kohala, Hawaii
TMR: 6-8-52/1, 3, 9

Accepting Authority: Hawaii County, Planning Department
Applicant: Mauna Lani Resort
Status: Accepted by the County of Hawaii Planning Department on December 4, 1990.

OAHU

THE WATERFRONT AT ALOHA TOWER
Location: Honolulu, Oahu
TMR: 1-01/01, 02, 03, 04

Accepting Authority: Office of the Office of Environmental Quality Control
Proposing Agency: ALOHA Tower Development
Status: Currently being processed by the Office of Environmental Quality Control.

The Aloha Tower Development Corporation is proposing The Waterfront at Aloha Tower which will integrate cruise ship and inter-island ferry terminal facilities, hotel, office, retail and restaurant use. These proposed uses will create a distinctive terminus for the Fort Street Mall, which will be extended through the project as a roadway to connect Downtown with the waterfront.

Specifically, proposed development components will include the Maritime Building and Passenger Terminal with commercial and governmental offices at Piers 5 and 6; the Pedestrian Promenade extending from Piers 5 to 14 with retail emphasis between Piers 6 and 9; Aloha Tower Marketplace retail and office complex at Piers 8 and 9 with maritime improvements at the pier front; a refurbished and beautified Aloha Tower; the Aloha Tower Hotel at Pier 10; and an international cruise ship terminal at Pier 10 and 11; the Oahu Tower Office Complex at Pier 11; Honolulu Fort Historic Park at Pier 12; and Honolulu Harborside condominiums at Piers 13 and 14 with maritime facilities at pier level. The project land area is approximately 22.4 acres.

WAIKOLOA HOTEL
Location: Waikoloa, Oahu
TMR: 2-6-09/02, 03, 10

Accepting Authority: City and County of Honolulu Department of Land Utilization
Applicant: JMA Corporation
Status: Currently being reviewed by the Department of Land Utilization.

The applicant is proposing to demolish the Waikoloa Hotel and rebuild a new hotel on the site with approximately 204 units (totaling 286,300 square feet), 20,000 square feet of commercial/office space, and parking for 150 automobiles.

There will be three parking levels, starting at grade, and a tower containing 216 of the guest rooms to a total height of 350 feet. A separate, four-story structure will contain eight additional “Ocean Terrace” guest rooms. Of the total 20,000 square feet of commercial/office space, approximately 8,000 will be occupied by office and administration functions, 7,000 will be set aside for shops, and 5,000 square feet will house the
Tahitian Lagoon, which will continue to be a restaurant on the project site.

The project site is in the Resort Hotel & Private Estates of the Waikiki Special District. All existing structures on the project site will be demolished. Other construction activities will include clearing, but minimal grading, since the site is relatively level. All new construction work will be done at grade, and no major alteration of land forms is proposed.

NEPA DOCUMENTS

The following documents have been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Should you require further information on these projects, please call the Office of Environmental Quality Control at 548-6915.

PROPOSED MARINE MINERAL LEASE SALE

For further information regarding this EIS, the following persons may be contacted:

Dr. Charles L. Morgan
State EIS Coordinator
Manganese Project
811 Kamehameha Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 522-5617/FAX 522-5818

Mr. Robert B. Paul
Federal EIS Coordinator
Minerals Management Service
1340 West Sixth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 894-2239/FAX 894-6485

A joint effort of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, and the State of Hawaii, Department of Business and Economic Development is proposing the leasing of mineral rights in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone adjacent to Hawaii and Johnston Island. The leasing proposal consists of offering 26,910 square kilometers (approximately 6,655 million acres) of Exclusive Economic Zone lands for lease. The estmate of potential resource in the proposed lease area are 2.6 million tonnes (metric tons) of copper, 1.6 million tonnes of nickel, and 81 million tonnes of manganese. Unknown amounts of platinum are also suspected but unconfirmed in the deposits. The deposits lie on the sea floor in the form of crusts or pavements of oxide minerals in water depths between 800 and 2,400 meters on the flanks of volcanically formed islands and seamounts. Presently, no date has been set for a lease sale.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE - CONSTRUCTION OF 90 FAMILY HOUSING UNITS (HONOLULU)

Location: Ewa, Oahu
TMO: 9-9-0113

Please send your comments to:

Proposing Agency: Lieutenant Colonel Donald T. Wynn, District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District
Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96855-5440

Contact: David Soz (808-5030)

Deadline: January 8, 1991

The proposed action is to construct 90 family housing units on a 16 acre aprons-paved, taxic northeast of Oahu. The units will be built at a density of 5.6 units per acre, consisting of seventy percent two-bedroom and thirty percent three-bedroom units. It is envisioned that all units will be constructed as townhouse-type structures, similar to the existing housing at Oahu. The building will have a separate road access from Freedom Avenue. All units will be centrally air conditioned. Ten percent of the new housing will be constructed in such a way which may be converted to provide housing for the physically challenged.

MAKUA MILITARY RESERVATION FIRE CONTROL AND SUPPRESSION PLAN - CLARIFICATION

Proposing Agency: Department of the Army

The purpose of this project is to provide a comprehensive fire control and suppression program of range grasses that are the fuel source for fires that may threaten the habitat of the endangered Oahu Tree Snail and candidate plant species located on the ridge forming the boundary at the Makua Military Reservation. Program intent of control and suppression will be accomplished by conducting controlled fire burns following a prescribed burn plan (twice yearly) to reduce fuel base (range grasses) and the application of ecologically safe systemic herbicides (approximately twice yearly) and dispersal of a biodegradable fire retardant (approximately twice yearly) along fire break roadways and surrounding fencelines to control extensive vegetation growth.

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION - FORTY UNIT FAMILY HOUSING PROJECT

Location: Koolau Polo, Oahu
TMO: 4-4-09-03

Please send your comments to:

Proposing Agency: LTC Donald T. Wynn, District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Honolulu District
Building 230
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96855-5440

Contact: David Soz (808-5030)

Deadline: January 8, 1991

The proposed action is to construct 40 family housing units for military service members and their families at a 13 acre site on the lower slope of Ufahana Road at the military eastern corner of the inhabited area of the Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay. The proposed dwelling units will be designed as multiple-unit row/townhouses; 12 (30 percent) will be three-bedroom, 1200 square foot units and 28 (70 percent) will be two-bedroom, 950 square foot units. Supporting facilities will consist of all utilities and communications, roadways and walkways, two tot lots, landscaping, and street lighting.

NON-APPROPRIATED FUND TRANSIENT LODGING

Location: Schofield Barracks, Oahu

Proposing Agency: Department of the Army

The purpose of the project is to provide non-appropriated fund transient lodging located in the Schofield Barracks area. The project will afford temporary accommodations for all military personnel (including dependents) stationed at Schofield Barracks and the community. The temporary accommodations are necessary to house personnel for training exercises and to fill any vacancies in the permanent housing facilities.

PAGE 10
MEETING NOTICE

MEETING OF THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
Date: December 12, 1990
Time: 5:00 p.m.
Location: Department of Health Board Room
1250 Punchbowl Street, Third Floor

AGENDA
1. Call to Order
2. Approval of November 14, 1990 Meeting Minutes
3. Concerns and Projects for 1991
4. Other Business
5. Adjournment

INTEGRATING WATER AND LAND USE PLANNING IN HAWAII WITH FOCUS ON REVIEW OF COUNTY WATER USE AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS - PEOPLE'S WATER CONFERENCE #2
Date: January 12, 1991
Time: 8:30 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
Location: Honolulu State Capitol Auditorium

FREE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC LUNCH AND RECEPTION
REGISTRATION REQUESTED
County Water Use and Development Plans are available from the DLNR Public Libraries on all islands; Department of Water on Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai; and Office of General Planning on Oahu.

FOR MORE INFORMATION: CONTACT Martha Breski, Chairperson, at 395-2127.

EE ADVISORY

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS AND NOTICES OF DETERMINATION
Agencies and applicants should be diligent in preparing environmental assessments to assure that they meet the letter and intent of the law.

Information should be contained in the documents which will substantiate statements and decisions. (i.e. There should be substantiating evidence to justify the statement that there will be no environmental impacts.)

Per Section 10, Chapter 200 of Title 11, Administrative Rules, Department of Health, environmental assessments shall contain:

1. Identification of applicant or proposing agency;
2. Identification of approving agency, if applicable;
3. Identification of agencies consulted in making assessment;
4. General description of the action's technical, economic, social, and environmental characteristics;
5. Summary description of the affected environment, including purpose and location of site maps;
6. Identification and summary of major impacts and alternatives considered, if any;
7. Proposed mitigation measures, if any;
8. Determination;
9. Findings and reasons supporting determination; and
10. Agencies to be consulted in the preparation of the environmental impact statement, if applicable.

Projects should not be done on an incremental basis to avoid preparation of an environmental impact statement. Per Section 12, Chapter 200, the agency shall consider every phase of a proposed action, the expected consequences, both primary and secondary, and the cumulative as well as the short and long-term effects of the action.

Please refer to Chapter 200 for more information or call OEQC at 548-6915.
**PUBLIC NOTICE**

Pursuant to Section 13-322-12, Hawaii Administrative Rules entitled "Shoreline Certification"

**NOTICE OF APPLICATION:** Application available for inspection at District Land Offices on the Islands of Kauai, Hawaii and Maui and at Room 220, Kalanioku Building, 1131 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Oahu

**LOCATION** | **APPLICANT** | **TAX MAP KEY** | **DATE RECEIVED**
---|---|---|---

2) Lot 3, Sec. E, Tanihara Beach Estates, Par. RP, LG. 1132, Lt. AV, S112, AP. 32 (Kawelo, Waianae, Oahu) | A.E. Minvielle, Jr. for Trust of Estate of B.P. Bishop | 6-1-12:13 | 11/28/90

3) Lot 18-A, par. B, sec. 5-5, lot 740, Tanihara Beach (Kalaupua, Waimea, South Kohala, Hawaii) | N.H. Towill Corp. for the Hawaii-Carlton Mauna Lani | 6-8-22:18 | 11/28/90

4) Lot 1, Map 2, LD, Cr. A, Map 104 (Hawaiian Koolau Estates, Kailua, Oahu) | A.E. Minvielle, Jr. for Milton Henn | 4-6-03:88 | 12/4/90

Concurs on application may be made in writing to the Department of Land and Natural Resources at Room 210, Kalanioku Building, 1131 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Oahu within fourteen (14) days of this notice.

**Department of Land and Natural Resources**
1131 Punchbowl Street, Room 210
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel. 548-6460
### Public Notice

Pursuant to Section 13-222-12, Hawaii Administrative Rules entitled “Shoreline Certification”

**Date:** December 8, 1990  **Number:** 90-011

#### Notice of Shoreline Certification or Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>TAX MAP KEY</th>
<th>DATE CERTIFIED (C) OR REJECTED (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Tenerasa Parcel</td>
<td>Controlpoint Surveying Co., Inc.</td>
<td>5-5-0314C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Par. of Grant</td>
<td>for Barbara Ching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kili (Laeli)</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Lot 11, Block</td>
<td>A Surveyor for Peter</td>
<td>3-6-01025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. L. Co.,</td>
<td>Kuneshofer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 1990</td>
<td>Honolulu, Oahu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Par. of Grant</td>
<td>H. A. and Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>6-8-820 &amp; 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kili and Forer</td>
<td>for Frank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Villa</td>
<td>Oppermann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Land Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Par. of L.P. Co.</td>
<td>Clifton V. Blackburn</td>
<td>3-6-0133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td>Land Surveyor for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114th to Hana</td>
<td>John Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loa to the end of Lot 7-9-40</td>
<td>Hana, Maui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal:** May be made to the Department of Land and Natural Resources in writing within twenty (20) days of the date of this notice.

Department of Land and Natural Resources
151 Punchbowl Street, Room 220
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel. 548-8460

---

### Public Notice

Pursuant to Section 13-222-12, Hawaii Administrative Rules entitled “Shoreline Certification”

**Date:** December 8, 1990  **Number:** 90-011

#### Notice of Shoreline Certification or Rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>TAX MAP KEY</th>
<th>DATE CERTIFIED (C) OR REJECTED (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Lot 13, D.L. Co.,</td>
<td>Walter P. Thompson,</td>
<td>4-6-3-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation, Inc. for All Pool</td>
<td>71st at Kealia</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr. 1990</td>
<td>John J. Cogan</td>
<td>71st at Kealia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Lot 1, Kaulua</td>
<td>Walter J. Thompson, Inc. for John K.</td>
<td>6-1-4-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Lots, Inc. for John K.</td>
<td>71st at Kaulua</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Lot 7-A, Kaulua</td>
<td>A Surveyor for</td>
<td>5-3-03-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Lots, Inc. for John K.</td>
<td>Winfield Hama Goys</td>
<td>Koolau, Oahu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal:** May be made to the Department of Land and Natural Resources in writing within twenty (20) days of the date of this notice.

Department of Land and Natural Resources
151 Punchbowl Street, Room 220
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel. 548-8460
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PREPARATION NOTICE
for
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
November 30, 1990

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES:

Development Summary:


2. Tax Map Key/Area/Owner(s):
   1-7-04: 4 - 57,865 square feet. City and County of Honolulu
   1-7-04: 1 - 7,335 square feet. Les Marks Revocable Living Trust and Les Marks, Trustee. (acquisition under negotiation)

3. Existing Land Use: Municipal Parking Lot; Eating drinking establishment (TMK: 1-7-04: parcel 1


8. LUO Special District Designation: Chinatown Special District.

The project involves the use of City land and the expenditure of approximately $10 million in City general obligation bond funds. An additional $6.2 million paid as a development premium for the Honolulu Park Place (Honolulu Tower II) project on Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue will also be used for development costs. Parking revenues will repay the general obligation bonds over the long term.

The components of the proposed project are as follows:
1. Parking - approximately 315 stalls of public parking within an underground parking facility containing two levels of parking with a single entrance/exit driveway onto South Beretania Street.

2. Child Care - approximately 10,000 square feet of ground-level indoor facilities and outdoor (courtyard) space to serve an estimated 150 children each day.

3. Public Park - a passive public park will be provided atop the parking structure possibly including a tot lot, landscaping, benches and other passive play apparatus.

4. Limited Retail Shops and Offices - ground floor, small-scale commercial uses (i.e. convenience shops and minor business services) along Pauahi Street and a small portion of Smith Street with City and private offices within the second and third floors of a three-story structure fronting on Pauahi Street. The retail uses will primarily be pedestrian-oriented. Proposed City offices will permit some consolidation of City offices presently scattered within the downtown area.

5. Land acquisition (TMK: 1-7-04: parcel 1).

OVERVIEW OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.

The proposed project is located on the block bounded by Beretania, Smith and Pauahi Streets on the fringe of Honolulu's Chinatown Special District (See Exhibit 1). The 57,865 square foot site currently contains 129 metered parking stalls at street level and 15 stalls reserved for tenants in the Smith-Beretania Apartments building. The site abuts the former Empress Theater which is now used as a church; the Smith-Beretania Apartments, a 164-unit apartment building; and three one-story buildings which contain two restaurants, two art galleries, a U.S. post office, convenience store, a hair stylist shop, and a travel service office. Numerous small businesses and retail shops line Smith and Pauahi Streets across from the project site. Exhibit 2, which follows the text of this Notice, shows various details of the project.

The project site is located within the State Urban District and designated for Commercial use on the Primary Urban Center Development Plan Land Use Map. The zoning designation for the property is B-MX-4, Central Business District, wherein mixed uses are permitted. The Chinatown Special District regulations of the Land Use Ordinance impose a 200-foot building height limit and certain design requirements on portions of the project site located within this District.
SMITH-BERETANIA
PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT

EXHIBIT 1
The proposed project relates to the Hawaii State Plan, several State Functional Plans, the City and County of Honolulu's General Plan, Primary Urban Center Development Plan, Land Use Ordinance and Chinatown Special District Ordinance. The project conforms to and implement various policies, guidelines and controls contained in these plans and regulations.

TECHNICAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION.

Traffic, Air Quality and Noise:

Access to the heavily-used existing parking lot is currently allowed only from Smith Street, a one-way collector street running in a mauka direction. A service entrance for the Smith-Beretania Apartments building is located on Pauahi Street.

Access to and from the proposed parking structure within the redeveloped project site would be provided only from South Beretania Street. Approximately 313 parking stalls within a underground parking facility containing two levels of parking are proposed within the project. The impacts of the various components of the project (i.e., parking facility, child care facility, passive park and limited commercial/office uses) on traffic conditions, air quality and noise levels will be reviewed and addressed in the project's draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Sewer, Water and Drainage:

The City Department of Public Works and Board of Water Supply are being consulted regarding the adequacy of the following existing, nearby infrastructure systems to serve the proposed project:

Sewer - An 8-inch sewer line on Smith and Beretania Streets. (By letter dated October, 1989, the City Public Works Department recommended that the proposed project connect with the existing 8-inch sewer line within Smith Street.)

Water - A 6-inch water main on Smith Street.
A 12-inch water main on South Beretania Street.
A 24-inch water main on Pauahi Street.

Drainage - Surface runoff drainage catch basins are located on the corners of Nuuanau Avenue and South Beretania Street and Smith and South Beretania Streets and provide for the drainage of surface water flowing from the project site.
ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS

Topography: The site's elevation is approximately two (2) feet higher than the ground elevation at South Beretania Street. The project site slopes gradually downward and in a mauka direction from Pauahi Street towards South Beretania Street.

Soils Resources: The soils in the area are classified as Ewa silty clay loam (EmA), 0 to 2% slopes, moderately shallow. This soil has a profile like that of Ewa silty clay loam, 3 to 5% slopes, except that the depth to coral limestone is 20 to 50 inches. Runoff is very slow and the erosion hazard is slight.

Flora and Fauna: The site currently contains six large monkeypod trees along Smith and South Beretania Streets which will either be incorporated into the project design or relocated. The site also contains paperbark trees which will be removed during project construction.

Birds, cats and mice typically found in inner city environments likely also reside within the project site.

Flood Hazard: According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map, the site is situated in the Flood Zone "X". Such areas are determined to be outside the 500-year floodplain.

Other Hazards: There is no evidence of existing man-made hazards, including industrial mills or plants, electric and gas manufacturing plants, or oil storage areas in the vicinity of the project site.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Socio-Economic Impacts: The project will not add new residents to the immediate surrounding area and, therefore, will not increase the existing demand for public services. Although the removal of public parking stalls during project construction will temporarily inconvenience the public, over the long term the additional public parking spaces within the project is expected to benefit downtown businesses and nearby residential areas. In the long run, the project's parking facility will generate substantial City revenues from metered as well as daily parking fees which are expected to be comparable to then-prevailing private parking facility fees.

The child care center is expected to benefit both downtown residents and employees by providing child care services close to their residences or work places and by creating new, full-time employment opportunities for approximately 20 persons.
The passive public park will also benefit downtown residents and employees by providing such people with directly accessible recreational facilities near their residences or work places.

The minor retail convenience shops and ground-level businesses proposed by the project to be located along Pauahi Street and a portion of Smith Street will be consistent in their use, limited scale, pedestrian orientation and character with other convenience shops and small-scale business establishments located in the immediate surrounding area of downtown. As such, these shops and offices will continue rather than disrupt the current and unique clustering of specialty shops, curios, small-scale businesses which prevail within the Chinatown District. Further, these will be new establishments as the project will not displace any existing businesses or residences within the project site.

It is anticipated that the proposed City business offices to be located within the second and third stories of the project's structure will enable the City to consolidate some City functions or services which are now dispersed throughout the downtown area due to a lack of City office space. As such, the project will result in the long term in fiscal savings for the City, greater convenience for current users of such City functions or services and increased available office space in the downtown area.

The establishment of new private, downtown office space within the project site will help to address the continuing low office space vacancy rate in the downtown area and generate additional City revenues from office rent.

**URBAN DESIGN.**

Since the project site is located within in the Chinatown Special Design District, a development permit for the project is required from the City Department of Land Utilization. Much of the site falls in the "Mauka Precinct" of that District which is subject to a 40-foot building height limit and setback requirement for each building exceeding 40 feet in height. The District also requires a 15-foot front yard setback along South Beretania Street.

The Smith-Pauahi corner of the project site falls in the "Historic Core Precinct" of the Chinatown Special Design District. A 40-feet building height limit is required within this Precinct.

The proposed redevelopment of the project site will replace the generally run-down and worn visual character of the existing parking lot with an open park space containing a variety of plants and grassy areas, pedestrian walkways and rest areas, other park amenities, and a new child care facility. In addition, the proposed redevelopment will increase the economic value and
productivity of the project site for the City with the establishment of small retail shops, businesses and offices as part of the redevelopment project. In so doing, the redevelopment will encourage revitalization of other nearby run-down areas.

HISTORIC RESOURCES.

The project will return much of the site to its former historical status as the City's first public playground opened in 1911 by the Free Kindergarten and Children's Aid Association. It remained a playground until 1952 when a parking lot was constructed on the project site. A 1944 report indicated that the 1.09-acre playground contained play courts, play equipment, a comfort station-pavilion and landscaping and further indicated that the City Planning Commission was considering the site for municipal parking lot.

Park Board minutes from 1950-52 indicate that the Park Board agreed to the establishment of the parking lot if a replacement site for the playground were provided. Apparently, the Beretania Community Park on Ash Street was the designated replacement playground.

During project construction, if any items or artifacts of apparent historic or archaeological interest are uncovered, the contractor will be directed to stop work immediately and further construction will be suspended until the archaeological/historic consultant for the project and the State Historic Preservation Officer are notified and have examined such items and artifacts for their historic or archaeological significance.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS.

Short-Term: Project construction activities may have short-term impacts on nearby businesses and residents because the temporary removal of the parking lot during the construction period will eliminate public parking stalls from the downtown inventory of parking stalls. The erection of safety barricades, construction noise, dust, and other environmental disturbances also may temporarily inconvenience nearby businesses and residents.

Long-Term: The proposed project will have impacts on traffic, air quality and noise. Consultant studies of such project impacts will be included in the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

The project will modify the physical character and visual appearance of the immediate neighborhood by providing additional public parking stalls while removing all parking stalls from public view; by establishing a fairly large child care center; by creating
a centrally-located public park space in the downtown area; and by constructing new retail and business establishments and offices—all within the project site which presently contains only a ground-level public parking facility.

The following consultant studies will be prepared and will be included as appendices to the draft EIS:

- Traffic Impact Study
- Air Quality Study
- Noise Study
- Archaeological/Historic Resources Study

ALTERNATIVES.

1. Retain in Present Use - No Project

The continued use of the City-owned subject property as a municipal offstreet parking lot would continue to benefit downtown merchants; however, none of the important social, recreational, economic, fiscal, urban design and redevelopment benefits of the proposed project would be realized by the City, immediate surrounding community and general public. These benefits include:

a. Provision of approximately 313 new public parking stalls within the downtown area which continues to lack adequate public parking facilities;

b. Provision of a centrally-located and convenient 10,000 square feet child care center within the downtown area to the benefit of downtown residents and employees;

c. Provision of a 45,000 square feet landscaped open public park space which would be readily and conveniently accessible to most downtown residents and employees; and

d. Provision of limited retail, business and office space within the project site which would yield sustained City revenues from lease rents as well as enable consolidation of City functions and services which are presently dispersed throughout the downtown area; and

e. Redevelopment of the project site which would encourage accelerated revitalization of nearby blighted areas in the Chinatown district.
2. Alternative Sites

Other municipal parking lots in the downtown area have been evaluated as to their potential for redevelopment and are in various stages of planning, design or construction. Where feasible, the City intends to use such underdeveloped facilities to provide additional residential and commercial space in the Central Business District to achieve the City's downtown redevelopment objectives.

3. Alternative Higher Density Development

This site was previously considered for development of 200 rental apartment units in addition to public parking, a child care center and public park. Because of concerns about resulting increases in downtown residential development, neighborhood traffic congestion and insufficient supporting park space for such apartments, this proposal was dropped from further consideration.

DETERMINATION.

The Department of Housing and Community Development will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in accordance with Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes.

AGENCIES TO BE CONSULTED IN PREPARATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

1. Federal:
   U.S Army Corps of Engineers
   U.S Department of Interior - Fish and Wildlife Service
   U.S Department of Agriculture - Soil Conservation Service
   U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development

2. State of Hawaii:
   Department of Health
   Department of Land and Natural Resources
   Department of Business and Economical Development
   Office of State Planning
   Department of Transportation
   Environmental Center, University of Hawaii
   Office of Environmental Quality Control
   Department of Agriculture
   Department of Education
   Land Use Commission
3. City and County of Honolulu:
   Board of Water Supply
   Department of General Planning
   Department of Land Utilization
   Department of Public Works
   Department of Transportation Services
   Building Department
   Fire Department
   Department of Parks and Recreation
   Fire Department
   Police Department
   Office of Human Resources
   Department of Finance

4. Others:
   Hawaiian Electric Company
   GTE Hawaiian Tel
   The Gas Company
   American Lung Association
   Downtown Improvement Association
   Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13
   Chinese Chamber of Commerce
   Chinatown Advisory Committee
   Downtown Business Council
   American Institute of Architects Hawaii Society
   Historic Hawai‘i Foundation Mainstreet
   Hawaii Theater Center
   Chinatown Merchants Association
   United Chinese Societies
   Honolulu Tower Board of Directors.
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MEMORANDUM

TO: Donald S.M. Chang  
   Acting Fire Chief  
   Honolulu Fire Department

FROM: Michael H. Scarfone, Director  
   Department of Housing & Community Development

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

We have reviewed the subject material provided and have no additional comments.

Should you have any questions, please contact Battalion Chief Attilio Leonardi of our Administrative Services Bureau at local 3624.

Donald S. M. Chang
Acting Fire Chief

ACL:ng
Copy to: Patrick A. Ribella

Copy: Watzick A. Ribella

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

DEP 2 1 1992
December 6, 1990

MEMO TO: MICHAEL SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: HERBERT K. MURAOKA
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE
PROPOSED SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

This is in response to the letter received from Patrick A. Ribellia, Attorney at Law, regarding the subject EISPW.

We have no comments at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject EISPW.

HERBERT K. MURAOKA
Director and Building Superintendent

DC: jo
CC: J. Harada
Patrick Ribellia

December 12, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Herbert K. Muraoka
Director and Building Superintendent
Building Department

FROM: Michael N. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing & Community Development

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

This acknowledges receipt of your December 6 memorandum regarding the above-captioned matter which states that your department has reviewed the subject preparation notice and has no comments thereon at this time.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

copy: Patrick A. Ribellia
December 6, 1999

Mr. Michael N. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

We have received an EIS preparation notice for a mixed-use development on the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot.

Our Executive Committee reviewed the plans earlier and had no objection to the proposal, other than questions about the market viability of the office space. Since the preparation notice indicates the City now intends to use that office space for its own purposes, our concern is satisfied.

We would appreciate being consulted during the preparation of the draft EIS.

Very truly yours,

William A. Grant, AIA
Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

December 14, 1999

Mr. William A. Grant, AIA
Executive Director
Downtown Improvement Association
700 Bishop Street, Ste. 1005
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Grant:

Subject: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE, SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII.

This acknowledges receipt of your December 6 letter informing us that your Executive Committee reviewed the above-captioned Notice. The Committee's comments with respect to the proposed office space within a portion of the project is duly noted and will be considered in the preparation of the project's draft environmental impact statement.

Thank you for reviewing the notice and for the comments thereon. Your Association will be consulted during the preparation of the draft EIS.

Sincerely,

Michael N. Scarfone
Executive Director

copy: Matthew A. Ribellis
Mr. Michael N. Scarfone  
Director  
Department of Housing and  
Community Development  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. Scarfone:  

Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice  
Smith-Be佐田 Parking Lot Redevelopment Project,  
Honolulu, Oahu, TMK: 1-7-04: I and 4  

Thank you for your letter of November 28, 1990, requesting our comments on the subject amended EIS preparation notice.  
We responded to you on October 6, 1990 (HWY-PS 2.8600). We had no comment to offer at that time, but wished to be consulted during the preparation of the EIS. We still wish to be consulted on the draft EIS.  

Very truly yours,  
Edward Y. Hirata  
Director of Transportation  

cc: Mr. Patrick A. Ribellia  

---  

Mr. Edward Y. Hirata  
Director of Transportation  
State of Hawaii  
869 Punchbowl Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-5097  

Dear Mr. Hirata:  


This acknowledges receipt of your December 17 letter responding to the above-captioned Preparation Notice and informing us that your Department has no comment on the project to offer at this time but wishes to be consulted on the draft EIS.  

Thank you for reviewing the Notice. Your Department will be consulted on the draft EIS.  

Very truly yours,  
Edward Y. Hirata  
Director  

copy: Patrick A. Ribellia
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael M. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing & Community Development

FROM: [Signature]
Department of Human Resources

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BEERIANA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

December 12, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marla Victoria R. Bynoe, Acting Director
Department of Human Resources

FROM: Michael M. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing & Community Development

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BEERIANA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

December 7, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael M. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing & Community Development

FROM: [Signature]
Department of Human Resources

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BEERIANA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

The Department of Human Resources has reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISP) for the proposed project cited above and wishes to offer the following comments:

1. Findings from our department's child care survey indicates that there is a pressing need for a child care center (specifically, infant-toddler care) in the downtown area. We are pleased that approximately 10,000 square feet of ground-level space has been designated for a child care center to accommodate up to 156 children.

2. The State Department of Human Services licensing requirements for group day care centers call for:
   a. thirty-five (35) square feet of indoor space per child; and,
   b. six-thousand two-hundred ninety-five (6295) square feet of outdoor space for 101 children plus forty-five (45) square feet per child therefore.

   In order for a child care center to be licensed to serve 156 children a minimum of 13,750 square feet is required. We recommend designating a portion of the required park space specifically for the child care center's use during its normal hours of operation to make up the shortfall.

3. We would like to request the continued involvement of our department as well as the Mayor's Child Care Task Force as the project evolves.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Michael M. Scarfone
Director
December 10, 1990

Mr. Michael H. Scarfone  
Director  
City and County of Honolulu  
Department of Housing and  
Community Development  
650 So. King St., 5th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:


Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, however, the Department has no comments to offer at this time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for Roger A. Ulveling

CC: Patrick A. Ribellis, Esq.

December 12, 1990

Mr. Roger A. Ulveling  
Director  
Department of Business &  
Economic Development  
State of Hawaii  
P.O. Box 2359  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Dear Mr. Ulveling:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice: Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

This acknowledges receipt of your December 10 letter regarding the above-captioned preparation notice informing us that your Department has no comments to offer on the proposed project at this time. We appreciate your attention to and review of the notice.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE  
Director

copy: Patrick A. Ribellis  
DEC 2, 1990
MEMORANDUM

TO: BERNARD B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: BERNARD B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE FOR THE PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT

We have reviewed the revised Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISPN) for the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment, as requested by project design alterations and additions. Enclosed for your reference are our comments on the original EISPN which was transmitted to us in September 1990.

The project is within the Chinatown District Commercial Mixed-Use area where retail commercial development is encouraged.

The project's proposed limited retail shops and offices are consistent with Development Plan objectives for the area. The other components of the project fill public facility deficiencies, and the child care center will provide services to the area's residents and employees with nearby child care. The project site has the required Government Building/Modification symbol on the Development Plan Public Facilities Map.

The traffic impact analysis to be included in the draft EIS should address possible vehicle queuing problems that a single access from North Beretania Street may cause. Otherwise, we find that this revised EISPN provides adequate basis for preparation of the draft EIS.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this preparation notice. If you have any questions, please contact Ronald Kodama at 527-6070.

[Signature]

BERNARD B. LEE
CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER

Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

TO: BERNARD B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: BERNARD B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE FOR THE PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT

Thank you for your December 27, 1990 memorandum informing us that you have reviewed the above-captioned EISPN and offering several comments.

We note your comments that the project is within the Chinatown District Commercial Mixed-Use area; that its proposed limited retail shops and offices are consistent with the Development Plan objectives for the area; that other project components fulfill public facility deficiencies; that the child care center will provide services to the area's residents and employees with nearby child care services; and that the project site has the required Government Building/Modification symbol on the DP Public Facilities Map.

Your comment that the project traffic impact analysis address possible vehicle queuing on North Beretania Street has been sent to the project's traffic engineer for attention in its traffic impact study.

Your department will be consulted in the draft EIS for the project. Please know that your comments on the project at this early stage are greatly appreciated and most helpful.

[Signature]

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

copy: Patrick A. Ribelli
Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc.
Mr. Michael N. Scarfone
Director, City Department of Housing
and Community Development
650 South King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice: Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

We have reviewed the subject EIS, and have no comments at this time on the proposed development in the subject area. HECO shall reserve comment pertaining to the protection of existing power lines bordering the development area until construction plans are finalized.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. William A. Bonnet
Manager
Environmental Department
Hawaiian Electric Co., Inc.
P.O. Box 2750
Honolulu, Hawaii 96803-0001

Dear Mr. Bonnet:


Thank you for commenting on the above-captioned EISPN by letter dated December 19, 1990. We hereby acknowledge that HECO has no comment at this time on the project and reserves comment as regards the protection of existing power lines bordering the project site until project construction is completed.

We greatly appreciate your response to the EISPN.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp: M. N. SCARFONE]

[Stamp: Director]

copy: Patrick A. Ribellia
December 20, 1990

Mr. Michael N. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
460 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

Subject: Comments on Environmental Impact Statement
Preparation Notice: Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

We have reviewed the Preparation Notice for the subject project and have no comment at this time other than to confirm that the subject property area is in the State Land Use Urban District.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me or my staff at 948-3039/6101.

Sincerely,

ESTHER UEDA
Executive Officer

---

January 6, 1991

Mrs. Esther Ueda
Executive Director
Land Use Commission
State of Hawaii
Old Federal Building, Room 104
335 Merchant Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mrs. Ueda:


Thank you for reviewing the above-captioned EISPN and commenting thereon by letter dated December 20, 1991. We note that the Land Use Commission has no comment at this time on the project other than confirming that the project site is within the State Land Use Urban District.

Your written response to the EISPN is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

Copy: Patrick A. Ribellis
MEMORANDUM

TO: MICHAEL M. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR 
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: SAM CALLEJO, DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE (EISP) 
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT 
(TAX MAP KEY: 1-7-04: 1 AND 4)

December 18, 1990

We have reviewed the subject EISP and have the following comments:

1. We have no objection to the proposed redevelopment project.
2. Sewer connection should be made to the existing 8-inch line on Smith Street.
3. In conformance with Ordinance 2412, street improvements along Hauanu Avenue should be constructed.
4. Is there an additional access other than at the Beretania Street?

SIN CALLEJO
Director and Chief Engineer

January 8, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: SAM CALLEJO, DIRECTOR & CHIEF ENGINEER 
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

FROM: MICHAEL M. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR 
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE (EISP) 
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAI (TAX: 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 & 4).

Thank you for reviewing the above-captioned EISP and commenting thereon in your December 18, 1990, memorandum.

We note that your Department has no objection to the proposed project; however, you recommend that sewer connections for the project should be made to an existing 8-inch line on Smith Street and that street improvements along Hauanu Avenue should be constructed in accordance with Ord. No. 2412. These comments will be sent to the project engineers for attention in the draft EIS.

Your comments on the project are greatly appreciated.

Michael M. Scarfone
Director

Copy: Patrick A. Ribellis
ROP Hawaii, Inc.
December 11, 1990

Mr. Michael X. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:


Our review of the subject EIS indicates the project will have negligible effect on the public schools.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent

January 6, 1991

Mr. Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent
Department of Education
State of Hawaii
P.O. Box 2350
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Dear Superintendent Toguchi:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice: Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

Thank you for responding by letter dated December 11, 1990, to the above captioned EIS Preparation Notice and informing us that the proposed project will have negligible effect on the public schools. We appreciate your review of the Notice and your written response thereto.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael N. Scarfone
Director

copy: Patrick A. Ribella.
Mr. Patrick A. Ribellis
Attorney at Law
Zoning Consultant
500 Fort Street, Suite 1506
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Dear Mr. Ribellis:

Re: Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project,
Honolulu, Hawaii

Due to current staff limitations, the Pacific Islands Office, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement cannot devote the time to adequately evaluate potential impacts to important fish and wildlife resources from the proposed project. Please understand that this notification does not represent the Fish and Wildlife Service’s approval of the proposed activity. As any new or future actions related to this project should enroll constraints be alleviated, or if significant adverse impacts to important fish and wildlife resources are identified.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest Kosaka
Field Office Supervisor
Fish and Wildlife Enhancement

JAN 22 1991

Mr. Ernest Kosaka
Field Office Supervisor
Fish & Wildlife Enhancement
U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish & Wildlife Service
Pacific Islands Office
P.O. Box 50167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Kosaka:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation

Thank you for your January 2 letter responding to the above-captioned Notice and informing us that your office has not yet evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed project on important fish and wildlife resources. We appreciate your communication on the matter.

Accordingly, please be informed that we are preparing the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the project and will seek your office’s comments, if any, on the DEIS.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Michael H. Scarfone
Director

copy: Patrick A. Ribellis
MEMORANDUM:

TO: Dr. John C. Lewin, M.D., Director  
Department of Health  
State of Hawaii

FROM: Michael N. Scarfone, Director  
Department of Housing & Community Development


Thank you for your written comments on the above-captioned Notice submitted to us by memorandum dated December 28, 1990 and focussing on noise related concerns. Please be informed that we have forwarded your comments to our noise consultant for review and attention in his noise studies for the proposed project.

Please be assured also that we will endeavor to meet all applicable requirements pertaining to noise control which are set forth in Title 11, Administrative Rules, Chapters 42 and 43, of the State Health Department as regards noise from heavy vehicle traffic and from equipment such as pumps, exhaust fans and generators during the construction and operation of the proposed project.

Your comments are greatly appreciated.

Michael N. Scarfone  
Director

Copy: Patrick A. Ribella  
cc: Y. Ebiu & Associates.
December 24, 1990

TO: MICHAEL H. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE (EISPN) FOR THE PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

We have the following comments on the proposed project:

1. The developer will be required to install a new 12-inch water main on Smith Street between Beretania Street and Paauhi Street to accommodate the proposed project.

2. There are two water meters serving the site, one from Paauhi Street and one from Smith Street (see attached map). The meter from Paauhi Street has been ordered off for two years. This meter should be retagged on before March 23, 1993, to receive applicable credits for the water system facilities charge (WSFC).

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

4. If water is made available, the project will also be assessed our WSFC with credit given for all qualifying water services.

5. The construction drawings for the installation of three-inch or larger water meters and for any off-site water main improvements should be submitted for our review and approval.

6. An approved reduced pressure backflow prevention device should be installed immediately after each domestic water meter and after any meter for a fire system using chemicals.

If you have any questions, please contact Bert Xeota at 527-5255.

Attachment

cc: Patrick A. Ribellia
KOP Hawaii, Inc.
March 6, 1991

Mr. Glenn E. Mason, AIA
President
Honolulu Chapter
American Institute of Architects
1128 Nuuanu Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Dear Mr. Mason:

Subject: EISPN: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot
Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, HI.

Thank you for your careful review of the above-captioned EISPN and your written comments thereon sent to us on behalf of the American Institute of Architects, Honolulu Chapter, by letter dated January 3, 1991.

Your detailed comments are very valuable and will be referred to our project consultants for review and consideration during the preparation of the draft EIS for the project. The AIA will be a consulted party on the draft EIS.

At this initial, conceptual stage of project development, the specific design details of the project are not yet determined. Your detailed project design comments are very helpful and useful; however, we're unable to respond to them adequately at this time for that reason. Please rest assured that they will be fully addressed when the project reaches the Chinatown Special District review stage. At that time, the design details of the project will be established. Meanwhile, we will attempt to address your comments as best we can in the draft EIS given available project design information.

In general, please know that every effort will be made to assure that the design of the project conforms to and implements the guidelines and requirements of the Chinatown Special District. We believe that the City's development objectives for the proposed project can be attained within the design framework established for that District.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL M. SCARFONE
Director

Copy: Patrick A. Ribellia
January 3, 1991

Michael N. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: EISPN for the Proposed Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project

Dear Mr. Scarfone,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the EIS Preparation Notice for the Smith-Beretania project. We believe that a well planned and well designed project with a program as described will be functionally and aesthetically a positive addition to its location.

We look forward to the opportunity to review the Draft EIS. We are particularly interested in the following points which we hope will be discussed and clarified in the Draft EIS -

- We strongly recommend that the first floor shops be at grade on F حولت Street rather than partially above grade as at the Chinatown Gateway project. To do otherwise would be against the very nature of Chinatown. Section A--A seems to indicate such a change of elevation whereas the ground floor plan does not.

- We further recommend the third floor and possibly the second floor bridge over the entire way to the loading area to visually connect with the adjacent existing building on Nuuanu Avenue. This is necessary to maintain the continuity of the street facade, another important characteristic of Chinatown.

- The economic and physical possibility of excavating down one more level to gain additional parking should be seriously investigated. Any additional level of parking should not push the first floor above the grade of the surrounding streets.

- The Draft EIS should discuss the exterior character of the project in relation to the character of Chinatown and compliance with the Chinatown Special District guidelines.

- Although the project is largely within the 200 Foot Mauka Precinct of Chinatown, we recommend that a project of this scale comply with the heights and guidelines of the 40 foot Historic Core Precinct of Chinatown which includes the makai portion of the site and areas directly across Smith and F حولت Streets.

In keeping with other activities in the project (child care center, community park, city and private offices located here should most preferably be of a service nature to the immediate community [i.e., social services, community services, etc] rather than unrelated city-wide agencies and offices.

The existing monkeypod trees are important in identifying the character of the area and also in defining the continuation of the Chinatown storefront line along both Smith and Beretania Streets at the proposed park. Every effort should be made to retain these on-site.

Also we note the following editing corrections in the EIS Preparation Notice -

Page 2, Overview of the Affected Environment: First sentence - The site is located within the Historic Core Precinct and the Mauka Precinct of the Chinatown Special District, not on the fringe of the District. Last sentence on the page - The total site is within the District. The building height limit is 40 and 200 feet for that portion of the site in the Historic Core Precinct.

Exhibit 1: The Project Location Map should indicate the boundaries of the Chinatown Special District, of the Precincts within the District and of the registered historic areas as indicated in Exhibits 9 and 10 of Chapter 7 of the EIS.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this project. We look forward to the in-depth analysis of the DEIS.

Sincerely,

Glen E. Maxon, AIA
President, Honolulu Chapter/AIA
December 27, 1990

Ms. Christine Brown, President
Smith-Beretania Tenants Association
1170 Nuuanu Avenue, Apt. 603
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Dear Ms. Brown and Association Members:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation
Notice: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot
Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Oahu,
Hawaii; TMK 1-7-06; parcel 1 and 4.

Thank you for informing our office that your Association wishes to be consulted on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the above-captioned project. Please be assured that your Association will be consulted on the draft and final EIS and that its comments on the project will be a very important source of community input to the project’s development.

Thank you for your interest in the project and your very kind attention to these remarks.

Very truly yours,

Michael N. Scarfone
Director

COPY: Patrick A. Ribella
March 6, 1991

Ms. Sarah Richards
Executive Director
Hawaii Theatre Center
P.O. Box 350
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

Dear Ms. Richards:

Subject: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment
     Project Environmental Impact Statement
     Preparation Notice (EISP).

Thank you for your January 28, 1991 letter commenting on the above-captioned EISP and informing us of the Hawaii Theatre Center's parking needs as regards the design and operation of the proposed parking facility within the project. We appreciate your comments and suggestions and are forwarding them to the project designers for consideration when they prepare the detailed EIS, engineering and building plans for the parking structure. As you may know, the preparation of such detailed plans still lies ahead as we are only in the early stage of project development.

Some general responses to your comments can be made at this time. We think that the substantial increase in parking stalls at the site as a result of the project will directly benefit the Hawaii Theatre Center and most other businesses in the surrounding neighborhood. Accordingly, the project addresses the problem of needed parking facilities in the Downtown area as noted in your comments.

To the extent that they can be accommodated within the project's design and budget, your suggestions for user convenience features (i.e., elevators, elevator lobbies, pedestrian access, elevator canopy, etc.) will be considered for incorporation within the project.

For your information, it is anticipated that the parking facility will be operated by a private company which will employ parking attendants. The decision to charge a flat fee for evening parking will be the prerogative of the parking concessionaire.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director
January 25, 1991

Mr. Patrick Ribolla
Attorney At Law
1188 Bishop Street, Suite 2506
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Subject: Brief 135: Smith-Bersteinia Parking Garage

Dear Mr. Ribolla:

The Hawaii Theatre Center is pleased to respond to the City's invitation to offer comments about the proposed development of the Smith-Bersteinia parking lot, as much as the Hawaii Theatre has been and will be a major user.

The current parking lot has been an important benefit to this not-for-profit organization which has acquired and is in the process of renovating the 69-year-old Hawaii Theatre at the corner of Bethel and Pauahi Streets, one block from the present Pauahi entrance to the parking lot. Since construction of the Chinatown Gateway Place eliminated that parking site, the Smith-Bersteinia lot has provided the only public parking lot within close walking distance for our patrons and volunteers. Although we recently closed the theatre to performances to prepare for restoration construction, the many volunteers who work here continue to depend on public parking.

But the situation will be far more critical when the Hawaii Theatre is restored and functioning as Downtown's only performing arts center. The Hawaii Theatre will seat more than 1,000 patrons, and it is expected a large percentage will park in the Smith-Bersteinia facility.

In 1987 we conducted an analysis of parking within a reasonable walking distance of the Hawaii Theatre to include in our business plan. This analysis revealed more than 2,000 publicly available parking spaces within a 2-block radius. Since that time, however, several properties then used for parking have been eliminated, including the Marks Garage gate, which will be razed shortly to make way for a private development with no public parking.

Although the Chinatown Gateway Place is nearing completion, it is unlikely that the public will understand that more parking is available there because it is hidden in what appears to be a private residential building. We will depend on the City's active marketing of these spaces. While privately owned parking facilities in the area may advertise of these spaces, while privately owned parking facilities in the area may advertise of these spaces, the availability for theatre patrons is subject to operators' decisions on a case-by-case basis and is therefore unreliable.

It should also be noted that, while Theatre patrons will represent a significant body of parking, audience change from performance to performance and will take a long time for patrons of the "new" theatre to become comfortable with the parking alternatives available to them. Moreover, evening patrons, especially senior citizens, are uncomfortable in unfamiliar parking areas, particularly in enclosed locations. They prefer to park where there are bright lights, reliable security and easy access.

Therefore, the proposed Smith-Bersteinia parking garage will be especially important to theatre patrons. It should be well-lighted, manned, and should offer easy pedestrian access from the Pauahi side of Pauahi Street. Of particular interest is the pedestrian access. Since patrons at live performances tend to leave all at once, adequate elevators, elevator lobbies and weather protection for theatre crowds should be included in the plans for this facility.

The issue of managing the parking facility is extremely important. Metered parking is not practical in a theatre district because patrons usually do not know how long they will remain and they cannot excuse themselves during a performance to put more money in the meter. Therefore, theatre patrons will use the facility only if it is marked. We hope that, at least at night and on weekends, the City will consider a flat fee policy similar to the Blaisdell parking lot, where a patron pays a single price on entry and departure gates are unmanned.

The parking garage should provide handicap spaces and ramps near the Pauahi pedestrian access, for the benefit of theatre patrons.

The present plan for vehicular entry and exit on Bersteinia Street fits the current vehicular traffic pattern in and from the Hawaii Theatre and reduces congestion on the narrower street that borders the site.

In summary, the Hawaii Theatre management forwards five specific recommendations to make the Smith-Bersteinia parking garage appropriate for our patrons:

1) bright lighting for safety and security,
2) reliable security protection for nighttime use,
3) appropriate elevators, elevator lobbies and canopy covering on the Pauahi site to handle after-theatre crowds,
4) handicapped parking spaces near the pedestrian access, with appropriate ramps and
5) manned operation with flat fee evening parking.

We appreciate your consideration of the needs of Hawaii Theatre patrons when reviewing plans for the Smith-Bersteinia parking lot. We believe our patrons will be an important source of parking revenue for the City if their needs are carefully considered in both the design and operations policy of the Smith-Bersteinia parking structure.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sarah M. Richards
Executive Director
January 9, 1991

Michael M. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
610 So. King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

RE: EISPM for The Proposed Smith-Beratania Redevelopment Project

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

In reviewing the EISPM of November 30, 1990, ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS -Flora and Fauna, Page 4, the Outdoor Circle finds this site contains six large, healthy monkeypod trees along Smith and South Beratania Streets.

The Outdoor Circle believes that these trees should be incorporated into the project design. To even relocate these trees would be a disaster from an aesthetic standpoint. So few of the many large, original trees are left standing.

This one site is a beautiful oasis in a densely built up area. It is unique for many reasons. Aesthetic and historic value, the waterfront. Shade provided by these trees is also a benefit.

We would like to add that the ancient, historic use of large, basalt curb stones should be retained in the design process. We also request that The Outdoor Circle be included on your mailing list for the EIS preparation of this most important project.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our views.

Sincerely,

Susan Field, Chair
Landscape & Planning

Betty Crocker
President

March 6, 1991

Ms. Betty Crocker
President
The Outdoor Circle
1110 University Avenue, Ste. 205
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Crocker:


Thank you very much for reviewing the above-captioned EISPM and for submitting written comments. The EISPM contains six large monkeypod trees along Smith and North Beratania Streets. We hereby respond accordingly.

Your suggestion that the existing trees should be incorporated into the project's design has been noted. Indeed, the project's design contemplates the planting of expansive shade trees approximately at the locations of the existing trees.

Unfortunately, those will not be the six existing trees which must be removed to facilitate project construction. They will be replaced at other locations within the City. Landscaping experts advise us that the six trees will not survive another uprooting and replanting after the initial removal and replanting.

They will be replaced at other locations which maximize their aesthetic and natural benefits to the general public. They maturity, will give the type of expansive shading currently provided by the six trees.

We note your suggestion that large, basalt curb stones be retained in the project's design process. To the extent that such building materials are available and can be managed within the project, we shall encourage their use within the project.

Finally, the Outdoor Circle will be consulted on the draft environmental impacts statement pursuant to your comments.

Again, thank you for providing valuable input into the project.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Scarfone
Director
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU
2006 TRAFALGAR STREET
REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
Planning Division

January 10, 1991

Mr. Michael M. Scarfone
Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISP) for the Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Hawaii. The following comments are offered:

a. A Department of the Army permit is not required for the project.

b. The flood hazard information presented on page 4 of the EISP is correct.

Sincerely,

Kisuk Cheung
Director of Engineering

Copy furnished:

Mr. Patrick A. Ribellia, Attorney at Law
Zoning Consultant
900 Fort Street, Suite 1505
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

March 6, 1991

Mr. Kisuk Cheung
Director of Engineering
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Building 210
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96856-5440

Attn: Planning Division

Dear Mr. Cheung:


This acknowledges your January 10 letter commenting on the above-captioned EISP and informing us that a Department of the Army permit is not required for the project and affirming that the flood hazard information presented on page 4 of the EISP is correct.

Thank you for your comments on the EISP.

Sincerely,

Kisuk Cheung
Director

Hail Kaide
Michael M. Scarfone
Director
January 7, 1991

The Honorable Michael N. Scarfone  
Director  
Department of Housing and Community Development  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. Scarfone:

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice  
Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project  
Honolulu, Hawaii

The applicant, the City and County of Honolulu, is proposing new retail commercial uses along part of Pauahi Street and some project design alterations on the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking lot Redevelopment Project.

We have reviewed the subject project and have no comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael S. Masumoto  
Director

March 6, 1991

Mr. Harold S. Masumoto  
Director  
Office of State Planning  
State of Hawaii  
State Capitol  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Mr. Masumoto:

Subject: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project  
Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice (EISP).

This acknowledges your letter dated January 7 pertaining to the above-captioned EISP and informing us that the Office of State Planning has no comments to offer at this time on the project.

Thank you for responding to the EISP.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael N. Scarfone  
Director
March 19, 1991

Ms. Lynne Matsuse, Chair,
and Members
Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13
P.O. Neighborhood Commission Office
City Hall, 4th Floor
220 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair Matsuse and Board Members:

Subject: EIS Preparations Notice
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

Thank you for your written comments on the above-captioned EIS/PRE submitted by letter dated December 24, 1990. We appreciate your keen interest in the project and your very careful review of the EIS/PRE.

Your comments have been sent to all project consultants for review and consideration during the preparation of their respective EIS/PRE supporting studies. However, some preliminary responses to them are offered at this time.

1. Project Ingress/Exgress

At this time, no other project ingress/egress point is contemplated. In part, the proposed ingress/egress point along North Beretania Street is designed to direct traffic to and from the site only to this roadways and, thus, keep traffic volumes along Smith Street, Puahi Street and Nuuanu Avenue in the vicinity of the site similar to existing levels. We note that these roadways are designed primarily to be "local" streets while North Beretania Street is considered a major arterial.

Some minor grooming of vehicular traffic to the parking facility along North Beretania Street is anticipated. These and other traffic impacts are addressed in the Traffic Impact Assessment which was prepared by consultants and will be included in the draft EIS.

2. Proposed Park Space

The relatively small size and narrow configuration of the project site prevent its use for any active sports activities (e.g., ballfields, gymnasium complex, multiple playcourts, etc.). For most of the site, the widest area measures only approximately 70-80 feet. Therefore, the site's potential for active recreational use is limited. There is not enough space within the site to properly design, place and build the kind of legitimate playcourts and other active recreational spaces desired by the Downtown Neighborhood Board.

The draft EIS will reflect that the public park will be approximately 38,600 square feet in size.

3. Child Care Facility

The proposed child care facility will be designed to meet all applicable requirements of the State Department of Human Services. This will require the use of approximately 2,750 square feet of the proposed building area adjoining the 10,000 square foot child care facility for child care activities during operating hours.

4. Limited Retail, Commercial & Office Space

We believe that limited mixed-use retail, commercial and office activities within a portion of the project is a scale and level commensurate with the mixed retail and office uses within the immediate surrounding neighborhood would be appropriate. Such commercial mixed uses comprise the prevailing land use pattern in the immediate area and the proposed office component of the project will be consistent with that pattern.

New City agency offices at the project site may not add any significant traffic to existing downtown traffic volumes because some of these agencies are already located downtown and their employees already park in the downtown area.

5. Social Impact Study

As you may already know, a social impact study is being prepared for inclusion within the EIS. It will include a review of the recreational space concerns raised in your comments.

6. Contacted Parties on EIS/PRE

The Smith-Beretania Tenants Association and PAC (People Against Civic/Commercial) Eviction), through Ms. Christine Brown, have been contacted on the EIS/PRE and will be consulted parties on the draft EIS for the project.

7. Project Site Land Use History

In response to your comments, research into the historical uses of the project site was conducted by Bishop Museum personnel. They found that approximately one-half (1/2) of the Smith-Beretania block was used as a playground area, and that small commercial businesses fronted Puahi Street. Therefore, a historical precedent exists for the type of mixed use being proposed for the project site.

In closing, let me say that the EIS process for this project facilitates continuing communication between our Department and affected and/or interested public agencies, individuals and organizations as demonstrated by this early dialogue between your Board and our office on the project. We anticipate and look forward to continuing communication on the project.

Your early comments on the project are greatly appreciated and will be reviewed carefully by our project team. Thank you for taking the time to submit them.

Sincerely,

Michael N. Scarfo
Director

cc: All Consultants
December 24, 1990

Mr. Michael Scarfone
Director
City Department of Housing and Community Development
610 S. King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: EIS Prep Notice, Smith-Bennetts Parking Lot Redevelopment

Dear Mike,

The Downtown Neighborhood Board wishes to be consulted on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Smith-Bennetts Parking Lot Redevelopment. In the interim, we have the following comments concerning the Prep Notice:

1. Traffic congestion on Bennetts Street is notorious. Changing the traffic pattern by putting the exit and entrance of an expanded parking lot on Bennetts Street needs to be studied in depth. Currently the entrance and exit are on Smith Street, where a traffic light controls the flow onto Bennetts.

2. The project is on North Bennetts Street, not South Bennetts Street. Also, on page 7 this is referred to as "a centrally-located public park space to be developed in the downtown area." It should be noted that it is in the heavily residential part of downtown.

3. We had been informed the child care facility would be 10,000 square feet, not 10,000 square feet plus additional space for their play area.

4. This is supposed to be a community park. Plans we saw in December have envisioned what should be a combined recreational park serving all age groups — kids, children, teens, adults and seniors — with a tot lot, children's play area, basketball and volleyball courts, comfort station, pavilion, and passive space into a meadow. In essence, unless the plans are changed to reflect the needs and wishes of all we get is a tot lot. We have been told the children's play area is not for community (i.e. public) use when the day care center is open. This is unacceptable. More than 6,000 people live in a one block radius of the site. They desperately need a community-oriented active park nearby. Since redevelopment began in the 1930s, no active recreational space has been created. Instead we get a covered plaza and waterfalls, called Wilcox Park, which is fast becoming a shoe box area, and a waterfalls called Chinatown Gateway Park. The Board wants the park redone. On page 5 of the Prep Notice you state, "The passive public park will also benefit downtown residents and employees by providing such people with directly accessible recreational facilities near their residences or work places." What recreational facilities? Do you expect the employees to play in the tot lot?

5. On page 7 you talk about a 14,000 square foot park. Given the children's play area which is not for public use most of the hours children are up, you should circumspectly extend figure.

6. The Board objects to retail, commercial and office space on site. If the City needs more office space, it should look to I-Wa and other areas outside the downtown business district. More City employees mean more people driving downtown to work which leads to more traffic congestion. These structures will also serve to further reduce the potential size of the park.

8. In addition to traffic impact, air quality, noise, and archaeological/historical resource studies, it is imperative that you do a social impact study. This study, among other things, should discuss the lack of active park space and how it contributes to children, teens, and young adults hanging out in pool parlors and video arcades instead of developing their social and motor skills in real spaces. Don't people matter?

9. On pages 8 and 9 you list agencies to be consulted in preparation of the DEIS. Why were the Smith-Bennetts Tenants Association (the group most closely affected by the project) and People Against Chinatown Evictions omitted?

10. This is the historic site of Honolulu's first playground, and the Board believes it should be reduplicated as such. The original playground did not encompass commercial and office space, and its long awaited successor must follow the proud tradition of the original.

Sincerely,

Lynne Macarver
Chairman
cc: Patrick Ribella
TO: MICHAEL W. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: MICHAEL S. NAKAMURA, CHIEF OF POLICE
HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

December 12, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: MICHAEL S. NAKAMURA, CHIEF OF POLICE
HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT

FROM: MICHAEL W. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARATION NOTICE: PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, HONOLULU, HAWAII

This acknowledges receipt of your December 12 memorandum on the above-captioned notice which states that the proposed redevelopment should not have a significant impact on your facilities or services in the area and noting that there is nothing in the project's redevelopment plans which require comment from your department.

Thank you for reviewing the preparation notice and responding accordingly.

Michael W. Scarfone
Director

cc: Patrick A. Ribellia

December 14, 1990
CHAPTER 7

Comments During The Preparation Of The Final EIS
CHAPTER 7. COMMENTS DURING THE PREPARATION OF THE FINAL EIS.

Sixty six (66) copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project were received by the Office of Environmental Quality Control on March 28, 1991. Notice of the DEIS was published in the April 8, 1991 OEQC Bulletin and the sixty six copies of the report were distributed to interested public agencies, organizations and individuals. The original plus one (1) copy of the DEIS were delivered to the accepting agency, the Department of General Planning, City and County of Honolulu. A total of twenty eight (28) comments were received in response to the Draft EIS. All comments were responded to with both comments and responses reprinted on the following pages.

Agencies and organizations submitting comments on the Draft Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project EIS are as follows:

City and County of Honolulu

Dept. of Parks and Recreation Fire Department

Dept. of Human Resources Police Department

Building Department

Dept. of Public Works

Board of Water Supply
Final Environmental Impact Statement
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Dept. of General Planning

Dept. of Transportation Services

Dept. of Land Utilization

Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13

State of Hawaii

Office of State Planning

Dept. of Accounting and General Services

Dept. of Health

Dept. of Tourism and Economic Development

Office of Environmental Quality Control

Dept. of Education

State Land Use Commission

State Housing Finance and Development Corporation

University of Hawaii Environmental Center

Dept. of Defense, Engineering Office
Federal Government

Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture

Corp. of Engineers, Dept. of U.S. Army

Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Dept. of Interior

Dept. of the Navy

Private Sector

Hawaii Electric Company, Inc.

Hawaii Theatre Center
April 19, 1991

TO: BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
   DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: WALTER M. OZAMA, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
         SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT PROJECT
         THM 1-7-04

We have determined that the EIS for the Smith-Beretania
Parking Lot Project is acceptable. The public park to be
developed on the parking lot site and its impact on the
Downtown/Chinatown district have been adequately addressed.

Should you have any questions, please contact Jason Yuen
of our Advance Planning Branch at extension 6315.

WALTER M. OZAMA
Director

WHO: 11

cc: Department of Housing and Community Development
    Mr. Patrick A. Bihaila

May 29, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: WALTER M. OZAMA, DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF PARKS & RECREATION

FROM: MICHAEL H. SCARFOHE, DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
         SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
         THM 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, OAHU, HAWAII.

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 19, 1991 communication
informing us that your Department has reviewed the above-captioned
DEIS and has determined that it is acceptable and that it has
adequately addressed the impacts of the proposed park on the
Downtown/Chinatown district.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication
thereon.

MICHAEL H. SCARFOHE
Director

CC: OESC
    Department of General Planning
April 12, 1991

TO: BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: LIONEL E. CAMARA, FIRE CHIEF

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, DOWNTOWN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT-HONOLULU, TPK: 1-7-04

We have reviewed the subject material provided and foresee no adverse impact in Fire Department facilities or services.

Access for fire apparatus, water supply and building construction shall be in conformance to existing codes and standards.

Should you have any questions, please contact Acting Assistant Chief Attilio Leonard of our Administrative Services Bureau at 943-3330.

LIONEL E. CAMARA
Fire Chief

May 29, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: LIONEL E. CAMARA, FIRE CHIEF
HONOLULU FIRE DEPARTMENT

FROM: MICHAEL H. SCARFOE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, TPK: 1-7-041.1 and 4, OAHU, HAWAII

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 12, 1991 memorandum commenting on the above-captioned DEIS and informing us that your Department reviewed the above-captioned project and foresees no adverse impact on Fire Department facilities or services.

We acknowledge your comment that access for fire apparatus, water supply and building construction must conform to existing codes and standards. Please be assured that such conformance will occur.

Thank you for your comments.

MICHAEL H. SCARFOE
Director

CC: OEQC
Department of General Planning
May 25, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: MARIA VICTORIA R. BUYLE, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

FROM: MICHAEL N. SCARFOE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
THK: 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, OAHU, HAWAII.

This acknowledges our receipt of a copy of your April 15, 1991, communication on the above-captioned DEIS which informs us that your Department has reviewed the document. Thank you for reviewing the document and for your comments.

We note your recommendation that approximately 8,500 square feet of outdoor space are needed for the proposed child care center to satisfy state licensing requirements for the facility. In accordance with your request, the project designers will be asked to satisfy this standard when preparing the detailed project design plans.

Please know that we anticipate continued involvement on the part of your Department and the Mayor’s Child Care Task Force during the evolution of the project.

Thank you for your helpful comments and kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL N. SCARFOE
Director

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

505 South King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

April 15, 1991

Mr. Patrick A. Ribellis
Attorney At Law
1188 Bishop Street, Suite 2201
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Ribellis:

The Department of Human Resources has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project.

We are pleased that the child care center will have exclusive use of approximately 2,800 square feet of an adjoining open courtyard during its normal hours of operation in addition to 10,000 square feet within the ground floor of the proposed three-story commercial building.

Of the total area (13,800 square feet) reserved for the Smith-Beretania child care center approximately 8,500 square feet must be outdoor space in order for the center to meet state licensing requirements for group day care centers serving 150 children. We ask that the developer take this into consideration in designing the child care center.

We request the continued involvement of our department as well as the Mayor’s Child Care Task Force as the project evolves.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Very truly yours,

MARY VICTORIA R. BUYLE
Acting Director
Department of Human Resources

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

HONOLULU MUNICIPAL BUILDING, 6TH FLOOR
505 SOUTH KING STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

1991-30-01

Acting

Acting

CC: DEQS
Department of General Planning
May 15, 1991

TO: BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: MICHAEL S. HAKAMURA, CHIEF OF POLICE
HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

We have reviewed the environmental impact statement for the Smith-Beretania project and have no comments on it.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal.

MICHAEL S. HAKAMURA
Chief of Police

By: CHESTER E. HUGHES
Assistant Chief of Police Support Services Bureau

cc: Michael N. Scarfone
Patrick Ribellia
GEQC

May 20, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: MICHAEL S. HAKAMURA, CHIEF OF POLICE
HONOLULU POLICE DEPARTMENT

FROM: MICHAEL N. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS), SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 15, 1991, communication informing us that your department has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has no comment on it.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

CC: GEQC
Department of General Planning
MEMORANDUM

FROM: HERBERT K. MURAOKA
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT

TO: BENJAMIN LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)

April 5, 1991

We have reviewed the DEIS for the subject project and have no comments to offer.

HERBERT K. MURAOKA
Director and Building Superintendent

CC: J. Harada
Patrick A. Ribellis, Atty. at Law
Office of Environmental Quality Control

MEMORANDUM

FROM: MICHAEL H. SCARFOE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TO: HERBERT K. MURAOKA,
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT
BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
THÈTE-7-04-1 AND 4, OAHU, HAWAII.

May 29, 1991

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 5, 1991 memorandum which states that your Department has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has no comment thereon.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

MICHAEL H. SCARFOE
Director

CC: OEGC
Department of General Planning
MEMORANDUM

TO: BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
   DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: SAM CALLEJO, DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT

THK: 1-7-04; 1 AND 4

We have reviewed the subject DEIS and have no additional comments to offer at this time.

SAM CALLEJO
Director and Chief Engineer

cc: DBCD
    Patrick A. Hibellia
    OEQC

MEMORANDUM

TO: SAM CALLEJO, DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER
   DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

FROM: MICHAEL N. SCARFORE, DIRECTOR
      DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS) SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

THK: 1-7-04; 1 and 4, OAHU, HAWAII.

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 11, 1991 memorandum commenting on the above-captioned DEIS and informing us that your department has reviewed the subject DEIS and has no additional comments thereon at this time.

Thank you for your comments and for reviewing the DEIS.

MICHAEL N. SCARFORE
Director

cc: OEQC
    Department of General Planning
May 20, 1991

TO: BENJAMIN B. LEE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

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

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT DATED MARCH 1991
REGARDING THE PROPOSED SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT
REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, TMDL 17-06.1 AND 4

We have no objections to the proposed project, which includes city offices, commercial space, child care facility, public park and parking facility. Our previous comments of December 24, 1990 which are included in the draft environmental impact statement are still applicable.

If you have any questions, please contact Bert Kaloka at 527-5235.

cc: Department of Housing and Community Development
    Patrick Ribellia
    Office of Environmental Quality Control

May 29, 1991

MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: MICHAEL N. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
TMDL: 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, CARY, HAWAII.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 29, 1991, communication informing us that the Board of Water Supply has no objections to the above-captioned project and that its December 24, 1990 comments thereon, which were included in the DEIS, are still applicable. Please be informed that the Board's comments will be addressed during the process of project development and construction.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

cc: OEQC
Department of General Planning
MEMORANDUM

TO: JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR., DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR., DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT
EIS PREPARATION NOTICE
TAX MAP KEY: 1-3-04: 4

This is in response to a letter from Mr. Patrick Abella dated November 28, 1990 requesting that we submit our comments for the subject project to your department.

Our department should be consulted during the preparation of the EIS. In addition to the preparation of a traffic impact study, the following issues and concerns should be addressed:

1. Our Traffic Engineering, Parking Branch, should be contacted to clarify the proposed design and operation of the public parking facility.
2. Vehicular access to this project should be limited to Smith and Panahi Streets. Access from Beretania Street may create operational problems during the peak periods of traffic which should be avoided.

If you have any questions, please contact Hel Hiyasawa of my staff at local 4119.

JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

MEMORANDUM

TO: JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR., DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

FROM: MICHAEL N. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS STATEMENT (DEIS)
SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
TM3-1-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, WAIKIKI, HAWAII.

This responds to your January 9, 1991 communication on the above-captioned matter which recommends that your Department's Traffic Engineering, Parking Branch be consulted to clarify the proposed design and operation of the public parking facility and that vehicular access to the project be limited to Smith and Panahi Streets.

Please be advised that, during the detailed design of the project's parking facility, the project designer will be required to work closely with your Parking Branch during the formulation of the design and construction plans for the parking facility.

Your recommendation that vehicular access to/from the parking facility be limited to Smith and Panahi Streets is duly noted. On that matter, the project's Traffic Impact Assessment Report (See, DEIS, Appendix II, p. 4) states the following finding:

With the project, the LOS (Level of Service) for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as the without project case. The LOS at study intersections will remain the same except for some minor street approaches which will drop from LOS C to LOS B. Vehicles exiting the project access onto Beretania Street will operate with little delays, LOS B, during the morning peak hour and very long delays, LOS E, during the afternoon.
It is possible that the peak periods along Beretania Street and King Street will lengthen slightly as the LOS at the study intersections declines with increases in traffic resulting from other projects scheduled for completion by 1993.

We believe that placement of the parking facility exit/entrance on Beretania Street will not significantly affect existing traffic flows on Beretania Street, but would affect the flow of traffic within the facility as noted in the above-cited finding. The finding addresses your concern about the Beretania Street traffic flow impact of the proposed exit/entrance driveway for the parking facility.

We hope that these remarks adequately respond to your January 9, 1991, comments. Thank you for your communication. We anticipate working closely with your Department during the formulation of detailed design and construction plans for the proposed parking facility.

Michael Kado
Director

CC: OEQC

Department of General Planning
May 21, 1991

TO:  MICHAEL H. SCAFONE, DIRECTOR  
      DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM:  DONALD A. CLEGG, DIRECTOR  

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)  
         SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, OAHU,  
         ZAP NO. RE51-1-J-21-41-1 AND 4

We have reviewed the subject DEIS, and have no comments at this  
time on the proposed development.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

\[ Signature \]
Director of Land Utilization

---

June 17, 1991

MICORANDUM:

TO:  DONALD A. CLEGG, DIRECTOR  
      DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM:  MICHAEL H. SCAFONE, DIRECTOR  
        DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)  
         SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT  
         TK1: 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, OAHU, HAWAI'I.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 21 communication  
informing us that your Department has reviewed the above-captioned  
DEIS and has no comments thereon at this time.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

\[ Signature \]
MICHAEL H. SCAFONE  
Director

CC:  DKSC  
Department of General Planning
MEMORANDUM

TO:  MICHAEL H. Scarfone, DIRECTOR
      DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
      DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
          DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS),
          DOWNTOWN HONOLULU, HAWAII

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
(DEIS) for the proposed Smith-Bertania Parking Lot
Redevelopment project. Our review of this document included an
analysis and comparison of: (1) all referenced letters
commenting upon the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation
Notice (EISP); (2) all responses to these letters by the
Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD); (3) all
letters received by the Department of General Planning to date
commenting upon this DEIS; and (4) the contents of the DEIS.

We find that the DEIS has adequately addressed all comments and
requests.

Should you have any questions, please call Vernis Hinquist of
our staff at 527-6044.

BBL:1h

June 1, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO:  BENJAMIN B. LEE, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
      DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL PLANNING

FROM: MICHAEL H. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
      DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: SMITH-BERTANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
          DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS),
          THM 1-7-04: PARCELS 1 AND 4, HONOLULU, HAWAII.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 8, 1991, communication
informing us that your Department has received the above-captioned
DEIS and has found that it adequately addresses all comments and
requests contained in comments on the project’s Environmental
Impact Statement Preparation Notice and in letters received to date
by your Department which comment on the DEIS.

We appreciate and thank you for your kind assistance and
cooperation on this project. Please be informed that we hope to
prepare the final DEIS on the project in time for publication in the
June 8, 1991, OEQC Bulletin. Any assistance your Department may be
able to provide towards that end would be greatly appreciated.

MICHAEL H. SCARFONE
Director

cc: OEQC
    Department of General Planning
Mr. Patrick Ribeira
1408 Bishop Street, Suite 2201
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Draft EIS, Smith-Beretania Parking Lot

Dear Mr. Ribeira:

The Downtown Neighborhood Board has the following comments concerning the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment EIS:

1. The DEIS says a passive park would have less impact on the adjacent housing project than an active park. The residents of the housing project have asked for an active park, and they have performed a community spaghetti survey. In the community spaghetti survey, 20% of the participants rate an active park as the best choice, 15% give the passive park as the best choice, 25% give both as equal choice, 20% rate the passive park as the worst choice, and 20% rate the active park as the worst choice. The residents of the housing project are concerned that noise from the parking lot will spread into their homes.

2. The parking lot was supposed to replace the present stalls and add parking space for residents and customers in the area. Our research shows the city is not rezoning any of the areas of the area, but the city is rezoning the entire area of the area.

3. Originally (see Honolulu Advertiser article August 27, 1991, page A-13) the park was supposed to be on the 77,000 square foot lot now occupied by Honolulu Park Place. Parcelling it to the parking lot site, the potential park size was reduced to approximately 37,000 square feet. The Smith-Beretania Community Park is approximately 20% smaller.

4. Several park site are listed in the area. The DEIS says we can use them. Kamii Park has been rezoned and may be demolished as part of the Pacific Haines Center. We have been told by St. Andrews Cathedral that Queen Emma Square may be private. In any event, it is on the Cathedral ground and no one is aware that it is public. The Paoli Community Service Facility is an indoor center with no active recreation. The Fort Street mall, Wilcox Park, and Chinatown Gateway Park are all passive. Two see waterfall parks and one, Wilcox, has a prohibited uses sign. Aili Park is on city and dangerous. Parents will not let their children go there. The Beretania Community Park is overused by its adjacent neighbors.

5. The DEIS says the overall park system within Chinatown and Downtown has not kept pace with the needs of the existing and future population of the area. While this project will add park space, it adds the wrong type. We agree. It does not provide recreation for all age groups—i.e., children, teenagers, adults, seniors. We agree that there must be a long range recreational plan.

6. The City is trying to revitalize the area. However, it can’t just keep dumping people here. Provisions must be made to give them community recreation space. On the rest of the island, the city builds planned communities around parks. Here they just dump.

7. The DEIS fails to mention that the Association of Apartment Owners of Honolulu Tower prefers an active park.

8. We believe that if the park were designed properly it could address the active park needs. First, all structures other than the day care center should be removed. That means no commercial and City office space. Second, the footprint of the day care center could be reduced by putting the administrative offices and any required kitchen facilities on the second floor. Also, a community room where community groups could meet as well as active indoor recreation space could be placed on top of the day care center. A volleyball court would be a good idea.

9. The Day Care Center at the Richards Street Y did not close in February. It is now run by the parents and is called Hawaii Kids at Work.

10. There is enough passive recreation for downtown residents and employees. This site is in the heart of the residential district. Over 6,000 people live within a two block radius of the site. It is on the fringes of the business district.

11. The census figures should be updated. 1990 census results are available.

12. We were glad to see that the DEIS agrees with our position that the project has no effect on much needed active recreation space. We also agree that indoor vertical parks should be established and that the Smith-Beretania site should include active recreation. We also agree with the comments that ground level playgrounds, recreation centers and ball courts will be needed in the area.

13. The day care center was supposed to be for residents of the area. How we hear it may be too expensive for some.

14. The DEIS says the project does not impact the residential neighborhood because no residences are being added. We disagree. The project does impact the residential neighborhood because it reduces potential park space.

15. The DEIS fails to state how many parking stalls we will get, stalls that will not be reserved for City employees and others.

16. We agree with the DEIS comments that parking lot reconstruction should be staggered. Too many will be closed at the same time unless some projects are delayed. Businesses cannot afford this quintuple whammy.

17. How can street crime be reduced by an attendant operated parking structure if the attendant is not at street level? Will the lot be open 24 hours a day, as at present, or will it have reduced hours like Chinatown Gateway?
17. Honolulu Park Place is at Huanu and Beretania, not Huanu and Vineyard.

18. We suggested the Zippy's block for a park, not the Foster Gardens Estate site.

19. Is the 12' watermain which will be needed on Smith Street required because of the office and commercial space? If so, it is another reason to drop the office and commercial space.

20. We question the wisdom of putting the entrance and exit for the parking lot on Beretania. We believe it should be on Smith Street. The traffic study refused to deal with the question of cross Beretania traffic, we believe many of the parking lot users will Beretania traffic. We believe it would be wiser to have the entrance on Beretania Street where there is a traffic signal.

21. We would have liked to redesign the parking lot for you. However, the illustrations were so small we could not read the size legends. The illustrations were virtually indecipherable, and need to be larger in the office area. The commercial and KIS. In essence, as mentioned above in item 8, the commercial and KIS. The office area should be moved to the second floor. The entrance and exit to the parking lot should be moved to Smith Street, and a basketball court (full size) should be placed on Beretania, by the church. There should also be a tennis court and a children's play area which would be available to everyone all the time.

22. We would also like to see diagrams which fully show what portion of the lot will be for the day care center when it is open, what portion will be for it exclusively, and show the community what it has 24 hour access to.

Sincerely,

Lynne Matsuno, Chairman

cc: Mr. Benjamin Lee
Mr. Michael Scarfone
OIC
Ms. Lynne Matsusow, Chair  
Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13  
c/o Neighborhood Commission Office  
City Hall, 4th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Chair Matsusow:  

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)  
Smith-Berenstein Parking Lot Redevelopment Project  
Tax Map Key: 1-7-94A 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii  

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 8 letter which provides comments on the above-captioned DEIS. Thank you for reviewing the document and for your comments. We respond to each of your comments below; however, a general observation is appropriate to first set the framework for our specific responses.  

Your letter expresses a preference for increased and active park space within the project area and the position that an active recreational facility within the site and no development of city office spaces and commercial uses within the site would better meet the recreational needs of the people living and working in the Downtown/Chinatown area. We understand, appreciate and respect your views. However, while the proposed project addresses some of the area's passive recreational needs, it also addresses other very important community and public needs which would not be accommodated at all if the project were designed only in the manner preferred by Neighborhood Board No. 13. These include the need for affordable child care services in a facility that satisfies all State licensing standards; the need to save taxpayer expenses by consolidating a number of City agencies and programs within the project and providing for rental income from ground floor commercial space leases to offset project development and operating costs; and the need to provide additional public parking spaces within the Downtown/Chinatown area.  

Neighborhood Board No. 13's preference regarding the use of the project site could not be fully accommodated because tradeoffs in allocating the limited space within the project site among these uses had to be made to achieve these recreational, financial and public service objectives. However, we're convinced that the public and community will still be well served by the proposed project in its current form for reasons cited above.  

Given this general framework, we respond to your specific comments accordingly:  

Comment #1:  

Your request for an active park on the site has been taken under advisement. As stated above, the proposed passive park will address recreational needs in the area and, thus, is also an appropriate use of the project site. Because the potential noise impacts of an active park on nearby residences would be greater than those from a passive park, the identification of this concern is not necessarily "inappropriate."  

Comment #2:  

As proposed, the new parking facility will replace present stalls and add more parking stalls for residents and customers of local businesses. The number of stalls within the site will increase from 129 to 325 parking stalls. Even with a portion of the stalls set aside for City employees, there will still be a net increase in the number of parking stalls available for residents and the public.  

Comment #3:  

As covered in the Honolulu Advertiser article of August 27, 1981, which you cited, the City agreed to allow changes to the development plans for the Honolulu Park Place site on Block F, the parcel bounded by Beretania, Maukaea and Kukui Streets and Nuuanu Avenue. However, there was no understanding that the park at the Honolulu Park Place site would be replaced with the Smith-Berenstein park. Therefore, your statement that the proposed Smith-Berenstein Park was originally supposed to be located on the Honolulu Park Place project site is incorrect. Project plans for the two sites were conceived, designed and are being developed independently.  

Comment #4:  

The DEIS identifies a number of parks in the surrounding area which are available to the public. Your concerns regarding the apparent inadequacies of these recreational resources have been taken under advisement. With respect to the Emergency Tent facility at Ala...
Park. It should be noted that the shelter is intended to be a temporary use. Therefore, Ala Park cannot be discounted as a recreational resource for the community.

We emphasize that the Smith-Beretania project will add new recreational park space to the inventory of recreational resources in the Downtown area which includes the Palahi Community Service Facility, the Kualii Park, the Queen Emma Square, the Kamehame Playground, the Fort Street Mini Park, the Millicent Park and the Chinatown Gateway Park as well as the nearby Ala Park and Beretania Community Park.

Comment #1:
Neither the DEIS nor the project’s Social Impact Assessment Report states that the Smith-Beretania project adds the “wrong type” of park to the Downtown/Chinatown area. In fact, the Social Impact Assessment Report states:

“The proposed Smith-Beretania park will improve the Chinatown/Downtown park situation by adding another recreational resource to the area. Similar to existing Downtown urban or mini parks, the Smith-Beretania park will add attractive open space and provide visual and psychological relief from the prevalent high-density urban environment. The proposed park will also provide a passive gathering area for the resident population and, possibly, a play area for young children.”

The Smith-Beretania park will not, however, improve the overall quality of regional recreational resources. As proposed, the proposed park is limited in terms of area and function. The total project site is far short of the ten-acre Department of Parks and Recreation recommendation. By itself, there is no way that the Smith-Beretania project could fully address the Chinatown/Downtown recreational needs, even if the entire site were used for a park.” (Emphasis added.)

Given the limited land area within the project site, it is probably unrealistic to expect to be able to provide recreation for all age groups—tots, children, teenagers, adults and seniors—at this site.

Comment #6:
Your concern that the Downtown area is becoming a “dumping ground” has been taken under advisement. It should be noted that the proposed project will not be a source of this “dumping.” As you are aware, the Smith-Beretania project does not involve the development of any housing units and, therefore, will not add any resident population to the surrounding neighborhood.

Comment #7:
Jeffrey Hishi confirmed that the Association of Apartment Owners of Honolulu Tower have agreed to support Neighborhood Board 11’s preference for an active park on the Smith-Beretania project site.

Comment #8:
We appreciate your suggestions for redesigning the project. However, operational and other design considerations may prevent your suggestions from being incorporated in the project. It should be noted that the current site plan calls for constructing no structures other than the child care center. The commercial/office space will be placed above the child care center and therefore does not reduce in any way the available park space. Furthermore, operational considerations require the child care center to be contained on a single level instead of two, as you suggested.

Comment #9:
The final EIS for the project will contain the corrected information that the day care center in the Richard Street YWCA continues to operate and did not close last February.

Comment #10:
We acknowledge your comment that there is sufficient passive recreation for Downtown residents and employees.

Comment #11:
1990 Census data were not available when the DEIS was published in March 1991. However, in the updated Social Impact Assessment Report, which will be included in the final EIS, will reflect 1990 Census figures as appropriate.

Comment #12:
As cited in the Social Impact Assessment for the project, while the proposed Smith-Beretania project may not affect the need for active recreation space in the Downtown/Chinatown area, it will add another recreational resource to the area. The Social Impact Assessment also states that there is no way the Smith-Beretania
project, by itself, could fully address the area's recreational needs, even if the entire site were used for a park.

Comment #12:

Page 78 of the DEIS states that "[t]he proposed child care facility will positively impact on the need for more child care services in the Chinatown/Downtown area; . . . . Special attention needs to be given to finding ways to financially assist Chinatown residents who may want to enter their children into the child care facility but cannot afford to do so on their own."

While we are sympathetic to the need for affordable child care, the City's objective is not to provide subsidized child care in this project. Revenues generated by the project will help to repay the construction debt, however, nearby employers may choose to provide such assistance to their employees.

Comment #14:

The extent to which a reduction in the potential size of a park area comprises an impact on a neighborhood is not clear. The "bottom line" is that the project will add a substantial amount of new park space to the Downtown/Chinatown area where none currently exists. Although a portion of the project site will not be used for park purposes, approximately 36,480 square feet (62%) of the 57,865-square feet project site will be devoted to park space.

Comment #16:

The DEIS states at page 79 that "the project will increase parking within the project site from an existing 325 stalls to 315 stalls." Potentially, about 325 parking stalls could be contained within the proposed parking facility; however, the design circulation impacts of that many parking stalls within the facility is still being studied.

A firm figure on the number of parking stalls which will be allocated to City employees working within the project site cannot be provided at this time. However, this number is expected to be a relatively small percentage of the total number of parking stalls.

Comment #17:

Your comment expressing agreement with the idea of staggering the reconstruction of City parking lots in the Downtown area is very much appreciated.

Comment #18:

At this time, the operational details of the proposed parking facility have not been formulated because the project is still in its conceptual development stage. In response to your concern about crime, please note that there will be lighting throughout the parking facility as required by the Building Code and that the facility will be located only 2 blocks from the Downtown Police Substation on Bethel Street. Finally, the parking lot attendant will service parking lot patrons and, his/her presence may discourage criminal acts within the parking facility.

Comment #19:

Your comment regarding the location of Honolulu Park Place is duly noted and the final FIG will be corrected accordingly.

Comment #20:

The updated Social Impact Assessment report will specify that the new 12-inch water main along Smith Street recommended by the Board of Water Supply is intended to serve the water needs of the proposed park, child care center, offices and commercial uses within the Smith-Beretania project. It is anticipated that the water demand generated by the child care center and park will be substantially larger than that generated by the offices and commercial uses.

Comment #21:

We referred this comment to our traffic consultant for review. The consultant noted that, with the project exit onto Beretania Street, vehicles leaving the parking structure will experience some delay (LOS B) during the morning peak hour and very long delays (LOS F) during the afternoon peak hour when turning left onto Beretania Street.
Ms. Lynne Matsumoto
June 17, 1991
Page 7

Vehicles attempting to get across Beretania Street to turn right onto Manukaua Street (to get to the freeway and beyond) will experience even longer delays. Due to the expected delays, drivers may take alternative routes to get to the freeway, such as going further down Beretania Street and turning right onto Aala Street or going around the block to get onto Smith or Bethel Streets. This information will be included in the FEIS. Additionally, your recommendation to locate the entrance and exit for the parking lot on Smith Street has been noted.

Comment #2:
The final FEIS will contain larger project illustrations in response to your comment. We appreciate your suggestions for redesigning the site plan for the project. As noted previously, operational and other design considerations may prevent your suggestions from being incorporated in the overall project plans.

Comment #2:
The project illustration on page 25 of the DEIS delineates the courtyard area, which abuts the proposed child care center. This courtyard area will be devoted to exclusive child care center use. The balance of the proposed park space shown on page 25 will be continuously accessible to the public, although supervised use of the park space by children from the child care center may occur from time to time.

Thank you for your informative comments on the DEIS.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL H. SCARFOE
Director

CC: DEPC
Department of General Planning
May 8, 1991

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
659 South King Street, 6th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Smith-Baretta Parkig Lot Redevelopment Project
Honolulu, Oahu

The above referenced project includes development of a multi-level 315 stall parking garage; a 36,650 square foot public park; a 160-vault day care facility; 10,600 square feet of commercial space; and 27,000 square feet of office space for city agencies.

The Environmental Center has reviewed this Draft EIS with the assistance of George Teo, Civil Engineer; Fred L. Creager, Architecture/Urban Planning; and Lee Lytles, Environmental Center.

General Comments on Urban Design Aspects

Our reviewers noted that inclusion of office and commercial space at this scale would strengthen the project. These uses support the pedestrian walkway which is consistent with the character of the district.

The open space, designed as a passive urban relief area, should be more visually and physically accessible from Punchbowl Street. A pedestrian way through the proposed structure would be supportive of the district's historic 'courtyard-style' development patterns and focus commercial exposure on Pearl and Smith streets. Consideration also should be given to design which can accommodate both active and passive use of the open space area.

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
May 8, 1991
Page 2

Although security in the area is generally good, the below grade parking areas could present safety hazards during the evening hours. Mitigative measures, such as a layout free of 'blind spots,' security lighting, and alarm systems should be considered.

Public Utilities and Services (pages 51-55)

The EIS describes the existing service infrastructure lines in the 'Water,' 'Sewer,' and 'Other Utilities' sections. However, it does not give any project utilization figures. How much water, gas, and electricity will the project use? How much sewage will the project generate? Without these figures, no adequate assessment of impact can be made.

Provision Social Impacts (pages 76-81)

The project is situated in a culturally sensitive section of Honolulu, yet the EIS provides no discussion of the aesthetic impacts of this sizable structure on the surrounding community. Further, the section entitled 'Design Characteristics' on page 72 includes no discussion on the treatment of the building's facade. The Final EIS should address this issue, and present possible measures to mitigate any visual impacts on the community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this document.

Yours truly,

John T. Harrison, Ph.D
Environmental Coordinator

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution
June 17, 1991

Dr. John T. Harrison, Ph.D
Environmental Coordinator
Environmental Center
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Crawford Hall, Rm. 317
2550 Campus Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Dear Dr. Harrison:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, TMK 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Gabu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 8, 1991 letter which informs us that your agency has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and which provides several comments thereon. Our responses to those comments are presented below.

General Comments:

We agree that the inclusion of office and commercial space within the project site strengthens its development concept and is consistent with, and supports the desired historic character of the district.

Presently, pedestrian access to the proposed, ground-level park space will be available from Smith and Beretania Streets. The project's design concept avoids providing direct public access to the park from Pauahi Street through the proposed courtyard to ensure the safety and security of children at the child care center which will be located next to Pauahi Street.

Dr. John T. Harrison
June 17, 1991
Page 2

Your suggestion that the project incorporate a pedestrian way through the structure and that active and passive uses of the open space are be considered will be taken under advisement. We will ask the project designers to consider them when the project reaches the detailed design stage to see if they can be accommodated without compromising child safety and other project objectives.

With respect to security, your recommendation that mitigative measures including a parking facility layout free of blind spots, security lighting and alarm systems is noted. It is anticipated that the proposed underground parking structure will be lighted to provide for safe internal vehicle circulation and, also, to avoid blind spots within the facility.

Comments Re: Public Utilities and Services:

Various public agency comments on the project's Environmental Impact Statement Preparatory Notice (EISP), which were included within the DEIS, partially respond to your comments regarding detailed estimates of the project's demand on public infrastructure.

No estimates of the amount of gas or electricity expected to be used by the project are available; however, the delivery of such services to the project is not expected to be problematic. Based on the Domestic Consumption Guideline, Average Daily Demand, of the Water System Standards, Vol. 1, 1985, it is estimated that the project's average daily water use demand will be approximately 10,972 gallons/day. The Final EIS will provide the detailed calculations pertaining to this estimate. It is noted that the Board of Water Supply has determined that a new 12-inch water main along Smith Street needs to be constructed to meet the needs of the project.

Estimates of the amount of sewage effluent which will be generated from the project and the amount of potable water it will use, if available, will be included within the Final EIS. The City Department of Public Works has determined that a sewer connection should be made between the project and an existing 8-inch line along Smith Street in order to provide adequate sewage collection and disposal services to the project site.

The Hawaiian Electric Company reviewed the EISP and DEIS. The DEIS stated that HECO services will be available to the project site and HECO essentially concurs.
Dr. John T. Harrison, Ph.D
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Agency comments on the EISPM and DEIS seem to confirm that the project can be adequately served by the necessary public infrastructure and utilities. Moreover, further public agency review of the project will occur during the design and construction plans stages to re-confirm the adequacy of such facilities and services.

Comment #2: Project Social Impacts:

The final EIS will provide a more detailed description of the applicable Chinatown Special District design requirements for the project with which the project must comply. This discussion will disclose the applicable building design, height, setback, architectural and other development requirements of the Special District which will facilitate project consistency with the unique historic character and features of the surrounding district.

Thank you for your very helpful comments and suggestions. We sincerely hope that we have responded to them adequately.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael M. Scavone
Director

cc: OKOC
Department of General Planning
April 16, 1991

Mr. Harold S. Masumoto
Director
Office of State Planning
State of Hawaii
Executive Chambers
State Capitol, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Masumoto:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

We have reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project which will include 56,480 square feet for a public park, an underground multi-level parking structure, a child care facility, 12,400 square feet of commercial space, and city offices. The subject site consists of 27,860 feet and is located within the State Urban District.

We have no comments to offer at this time.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Harold S. Masumoto
Director

cc: Office of General Planning.
Mr. Tenua Tominaga  
Public Works Engineer  
Department of Accounting and  
General Services  
State of Hawaii  
P.O. Box 118  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810

June 1, 1991

Dear Mr. Tominaga:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEI’S)  
Smith-Perotani parking lot Redevelopment  
Project, TMK 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.

Thank you for your April 16, 1991, letter informing us  
that your Department has reviewed the above-captioned DEIs and  
has no comments to offer thereon. Your attention to and cooperation on  
this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Scarfoe  
Director

cc: DEQC  
Department of General Planning

cc: Department of Housing and Community Development  
Mr. Patrick A. Ribellis  
DEQC

TEUAN Tominaga  
State Public Works Engineer

The City and County of Honolulu  
Department of General Planning  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attention: Mr. Benjamin B. Lee

Gentlemen:

Subject: Smith-Perotani Parking Lot  
Redevelopment Project  
Downtown Central Business  
EIS

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject  
document. We have no comments to offer.

Should there be any questions, please have your staff  
contact Mr. Ralph Yukimoto of the Planning Branch at 848-7192.

Very truly yours,

TEUAN Tominaga  
State Public Works Engineer

Ft: dbk

cc: Department of Housing and Community Development  
Mr. Patrick A. Ribellis  
DEQC
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
652 S. King Street, 8th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Attn: Benjamin B. Lee

Gentlemen:

Subject: Comments to Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the Draft EIS for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project.

We do not have any comments to offer at this time.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

For John C. Lewin, M.D.
Director of Health

Cc: Michael H. Scantlebury
    Patrick A. Pinal
    DEQC

Dr. John C. Lewin, M.D.
Director
Department of Health
State of Hawaii
P.O. Box 3376
Honolulu, Hawaii 96801

Dear Dr. Lewin:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, THK: 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Kahua, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 6, 1991, communication informing us that your Department reviewed the DEIS and has no comment to offer on the project at this time.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication thereon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For Michael W. Scantlebury
Director

CC: DEQC
Department of General Planning
April 4, 1991

Department of General Planning
City & County of Honolulu
Municipal Office Building, 8th Floor
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Attention: Benjamin B. Lee

Dear Sir:

Subject: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project
Downtown Central Business District-Honolulu
TMX: 1-7-04

We wish to inform you that we have no comments to offer on the subject environmental impact statement.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the document.

Sincerely,

Maurice H. Kea
Energy Program Administrator

Cc: Department of Housing and Community Development
Mr. Patrick A. Ribaila, Attorney
Office of Environmental Quality Control

May 29, 1991

Mr. Maurice H. Kea
Energy Program Administrator
Department of Business & Economic Development
State of Hawaii
Old Federal Bldg., Rm. 110
335 Merchant Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Kea:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, TMX: 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 4, 1991 letter regarding the above-captioned DEIS informing us that your department reviewed the DEIS and has no comments thereon.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. SCARFONE
Director

Cc: DEQC
Department of General Planning
Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Department of General Planning
620 South King Street, 8th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Benjamin:

SUBJECT: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

We have reviewed the document listed above and have no comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brian J.J. Choy

cc: Michael Scarfone, DHCD
    Patrick Ribellia

May 29, 1991

Mr. Brian J.J. Choy
Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
State of Hawaii
220 S. King Street, 4th Flr.
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Choy:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Permit: 1-7-84; 1 and 5, Oahu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 9, 1991 letter regarding the above-captioned DEIS informing us that your agency has reviewed the DEIS and has no comments thereon at this time.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael N. Scarfone
Director

cc: Department of General Planning
April 9, 1991

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Chief Planning Officer
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project
Honolulu, Hawaii

We reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice for the subject project on December 11, 1990, and have no additional comments to make based on the draft EIS.

The project will have negligible effect on the public schools in Honolulu.

Thank you for the additional opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent

cc: T. Nakai
    J. Kim
    M. Scarfone, CSC Honolulu
    L. Bibbilla

May 28, 1991

Mr. Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent
Department of Education
State of Hawaii
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Dear Superintendent Toguchi:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, THC: 1-7-04; 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 9, 1991, letter commenting on the above-captioned DEIS and informing us that the proposed project will have negligible effect on the public schools in Honolulu and that your Department has no other comment thereon.

We appreciate your review of the DEIS and your written communication.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Scarfone
Director

cc: OEGC
Department of General Planning
April 16, 1991

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee  
Chief Planning Officer  
Department of General Planning  
City and County of Honolulu  
625 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

Subject: DEIS for Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Oahu, TMK Nos. 1-7-04-11 and 1

We have reviewed the subject DEIS and have no comments except to confirm that the proposed project is designated within the State Land Use Urban District.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this matter. If you have any questions, please call me or my staff at 548-4611.

Sincerely,

ESTHER UEDA  
Executive Officer

cc: Michael Scarfone  
Patrick Ribellia  
OGC

May 29, 1991

Ms. Esther Ueda  
Executive Director  
Land Use Commission  
State of Hawaii  
Old Federal Bldg., Rm. 104  
335 Merchant Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Ueda:


This acknowledges our receipt of your April 16, 1991 letter commenting on the above-captioned DEIS and informing us that the Land Use Commission has reviewed the DEIS and has no comments thereon at this time except to confirm that the proposed project site is located within the State Land Use Urban District.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your comments.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE  
Director  
OGC  
Department of General Planning.
May 21, 1991

TO: Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
    Dept. of General Planning
    City and County of Honolulu

FROM: Joseph A. Conant
       Executive Director

SUBJECT: Draft EIS for the Proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject draft EIS. We have no comments to offer.

cc: Mr. Michael H. Scarfone
    Mr. Patrick A. Rimella
    Office of Environmental Quality Control

May 29, 1991

Mr. Joseph X. Conant
Executive Director
Housing Finance & Development Corp.
State of Hawai‘i
Seven Waterfront Plaza, Ste. 300
500 Ala Moana Boulevard
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Conant:


This acknowledges our receipt of your May 21, 1991, communication informing us that your agency has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has no comment to offer thereon.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: OGC
Department of General Planning
Planning Division

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Chief Planning Officer
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 8th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

May 16, 1991

Dear Mr. Lee:

We have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu. Our previous comments in response to the Preparation Notice (letter dated January 15, 1991) have been incorporated into the document. We have no additional comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kisuk Cheung
Director of Engineering

Copies Furnished:

Mr. Michael N. Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing & Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Mr. Patrick A. Ribolla, Attorney at Law
1100 Bishop Street, Suite 2201
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Office of Environmental Quality Control
State of Hawaii
120 South King Street, Fourth Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

May 29, 1991

Mr. Kisuk Cheung
Director of Engineering
U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Department of the Army
Building 320
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440

Dear Mr. Cheung:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impacts Statement (DEIS) - Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, ZBA: 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 16, 1991 letter informing us that your department has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS; that its previous comments on the project's Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice were incorporated into the DEIS; and that you have no additional comment on the project.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication thereon.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael R. Scarfone
Director

cc: DEQC
Department of General Planning
Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Department of General Planning
City and County of Honolulu
665 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

Re: Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

The proposed action will have little adverse impact on fish and wildlife resources within our jurisdiction. In view of this, we have no objection to your issuance of a permit for this project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Robert P. Smith]
Field Supervisor
Pacific Islands Office
City and County of Honolulu

cc: Michael H. Scarfone, BEOC
Patrick A. Balton
GECC

May 29, 1991

Mr. Robert P. Smith
Field Supervisor
Pacific Islands Office
Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
P.O. Box 59167
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Dear Mr. Smith:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, TMR 4-1-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 19, 1991 letter informing us that your agency has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has determined that the proposed action will have little adverse impact on fish and wildlife resources within your jurisdiction and, therefore, that it has no objection to the project.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and informing us of your determinations with respect to the proposed project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Michael H. Scarfone]
Director

cc: GECC
Department of General Planning
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Chief, Planning Officer
Department of General Planning
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King St., 8th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

SMITH-BERETANIA PARKING LOT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

We reviewed the subject DEIS and have no comments to offer. Since we have
no further use for the DEIS, it is being returned to the Office of
Environmental Quality Control.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft.

Sincerely,

W.K. Liu
Assistant Base Civil Engineer
By direction of
the Commander

Copy to:
C&C Dept of Hsg & Comm Dev
Patrick A. Nibelti,
Attorney at Law
OCC (w/DEIS)

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. W.K. Liu
Assistant Base Civil Engineer
Department of the Navy
Naval Base Pearl Harbor
P.O. Box 110
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860-5020

Dear Mr. Liu:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 11, 1991 letter commenting on the above-captioned DEIS and informing us that
your department has reviewed the DEIS and has no comments thereon.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

Sincerely,

Michael H. Scarfone
Director

cc: OCC
Department of General Planning
April 5, 1991

Engineering Office

Department of General Planning
City & County of Honolulu
Municipal Office Building
650 South King Street, 6th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Gentlemen:

Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the above subject project.

We have no comments to offer at this time regarding this project.

Sincerely,

Jerry H. Matsuda
Lieutenant Colonel
Hawaii Air National Guard
Contracting & Engineering Officer

cc: Dept of Housing & Comm. Dev.
   Attorney at Law
   Department of General Planning

May 29, 1991

Lt. Col. Jerry H. Matsuda
Contracting & Engineering Officer
Hawaii Air National Guard
Department of Defense
State of Hawaii
3459 Diamond Head Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816-4495

Dear Lt. Col. Matsuda:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, TMR: 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii

This acknowledges our receipt of your April 5, 1991 letter commenting on the above-captioned DEIS. Thank you for reviewing the document and informing us that your agency has no comment to offer thereon at this time.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

cc: OEQC
   Department of General Planning
April 23, 1991

Mr. Benjamin B. Lee
Department of General Planning
City & County of Honolulu
Municipal Office Building, 9th Floor
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Lee:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

We have reviewed the subject DEIS, and have no comments at this time on the proposed project. HECO shall reserve comments pertaining to the protection of existing power lines bordering the project area until construction plans are finalized.

Sincerely,

cc: Michael H. Searfose, Dept. of Housing & Community Development
    Patrick A. Ribellis, Attorney at Law

May 29, 1991

Mr. William A. Bonnet
Manager
Environmental Department
Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 2750
Honolulu, Hawaii 96810-0001

Dear Mr. Bonnet:


This acknowledges our receipt of your April 23, 1991 communication informing us that your department reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has no comment at this time on the proposed project.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication thereon.

Sincerely,

cc: OROC
    Department of General Planning

Michael H. Searfose
Director
Michael Scarfone, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, HI 96813

Re: Draft EIS - Smith/Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project

Dear Mr. Scarfone,

Thank you for providing the Theatre with a copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) concerning the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project. Upon reviewing the draft we noted with concern that the Hawai‘i Theatre restoration/ construction project was not mentioned in Section 3.2.1 “Projects Under Construction” or Section 3.2.2 “Planned and Proposed Changes.” Additionally, Section 5.1.c “Traffic Impacts,” does not seem to take into account the Theatre's scheduled reopening in 1991.

We feel that it is vital that the final Environmental Impact Statement address the impact of the Theatre and its relation to proposals for the Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project.

Section 3.2.1 or Section 3.2.2 “Projects Under Construction”
“Planned and Proposed Changes”

The Hawai‘i Theatre Center is located one block east of the Smith/Beretania Parking Lot. The Theatre’s $13 million restoration and renovation is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1991, with reopening of the 1400-seat Theatre slated for early 1994.

The League of Historic American Theatres can provide sound and factual information on the impact of restored theatres in downtown areas. Signs of economic revitalization in the Hawai‘i Theatre’s immediate neighborhood already are evident, as referenced frequently by Honolulu daily newspapers and downtown-related periodicals, such as the Downtown Improvement Association. This upswing will increase dramatically as the Theatre nears reopening. Restaurants and shops will open and prosper, bringing yet more pedestrians and automobiles into the Bethel/Faunihi/Smith/Beretania district.

The restoration of the Hawai‘i Theatre also will have a far-reaching social impact on the Downtown/Chinatown neighborhoods. The Theatre’s social impact corresponds to the "continued and increased need for resident-oriented facilities," especially in light of project demographic changes in the Downtown sub-area, i.e., “higher owner occupancy rate, younger population, higher incomes, increased ethnic diversity, and higher education levels” (DEIS, pp. 29, 27).

Section 5.1.c Traffic Impacts:

Although the Theatre will not be finished until after the completion of the Parking Lot Redevelopment, the Theatre will have an obvious and immediate impact on traffic upon its completion.

Theatres, as you know, are hubs of activity. Permanent employees will staff the Theatre twenty hours a day and a large core of HTC volunteers will frequent the area. User groups and audiences will frequent the Theatre throughout the day and evening, workers will deliver sets, costumes, and refreshments, and Chinatown and other tour groups will "drop in." All of this activity will create a heavy demand for parking. The omission of the Hawai‘i Theatre on the overall Project Location Map, p. 6, however, seems to indicate that Theatre traffic was not considered when planning traffic control changes.

It is also important to consider that whether a theatre performance takes place in the day or in the evening, Theatre goers will empty all of their parking spaces at one time. If traffic during afternoon peak period now is considered to be at Level of Service-E, it is fair to assume that it is likely to reach LOS-F after a
The Theatre is pleased to be a major player in not only the revitalization of Downtown, but also in the preservation of the historic fabric of Chinatown. As such, we reviewed carefully Section 4.4 where reference is given to PUC DP Special Provisions stating: "The Chinatown District shall be redeveloped with emphasis on historic preservation, architectural character and adaptive reuse. The retail-commercial function shall be strengthened."

The DEIS states that the Smith-Beretania project "conforms to and implements this directly applicable land use policy by facilitating and being a part of the Chinatown revitalization in a manner consistent with the Chinatown Special District's historical (sic) preservation objectives and standards." Yet, instead of providing retail-commercial functions to the private sector, it appears that the City plans to use this space primarily to locate City offices. Furthermore, according to City personnel, an undetermined number of parking spaces on the Smith-Beretania site may be devoted to City workers. We believe the use of this space for City offices and the corresponding use of public parking spaces would violate the PUC DP Special Provisions emphasizing strengthening the retail-commercial aspect of Chinatown.

City personnel also have indicated that plans are being considered to decentralize the Department of Motor Vehicle Offices to make them more accessible to the public. We earnestly hope that there is no plan to locate a DMV office on the Smith-Beretania site, as the heavy demand for parking would add to the already serious parking congestion in the area.

Other offices mentioned as possible tenants for the Smith-Beretania site were:

- Prosecutors' Offices 1164 Bishop Street 14 parking spaces
- Upper Commission 711 Kapiolani Blvd. 1 parking space
- Work Hawaii 715 South King Street 1 parking space

These offices would require a total of 16 parking spaces for City employees who need to have their vehicles accessible to conduct City business. Others employees in these offices, we have been advised, would make private parking arrangements or use the Blaisdell Center parking lot and City Bus. It therefore seems that relocation of these offices to a downtown site would have a much less negative impact on the Chinatown neighborhood than would DMV offices.

In Conclusion:

We are deeply concerned that the Draft EIS does not reference the Theatre, nor the tremendous increase that the Theatre will have on day and night pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The Theatre's impact will stem not only from activities at the theatre, but also from the revitalization of the surrounding neighborhood that the Theatre will spur.

Thus, we strongly believe that the Final EIS should not fail to mention the Theatre's impact.

While the availability of accessible public parking for patrons of the Hawaii Theatre Center during both day and evening hours is, of course, our primary concern, our concern is also for the economic stability of both Chinatown and Downtown. We hope that you will consider placing public needs over those of City offices and employees and will develop parking on the Smith-Beretania site that is open to the public and accessible to elderly and individuals with disabilities. Parking that is accessible from the Pauahi site also would benefit our neighborhood.

Page 30 of the DEIS indicates that community interviews were conducted with people who own land near the project site, have a regional interest in the proposed project, or would be able to provide specific information on how the site might affect the neighboring community. Although forty-four individuals were interviewed, no representative from the Theatre was included in the pool.

While we appreciate the opportunity to comment in writing on the draft EIS, we suggest that an interview be conducted with representatives from the Hawaii Theatre. We will contact the appropriate EIS representatives to arrange for such a meeting.

Again, thank you for reviewing our comments.

Sincerely,

Sarah M. Richards
Executive Director

cc: Patrick A. Ribellia
Berna Cabacungan
Ms. Sarah Richards  
June 14, 1991  

Ms. Sarah M. Richards  
Executive Director  
Hawaii Theatre Center  
1130 Bethel Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Dear Ms. Richards:  

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)  
Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment  
Project, EIS: 1-7-94; 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.  

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 23, 1991,  
comments on the above-captioned DEIS and expresses our thanks  
and appreciation for your review and comments.  

We appreciate your remarks concerning the need to discuss  
the potential traffic impacts of the renovated Theatre. As stated  
in an earlier communication to your organization, the project will  
directly benefit the community at large by providing accessible  
and nearby parking facilities. It will do the same for the other  
businesses and artistic activities within the Downtown/Chinatown  
area. We fully anticipate that Theatre patrons will use the  
project's "public" parking facility within the project.  

We respectfully disagree with your comment that use of a  
small number of the proposed 105 parking spaces at the proposed  
parking facility for City employees located within the project site  
would violate the Primey Urban Center Development Plan policy  
eitherly strengthening the retail-commercial aspect of  
Chinatown. If that were true, then, the same must be said about the  
parking structure, itself, since it is not a retail-commercial  
land use as well as most other public or quasi-public uses proposed for the Chinatown area.  

We believe that the centralization of certain City  
agencies and programs within a part of the Smith-Beretania project  
and the corresponding allocation of some parking stalls to those  
agencies or programs complements and augments the redevelopment  
and rejuvenation of Chinatown as a retail-commercial  
area by adding a use which will attract customers to the area.  

It is a well-established city planning principle that any  
proposed use which helps to accomplish the basic purposes, intent  
and objectives of a public planning policy is customarily viewed as  
confirming to and implementing that policy.  

Your concern that the DEIS fails to mention the Theatre's  
impact on traffic in the area is noted. As mentioned, we fully  
expect much use of the project's parking facility by Theatre  
patrons and the final EIS will generally note that anticipated  
circumstance.  

We anticipate that traffic impacts within the area  
surrounding the project site and use of the project's parking  
facility by people attending Hawaii Theatre functions will  
generally occur during non-peak hours (i.e., evenings and weekends).  
Although such traffic will increase the overall amount of traffic  
within the area, it should not significantly impact peak hour  
traffic flows within the various nearby streets and intersections.  
The facility is intended to meet the parking needs of many existing  
and future uses in the Downtown/Chinatown area, including the  
Hawaii Theatre's parking needs.  

The scope of the project's EIS focuses on the project's  
impacts on surrounding areas. The traffic impact assessment  
prepared for the EIS was not intended to assess the Hawaii  
Theatre's anticipated impacts on day and night pedestrian and  
vehicular traffic in the area. However, as indicated above, since  
the onset of the project, it has been recognized and anticipated  
that Theatre events will impact traffic flows within the immediate  
area, mostly during non-peak hours. Without detailed information  
about the type of events anticipated at the Theatre, however, the  
final EIS can only generally comment on the Theatre's traffic  
impacts.  

We thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your  
communication.  

Sincerely,  

RICHARD M. SCARFONE  
Director  
Department of General Planning  

cc: DEP
May 24, 1991

Mr. Warren M. Lee
State Conservationist
Soil Conservation Service
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
P.O. Box 50004
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Mr. Benjamin R. Lee, Director
Department of General Planning
650 S. King Street, 8th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii

Dear Mr. Lee:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) - Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, Honolulu, Hawaii

We appreciated the opportunity to review the above-mentioned document and have no comments to offer at this time. We would appreciate the opportunity to review the final EIS.

Sincerely,

WARREN M. LEE
State Conservationist

cc: Mr. Michael N. Scarfone, Director, Department of Housing & Community Development, City and County of Honolulu, 650 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Mr. Patrick A. Ribelli, Attorney at Law, 1108 Bishop Street, Suite 2201, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Office of Environmental Quality Control, State of Hawaii, 210 South King Street, Fourth Floor, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

June 14, 1991

Mr. Warren M. Lee
State Conservationist
Soil Conservation Service
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
P.O. Box 50004
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850

Mr. Lee:

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project, THK 1-7-04: 1 and 4, Oahu, Hawaii.

This acknowledges our receipt of your May 24 letter informing us that your agency has reviewed the above-captioned DEIS and has no comment thereon to offer at this time. A copy of the final EIS will be sent to you in response to your request.

Thank you for reviewing the DEIS and for your communication.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL N. SCARFONE
Director

cc: ORQC
Department of General Planning
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Earthplan
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment

Social Impact Assessment

Prepared for the City Department of Housing and Community Development by Earthplan

February 1991
(Revised May 1991)
1. Page 53, replacement for last paragraph:

Construction of four parking lots would overlap: Alakea-Richards, Smith-Maunakea, Kaahumānu and Kekaulike. All four of these lots would be closed between January 1992 and February 1992, which would reduce the parking space supply by 989 spaces; the inventory would drop to 1,295 spaces, which is a major reduction from the preconstruction supply. If the Smith-Beretania project were to overlap this project, then the total inventory would be further reduced to 1,160 parking spaces.

2. Page 26, insert as new fifth paragraph:

The Hawaii Theater Center is located one block east of the project site. The renovation and restoration of this facility is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1991, and the 1,400-seat theater is expected to reopen in early 1994.

3. Youth Center.

In June 1991, after the social impact assessment was finalized, project plans were modified to include a youth center. The center would be located in approximately 10,000 square feet of floor area on the second floor of the three-story structure. This multi-use space may be used for youth activities, social events and possibly for elderly citizens.

In terms of social issues related to the youth center, this component was not presented to community informants in interviews. Based on reactions to other project components, as well as to non-project issues, a preliminary identification of possible issues related to the youth center is as follows:

* **Consistent with recommendation** -- The Hale Puaahi Community Association voted to explore the possibility of a youth center in Chinatown, and asked that "the City consider providing a youth center in the Smith-Beretania proposed development" (letter from Mable Blackwell to Mayor Frank Fasi dated 28 March 1991). The youth center is consistent with this recommendation.

* **Improvement of recreational resources for youth** -- As the SIA points out, the study area has very limited recreational resources. Depending on programmatic and managerial aspects, this component will improve the supply of recreational resources for young people.

* **Accommodation of active recreation** -- Vocal opponents of the project have consistently advocated an active recreation park and minimal or no structures on-site. The community will only see the new component as an improvement if there are indoor active recreation areas, such as ball courts.

* **Inadequate opportunity for community input/reaction** -- Community informants and organizations were not apprised of this project component during interviews, previous project
presentations, or the DEIS. Community members, particularly project opponents, will likely be concerned about not having an opportunity to comment on this component during the EIS process.

To fully assess potential social impacts of this component, more information is needed. The following is offered as items to consider in further planning of the youth center:

* **Importance of a good program**

  A youth center is not simply physical space. The concept, program and management of a youth center will make the difference between a popular gathering place for young people and a room with amusement equipment.

  To ensure that the new facility will be optimally used, there should be a needs assessment and community input. What do you hope to achieve with this youth center? Which age groups will the facility target? Will there be counselors and organized outings? What kind of recreational and amusement equipment will be housed in this facility? In light of center's second-story location, how will you advertise the facility so that there is psychological and physical access? These and other important questions can be answered by evaluating the various needs of young people in the Downtown and Chinatown area. The area's young people, community organizations, nearby residents and regional youth organizations should be solicited for input.

* **Security**

  Whenever there is a proposed gathering place, community members ask about security and assurances that the area will be well-monitored. A gathering place for young people will raise such concerns. Security should therefore be a major consideration in planning the youth center.

* **Mixed use**

  The youth center should primarily target young people, and the introduction of other uses should be well-managed. A successful youth center is one which provides a friendly gathering place, a haven and security for young people. Mixing age groups, such as having activities for the elderly, is not in itself a negative impact, and can be socially very rewarding. It can be a deterrent, however, if the young people begin to feel that other users will put limits on the youth enjoyment of the facility.
Smith-Beretania Project
Summary of Social Impact Assessment

1 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Earthplan, with assistance from independent contractor Michael P. Mays, prepared this social impact assessment for the City Department of Housing and Community Development on the proposed Smith-Beretania redevelopment.

2 PROFILE OF THE EXISTING COMMUNITY

2.1 Definition of the Study Area

The Smith-Beretania Redevelopment project site is within the boundaries of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13. Depicted in Figure 1, the study area for this report encompasses neighborhoods easily accessible to the project, and includes (1) the Downtown sub-area made up of Census Tracts 40 and 42; and (2) the Chinatown sub-area, made up of Census Tracts 51 and 52.

2.2 Population Trends and Characteristics

Study Area Employment. In 1985, an estimated 42,584 people worked in the study area; most of them live outside the study area. Figure 2 shows that 30 percent of the total jobs were service-related, followed by 28 percent in jobs related to finance, insurance, and real estate.

Figure 3 shows the distribution of jobs relative to Chinatown and Downtown. In 1985, Chinatown contained 4,653 jobs, which were evenly distributed throughout the region. The largest category of jobs was retail, at 28 percent, followed by service at 25 percent. As expected, most of the jobs were found in the Central Business District (CBD), which is Census Tract 40, where almost 38,000 people worked. In contrast to the strong retail showing in Chinatown, Downtown's strongest categories were service and finance, insurance, and real estate.

Population and Housing Trends. Over the past thirty years, the study area net population grew from 4,666 persons in 1960 to 8,342 persons in 1990.

The rate of population growth in the City and County of Honolulu has been steadily decreasing over recent decades. In contrast, the study area population has been fluctuating due to redevelopment efforts. As shown on Table 1, the study area population decreased by approximately 5.4 percent a year in the 1960s. During the 1970s, the study area grew at a significant rate of 8.3 percent a year. With new residential projects, the study area population continues to grow at rates higher than the rest of the island. Between 1980 and 1990, the study area grew an average of 3.7 percent each year.

The project site is in the makai portion of Chinatown, or Census Tract 52. This area had modest population increases in the 1960s, followed by a decline in the 1970s. As new medium- and high-density housing complexes were constructed in the 1980s, growth has been accelerating. After a period of population decline, this area had the highest growth rate at eleven percent between 1980 and 1990.
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In the portion of Chinatown mauka of Beretania Street (Census Tract 51), revitalization and urbanization efforts caused the virtual elimination of the residential population in the 1960s and major increases in the 1970s. In the first half of the 1980s, this area was still experiencing major growth, at approximately 8.1 percent a year; no growth was experienced between 1985 and 1990.

In the Downtown Sub-Area, residential growth occurred in the 1970s, with projects such as the Executive Centre, Harbor Square and Kukui Plaza. No residential growth has occurred between 1985 and 1989.

Figure 4 shows that the proportion of Chinatown and Downtown residents varied with respect to the two sub-areas. In 1980 Chinatown's population was over twice the size of the Downtown population. By 1970, the two areas were almost even, and, by 1980, there were more people living in Downtown. In 1985, Chinatown's population rose sufficiently to almost equal that of Downtown, and by 1990, there were again more people living in Chinatown.

Table 2 provides 1980 Census housing stock information for O'ahu and the study area. Study area residential units are all in multiple-unit buildings. The units are small, in comparison to the City and County norm, and mostly occupied by renters. On the Downtown side of the study area most units were in condominiums. In most of the study area, 1980 rents were below the City and County average. This is in part because of the relatively high density of government-subsidized housing in Chinatown.

By 1989, the study area contained 4,831 residential units, as shown on Table 3. Compared to an islandwide 1989 household size of 3.04 persons, the study area had an average household size of 1.84 persons, as is to be expected because of the predominance of multi-family units. Makai Chinatown had the smallest household size of 1.65 persons.

Population and Family Characteristics. The 1980 census shows that the people of the study area were relatively older when compared to the islandwide population. In much of the study area, a large part of the 1980 population lived in non-family households. Throughout the study area, the average number of persons per family was below the City and County average. In all tracts, the majority of the 1980 population was not Hawai'i-born, though the population of different tracts vary in background. Tables 4 and 5 provides further information about such statistics.

The Downtown and Chinatown communities differed in several respects. In the Downtown sub-area, the population was relatively well-educated and affluent. Median family incomes in the makai portion of Downtown were well above the O'ahu average in 1980, while mauka incomes were close to the average. In both tracts, few families had incomes below the poverty line. Most families in the Downtown sub-area did not have children in the household in 1980. Caucasians formed the largest ethnic group in this area. While many residents were Hawai'i-born, a
high percentage were from other states. The proportion of the population who had lived in the same house five years previously was low, mostly because of the then new residential units.

In the Chinatown sub-area, most residents were far less affluent in 1980. The proportion of both family and non-family households below the poverty line in Census Tracts 51 and 52 was well above the O'ahu averages. Also, many residents had relatively less schooling.

Labor Force Characteristics. The 1980 Census showed that residents in the Downtown side of the study area were likely to have relatively high-status and well-paid occupations. Laborers and service workers were numerous on the Chinatown side (see Table 6). Labor force participation was high among Downtown sub-area residents, while many more adults were not in the labor force on the Chinatown side. Unemployment was relatively high in Chinatown. Although residents of the study area live near Honolulu's financial and government center, they had to spend about as much time getting to work as did other O'ahu residents in 1980.

3 MAJOR CHANGES WITHOUT THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

3.1 Plans and Guidelines in Relation to the Study Area

The project site is in the Chinatown District, which was established to preserve the historic significance, architecture and characteristic uses of the area, and to meet the community's needs. Most of the project site is in the Mauka Precinct, which is to provide for a range of household incomes, while supporting and contributing to Chinatown's retail-commercial function — particularly at street level. A major function of the Mauka Precinct is to create a transition between the Chinatown's Historic Core Precinct and the high density area of the Kukui area.

The entire portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street is in the Historic Core Precinct. Objectives of the Historic Core include the retention and renovation of historic buildings, and the continuation and concentration of the long-established ethnic retail and light manufacturing activities (City and County of Honolulu, Ordinance No. 89-32).

3.2 Projects Under Construction

There are two construction projects near the project site. Located across from the project site on the mauka side of Beretania Street is the Honolulu Park Place, a residential fee simple condominium containing 437 units. The Liberty Theater site and the adjacent gas station have been demolished and will be developed temporarily as a parking lot.

3.3 Planned or Proposed Changes
Proposed changes for the Chinatown Sub-Area are mostly City-initiated. The City and County of Honolulu is proposing the (1) Kekaulike Parking Lot Redevelopment (154 rental units, 15,000 square feet of ground level commercial space, parking and a pedestrian mall); (2) the redevelopment of the Smith-Maunakea parking lot (234 residential units and ground floor commercial uses); (3) the Foster Garden Estates (1,600 residential units); and (4) the rehabilitation of Pauahi Hale and Winston Hale. Park Place, a 422-unit residential project is proposed for a site just ‘Ewa of the project site.

Near the project site at the former Liberty Theater site is the proposed Highness Tower with 150 residential units and commercial uses.

3.4 Likely Future of the Study Area with the Smith-Maunakea Redevelopment

Residential Population And Demographics -- As shown in Table 7, the 727 residential units currently under construction or just recently completed will bring the total housing count to 5,600. Thus, in the near future, the population is expected to increase to almost 9,882 persons, independent of Smith-Beretania. The study area long-range population is projected to reach 15,900 persons, if all current proposals are implemented.

The types and locations of residential development proposed for the study area indicate that the demographic differences between Downtown and Chinatown residents will continue both in the short- and long-term time frame. As the City increases rental units in Chinatown, there will be more renters of the low and moderate income category, as well as more elderly people. People who can afford market rents will also live in Chinatown, and, except for the Honolulu Park Place mauka of Beretania Street, and planned sales units at Foster Garden Estates, no private homeownership is expected in Chinatown.

With the completion of current construction projects, the demographics of the future population of the Downtown sub-area will likely change to reflect a high owner occupancy rate, younger population, higher incomes, increased ethnic diversity, and higher education levels.

Continued Need For Resident-Oriented Facilities -- As more people live in the area, the demand and need for public services and facilities, especially recreational facilities, will continue.

Continued Rehabilitation in the Chinatown Sub-area -- Chinatown is expected to undergo low-rise commercial redevelopment, mixed with high-density residential uses. The current efforts are primarily City-initiated. It is anticipated that, as Chinatown accommodates more residents, and as the area's physical characteristics and infrastructure improve, private landowners in the area will redevelop their properties or rehabilitate existing structures.

Continued Development Of Downtown As The Financial Center -- The pressure for Downtown office development is expected to continue. By upgrading currently underdeveloped land, these projects are expected to change the urban landscape and intensify human activity in the area.
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Temporary Parking Problems -- As the City continues to develop sites containing public parking garages, there will be a shortage of public parking spaces. These shortages are expected to be temporary, since the new structures reportedly will contain replacement parking stalls. In the meantime, some businesses may suffer because of potential decreases in clientele.

4 COMMUNITY ISSUES ON THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

Community issues indicate how a group of people feel about something, and hence represent perceptions which shift over time as people's priorities and values change. The issues related to the proposed Smith-Beretania Redevelopment are those identified in February 1991.

4.1 Sources of Information

Two sources of information were used in this analysis. First, this study examined the minutes of the Neighborhood Board meetings from January 1988 through January 1991. Second, Earthplan conducted interviews with people who (1) live, conduct business or own land near the project site or (2) have a regional interest in the Smith-Beretania Redevelopment. These interviews were held to supplement information from printed sources of material regarding community needs and values, and, more importantly, to identify community issues and concerns relative to the proposed Smith-Beretania Redevelopment. This study did not include a scientific poll, and does not quantify project support or opposition.

Forty-four people were interviewed during this study and the list is presented in the report. Most of those interviewed lived, conducted business or owned land near the project site or in the Downtown area.

4.2 General Community Issues and Concerns

Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13. The theme central to most of the Neighborhood Board discussions held over the last three years is the need to create a more livable environment for residents in this high density and mixed use community. The Board strongly advocated more open space, more recreation areas, and more resident-oriented public services and facilities. In addition, the Board supported efforts which would increase the safety and efficiency of Downtown vehicular and pedestrian systems.

These themes were carried through in specific topics addressed. The Board reviewed numerous proposals which would bring change to Downtown and Chinatown, as well as to Kaka'ako. As these proposals are introduced, the Board reiterated the need more downtown parks; the need to encourage more affluent people to live in this area; the possibility of using higher-priced living units in the waterfront area to help finance lower-priced units elsewhere; the need for active recreational areas; and the need to minimize displacement of small
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businesses. The Neighborhood Board also strongly discouraged displacement of public parking because of the need to serve Downtown businesses and their clientele.

Issues and Concerns of Other Organizations. There are a number of business-oriented organizations in Chinatown, including the Chinatown Merchants Association, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, and the Downtown River Pauahi Merchants Association. They share a common goal of promoting and enhancing the business climate in Chinatown.

PACE, which is also known as People Against Chinatown Evictions, is currently working on outreach and advocacy services for low and middle-income Chinatown families. The United Chinese Society and the Association for Chinese from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are culturally-oriented.

The Downtown Improvement Association (DIA) is a business organization dedicated to the development of Downtown as the State’s premier business headquarters.

None of these organizations have taken a formal position on the proposed project, although PACE members have actively lobbied against the project.

Issues and Concerns Raised by Those Interviewed. Interviewees were asked to share their likes and concerns about Chinatown. They felt that the area offered the following positive characteristics:

1. **Socially heterogeneous and comfortable** -- Informants liked Chinatown’s ethnic and cultural diversity.

2. **Convenience and affordability** -- This was a major plus for informants. Residents liked being close to the open markets, restaurants, doctors' offices and banks. Business operators felt that Chinatown offers the dual advantage of having low business rents and accessibility.

3. **Revitalization efforts** -- Those interviewed generally liked the improvements in Chinatown. They felt that Chinatown is slowly losing or has lost its sleazy reputation. There was, however, disagreement as to the future of Chinatown. Business interests preferred strengthening and increasing the business/commercial atmosphere. Residents wanted to see more resident- and family-oriented facilities and services.

Whereas residents and businesses expressed many similar viewpoints regarding Chinatown’s strengths, there were major differences in perspectives between residents and business people regarding Chinatown’s concerns/problems.

1. **Lack of resident-oriented facilities** -- The biggest problem cited by resident informants was the lack of park space.
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2. **Type of housing** -- Resident informants wanted to see more housing in the area. Some felt more affordable units were in order; others wanted more market housing.

3. **Disruption of businesses** -- Those involved with business were concerned about traffic, insufficient parking facilities and construction. These activities disrupted their operation.

4. **Regulations governing Chinatown's development** -- Some business-related informants felt that there should be less regulation so that the area can flourish economically.

5. **Presence of undesired elements** -- Residents and business people wished to see crime and loiterers eliminated from the area.

### 4.3 Community Issues and Concerns About the Smith-Beretania Redevelopment

**Organizational Positions.** To date, two organizations have taken a position on the proposed project. The Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13 has consistently advocated the establishment of an active park on the project site, and Board members have opposed both the previous proposal for a residential tower, as well as current plans for a commercial area and City office space. The Smith-Beretania Apartment Association has also historically voiced strong concerns about the project, and the Honolulu Tower Board has reportedly agreed to follow the Neighborhood Board's position in lobbying for an active park.

**Summary of Issues and Concerns on the Smith-Beretania Project.** The project elicited strong concern from resident informants, all of whom knew about the "Smith-Beretania project." Business informants were less aware of proposed actions. Because this was not a statistical survey, frequency of statements are provided only in extreme situations.

**Issues and Concerns Raised by Resident Informants.** Resident interviewees either strongly opposed the project as proposed, or were mildly supportive. Their comments are summarized as follows:

1. **Maximize park area and potential** -- Resident informants consistently pointed to the need for resident-oriented parks in Chinatown/Downtown. Residents felt that the City has a responsibility to take every opportunity to develop park space -- especially because the City is responsible for most of the residential projects proposed in Chinatown.

   To resident interviewees, the project will neither address the immediate need for more resident-oriented park space nor meet the long-range need for resident-oriented active park area. The other proposed uses will irrevocably remove a major portion of the project site from park use.

*Summary page 7*
2. Need for active park -- Neighborhood Board members and Smith-Beretania residents preferred that the park area contain equipment which will provide opportunities for active physical stimulation.

3. Project History -- During the ten-year period during which Smith-Beretania redevelopment has been discussed, the resident sector of Chinatown/Downtown has consistently requested an active park and opposed other uses which would compete with active park space. The introduction of yet another park-competing use frustrated resident informants.

4. Revitalization -- Resident informants said that the Smith-Beretania parking lot and the peripheral sidewalks were the scene of illegal activities including drug dealing and use and prostitution solicitation. They believed that the project would help by cleaning up the area and attracting more people.

5. Reactions to specific project components -- As earlier discussed, the commercial and office component were criticized for competing with valuable park space. The additional parking was appreciated, but the Beretania Street ingress/egress was seen as dangerous and a traffic problem. The proposed child care center was generally accepted. It was felt that every effort should be made to accommodate the needs of Chinatown/Downtown parents and children; affordable rates or special rates for nearby residents were offered as suggestions.

Business Issues and Concerns. The business people interviewed for this project were mostly those who operated in the immediate vicinity; other business interests were the leaders of regional business organizations. They were generally open to the Smith-Beretania project, though they asked questions or expressed concerns about impacts specific to their activities.

1. Generally good for business -- Business informants felt that the redevelopment of Smith-Beretania would be good for business because it would attract more people, revitalize the area, and offer convenient child care for employees.

2. Short-term shortage of parking and construction activities -- There was concern that many customers and clients would be deprived of convenient parking during construction. Also of concern were the typical construction impacts of noise and dust. A few people looked forward to construction because of possible increase in business.

3. Concerns about long-term effects -- Business informants were concerned about physical and circulation impacts. It was feared the project would "create a wall" on Pauahi Street, thereby
eliminating the current open space quality. Further, nearby businesses strongly discouraged street drop-off and pickup for the child care facility because of possible traffic impact.

5 POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

5.1 Recreation Impact

The Chinatown/Downtown area is estimated to have a population of over 10,000 people at the completion of existing construction. Based on the Long Range Plan of the City Department of Parks and Recreation, a population base of 10,000 should have (1) an average recreational site of ten acres; (2) children’s play area; (3) three to four basketball courts; (4) three to four volleyball courts; (5) one to two softball fields; and (6) a comfort station/recreation building.

Parks in the study area include the Kamali'i Park (0.68-acre, benches and walkways); Queen Emma Square (0.56-acre, no facilities or structures); and Kamamalu Playground (5.5 acres, ball courts and field, play equipment). In addition, the Paiahi Community Service Facility, a two-story, 6,000 square foot multi-purpose recreation building, is used primarily by senior citizens. The study area also contains a number of urban or mini parks, including the Fort Street Mall Mini Park, the Wilcox Park, and the Chinatown Gateway Plaza.

Just Ewa of the project site are parks within the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board area including Aala Park and the Beretania Community Park.

Inasmuch as these existing facilities are available for resident use, the overall park system in the study area has not kept pace with the existing and near future residential population of the study area.

1. There are no active parks within the "practical" boundaries of Downtown or Chinatown. Although the Kamamalu Playground is within the Downtown Neighborhood Board area, it is far from most Downtown and Chinatown residential complexes and more accessible to Punchbowl residents.

2. Aala Park and Beretania Community Park are used primarily by residents of those areas; Chinatown and Downtown residents would need to compete for park space with Kalihi-Palama residents.

3. These active play areas and playgrounds are within walking distance of some residential towers in Chinatown/Downtown, but are not easily accessible because of busy streets.

4. The Downtown urban or mini parks are part of the overall park inventory, but these are designed for the office environment, and not for resident-oriented recreation. These parks are paved with well-defined circulation patterns, and are not conducive to active play.
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The proposed Smith-Beretania park will improve the Chinatown/Downtown park situation by adding another recreational resource to the area. Similar to existing Downtown urban or mini parks, the Smith-Beretania park will (1) add attractive open space, (2) provide a visual and psychological relief from the prevalent high-density urban environment, and (3) provide a passive gathering area for the resident population and, possibly, a play area for young children.

The Smith-Beretania park will not, however, improve the overall quality of regional recreational resources. As proposed, the proposed park is limited in terms of area and function. The total project site is far short of the ten-acre Department of Parks and Recreation recommendation. By itself, there is no way that the Smith-Beretania project could fully address the Chinatown/Downtown recreational needs, even if the entire site were used for a park.

Further, Smith-Beretania has no effect on the existing and long-term need for active recreation space; it will contain none of the facilities recommended by the City Department of Parks and Recreation.

Proposed Mitigation -- The Smith-Beretania project represents the ongoing and increasing conflict between resident needs and a business environment. The resident-business conflict will become more acute as more residential projects are proposed. The area's population is expected to undergo major increases, but there is no long-term plan to meet existing and anticipated resident needs. If the City continues to advocate increasing the Chinatown/Downtown residential population, then we strongly recommend that the City formulate policies and plans for meeting the recreational needs of residents. It appears that both the City Departments of Housing and Community Development and Parks and Recreation would be involved in establishing such policies and plans.

Land availability is understandably a major constraint in increasing park space, and ongoing development by the public and private sectors will further restrict park development. We therefore suggest that high-density indoor recreational facilities, such as a gymnasium, indoor interchangeable courts and community meeting rooms, be considered in the planning process. Further, in the development of the long-range recreational plan for Chinatown/Downtown, the Smith-Beretania park should be re-evaluated to see if some form of active recreation would be consistent with the plan.

5.2 Impacts on Child Care

Statewide Ramifications. In 1984, the State Office of Children and Youth conducted a statewide assessment of the needs of parents, state employees, and child care providers for affordable, available, quality child care. It was found that the current supply of child care providers is inadequate in terms of affordability, availability and quality. There is potential demand for 6,400 additional full-time slots for infants and toddlers and for 3,300 full-time slots for preschool children. It is estimated that 28,000 parents would like to work, but cannot afford child care. In addition to affordability problems, parents also cited the unavailability of preferred types of care.
Smith-Beretania Project
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The proposed child care center will have a positive impact on the availability of child care in Hawai‘i. It will increase the number of slots for infants, toddlers and preschoolers and therefore increase the supply of quality child care. The project’s affordability can only be determined after an operator is selected.

Proposed Mitigation -- The project will have a positive impact on the supply of child care facilities, and no mitigation is required. To enhance the affordability of the proposed facility, the City should (1) work with major area employers to see if parent costs can be reduced and (2) explore ways to minimize the financial burden of the private operator.

Chinatown/Downtown Impacts. In late 1989, the then City Office of Human Resources (currently the Department of Human Resources) conducted a survey of employees in selected organizations. It was found that the cost of child care was a moderate to major problem for 55 percent of respondents and location was a moderate or major problem for approximately 48 percent of respondents. Care of children under two was a moderate or major problem for 36.5 percent. About a third used center-based care, while another 31 percent used a relative in their home. The largest preference, however, was for center-based care.

Respondents were asked if they would enroll, prefer or consider a child care center at or near the work site. Twenty-four percent felt they would enroll, while 14 percent would prefer such a center. Forty-six percent said they would at least consider such a facility.

Nine child care providers in the area and child care officials were contacted for this study. Full-day service tuition in the area ranges from $285 to $485 a month for toddlers and preschoolers. The facilities vary on whether non-toilet-trained children are accepted. The only facility offering infant care is the YWCA Day Care Program. Because of the high staffing requirement, the program has been operating at a loss and will close at the end of February 1991.

PATCH indicated a high demand for child care services in the Chinatown/Downtown area from both residents and out-of-area employees. All of the caregivers interviewed indicated a waiting list. The least demand is for spaces for three to five-year olds.

The greatest demand is for infant care. With the closure of the YWCA program, the supply of infant toddler care is restricted to family child care within homes.

The proposed child care center will positively impact the delivery of child care services in Chinatown/Downtown by increasing the supply of services.
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Proposed Mitigation -- This impact will benefit the area's child care resources and no mitigation is needed. To further enhance child care resources, the City could explore providing infant care. This would be an expensive operation and any operator would need to be subsidized in some form to successfully implement this program.

Special consideration should be given to study area residents. Given the socio-economic profile of Chinatown, it is anticipated that even though nearby residents may want to use the child care services, they may not be able to afford the tuition. The City should explore ways to assist these families in using facility services.

Site-specific Considerations. The proposed child care center would apply to the State Department of Human Resources for a license to operate. In our review of plans provided by the project architect (dated October 1990), we found that the available interior space seems adequate to meet licensing requirements for 150 children. It was further found that at least 3,500 square feet of land currently planned for the public park will be needed to comply with licensing standards. It is noted that the State may require that the public park portion contain some kind of physical barrier during facility operation to ensure exclusive use.

Proposed Mitigation -- The project's compliance with State licensing requirements will be determined by the State Department of Human Services.

5.3 Employment and Resident Population Impacts

The redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania project site will generate both short- and long-term employment opportunities. It is estimated that the project will generate an estimated 183 construction jobs.

Long term jobs will result from the ground floor commercial retail uses, the City office activities and the child care center. It is estimated that the facility will house approximately 148 long-term jobs, including 23 employees in ground floor retail uses, 103 City employees in the upper; and 20 employees at the child care center.

The proposed project will not add housing units to the area and will therefore not impact the residential population.

Proposed Mitigation -- The project will not adversely impact employment, nor will it add to the residential population. No mitigation is required.

5.4 Impact on Public Parking

Until the some of the public parking lots underwent construction, the study area was served by 2,256 public parking stalls. Two lots are currently under construction, and the current supply of public parking spaces is 294 spaces less than previous.
Smith-Beretania Project
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Construction of the Ala'ikea-Richards, Smith-Maunakea and the Kekaulike public parking lots would overlap between January 1992 and March 1992; this would result in an decrease of 578 spaces. If the Smith-Beretania project were to overlap these projects, then the total inventory would be further reduced to 1,571 parking spaces.

The Smith-Beretania parking lot is valuable because it allows patrons of nearby Chinatown shops to park for low rates and circulate comfortably within a few blocks. Even though redevelopment would eventually increase public parking stalls, the temporary shortage during construction could hurt businesses in the area.

In the long-term time frame, the proposed project will increase the number of public parking stalls; though the extent is unclear because some of the stalls will be reserved for commercial tenants, City employees and the child care facility.

Proposed Mitigation -- The worst case scenario is expected to occur during a three-month period earlier identified, whereby five parking garages will be under construction. Two mitigation measures are recommended. First, the City should consider delaying some of the projects to minimize hardship on Chinatown patrons and businesses. Second, the City should explore special parking arrangements with private garages in the study area. For example, private garage operators could offer reduced rates during certain times, such as weekends and weekday mornings. Another example is the use of "parking passes." The City and/or Chinatown merchants could sell inexpensive parking passes which would be usable in certain private garages.

Long term alternatives to the automobile, such as a more diverse public transportation system, will ultimately decrease dependency on public parking garages.

5.5 Impact on the Character of and Uses in the Immediate Vicinity

In the Chinatown vicinity of the project site, there is a large diversity of uses, including small ethnic restaurants, local style and hostess bars, lei, flower and gift shops, convenience/trading company stores, barber shops, noodle factories, a theater and art galleries.

Immediately Diamond Head of the project site are the Smith-Beretania Apartments and ground floor commercial uses, Calvary Chapel, a travel agency and two art galleries. Along Nu'uanu Avenue and in the Downtown side of the project site, there is a proliferation of art galleries and professional services which signal a permanent departure from the former entertainment atmosphere. The Downtown side of the project site promises further changes with the development of the "Liberty Theater" site and the Marks Garage.

Mauka of the project site is high-density residential uses of Honolulu Tower, Honolulu Park Place, Kukui Plaza and Beretania North.
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The redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania parking lot as proposed is expected to complement and support the existing character and uses of the immediate vicinity:

1. **Consistent with revitalization efforts** -- The Smith-Beretania project is supportive of and consistent with public and private efforts to revitalize Chinatown.

2. **Provision of open space** -- The proposed open space will provide visual relief amidst the predominant commercial activity and residential structures. Further, the open space will allow for leisure gatherings and passive recreation for residents and workers alike.

3. **Uses consistent with and supportive of existing and proposed uses** -- The proposed uses are not expected to interfere with the operation of existing and proposed uses. The proposed child care center is supportive of residents and employees. The project will bring over 140 employees into the area, and will therefore increase business for those who depend on walk-ins.

4. **Temporary shortage in parking spaces** -- Nearby businesses will be negatively impacted by the temporary parking shortage during construction.

5. **Increased business competition** -- The new on-site businesses may compete with existing establishments if they are similar in nature. The City needs to minimize this competition by ensuring that project lessees are subject to prevailing market rents and terms.

**Proposed Mitigation** -- The project’s revitalization efforts, provision of open space and consistency with existing uses are considered positive impacts, and no mitigation is recommended. Parking-related mitigation is recommended in Section 5.4. The purpose of redevelopment is to stimulate and improve the existing environment, including existing businesses. Competition between nearby shops and future on-site commercial tenants should be minimized, and the City should (1) provide nearby shop owners opportunities to comment on the types of City tenants; (2) give nearby businesses a chance to relocate on-site; and (3) use fair market rates for new tenants.

**5.6 Public Services**

**Police Protection.** The study area is in Beats 40 through 43 of District 1 of the Honolulu Police Department. The project site is in Beat 41. The nearest police facility is the Downtown Substation at the corner of Nuuanu Avenue and Hotel Street. At any given time, a total of six to eight officers patrol the study area in Cushman vehicles, automobiles and on foot. The proposed project can be adequately served by existing police protection services and is not expected to negatively impact or strain such services.
Smith-Beretania Project
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Police officials and nearby residents and businesses indicate that crime is a problem at and near the corner of Smith and Pauahi Streets. There is loitering, prostitution and drug dealing, and police indicate numerous incidents of vandalism and assault.

Proposed Mitigation -- No adverse impacts on police services are expected. The project will revitalize the area and the new uses are expected to have a deterring effect on crime. On-site security measures including (1) a well-designed and lighted park, (2) building security, and (3) an attendant-operated parking structure can further assist in reducing and preventing crime.

Fire Protection. The proposed project can be served by existing fire protection services and is not expected to negatively impact such services.

The project site would be served by the Central Fire Station, which is an engine company. In addition to the Central Fire Station, the Kakaako and Kuakini Fire Stations, both of which are engine and ladder companies, respond to an initial fire alarm in the Downtown area. Backup can be provided by the Kalihi Kai and other fire stations in the perimeter of the area.

Proposed Mitigation -- No adverse impacts are expected, so no mitigation is recommended.
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1 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description Of This Report

The City and County of Honolulu is proposing to convert a publicly-owned parking lot and an adjacent commercial building into a number of uses. An Environmental Impact Statement is being prepared because of use of City funds. This social impact assessment is summarized in and appended to that document.

This report was prepared by Earthplan located at 81 South Hotel Street, Suite 211. Berta Cabacungan, principal of Earthplan, was the project manager, and principal researcher and writer. Independent contractor Michael P. Mays was principal interviewer.

This report contains five major sections. The remaining portions of Section 1 summarizes existing and surrounding uses and the proposed project and discusses the purpose and application of social impact assessments.

Section 2 provides a profile of the existing community to establish the social context in which project impacts may occur. Information includes employment, population, housing and other social characteristics.

Section 3 explores the study area's future without Smith-Beretania redevelopment. This information extends the baseline data by identifying the possible future scenarios for the community independent of the proposed project. Public policies and major public and private developments are included in this analysis.

Section 4 identifies preliminary community issues and concerns on this project, based on historical trends to date and on interviews conducted for this report.

The potential social impacts of the Smith-Beretania project are identified in Section 5. This section discusses recreation and child care impacts; impacts on employment and the resident population; project effects on the character and uses of the immediate vicinity; and impacts on public services and facilities.

1.2 Project Description

1.2.1 Description of the Subject Property

The project site represents a major portion of the block bounded by Smith Street on the ewa or west side, Nu‘u-anu Avenue on the Diamond East or east side, and Beretania and Pauahi Streets on the mauka and makai sides, respectively.

The project site was the City’s first public playground. The Free Kindergarten and Children’s Aid Association opened the playground in 1911. The 1.09-acre playground contained play courts and equipment, a comfort station and pavilion. The City Planning Commission targeted the site for a municipal parking lot in
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the early 1950s and the recreational resource was replaced by a parking lot in 1952. Today, the main feature of the project site is a metered public parking lot with 129 stalls.

Four buildings share the block with the project site. The most mauka is the Calvary Church. The tallest is the Smith-Beretania Apartment Building. This structure contains 164 apartments, as well as uses which are supportive of residents, Downtown/Chinatown workers and businesses. Next to this building are two low-rise structures with art galleries and service businesses.

1.2.2 Project Background and Components

The "Smith-Beretania" project has undergone changes over the years. The project started with the development of Honolulu Tower, the residential high-rise just mauka of the project site. In 1981, developer CAP Development agreed to contribute $5.6 million to the City and County of Honolulu in exchange for rights to develop the site adjacent to Honolulu Tower. That site, which is now occupied by the soon-to-be-completed Honolulu Park Place, was originally earmarked for a park (Kresnak, 1988).

At the same time, the City Council adopted a resolution which acknowledged the agreement with CAP Development and specifically stated City desires for a "park, day care center, and parking in the area using these funds for these purposes" (Honolulu City Council, Resolution No. 81-245).

In 1988, the City Council again proposed a resolution "establishing City policy regarding the development of the City-owned Smith-Beretania parking lot, situated in Downtown Honolulu." This time, the City Council said that the project should include (1) a public park of maximum feasible size; (2) a child care facility; (3) a housing development of approximately 200 units; (4) approximately 400 parking stalls; and (5) commercial space, as feasible. The housing component was to target people with disabilities, low income families and elderly persons. The 1988 resolution also called for a feasibility study which would review design alternatives and include a marketing and financial analysis (Honolulu City Council, Resolution No. 88-194).

Downtown's residential community strongly opposed the resolution. Residents of Honolulu Tower and the Downtown Neighborhood Board said that the site and developer funds were intended for a park, day care center and parking. They preferred the originally-intended uses, mostly because the they wanted additional park space (Kresnak, 1988; and City Department of Housing and Community Development, 1988).

In early 1989, the housing component was dropped because of community concern. The City Council Housing Committee introduced a resolution to request $75,000 for a feasibility study for the project site. The resolution called for a (1) public park of maximum feasible size; (2) a child care facility; and (3) a public parking facility. The resolution was adopted in March 1989 (Honolulu City Council, Resolution No. 89-62).
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The Preparation Notice for the proposed project was published in the OEQC Bulletin initially on September 23, and again on December 8, 1996. Current project components are as follows:

1. Public Park. Approximately 35,587 square feet is proposed for a park. This is to be a passive park, one which will accommodate low levels of activity. The City Department of Parks and Recreation recommends this type of park over an active park, one which would contain play courts or ball fields. The major reasons for this recommendation are (1) limited area; and (2) potential noise impacts on the adjacent residential complex. The public park will contain a tot lot, benches and, possibly, fixed non-moving play apparatus.

2. Parking. An underground parking structure is proposed. This structure would be below the park and would contain approximately 325 parking stalls. The ingress and egress for this facility would be located on Beretania Street. Some of the stalls will be solely for the use of commercial tenants and City employees, though the extent of this exclusivity has not been determined. A private parking service will be contracted to operate the garage.

3. Child Care. The City proposes that a child care facility be established at the corner of Smith and Pauahi Streets. The child care operation will occupy approximately 10,000 square feet of the ground floor of a three-story building and the 3,000 square-foot courtyard. Approximately 3,500 square feet of park space will be for the exclusive use of the child care facility during hours of operation. The total facility will be designed for 150 preschoolers, toddlers and infants; the specific proportion of each group is undetermined at this time.

4. Commercial Areas. Also on the ground floor will be approximately 10,600 square feet of retail space.

5. City Offices. Above the child care facility and ground floor commercial space will be two floors containing 37,000 square feet used for City offices. The City intends to consolidate its offices currently located in various locations in downtown; specific City agencies or offices have not been programmed yet.

1.3 Social Impact Assessments And Its Application In This Project

Social impact assessment is a field of applied social science which has to do with the development and disclosure of social information relevant to (1) informing the decision-making process, and/or (2) developing management actions.
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The Preparation Notice for the proposed project was published in the OEQC Bulletin initially on September 23, and again on December 8, 1990. Current project components are as follows:

1. **Public Park.** Approximately 35,587 square feet is proposed for a park. This is to be a passive park, one which will accommodate low levels of activity. The City Department of Parks and Recreation recommends this type of park over an active park, one which would contain play courts or ball fields. The major reasons for this recommendation are (1) limited area; and (2) potential noise impacts on the adjacent residential complex. The public park will contain a tot lot, benches and, possibly, fixed non-moving play apparatus.

2. **Parking.** An underground parking structure is proposed. This structure would be below the park and would contain approximately 325 parking stalls. The ingress and egress for this facility would be located on Beretania Street. Some of the stalls will be solely for the use of commercial tenants and City employees, though the extent of this exclusivity has not been determined. A private parking service will be contracted to operate the garage.

3. **Child Care.** The City proposes that a child care facility be established at the corner of Smith and Pauahi Streets. The child care operation will occupy approximately 10,000 square feet of the ground floor of a three-story building and the 5,000 square-foot courtyard. Approximately 5,500 square feet of park space will be for the exclusive use of the child care facility during hours of operation. The total facility will be designed for 150 preschoolers, toddlers and infants; the specific proportion of each group is undetermined at this time.

4. **Commercial Areas.** Also on the ground floor will be approximately 10,600 square feet of retail space.

5. **City Offices.** Above the child care facility and ground floor commercial space will be two floors containing 37,000 square feet used for City offices. The City intends to consolidate its offices currently located in various locations in downtown; specific City agencies or offices have not been programmed yet.

### 1.3 Social Impact Assessments And Its Application In This Project

Social impact assessment is a field of applied social science which has to do with the development and disclosure of social information relevant to (1) informing the decision-making process, and/or (2) developing management actions
to deal with problematic social outcomes of a proposed project. It draws
sometimes from social science, but other times from organizational development,
political analysis, or simple journalism.

Commonly identified uses of social impact assessments include (1) understanding
the ability of a community or group to adapt to changing conditions; (2)
defining the problems or clarifying the issues involved in a proposed change;
(3) illuminating the meaning and importance of anticipated change, and (4)
identifying mitigation opportunities or requirements.

The emphasis of this process varies, based on the particular land use
class characteristics of a project, the extent of development in nearby areas and the
requirements of the different permit processes.

This report serves as the mechanism to identify current community issues and
potential social impacts which should be considered in the current process of
preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Smith-Beretania project.

In the overall social impact assessment process, this report can be useful in
further and ongoing community dialogue between the City and the affected
parties. The ongoing nature of this process can lead to an informed community
and project team, possible project modifications, and, ideally, consensus on
proposed actions.
2 PROFILE OF THE EXISTING COMMUNITY

This section describes the social context in which the Smith-Beretania would be located. This information helps in understanding who makes up the community and their desires and aspirations. Section 2.1 defines the study area, and Section 2.2 describes community trends and characteristics, including study area employment, population and housing trends, population and family characteristics, and labor force characteristics.

2.1 Definition of the Study Area

The Smith-Beretania project site is in the easternmost section of Chinatown and near the Honolulu Central Business District. The site is within the boundaries of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13 and is located in the 18th Senatorial District and the 55th Representative District.

In this report, the study area encompasses neighborhoods easily accessible to the project and includes the variety of residential, commercial and office developments in the area. Depicted in Figure 1, the study area includes the following:

* The Chinatown Sub-Area is bounded by Nu’u-anu Avenue on the east and River Street on the west, and extends from the H-1 Freeway to Piers 13, 14 and 15. Census Tracts 51 and 52, which are separated by Beretania Street, comprise this sub-area. The project site is located in Census Tract 52.

* The Downtown Sub-Area is bounded by Queen Emma, Beretania and Richards Streets on the eastern side and Nu’u-anu Avenue on the west, and extends from the H-1 Freeway to Nimitz Highway. Within these boundaries, Beretania Street separates the Central Business District, which is most of Census Tract 40, from Census Tract 42.

In the late 1800s, Honolulu’s commercial area centered around Fort and Hotel Streets. Less extensive, Chinatown was further inland, bounded by Hotel, Nuuanu, Beretania and River Streets. Both districts have since grown over the years and they now meet at Nu’u-anu Avenue and extend from Nimitz Highway to Beretania.

Chinatown and the Central Business District were Honolulu’s retail and commercial center earlier in this century. Over time, however, residential growth occurred further and further away from downtown Honolulu. Subsequently, supermarkets and shopping centers were built in outlying areas, offering customers more convenience and a wide range of merchandise. Ala Moana Shopping Center became the primary retail center of the island, followed by other shopping centers.
Chinatown merchants had difficulty competing with shopping centers (Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., 1981). Some stores closed; those that stayed kept renovations to a minimum. The deteriorating appearance of the area was exacerbated by the fragility of most of Chinatown's buildings which are wooden structures built soon after 1900.

Plans for urban renewal were drawn up in the 1960s and 1970s. In the Central Business District, new high-rises have replaced many older structures. Further construction and beautification have been proposed by private developers and the City. Fort Street Mall was developed as a pedestrian mall, and Hotel Street became restricted to busses and emergency vehicles.

Initially, the renewal of Chinatown was conceived as a matter of clearing away most structures to build a new "superblock" (Gruen, 1968). Current City policy calls for the respect and enhancement of the historical quality of much of Chinatown, while encouraging new residential developments which meet housing needs and help the economic renewal of small businesses in the area.

Further inland are areas affected by the development of both the Business District and Chinatown, but are not directly identified with these areas. Between Beretania and School Street, there are multifamily buildings mostly built since 1970, a few service enterprises, and the H-1 Freeway. Large parts of these areas were cleared for the highway as part of the urban renewal process, making them distinct from the older residential districts further from the urban center.

2.2 Population Trends and Characteristics

2.2.1 Study Area Employment

In 1985, an estimated 42,584 people worked in the study area; most of them live outside the study area. Figure 2 shows the breakdown of study area jobs by job types. In the total study area, 30 percent of the total jobs were service-related, followed by 28 percent in jobs related to finance, insurance, and real estate. The next highest categories were retail (14 percent) and transportation, communications and utilities (13 percent) (City and County of Honolulu Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch, 1989). Note that one percent of the total study area jobs are agricultural, and these are agriculture-related jobs of the major landowner companies, such as Alexander and Baldwin and Castle and Cooke.

A Downtown Improvement Association official estimates that 55,000 people currently work in and visit Downtown and Chinatown for business/commercial purposes. He indicated that there is an annual increase of approximately 1,000 to 1,100 workers/clients/customers. In 20 years, it is expected that, given the current land use regulations, the Downtown/Chinatown region will be built out and will accommodate about 75,000 workers/clients/customers (personal communication with William Grant, Executive Director, Downtown Improvement Association, January 29, 1991).
Figure 2
Study Area Jobs by Type, 1985

T.C.U. — Transport, communications and utilities
F.I.R.E. — Finance, insurance, real estate
Agriculture jobs are those in large landowner companies which are related to agricultural activities

Figure 3 shows the distribution of jobs relative to Chinatown and Downtown. In 1985, Chinatown contained 4,653 jobs, which were distributed quite evenly throughout the region. The largest category of jobs was retail, at 28 percent, followed by service at 25 percent.

As expected, most of the jobs were found in the Central Business District (CBD), which is mostly Census Tract 40, where almost 38,000 people, or 85 percent, worked. In contrast to the strong retail showing in Chinatown, Downtown’s strongest categories were service and finance, insurance, and real estate. This district captured the majority of all job categories with the exception of retail and industrial jobs; Chinatown contained one-fourth of the total retail and industrial jobs (City and County of Honolulu Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch, 1989).

2.2.2 Population and Housing Trends

Between 1960 and 1990, the residential population in the City and County of Honolulu increased by over 335,000 people, from 500,409 in 1960 to 836,231 in 1990 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991).

The rate of the island’s growth has been steadily decreasing over recent decades. As shown in Table 1, islandwide population in the 1960s increased by an average of 2.3 percent per year. In the 1970s, the annual growth rate decreased to 1.9 percent. In the 1980s, the rate decreased even further, to less than one percent.

For the study area, the net population increase between 1960 and 1990 is estimated at 3,876 persons, from 4,666 to 8,542 persons.

The study area population growth rate was not as consistent as the islandwide rate. Between 1960 and 1970, the study area residential population decreased by approximately 5.4 percent a year. Since 1970, the population has increased with the highest average annual growth rate occurring in the 1970s, at 8.3 percent a year. This uneven pattern of growth reflects major construction projects -- the H-1 highway and urban development efforts -- occurring in the study area.

With new residential projects, the study area population continues to grow at rates higher than the rest of the island. Between 1980 and 1990, the growth rate in Chinatown/Downtown was 3.7 percent, as compared to the islandwide 0.9 percent.

Within the study area, the population growth patterns of particular census tracts have changed significantly as parts of these were cleared and redeveloped. Honolulu’s so-called Chinatown has never had exclusively Chinese residents (Lind, 1980; Glick, 1936). Chinatown has been, and still remains, an urban hub for new immigrants and immigrants who first came to rural sites in Hawaii. Its population declined, as the flow of new immigrants has decreased and the housing stock has aged.
Figure 3
Study Area Jobs by Area, 1985

Source: Based on traffic zone information available at the City and County of Honolulu, Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch.
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Table 1
Study Area Average Annual Growth Rates:
1960 to 1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area Total</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Sub–Area</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka (CT 42)</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makai (CT 40)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Sub–Area</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauka (CT 51)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-53.4%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makai (CT 52)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project
Social Impact Assessment

The Central Business District has not been a major residential zone. In the inland tracts of the study area, population growth began in the 1970s, with the construction of Kukui Gardens, Kukui Plaza, and Beretania North, and has continued. Specific population counts are provided in Figure 4, and trends are as follows:

* The project site is in the makai portion of Chinatown, or Census Tract 52. This area contains a highly fluctuating residential population. In the 1960s, growth was modest at 1.3 percent a year. In the 1970s, the population decreased. As new multi-family housing projects were constructed in the 1980s, growth has been accelerating. With an annual growth rate of eleven percent, this census tract experienced the highest growth rate. It is estimated that 2,480 people lived in this area at the time of the 1990 census (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991).

* Revitalization and urbanization efforts caused the virtual elimination of the residential population in the mauka portion of Chinatown (Census Tract 51) in the 1960s. This was followed by the addition of 1,600 residents in the new multi-family housing developed by the City during the 1970s. In the first half of the 1980s, this area was still experiencing major growth, at approximately 8.1 percent a year. No growth was experienced between 1985 and 1990, and the growth rate for the last decade averaged out at four percent a year. The census takers counted 2,399 people in this area in 1990 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991).

* In the Downtown Sub-Area, the Census Tract 40 population decreased in the 1960s, but increased eight times during the 1970s, with the development of Harbor Square Town and Harbor Towers. This area has continued to grow in the early 1980s, mostly because of the addition of residential units in the Executive Centre. An estimated 991 persons lived in the makai portion of the Downtown sub-area (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991).

* In mauka Downtown, or Census Tract 42, the population grew the most between 1970 and 1980, with an annual growth rate of 8.5 percent. This was due mostly because of the addition of Kukui Plaza. Since 1980, the residential population of this area has remained stable. The 1990 population is estimated at 2,672 persons.
As a result of these fluctuating growth trends, the proportion of Chinatown and Downtown residents varied with respect to the two sub-areas. Figure 4 illustrates the study area population from 1960 to 1990. In 1960 Chinatown's population was over twice the size of the Downtown population. By 1970, the two areas were almost even, and, by 1980, there were more people living in Downtown. In 1985, Chinatown's population rose sufficiently to almost equal that of Downtown, and by 1990, there was once again more people living in Chinatown.

Table 2 provides 1980 Census housing stock information for Oahu and the study area. Study area residential units are virtually all in multiple-unit buildings. The units are small, in comparison to the City and County norm.

In all the study area tracts, most units were occupied by renters. On the Downtown side of the study area most units were in condominiums. Generally, 1980 rents were below the City and County average. This is in part because of the relatively high density of government-subsidized housing in Chinatown.

At the same time, demand for housing in Census Tracts 42, 51, and 52 was strong, as the low vacancy rates indicate. The relatively high vacancy rate in tract 40 for 1980 may have resulted from apartments being held for vacation rentals or for short-term rentals.

In the past, single-room "bachelor housing" units were numerous in the area. Relatively crowded quarters and shared plumbing facilities were not uncommon. This is less apt to be the case as older buildings are replaced or turned to non-residential uses.

Preliminary census information was released during the writing of this report. The information is presented in Table 3; however, because no details regarding housing have been released, the City 1989 estimates are used for the purposes of this study.

According to City estimates, the study area contained 4,831 residential units by 1989 and as shown on Table 3. Virtually all of these units continue to be multi-family units. Over half (57 percent) of the units were in Chinatown.

Five percent of the study area residents, or about 420 people, lived in group living quarters, such as rooming houses, and most of these quarters are located in the Chinatown Sub-Area.

Compared to an islandwide 1989 household size of 3.04 persons, the study area had an average household size of 1.84 persons, as is to be expected because of the predominance of multi-family units. The mauka portion of Chinatown had the largest average household size of 2.12 persons. Makai Chinatown had the smallest household size of 1.65 persons (City and County of Honolulu, Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch, September, 1990).
Figure 4
Study Area Population, 1960 - 1990

Table 2

Housing Stock Characteristics:
Oahu and Study Area, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oahu</th>
<th>Chinatown Sub-Area Mauka (CT 51)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 52)</th>
<th>Downtown Sub-Area Mauka (CT 42)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round housing units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total vacant</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant for sale</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant for rent</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held for occasional use</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of rooms</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium units as a percentage of total housing</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure as a percentage of total housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median cash rent</td>
<td>$279</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As percent of median family income</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Summary Tape File 1-A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Study Area</th>
<th>Chinatown Sub-Area (CT 51)</th>
<th>Chinatown Sub-Area (CT 52)</th>
<th>Downtown Sub-Area (CT 42)</th>
<th>Downtown Sub-Area (CT 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in households (%)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in group living quarters (%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Units</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent occupancy</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on traffic zone information available at the City and County of Honolulu, Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch
2.2.3 Population and Family Characteristics

Results of the 1980 census are summarized in Tables 4 and 5. This information shows that, in 1980:

- The people of the study area were older compared to the islandwide population.
- In much of the study area, a large part of the 1980 population lived in non-family households.
- Throughout the study area, the average number of persons per family was below the City and County average.
- In all tracts, the majority of the 1980 population was not Hawaii-born, though the population of different tracts vary in background (United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981a and 1981b).

It is useful to discuss the Chinatown and Downtown Sub-Areas separately, as their populations differ in several respects.

In the Chinatown sub-area, most residents were far less affluent in 1980. The proportion of both family and non-family households below the poverty line in Census Tracts 51 and 52 was well above the O'ahu averages. Also, many residents had relatively less schooling.

There were also distinctions between the mauka and makai portions of Chinatown. In makai Chinatown, or in Census Tract 52, residents had the following characteristics:

- Residents were likely to have been born outside the United States. Nearly half were Filipino in 1980. Chinese were also well represented; other major groups had few members in the district.
- Older men were numerous. Only a third of the resident families had children in the household. The neighborhood was stable, with half the residents in the same house they had occupied five years before (United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981a and 1981b).

Living mauka of Beretania Street, Chinatown residents of Census Tract 51 can be described as follows:

- Many of the residents could not have lived in the same house in 1975 and 1980, since many buildings in that tract were constructed in the 1970s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinatown Sub-Area</th>
<th>Downtown Sub-Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu (CT 51)</td>
<td>Mauka (CT 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 17 years</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 64 years</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or more years</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age years</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(people aged 25+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 8 years only</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school (9-12)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post high school</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 4+ years</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(people aged 5+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. born **</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign country</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence 5 years Previous (people aged 5+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same island</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different island</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different state</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different country</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures based on 15 percent sample
** Includes persons born in U.S. territories and persons born abroad or at sea to American parents

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Summary Tape File 1-A and 3-A
### Table 5
Study Area Family Characteristics, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chinatown Sub-Area</th>
<th></th>
<th>Downtown Sub-Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Mauka</td>
<td>Makai</td>
<td>Mauka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population in families as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of total population</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife present</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male only</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female only</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below poverty level</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income</td>
<td>$23,554</td>
<td>$9,886</td>
<td>$12,292</td>
<td>$23,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage below poverty level</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for "Population in Families," all figures based on 15 percent sample.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Summary Tape File 1-A and 3-A
Most of the residents came from O'ahu, but a substantial number had lived outside the United States. Also, nearly as many residents were foreign-born as were Hawai'i-born, and other U.S.-born Americans were few.

Ethnically, Chinese and Koreans were strongly represented in this tract, while Caucasians, Japanese, Filipinos and Hawaiians were all present in roughly equal numbers.

The population was young compared to the rest of the study area, and families with dependent children were in the majority. The proportion of families headed by women was exceptional (United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981a and 1981b).

In the Downtown sub-area, which includes Census Tracts 40 and 42,

The population was relatively well educated and affluent. Median family incomes in tract 40 were well above the O'ahu average in 1980, while incomes of tract 42 families were close to the average. In both tracts, few families had incomes below the poverty line.

Most families in the Downtown sub-area did not have children in the household in 1980.

In 1980, Caucasians formed the largest ethnic group in this area. Ethnic Japanese and Chinese formed the next largest groups. While many residents were Hawai'i-born, a high percentage were from other states.

The proportion of the population who had lived in the same house five years previously was low, mostly because of the then new residential units. In Census Tract 40, a third of the residents had lived elsewhere in the United States five years earlier (United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1981a and 1981b).

2.2.4 Labor Force Characteristics of the Downtown Resident Population

Labor force characteristics were in line with the findings concerning population and families noted earlier. The 1980 Census showed that laborers and service workers were numerous on the Chinatown side (see Table 6). Residents in the Downtown side of the study area were likely to have relatively high-status and well paid occupations.
Table 6
Labor Force Characteristics, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Labor Force, aged 16+</th>
<th>Oahu (CT 51)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 52)</th>
<th>Mauka (CT 42)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not participating in labor force</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In armed forces</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of civilian labor force</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Employed Civilian Force Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Oahu (CT 51)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 52)</th>
<th>Mauka (CT 42)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and professional</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, sales and administration</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, forestry</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision, craft, repair</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, fabricators, laborers</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commute to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean travel time in minutes</th>
<th>Oahu (CT 51)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 52)</th>
<th>Mauka (CT 42)</th>
<th>Makai (CT 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are based on a 15 percent sample.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Summary Tape File 3-A
Labor force participation was high among Downtown sub-area residents, while many more adults were not in the labor force on the Chinatown side. Unemployment was relatively high in Chinatown.

Although residents of the study area live near Honolulu's financial and government center, they had to spend about as much time getting to work as did other O'ahu residents in 1980.
3 MAJOR CHANGES WITHOUT THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

This section looks at what guides the changes in the study area, as well as identifies some community changes which may occur. This information indicates how the proposed Smith-Beretania redevelopment relates to the expectations of the existing community and the likely changes this community will experience. Section 3.1 summarizes plans and guidelines in relation to the project site. Section 3.2 identifies construction projects and proposed changes in the study area, and Section 3.3 describes a likely future scenario of the study area without the Smith-Beretania redevelopment.

3.1 Plans and Guidelines in Relation to the Project

The project site lies in the Primary Urban Center Development Plan area. The Special Provisions for the Primary Urban Center single out Downtown as a special area. Bound by Nu‘uanu Stream, Vineyard Boulevard, Alakea Street and Honolulu Harbor, the Downtown Special Area includes the Financial, Kukui and Chinatown districts, as well as the Aloha Tower-Honolulu Harbor area.

Smith-Beretania is in the Chinatown District, which is to be redeveloped with emphasis on historic preservation, architectural character and adaptive re-use, and with strengthening of the commercial and retail function (City and County of Honolulu, Special Provisions for the Primary Urban Center).

Honolulu’s Land Use Ordinance brings together zoning requirements for the city as a whole and for special districts. The project site is in the Chinatown District, which was established to preserve the historic significance, architecture and characteristic uses of the area, and to meet the community’s needs. Specific objectives also call for economic revitalization and compatibility between new developments and the existing character of the area.

Most of the project site is in the Mauka Precinct of the Chinatown District. The Mauka Precinct is to provide for a range of household incomes, while supporting and contributing to Chinatown’s retail-commercial function -- particularly at street level. A major function of the Mauka Precinct is to create a transition between the Chinatown’s Historic Core Precinct and the high density area of the Kukui area.

The entire portion of the project site fronting Pauahi Street is in the Historic Core Precinct. Objectives of the Historic Core include the retention and renovation of historic buildings, and the continuation and concentration of the long-established ethnic retail and light manufacturing activities (City and County of Honolulu, Ordinance No. 89-52).
3.2 Changes In the Study Area

The urban landscape of the study area is changing daily. Construction activities have become integral to the study area environment, and proposed developments indicate an ongoing transformation of many individual sites and whole city blocks. This section summarizes these changes for an understanding of what is likely to happen in the study area independent of the Smith-Beretania redevelopment.

3.2.1 Projects Under Construction

As of February 1991, the construction projects in the Chinatown Sub-Area include the Honolulu Park Place and River-Nimitz Housing. Located across from the project site on the mauka side of Beretania Street is the Honolulu Park Place, a residential fee simple condominium at the corner of Vineyard Boulevard and Nu'u-anu Avenue. The project is being developed by Honolulu Park Place Limited Partnership, an affiliate of Charles Pankow Builders, Ltd. The project is being marketed as an exclusive condominium, with a private health club, pool, an open deck, putting green, driving range and tennis court. This 40-floor tower will contain 437 units and is expected to be ready for occupancy soon (Honolulu Park Place Limited Partnership, 1989).

The River-Nimitz Housing is located at the corner of River Street and Nimitz Highway. The City and County of Honolulu is developing residential units, as well as retail spaces (Downtown Improvement Association, 1989a).

Nu'u-anu Avenue forms the mauka-makai boundary between the Chinatown and Downtown Districts. The Liberty Theater site and the adjacent gas station have just been demolished. Consolidated Amusement Company is constructing a parking lot in a joint development of both parcels (Office of Environmental Quality Control, 1990).

There are also numerous other projects under construction in the Downtown Sub-Area, as follows:

* Located at the corner of Hotel and Bethel Streets, Chinatown Gateway Plaza is nearing completion. Developed by the City and County of Honolulu, this project includes a 27-story residential tower containing 200 1-bedroom units. Forty percent of this rental project will be priced for people who can afford market rents. Another forty percent will be for people with gap group incomes, with the remaining 20 percent being for people with low and moderate incomes. A two-story commercial structure is also included.

* Pan Pacific Plaza is located on the Diamond Head side of Fort Street Mall. Being developed by the Daniels Company of California, this complex will offer 495,000 square feet of office space and is already pre-leasing with 60,000 - 80,000 square feet
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committed to First Interstate Bank. The project is scheduled for completion in 1991 (Grubb and Ellis/Locations, Inc., 1990; Downtown Improvement Association, 1989a).

* The State Office Tower is located on Beretania Street, on the Diamond Head side of Bishop Street. The structure is being developed by the Hemmeter Corporation, and will contain 160,000 square feet of office space which will be leased to the State (Downtown Improvement Association, 1989a).

* A 31-story office building containing 200,000 square feet of office space is planned for the former Merchandise Mart site, at the corner of Alika and Hotel Streets (Grubb and Ellis/Locations, Inc., 1990).

* Alii Place is makai of the Merchandise Mart site, and construction for a 231,000 square foot office tower/retail complex has begun (Grubb and Ellis/Locations, Inc., 1990).

* The old City Bank Building is undergoing a $2 million face-lift (Grubb and Ellis/Locations, Inc., 1990).

3.2.2 Planned and Proposed Changes

Numerous other projects are envisioned for the study area, and these are in different stages of planning and obtaining necessary approvals. Proposed changes in the Chinatown sub-area include:

* The City and County of Honolulu is proposing the Kekaulike Parking Lot Redevelopment which would encompass two blocks bounded by Hotel, Maunakea, King and River Street. Proposed are 154 residential rental units, 15,000 square feet of ground level commercial space, parking and a pedestrian mall. An EIS Preparation Notice was filed late last year, and a Draft EIS was published in April 1991.

* The Smith-Maunakea project is the redevelopment of another City-owned parking garage. The City proposes to develop 234 residential units, ground-level commercial spaces, public parking and an open courtyard and mall. A Draft EIS is being prepared, and a Draft EIS was published in April 1991.

* The City is also proposing 1,600 residential units at the Foster Garden Estates which is bounded by Nu‘u-ano Avenue, Vineyard Boulevard, River Street, and Kukui Street (Downtown Improvement Association, 1989). Half of the units are expected to be rental units; the other half will be for sale. The project is in preliminary planning stages.
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* Two existing residential structures are slated for redevelopment by the City. Pauahi Hale, or Pauahi Annex, would be renovated and Winston Hale would be rehabilitated (City and County of Honolulu Department of Housing and Community Development, 1990).

Just 'Ewa of the study area is the site of Park Place, another residential project proposed by the City. The site is bounded by River Street, Nimitz Highway, Iwilel Road and King Street. Preliminary plans call for 422 units in a mix of market units and units priced for low and moderate incomes.

The following is a summary of proposals in the Downtown sub-area.

* Near the project site is the proposed Highness Tower. Located on the site of the Marks Garage, the project includes 153 residential units, and space for retail, office, coffee shop, health club and recreational use. The residential units will include penthouses in the $1 million and more price range. The project is currently being reviewed for compliance with the Chinatown Special District requirements (Tune, 1991).

* A new Downtown Park at Bishop and Hotel Streets was proposed by the developer of the Pan Pacific Plaza.

* Pacific Nations Center is the largest proposal for the overall study area. In the DEIS for this project, a maximum development program for this site included a 350-foot residential tower, a 550-foot office tower, a 350-foot tower with small-scale luxury hotel and office space, and park/plaza space. Parking would be provided in a five-level underground parking structure, and the existing on-site electrical substation would be relocated (City Department of Housing and Community Development, 1989). The City has re-issued a request for proposals.

* Fort Street Mall is currently planned for renovation which will accommodate increased use and reflect changes in properties adjacent to the mall (Spencer Mason Architects, 1989).

* Another large-scale proposal is the Aloha Tower Project, which is located in the vicinity of Piers 8 through 11. After a year-long competition which included proposals by five development teams, Aloha Tower Associates was awarded the project. Plans for this "festival" development include two 350-foot condominium towers, a seven-story 109-room hotel, an office tower with 340,000 square feet, a maritime facility and parking (Grubb and Ellis/Locations, Inc., 1990). Near the Aloha Tower is an electricity generating plant which may be developed into a mixed-use project containing office, condominium and parking.
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- Harbor Court Developers was selected by the City and County of Honolulu as the developer in the Kaahumanu Parking Structure Redevelopment, located at the makai end of Bethel Street. The mixed-use project combines retail, commercial operations with a 19-story office tower, a 28-story apartment tower containing 120 units, and a six-story office/commercial mixed use building (R.M. Towill Corporation, 1990).

- Other proposals in the Downtown include an unnamed office project on the former King Theater site, and a Campbell Estate Office Tower along Hotel Street between Fort Street Mall and Bethel Street (Downtown Improvement Association, 1989).

3.3 Likely Future of the Project Area Without the Smith-Beretania Project

Based on an analysis of the existing community (Section 2) and current and potential development activity in the study area, the following is a likely scenario of the future study area without the Smith-Beretania redevelopment:

- Increase in Residential Population and Mix. In 1990, an estimated 8,542 people lived in the study area. Currently, 727 new residential units are being built or recently completed. As shown in Table 7, these units will bring the total housing count to 3,533 by early next year. Thus, in the near future, the population is expected to increase to almost 9,880 persons.

If all of the planned and proposed residential projects are built, the study area’s housing count could total 8,535 units. The study area long-range population is projected to reach 15,868 persons, if all current proposals are implemented.

The types and locations of residential development proposed for the study area indicate that the demographic differences between Downtown and Chinatown residents will continue both in the short- and long-term time frame. As the City increases rental units in the area, there will be more renters of the low and moderate income category, as well as more elderly people. People who can afford market rents will also live in Chinatown, and, except for the Honolulu Park Place mauka of Beretania Street, and planned sales units at Highness Tower and Foster Garden Estates, no private homeownership is expected in Chinatown.

With the completion of current construction projects, the demographics of the future population of the Downtown sub-area will likely change to reflect a high owner occupancy rate, younger population, higher incomes, increased ethnic diversity, and higher education levels.
### Table 7
Estimate of Potential Residential Units and Residential Population for the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Residential Units</th>
<th>Potential Residential Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 Estimate (*)</td>
<td>4,608</td>
<td>8,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Under Construction and Recently Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Park Place</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway Plaza</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River/Nimitz</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned and Proposed Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Nations Center</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highness Tower</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloha Tower Redevelopment</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaahumanu Parking Structure</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Maunakea</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike Maunakea</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Garden Estates</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUMULATIVE TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,362</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,449</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Residential population is based on study area 1989 household size of 1.84 persons which excludes people living in group quarters.

(*) based on 1990 preliminary census information.
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• Continued and Increased Need For Resident-Oriented Facilities. As more people live in the area, the demand and need for public services and facilities will continue. This is especially so with recreational facilities. Even though many residential complexes may contain on-site recreational facilities, the anticipated younger population will still need ground-level playgrounds, ball courts and recreational centers.

• Continued Rehabilitation in the Chinatown Sub-area. Chinatown is expected to undergo low-rise commercial redevelopment, mixed with high-density residential uses. The current efforts are primarily City-initiated. It is anticipated that, as Chinatown accommodates more residents, and as the area's physical characteristics and infrastructure improve, private landowners in the area will redevelop their properties or rehabilitate existing structures.

• Continued Development Of Downtown As The Financial Center. Honolulu retains the distinction of having the lowest downtown office vacancy rate in the nation. At the end of 1989, the vacancy rate was 3.7 percent, as compared to over 16 percent nationwide (Sylvester, 1990). The pressure for Downtown office development is expected to continue, even with the Kapiolani corridor office development activity. By upgrading currently underdeveloped land, these projects are expected to change the urban landscape and intensify human activity in the area.

• Temporary Parking Problems. As the City continues to develop sites containing public parking garages, there will be a shortage of parking spaces. These shortages are expected to be temporary.
• Continued and Increased Need For Resident-Oriented Facilities. As more people live in the area, the demand and need for public services and facilities will continue. This is especially so with recreational facilities. Even though many residential complexes may contain on-site recreational facilities, the anticipated younger population will still need ground-level playgrounds, ball courts and recreational centers.

• Continued Rehabilitation in the Chinatown Sub-area. Chinatown is expected to undergo low-rise commercial redevelopment, mixed with high-density residential uses. The current efforts are primarily City-initiated. It is anticipated that, as Chinatown accommodates more residents, and as the area's physical characteristics and infrastructure improve, private landowners in the area will redevelop their properties or rehabilitate existing structures.

• Continued Development Of Downtown As The Financial Center. Honolulu retains the distinction of having the lowest downtown office vacancy rate in the nation. At the end of 1989, the vacancy rate was 3.7 percent, as compared to over 16 percent nationwide (Sylvestre, 1990). The pressure for Downtown office development is expected to continue, even with the Kapiolani corridor office development activity. By upgrading currently underdeveloped land, these projects are expected to change the urban landscape and intensify human activity in the area.

• Temporary Parking Problems. As the City continues to develop sites containing public parking garages, there will be a shortage of parking spaces. These shortages are expected to be temporary.
4 COMMUNITY ISSUES ON THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

This section explores potential community issues and concerns on the proposed Smith-Beretania redevelopment. Section 4.1 identifies information sources used in this analysis. Section 4.2 extends the baseline data on the existing community by presenting issues and concerns independent of the proposed project. Section 4.3 identifies preliminary community issues on the proposed project.

4.1 Sources of Information

Two sources of information were used in this analysis:

1. Neighborhood Board minutes.

   The Neighborhood Board system is a formal mechanism for citizen input to public entities regarding islandwide City policies, specific community problems and other matters, and proposed changes. The types of issues addressed by a Neighborhood Board and subsequent actions often reflect values and concerns of the constituent population.

   To understand the values, concerns and issues of Downtown residents, this study examined the minutes of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13 over a three-year period, from January 1988 through January 1991. Section 4.2.1 discusses issues addressed by this Board.

2. Community Interviews.

   Earthplan conducted interviews with people who (1) live, conduct business or own land near the project site, (2) have a regional interest in the proposed project, or (3) would be able to provide specific information on how the site might affect the neighboring community.

   These interviews were held to supplement information from printed sources of material regarding community needs and values, and, more importantly, to identify community issues and concerns relative to the proposed project. This study did not include a statistical poll, and does not quantify project support or opposition.

   Forty-four people were interviewed during this study and the list is presented in Table 8. Each person was informed that input would be summarized in the Social Impact Assessment and that individual opinions would remain confidential. The source of project information was the environmental assessment prepared by the City and County of Honolulu on the project.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization or Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Adolf</td>
<td>Resident of Smith-Beretania Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diosdado Avevilla</td>
<td>Adjacent land and building owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President and General Manager of Aveco Travel Service, Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Barnhart</td>
<td>Member of the Board of Directors of the Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Brawley</td>
<td>Member of the Board of Directors of the Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Brink</td>
<td>Member of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident Manager of the Lunalilo Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Brown</td>
<td>President of the Smith-Beretania Residents Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. C. Ching</td>
<td>Owner of Tai You Ching Corporation and nearby property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chong</td>
<td>President of Wing Coffee Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Ching</td>
<td>President of United Chinese Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Choy</td>
<td>Manager of the Golden Harvest Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Cui</td>
<td>Resident of Smith-Beretania Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Darr</td>
<td>General Manager of the Kukui Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Doling</td>
<td>Member of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Those interviewed provided their perspectives on how the Smith-Beretania project might affect the nearby and regional communities. They were not asked to represent the views of their organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization or Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Donnarumma</td>
<td>Member of Board of Directors of Smith-Beretania Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dunne</td>
<td>Manager and Partner of the Pauahi Nuuanu Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Grant</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Downtown Improvement Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelli Griswold</td>
<td>Owner of the Griswold's Glass Etching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atan Han</td>
<td>Owner of Town Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Hardin</td>
<td>Vice President of the Board of Directors of Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hersh</td>
<td>Manager of the Pegge Hopper Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chol Kim</td>
<td>Resident manager of Smith-Beretania Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Knight</td>
<td>Resident manager of Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Kuan</td>
<td>Owner of DH Fashions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Lee</td>
<td>Owner of Hairstyles by Carol Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Li</td>
<td>President of the Association of Chinese from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President of the Chinatown Merchant Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Luke</td>
<td>Assistant Treasurer of the Kukui Plaza Owners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Matusow</td>
<td>Chair of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caralyn Merrill</td>
<td>Member of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Moratin</td>
<td>Owner of Moratin Downtown Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari McCaig</td>
<td>Community Organizer of PACE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization or Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Musgrove</td>
<td>Director of Housing Grounds of the Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Nishi</td>
<td>President of the Board of Directors of the Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Padilla</td>
<td>Owner of Virgie's Barbecue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Pintor</td>
<td>Owner of Ray's Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwok Hung Poon</td>
<td>Owner of Fly On Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Potter</td>
<td>Administrative Pastor of the Calvary Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sablan</td>
<td>Manager of Waterfall Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rothstein</td>
<td>Vice Chair of the Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Board of Directors of Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phuong N. Tran</td>
<td>Owner of The Art Treasures Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Tellefsen</td>
<td>President of Board of Directors of Kukui Plaza Owners Assn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Wan</td>
<td>Manager and part owner of Yung Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Weir</td>
<td>Treasurer of the Board of Directors of Honolulu Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Wong</td>
<td>Community Organizer of PACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Hong Wong</td>
<td>President of Chinatown Merchants Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of the Downtown Business Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 44 people interviewed for this project were asked to provide their perspectives on how the proposed project might affect the nearby uses and the regional community. Interviewees were first asked to discuss their perspectives on Chinatown and how the area is changing. Next, they were asked about their views on the Smith-Beretania project; they were provided information if necessary. They were not asked to represent the views of their organizations, although if the organization has taken a formal position, then they were asked to discuss these positions. The following is a rough breakdown of these interests.

- **Downtown residents** included Downtown Neighborhood Board members, residents of nearby residential towers. Twenty-two study area residents were interviewed.

- The project site is located in an existing business district and is in the vicinity of numerous businesses. Twenty-two individuals represented interests as nearby businesses and landowners or were active in business organizations.

4.2 General Community Issues and Concerns

4.2.1 Neighborhood Board Issues and Concerns

The Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13 area is larger than the study area for this report. In 1980, the Neighborhood Board area population was 8,674, whereas the study area population was 5,926. Hence the study area accounted for just over two-thirds of the Neighborhood Board area constituents in 1980.

The Neighborhood Board area extends from River Street to the eastern boundary formed by Ward Avenue, and Beretania, Alapai, South Streets, Ala Moana Boulevard and Keawe Street. The H-1 Freeway and Honolulu Harbor form the mauka and makai boundaries.

The theme central to most of the Neighborhood Board discussions held over the last three years is the need to create a more livable environment for residents in this high density and mixed-use community. The Board strongly advocated more open space, more recreation areas — particularly active recreation — and more resident-oriented public services and facilities. In addition, the Board supported efforts which would increase the safety and efficiency of Downtown vehicular and pedestrian systems.

These themes were carried through in specific topics addressed, some of which are as follows:

- **Public facilities.** The Board advocated the improvement and retention of resident-oriented public facilities. The Board supported a new satellite City Hall. Members supported Central
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Intermediate School remaining open and opposed consolidation with Kawanakaoa Intermediate School; over the years the Board opposed converting the school into a park. The Board paid close attention to the library renovation, and supported efforts to temporarily use the NBC Exhibition Hall as a library.

The Board objected to rezoning Kamalii Park to BMX-4, although it considered removing the objection if the site would be replaced in Block J as an active public recreation area. In a review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Block J, the former Neighborhood Board Chair suggested various alternatives for including active recreational and entertainment spaces at Block J.

The Board opposed the City acquisition of seven parcels which would be used for a park at the corner of Hotel and Bishop Streets. Basic to this opposition was Board's concern over the use of City powers in a private development project.

The Board reviewed plans for Fort Street Mall improvements and submitted recommendations designed to accommodate nearby businesses and mall users.

- Proposed projects. The Board reviewed numerous proposals which would bring change to Downtown and Chinatown, as well as to Kakaako. Many of these proposals were generated by the City and County of Honolulu and many included a residential element, as indicated in Section 3.2.2.

Perhaps the best illustration of the framework for the Board's review of new projects is the response to the City Department of Housing and Community Development when City-proposed projects were presented in April 1989. The Board reiterated the need for the following:

- the large need for more downtown parks, especially in light of the increase in residential population;
- the need to encourage more affluent people to live in this area;
- the possibility of using higher-priced living units in the waterfront area to help finance lower-priced units elsewhere;
- the need for active recreational areas; and
- the need to minimize displacement of small businesses.
Similar comments were made regarding the Aloha Tower development in June 1990 responses to the EIS Preparation Notice for the project.

- **Parking.** The Neighborhood Board strongly discouraged displacement of public parking because of the need to serve Downtown businesses and their clientele. The Board has expressed concern that many of the City-proposed projects are on existing public parking garages, and that simultaneous development of some of these sites will cause at least temporary displacement of parking.

- **500-foot building height.** Allowing 500-foot height limit on nine different parcels did not meet Board approval, since many felt it was premature for making a decision at this time. Some felt that taller buildings did not necessarily guarantee more open space at ground level.

- **Facilities for homeless people.** The Board supported the Edwin Thomas Home for homeless families in January 1988; subsequent efforts to qualify or change that position were strong but unsuccessful. After further deliberation, the Board supported the project in May of 1990 provided that the applicant monitor the project closely.

The Board also addressed the Aala Park Homeless Shelter, which is just outside the Downtown Neighborhood Board area. It was felt that public parks are scarce in the area, and shouldn't be used for "tent cities." Other concerns included policy precedence set by using public parks for this purpose and use of City funds.

### 4.2.2 Issues and Concerns of Other Organizations

There are a number of organizations in Chinatown, including the Chinatown Merchants Association, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, and the Downtown River Pauahi Merchants Association. They share a common goal of promoting and enhancing the business climate in Chinatown. These organizations tend to be loosely structured, except for the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, which is based in Chinatown and which contains 350 members.

PACE, the United Chinese Society, and the Association for Chinese from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia are culturally-oriented:

- **PACE,** which is also known as People Against Chinatown Evictions, has been working in Chinatown for 15 years. Their initial task of assisting Chinatown residents during previous urban renewal projects has evolved into outreach and advocacy services for low and middle-income Chinatown families.
• Functioning as a coordinator for social events, the United Chinese Society is an umbrella organization for over 100 Chinese clubs and societies.

• The Association for Chinese from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia was initiated to assist in-migrants and works to perpetuate their culture. Free organizational services range from job and housing referrals to translation services.

The Downtown Improvement Association (DIA) is a business organization dedicated to the development of Downtown as the State's premier business headquarters. The goals are to maintain a good Downtown business climate, promote employee satisfaction and encourage an adequate supply of office space and supporting services including parking, retail facilities and housing. The organization comprises 400 members.

None of these organizations has taken a position on the proposed project.

4.2.3 Issues and Concerns Raised By Those Interviewed

Interviewees were asked to share their likes and concerns about Chinatown. They felt that the area offered the following positive characteristics:

1. Socially heterogeneous and comfortable.

   Informants liked Chinatown's ethnic and cultural diversity. Residents and business people alike pointed out that one can find many different kinds of foods, products and establishments. People who have lived or operated a business in the area for a long time felt comfortable about their neighborhood, and it was pointed out that this Chinatown was safe and peaceful compared to mainland counterparts.

2. Convenience and affordability.

   This was a major plus for informants. Residents liked being close to the open markets, restaurants, doctors' offices and banks. They pointed out that Chinatown has and attracts many old people, and that the bus system facilitates access in and out of Chinatown. Business operators felt that Chinatown offers the dual advantage of having low business rents and accessibility.

3. Revitalization efforts.

   Those interviewed generally liked the improvements in Chinatown. They felt that Chinatown is slowly losing or has lost its sleazy reputation. It was felt that revitalization meant less crime,
prostitutes and drugs. Informants liked the restoration of old
buildings, as well as the relatively new art galleries and
professional offices.

There was, however, disagreement as to the future of Chinatown.
Business interests preferred strengthening and increasing the
business/commercial atmosphere. Residents wanted to see more
resident- and family-oriented facilities and services.

Whereas residents and businesses expressed many similar viewpoints regarding
Chinatown's strengths, there were major differences in perspectives between
residents and business people regarding Chinatown's concerns/problems.

1. Lack of resident-oriented facilities.

The biggest problem cited by resident informants was the lack of
park space. It was pointed out that, although the City continues
to propose new housing units, there are no plans to make
Chinatown more livable. Recreational needs were a top priority
with these informants. They felt that children have no nearby
outdoor space to play and the elderly have very few places to
gather.

2. Type of housing.

Resident informants wanted to see more housing in the area, but
they disagreed on the type of housing. Affordable housing was
important to some, but others felt that there needs to be more
diversity in Chinatown's housing market. The latter group wanted
more market housing.

3. Disruption of businesses.

Those involved with business were concerned about activities
which disrupted their operation. Traffic was a big problem, as
well as insufficient public parking facilities. The latter was
becoming more problematic as the City develops its parking lots.
Construction in general was seen as a problem, with its noise and
dust.

4. Regulations governing Chinatown's development.

Another concern on some business-related informants was the
amount of regulation governing Chinatown. They felt that there
should be less regulation so that the area can flourish
economically.
5. Presence of undesired elements.

Residents and business people wished to see crime and loiterers eliminated from the area.

4.3 Community Concerns About the Smith-Beretania Redevelopment

4.3.1 Organizational Positions

To date, two organizations have taken a position on the proposed project. The Downtown Neighborhood Board No. 13 has consistently advocated the establishment of an active park on the project site. The Board's position, which was reiterated in January of this year, is that the primary use of the project site should be a park, particularly in light of the site's history as the first public park. Board members have opposed both the previous proposal for a residential tower, as well as current plans for a commercial area, day care and City office space.

The Smith-Beretania Apartment Association has also historically voiced strong concerns about the project. The organization prefers an active park, and opposes the other uses on the site, except for parking.

The issues raised by these organizations are discussed in detail in subsequent sections.

4.3.2 Summary of Issues and Concerns

The project elicited strong concern from resident informants, all of whom knew about the "Smith-Beretania project." Business informants were less aware of proposed actions. Because this was not a statistical survey, frequency of statements are provided only in extreme situations.
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project
Social Impact Assessment

Issues and Concerns Raised by Resident Informants

Resident interviewees either strongly opposed the project as proposed, or were mildly supportive. Their comments are summarized as follows:

1. Maximize Park Area and Potential.

   Resident informants consistently pointed to the need for resident-oriented parks in Chinatown/Downtown, although one person felt that this need may not need to be addressed because of the precedence set by and the predominance of the business environment.

   From this perspective, residents felt that the City has a responsibility to take every opportunity to develop park space -- especially because the City is responsible for most of the residential projects proposed in Chinatown.

   They believed that, without a City plan for developing Chinatown/Downtown parks, Smith-Beretania is "our last hope." These informants were concerned that the Smith-Beretania redevelopment project is not maximizing the site's park potential in the following ways:

   - The City is introducing other uses which will irrevocably remove a major portion of the project site from park use. In particular, the commercial and office uses were seen as unnecessary and competing with vital park space.

   - The park will be used for passive purposes only. Informants feared that another "waterfall" park, which is seen more appropriate for office workers, will use up potentially active recreation space.

   To resident interviewees, the project will neither address the immediate need for more resident-oriented park space nor meet the long-range need for resident-oriented active park area.

2. Need for Active Park.

   Neighborhood Board members and Smith-Beretania residents preferred that the park area contain equipment which will provide opportunities for active physical stimulation. Basketball, tennis and volleyball courts, a tot lot and playground areas were seen as appropriate for the site. Although there was concern about the effect of these activities on the elderly in the Smith-Beretania Apartments, the Smith-Beretania informants which included elderly people felt that noise and light would not be problematic. They felt that appropriate regulation and design would eliminate these potentially negative impacts.
3. Project History.

The Smith-Beretania project has been a possibility for over ten years. During this time, though the project has taken different shapes, the resident sector of Chinatown/Downtown has consistently requested an active park and opposed other uses which would compete with active park space. Until the Environmental Impact Statement Preparation Notice and the interviews, resident informants were under the impression that (1) the park would indeed be active (since the project architect recently discussed ball courts with them); and (2) the only other uses would be a child care and parking. They believed that the project was finally responding to resident requests.

Because of the constant resident reactions and recently-developed expectations, the introduction of the office space (which represents yet another park-competing use) frustrated resident informants. Further, the Smith-Beretania Resident Association has had problems with the building developer and management regarding the use of commercial and resident common space in Smith-Beretania Apartments.

4. Revitalization.

Resident informants said that the Smith-Beretania parking lot and the peripheral sidewalks were the scene of illegal activities including drug dealing and use and prostitution solicitation. They believed that the project would help by cleaning up the area and attracting more people. They also liked the removal of the unused building at the corner of Nu'uanu Avenue and Pauahi Street.

5. Reactions to Specific Project Components.

As earlier discussed, the commercial and office component were criticized for using valuable park space. Resident informants did not believe that these uses were necessary, and there was also a feeling that the City should not be competing with the private sector in the development of commercial retail space.

The additional parking was appreciated, but the Beretania Street ingress/egress was seen as dangerous and a traffic problem.

The proposed child care center was generally accepted, mostly because it was a project component since 1981. It was felt that every effort should be made to accommodate the needs of
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Chinatown/Downtown parents and children; affordable rates or special rates for nearby residents were offered as suggestions.

Business Issues and Concerns

The business people interviewed for this project were mostly those who operated in the immediate vicinity; other business interests were the leaders of regional business organizations.

Business informants were generally open to the Smith-Beretania project, though they asked questions or expressed concerns about impacts specific to their activities. The regional representatives were well aware of the proposed project; individual proprietors were less knowledgeable of project components.

1. Generally Good For Business.

Business informants felt that the redevelopment of Smith-Beretania would be good for business, as follows:

- The project would bring more people to the area, which means more potential customers and clients. Art gallery operators anticipated a potential for more galleries and felt that this would be good for the type of ambience conducive to art patrons.

- Revitalization of the area would make the area more attractive and presumably get rid of the loiterers, prostitutes and drug dealers.

- Convenient child care may attract employees to the area.

2. Short-Term Shortage of Parking and Construction Activities.

There was concern that many customers and clients would be deprived of convenient parking during construction. One person feared that business could drop as much as 50 percent.

Also of concern were the typical construction impacts of noise and dust. Clothing stores and art galleries feared that dust would require additional maintenance and ruin their merchandise. Business operators also feared that construction activities would keep people away.

A few people looked forward to construction. Construction activities at the nearby Honolulu Park Place have proven beneficial for nearby restaurants.
3. Concerns About Long-Term Effects.

Business informants were concerned about physical and circulation impacts. It was feared the project would "create a wall" on Paughi Street, thereby eliminating the current open space quality.

Further, nearby businesses strongly discouraged street drop-off and pickup for the child care facility. They felt that this would exacerbate traffic, particularly in the afternoon hours.
5 POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

This section identifies and analyzes potential social impacts of the Smith-Beretania project. Section 5.1 presents recreation impacts. Section 5.2 identifies impacts on statewide and study area child care needs, and site-specific considerations. Section 5.3 discusses the impacts on employment and residential population. Section 5.4 evaluates impacts on public parking character. The impacts on the character and uses of the immediate vicinity are discussed in Section 5.5. Project impacts on public services are presented in Section 5.6.

5.1 Recreation Impact

Approximately 9,000 people lived in the study area in 1989. When current construction is completed, over 10,000 people could be living in the study area in the near future. If all of the proposed residential units are built, over 15,000 people are expected to live in the area. Based on the Long Range Plan of the City Department of Parks and Recreation, a population base of 10,000 should have the following:

- an average recreational site of ten acres which could be shared with intermediate schools;
- children's play area;
- three to four basketball courts;
- three to four volleyball courts;
- one to two softball fields; and
- a comfort station/recreation building.

There is no apparent difference in standards for urban, suburban or rural areas.

The study area contains the following recreational resources:

- Pauahi Community Service Facility, a two-story, 6,000 square foot multi-purpose recreation building located on Pauahi Street near River Street and used primarily by senior citizens;
- Kamalii Park, a 0.68-acre triangular space bounded by Pali Highway and Beretania Street and containing benches and walkways;
- Queen Emma Square, a 0.56-acre rectangular space near St. Andrews Priory; and
- Kamamalu Playground, a neighborhood park mauka of Vineyard Boulevard, encompassing 5.3 acres, and containing basketball, tennis and volleyball courts, as well as a softball field and play equipment.
The study area also contains a number of urban or mini parks, including the Fort Street Mall Mini Park, the Wilcox Park, and the Chinatown Gateway Plaza.

Just Ewa of the project site are parks within the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board area including:

- **Aala Park**, a 6.7-acre urban park containing a skating rink, children’s play apparatus, and a comfort station, as well as a tent shelter for homeless people; and

- **Beretania Community Park**, a 5.3 acre community park with a community meeting place, basketball and volleyball courts, a softball field and play apparatus.

In addition to the City park system, there are the private recreation decks for the enjoyment of on-site residents.

Inasmuch as these existing facilities are available for resident use, the overall park system in the study area has not kept pace with the existing and near future residential population of the study area.

1. There are no active parks within the "practical" boundaries of Downtown or Chinatown. The Kamanamalu Playground is within the Downtown Neighborhood Board area. Although the site is close to Foster Gardens residents, it is far from most Downtown and Chinatown residential complexes and more accessible to Punchbowl residents.

2. The Aala Park and Beretania Community Parks, are used mostly by residents of that area; Chinatown and Downtown residents would need to compete for park space with Kalihi-Palama residents.

3. These active play areas and playgrounds are within walking distance of some residential towers in Chinatown/Downtown, but are not easily accessible because of busy streets.

4. The Downtown urban or mini parks are part of the overall park inventory, but these are designed for the office environment, and not for resident-oriented recreation. These parks are paved with well-defined circulation patterns, and are not conducive to active play.

*Project Effects*

The proposed Smith-Beretania park will improve the Chinatown/Downtown park situation by adding another recreational resource to the area. Similar to existing Downtown urban or mini parks, the Smith-Beretania park will add attractive open space and provide a visual and psychological relief from the
prevalent high-density urban environment. The proposed park will also provide a
passive gathering area for the resident population and, possibly, a play area
for young children.

The Smith-Beretania park will not, however, improve the overall quality of
regional recreational resources. As proposed, the proposed park is limited in
terms of area and function. The total project site is far short of the ten-acre
Department of Parks and Recreation recommendation. By itself, there is no way
that the Smith-Beretania project could fully address the Chinatown/Downtown
recreational needs, even if the entire site were used for a park.

Further, Smith-Beretania has no effect on the existing and long-term need for
active recreation space; it will contain none of the facilities recommended by
the City Department of Parks and Recreation.

Proposed Mitigation

The Smith-Beretania project is based on a weighing of priorities. The need for
resident-oriented park space is being weighed against the need for City office
consolidation and more retail space. In essence, this project represents the
ongoing and increasing conflict between resident needs and a business
environment.

The resident-business conflict will become more acute as more residential
projects are proposed. The area's population is expected to undergo major
increases, but there is no long-term plan to meet existing and anticipated
resident needs. If the City continues to advocate increasing the
Chinatown/Downtown residential population, then we strongly recommend that the
City formulate policies and plans for meeting the recreational needs of
residents. It appears that both the City Departments of Housing and Community
Development and Parks and Recreation would be involved in establishing such
policies and plans.

Currently, most of the substantive recreational solutions are long range
possibilities at best. The use of Central Intermediate School as an active park
has been considered, but approval by the State Department of Education is
needed. Further, in anticipation of the increased residential population, the
Downtown Neighborhood Board opposes deleting this facility from the school
inventory. The Downtown Neighborhood Board has advocated the inclusion of
active recreation areas in the Pacific Nations Center. In the reissue of the
RFP, the City added a new gym as a requirement. The Neighborhood Board has also
advocated the use of the "Zippy's" block for an active park.

Land availability is understandably a major constraint in increasing park space,
and ongoing development by the public and private sectors will further restrict
park development. We therefore suggest that high-density indoor recreational
facilities, such as a gymnasium, indoor interchangeable courts and community
meeting rooms, be considered in the planning process.
Further, in the development of the long-range recreational plan for Chinatown/Downtown, the Smith-Beretania park should be re-evaluated to see if some form of active recreation would be consistent with the plan.

5.2 Impact on Child Care

5.2.1 Statewide Ramifications

The four age categories in the State child care delivery system are (1) infants ranging from birth to 18 months; (2) toddlers, which include children between 18 months and three years old; (3) preschoolers, from three through five six years old; and (4) school-aged children between five through 14 years old. The fourth category is not included in the analysis for this report.

In 1989, the State Office of Children and Youth conducted a statewide assessment of the needs of parents, state employees, and child care providers for affordable, available, quality child care. It was found that the current supply of child care providers is inadequate in terms of affordability, availability and quality. The following summarizes findings:

1. In Hawai‘i, there were approximately 189,000 children living in "workforce households," those which have all parents working, looking for work, going to school or in job training. It is estimated that, in the 103,000 workforce households, 37,000 children were infants and toddlers and 30,000 were preschool-aged. Fifty-four percent of these children receive some type of child care (Office of Children and Youth, 1989).

2. Hawai‘i has approximately 26,600 spaces available in registered or licensed child care facilities for all four age categories. The need is most acute in the infant and toddler age categories (Office of Children and Youth, 1990b).

3. In the infant and toddler categories, 75 percent receive some kind of child care. The most common type of care is out-of-home care by a non-relative. The highest cost for this type of infant/toddler care was $1,000 a month; the average; $200.

Another common type of child care in these age categories was in-home care by a relative. The average cost was $127 a month.

There is potential demand for 6,400 additional full-time slots for infants and toddlers (Office of Children and Youth, 1989).

4. Preschoolers comprised the smallest category in this study. The majority of these children received care and most were in a child care center or preschool. The average cost was $209 a month.
There is an estimated demand for 3,300 full-time slots for preschool children (Office of Children and Youth, 1989).

5. It is estimated that 28,000 parents would like to work, but cannot afford child care. The problem is acute for lower-income households; lower income workforce households are much less likely to have child care than their middle to high income counterparts.

In addition to affordability problems, parents also cited the unavailability of preferred types of care (Office of Children and Youth, 1989).

6. The child care industry finds it difficult to respond to the demand for child care because of a serious labor shortage attributed to the low wages earned by child care workers.

Last year, the State developed a “State Strategic Plan for Child Care” to address solutions to these problems. Major recommendations include (1) providing funding to enable parents to purchase quality child care; (2) provide funding for child care providers to stimulate the supply; (3) create an infrastructure to coordinate the development and provision of child care services; (4) develop child care policy; and (5) develop a public education program (Office of Children and Youth, 1990a).

The proposed child care center will have a positive impact on the availability of child care in Hawai‘i. It will increase the number of slots for infants, toddlers and preschoolers and therefore increase the supply of quality child care.

The project’s affordability can only be determined after an operator is selected.

Proposed Mitigation

The project will have a positive impact on the supply of child care facilities, and no mitigation is required.

To enhance the affordability of the proposed facility, the City should (1) work with major area employers to see if parent costs can be reduced and (2) explore ways to minimize the financial burden of the private operator.

5.2.2 Chinatown/Downtown Impacts

To understand the specific needs of Chinatown/Downtown, this study (1) looked at a survey of downtown employees and (2) interviewed people involved in child care in this area.
In late 1989, the then City Office of Human Resources (currently the Department of Human Resources) conducted a survey of employees in selected large organizations. The following summarizes findings:

1. The cost of child care was a moderate to major problem for 55 percent of respondents.

2. Location was a moderate or major problem for approximately 48 percent of respondents.

3. Care for a sick child and temporary/emergency care were moderate to major problems for 54 percent.

4. Care of children under two was a moderate or major problem for 36.5 percent.

5. About 39 percent lost days due to child care difficulties and 52 percent lost days at work because of a child's illness.

6. Almost half of the respondents paid $300+ a month for child care. About a third used center-based care, while another 31 percent used a relative in their home. The largest preference, however, was for center-based care.

7. Respondents were asked if they would enroll, prefer or consider a child care center at or near the work site. Twenty-four percent felt they would enroll, while 14 percent would prefer such a center. Forty-six percent said they would at least consider such a facility.

The nine child care providers or officials contacted for this study are identified on Table 9. According to those interviewed, full-day service tuition in the area ranges from $285 to $485 a month for toddlers and preschoolers. The facilities vary on whether non-toilet-trained children are accepted.

The only facility offering infant care is the YWCA Day Care Program. Monthly tuition is $550. In February 1991, parents assumed responsibility for the program through "Hi Kids at Work," a non-profit corporation.

PATCH indicated a high demand for child care services in the Chinatown/Downtown area from both residents and out-of-area employees. All of the caregivers interviewed indicated a waiting list. The least demand is for spaces for three to five-year olds.

The greatest demand is for infant care. In March, there will only be between 38 to 42 slots in the family child care in the 96813 zip code area; these are already filled.
Table 9
List of Child Care Informants Interviewed for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization or Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Buck</td>
<td>Coordinator of the Early Childhood and Child Care of the State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Children and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Dell</td>
<td>Director of Resource and Referral of PATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran DeMattos</td>
<td>Director and Teacher of Bamboo Shoots Pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Deweese</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant of the Kawaiahao Church Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Fiquorea</td>
<td>Teacher at St. Luke’s Pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Kemper</td>
<td>Director of the Downtown branch of the Hawai‘i Child Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(joint operation with the Kapiolani Straub Child Care Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Larsen</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Early Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director of Seagull Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Takano</td>
<td>Director of the YWCA Day Care Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Tom</td>
<td>Director of the Prince Kuhio Child Care Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demand far exceeds this supply. The Downtown/Kaka'ako area generated 270 requests for infant care in this area; there were over 1200 requests for infant care in this area generated by out-of-area residents.

The proposed child care center will positively impact the delivery of child care services in Chinatown/Downtown by increasing the supply of services.

**Proposed Mitigation**

This impact will benefit the area’s child care resources and no mitigation is needed.

To further enhance child care resources, the City could explore providing infant care. This would be an expensive operation and any operator would need to be subsidized in some form to successfully implement this program.

Special consideration should be given to study area residents. Given the socio-economic profile of Chinatown, it is anticipated that even though nearby residents may want to use the child care services, they may not be able to afford the tuition. The City should explore ways to assist these families in using facility services.

**5.2.3 Site-Specific Considerations**

The proposed child care center would apply to the State Department of Human Resources for a license to operate. The *Rules Governing Licensing of Group Day Care Centers and Group Day Care Homes* call for the following:

- "35 square feet per child of unencumbered instructional or play area exclusive of bathrooms, kitchens, cupboard space and hallway... Lanai area may be counted for not more than thirty per cent of required area (Section 17-892-40(d))."

- "Six-thousand two-hundred ninety-five (6295) square feet of outdoor space for 101 children plus forty-five (45) square feet per child thereafter... Lanai area which has both a roof and finished flooring does not count for either enclosed or more than thirty percent of outdoor space (Section 17-892-40(d))."

This means that a child care center licensed for 150 children would need the following:

- 5,250 square feet of interior play area (This area cannot include typical support and administrative spaces, nor can the lanai comprise more than thirty percent of the required area); and

- 8,500 square feet of outdoor area.
In our review of plans provided by the project architect (dated October 1990), we found that the available interior space seems adequate to meet requirements.

The courtyard encompasses approximately 5,032 square feet, and it appears that a portion may be covered by a roof canopy. This means that at least 3,500 square feet of currently planned for the public park will be needed to comply with licensing standards. It is noted that the State may require that the public park portion contain some kind of physical barrier during facility operation to ensure exclusive use.

Proposed Mitigation

The project's compliance with State licensing requirements will be determined by the State Department of Human Services.

5.3 Employment and Resident Population Impacts

The redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania project site will generate both short- and long-term employment opportunities.

Construction activities will occur over a two-and-a-half year period. The total construction cost is estimated at $20 million. It is estimated that the project will generate an estimated 183 jobs, based on the 1989 statewide ratio of total construction monies actually spent and number of construction employees (Bank of Hawaii, 1990).

Long term jobs will result from the ground floor commercial retail uses, the City office activities and the child care center. It is estimated that approximately 143 long-term jobs will be generated, the breakdown of which is as follows:

* 23 employees in ground floor retail uses (based on commercial floor area absorption rates provided in City and County of Honolulu Department of General Planning, 1980);
* 105 City employees in the upper levels (based on commercial floor area absorption rates provided in City and County of Honolulu Department of General Planning, 1980); and
* 20 employees at the child care center, including a director, two lead teachers, four teachers, six full-time aides, four part-time aides, and clerical and maintenance support.

The proposed project will not add housing units to the area and will therefore not impact the residential population.

page 52
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project
Social Impact Assessment

Proposed Mitigation

The project will not adversely impact employment, nor will it add to the residential population. No mitigation is required.

5.4 Impact on Public Parking

Public parking is a major issue for study area residents and business operators. The City parking lots appeal to those who seek lower parking rates, or who visit establishments in different locations. Although many of the privately-owned parking structures offer public parking, their rates are higher or they require validation by on-site businesses. In Chinatown, the public parking areas are near Chinatown shops and markets; they allow patrons to park for low rates and circulate comfortably within a few blocks.

The Smith-Beretania parking lot is valuable in this aspect. It is near markets, shops, and personal and business services. Many of the nearby business operators interviewed for this study indicated that their patrons often park at this metered parking lot.

Although the public parking lots are a valuable public resource, they still represent underdevelopment in a highly urban area; the City's ownership of these lands facilitates redevelopment.

*Table 10* shows that, until the some of the public parking lots underwent construction, the study area was served by 2,256 public parking stalls. Two lots are currently under construction: Alakea-Richards (Alii Place) and River-Nimitz (River-Nimitz Housing). This means that the current supply of public parking spaces is 294 spaces less than previous.

Even though redevelopment may eventually increase public parking stalls, the temporary shortage during construction could hurt businesses in the area.

Construction of three parking lots would overlap: Alakea-Richards, Smith-Maunakea, and Kekaulike. All three of these lots would be closed between January 1992 and March 1992, which would reduce the parking space supply by 578 spaces; the inventory would drop to 1,696 spaces, which is a major reduction from the preconstruction supply. If the Smith-Beretania project were to overlap this project, then the total inventory would be further reduced to 1,571 parking spaces.
### Table 10
Status of Study Area Public Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Previous Public Stalls (5/91)</th>
<th>Existing Public Parking</th>
<th>Proposed for Public Parking</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Est. Closure Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River–Nimitz</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>till 6/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith–Beretania</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1/92 – 3/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith–Maunakea</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/92 – 1/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alakea–Richards</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>till 3/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaahumanu</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8/91 – 7/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block J</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukui Plaza</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale Pauahi</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,274</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,957</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,699</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (1)*Downtown Public Parking Inventory,* a computer printout produced by the Department of Housing and Community Development, and dated May 20, 1991
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project
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In the long-term time frame, the proposed project will have a positive effect by increasing resources. The extent of this benefit is undetermined at this time, since some of the stalls will be solely for the use of commercial tenants and City employees.

Proposed Mitigation

The worst case scenario is the five-month period earlier identified, whereby five parking garages will be under construction. Two mitigation measures are recommended:

- The City should consider delaying some of the projects to minimize hardship on Chinatown patrons and businesses.
- If delay is not possible, then the City should explore special parking arrangements with private garages in the study area. For example, private garage operators could have reduced rates during certain times, such as weekends and weekday mornings. Another example is the use of “parking passes.” The City and/or Chinatown merchants could sell inexpensive parking passes which would be usable in certain private garages.

Long term alternatives to the automobile, such as a more diverse public transportation system, will ultimately decrease dependency on public parking garages.

5.5 Impact on the Character of and Uses in the Immediate Vicinity

In the recent past Chinatown was primarily frequented by transients seeking night entertainment and daytime local shoppers at mostly Chinese-operated markets. Today Chinatown consists of three primary clusters of commercial activities and services—(1) the bar/video entertainment for transients and locals; (2) ethnic markets, restaurants and stores; and (3) professional and service businesses.

The predominant business activities are Chinatown’s multi-cultural family/entrepreneurial enterprises. These include lei stands, bars, convenience stores, small markets, noodle factories, clothing and tailor stores for walk-in trade. Specialty meat markets, bakeries, and restaurants are located along Maunakea Street servicing local, ethnic and lunch hour business patrons. The restaurant cuisines feature Chinese, Thai, Vietnamese/Lao and Filipino foods appealing to residents and tourists alike.

Newer professional businesses have accompanied the downtown improvement efforts; remodeled structures have been converted into eight art galleries adjacent to the target site between Nu‘uanu Avenue and Smith Street. These artistic and professional attractions add diversity to the ambience.
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With redevelopment and improvement efforts, clusters similar to ethnic family businesses have displaced older ones. The 1980s provided new opportunities for immigrants from Southeast Asia who have replaced many older Chinese family businesses. What was once "the strip", from Bethel Street via Hotel Street to River Street, featuring hostess bars for local and military entertainment, has given way to remodeled store fronts, small Laotian/Vietnamese convenience stores and markets. Today walking tours along Maunakea Streets and hourly visits of Waikiki Trolley are seen daily mixing with local business people.

In the Chinatown vicinity of the project site, there is the following diversity of uses:

- Small ethnic restaurants
- Local style and hostess bars
- Lei and flower shops
- Gift shops
- Ethnic convenience/trading company stores
- Liquor and beverage stores
- Video game centers
- Barber shops
- Several noodle factories
- Manapua and Chinese Dim Sum factories
- Art galleries
- Golden Harvest Theatres
- Several small privately-managed parking lots
- City-initiated residential complexes

Immediately Diamond Head of the project site are the following uses:

- Calvary Chapel which serves approximately 800 members
- Smith-Beretania Apartments (164 apartments; divided equally between one- and two-bedroom apartments; includes market units with rents ranging from $928 to $1,000+ and units subsidized by Section 8 funds; many elderly)
- In Smith-Beretania Apartments, ground floor convenience store, restaurant, post office and personal services
- A travel agency
- Two art galleries

Along Nu'uanu Avenue and in the Downtown side of the project site, there is a proliferation of art galleries and professional services which signal a permanent departure from the former entertainment atmosphere. Adding to the legal offices, architectural and planning services, private photography studios, and medical/dental offices are newly remodeled galleries and Hawaii Theatre. Also present in the vicinity is a police substation and restaurants.
Smith-Beretania Redevelopment Project
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The Downtown side of the project site promises further changes with the development of the "Liberty Theater" site and the Marks Garage.

Mauka of the project site is high-density residential uses of Honolulu Tower, Honolulu Park Place, Kukui Plaza and Beretania North.

The redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania parking lot as proposed is expected to complement and support the existing character and uses of the immediate vicinity:

1. **Consistent with Revitalization Efforts.**
   
   The Smith-Beretania project is supportive of and very consistent with public and private efforts to revitalize Chinatown. The project will beautify and clean up the area.

2. ** Provision of Open Space.**
   
   The proposed open space will provide visual relief amidst the predominant commercial activity and residential structures. Further, the open space will allow for leisure gatherings and passive recreation for residents and workers alike. Section 5.1 discusses the recreational aspects of the project.

3. **Uses Consistent with and Supportive of Existing and Proposed Uses.**
   
   The proposed uses are not expected to interfere with the operation of existing and proposed uses. The proposed child care center is supportive of residents and employees. A number of the nearby businesses depend on walk-in customers. The project will bring over 140 employees into the area, and will therefore increase business for those who depend on walk-ins. Further, the additional de facto population generated by the proposed project will increase the potential clientele for nearby professional and personal services.

4. **Temporary Shortage In Parking Spaces.**
   
   As discussed in the previous section, nearby businesses would be negatively impacted by the temporary parking shortage during construction.

5. **Increased Business Competition.**
   
   The project will add over 10,000 square feet of commercial space to the area. The new businesses may compete with existing establishments if they are similar in nature. The City needs to minimize this competition by ensuring that project lessees are subject to prevailing market rents and terms.
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Proposed Mitigation

The project's revitalization efforts, provision of open space and consistency with existing uses are considered positive impacts, and no mitigation is recommended. Parking-related mitigation is recommended in Section 5.4.

The purpose of redevelopment is to stimulate and improve the existing environment, including existing businesses. Competition between nearby shops and future on-site commercial tenants should be minimized, and the City should (1) provide nearby shop owners opportunities to comment on the types of City tenants; (2) give nearby businesses a chance to relocate on-site; and (3) use fair market rates for new tenants.

5.6 Public Services

5.6.1 Police Protection

The study area is in Beats 40 through 43 of District 1 of the Honolulu Police Department. The project site is in Beat 41.

The proposed project can be adequately served by existing police protection services and is not expected to negatively impact or strain such services.

The nearest police facility is the Downtown Substation at the corner of Nuuanu Avenue and Hotel Street. At any given time, a total of six to eight officers patrol the study area in Cushman vehicles, automobiles and on foot. The study area has no special or distinct crime problems, nor does it have any recent trends. There is a general feeling that the combination of a new substation and reduction in bars is resulting in less crime for the study area.

Police officials and nearby residents and businesses indicate that crime is a problem at and near the corner of Smith and Pauahi Streets. There is loitering, prostitution and drug dealing, and police indicate numerous incidents of vandalism and assault.

Proposed Mitigation

No adverse impacts on police services are expected. The project will revitalize the area and the new uses are expected to have a deterring effect on crime. On-site security measures including (1) a well-designed and lighted park, (2) building security, and (3) an attendant-operated parking structure can further assist in reducing and preventing crime.
5.6.2 Fire Protection

The proposed project can be served by existing fire protection services and is not expected to negatively impact such services.

The project site would be served by the Central Fire Station, which is an engine company. In addition to the Central Fire Station, the Kakaako and Kuakini Fire Stations, both of which are engine and ladder companies, respond to an initial fire alarm in the Downtown area. Backup can be provided by the Kalihi Kai and other fire stations in the perimeter of the area.

Proposed Mitigation

No adverse impacts are expected, so no mitigation is recommended.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pacific Planning & Engineering, Inc. (PPE) was engaged to undertake a traffic impact study to identify and assess future traffic impacts caused by the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment project. This Report identifies and evaluates the probable impacts of traffic generated by the proposed development in the year 1993 when the project is expected to be completed and occupied.

Project Description

The City & County of Honolulu, Department of Housing and Community Development, is proposing to build the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment project in downtown Honolulu on Oahu, Hawaii. The project is located on the block between Maunakea Street, Smith Street, Beretania Street, and Pauahi Street.

The project consists of a child care facility for 150 children, 44,300 gross square feet of commercial/office area, a 330 stall parking garage, and a passive park. The project will have one driveway to the parking structure along Beretania Street.

Methodology

Analysis was conducted for five intersections along Beretania and King Streets to determine the relative impact of the proposed project on the local roadway system. The intersections under study are as follows:
• Beretania Street and Smith Street
• Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue
• Beretania Street and the project driveway
• King Street and Smith Street
• King Street and Nuuanu Avenue

Traffic was forecasted at these intersections by adding traffic generated from other planned or committed developments in the area that would impact the study intersections, including the:

* Pan Pacific Plaza/First Interstate Tower
* Alii Place
* Chinatown Gateway Plaza
* River-Nimitz Housing
* Honolulu Park Place Condominium
* 1100 Alakea Plaza
* Harbor Court
* Kekaulike-Maunakea Housing
* Smith-Maunakea Housing

The Report assesses the impact on each intersection by determining the level-of-service (LOS) for three conditions: existing, 1993 forecast without the project, and 1993 forecast with the project traffic.

Conclusions & Recommendations

The proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment project, when completed in 1993, will have a slight impact on traffic conditions. The project will increase delays slightly in the study area.
Presently, traffic flow through the central business district is congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours. This is due to the limited capacity of the roadway system within the CBD and the relatively large number of vehicles circulating within the area. Added vehicle delays are also caused by by buses stopping to drop off passengers, pedestrians, and cars stopping to pick up or drop off passengers in the travel lane.

Our analysis and field observations of King Street indicates that traffic is presently operating near capacity, LOS E, during the morning peak hour and at LOS D in the afternoon. Arterial analysis was used to analyze a segment of King Street between Kekaulike Street and Bethel Street. The average speed to traverse this segment (which includes delays caused by stop lights, pedestrians, or other vehicles) was used to determine level-of-service (LOS).

Analysis and field observations of Beretania Street indicates that traffic is currently operating at LOS D during the morning and at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour. Beretania Street was analyzed between Bethel Street and Maunakea Street. The major cause for LOS E during the afternoon was the downstream congestion along Beretania Street, Maunakea Street and Nuuanu Street.

LOS for arterial streets and signalized intersections are not directly comparable, since the first is based on speed and the last on seconds of delay. Signalized intersections decrease the average speed along arterial streets by stopping traffic on the major street to allow minor street traffic to enter or cross the arterial.

The signalized intersection analysis indicates that study intersections along King Street are presently operating at LOS B or better. This LOS is due to the synchronized traffic signal system along King Street as well as
the four-lane one-way operation. The intersections along Beretania Street are operating overall at LOS B or better, due to the synchronization of signals and the five-lane one-way operation.

Without the project by 1993, King Street and Beretania Street will continue to operate at the same LOS as existing, except during the afternoon along King Street which will drop from LOS D to LOS E. The LOS for some of the minor street approaches at the study intersections will drop from LOS C to LOS D.

With the project, the LOS for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as the without project case. The LOS at study intersections will remain the same except for some minor street approaches which will drop from LOS C to LOS D. Vehicles exiting the project access onto Beretania Street will operate with little delays, LOS B, during the morning peak hour. During the afternoon, drivers exiting the project will experience very long delays, LOS E, especially if they attempt to get to Beretania Street's mauka lane to turn right into Maunakea Street. The long delays are expected to occur only during the afternoon peak period. Due to the delays and weaving action caused by drivers attempting to across Beretania Street to get to Maunakea Street, we recommend that left turns exiting the project be restricted from crossing Beretania Street to turn right into Maunakea Street, during the weekday afternoon peak period, using appropriate signage and/or striping.

It is possible that the peak periods along Beretania Street and King Street will lengthen slightly as the LOS at the study intersections declines with increases in traffic resulting mostly from other projects scheduled for completion by 1993. Since the LOS without or with the project is the same, no improvements are recommended for the existing roadways serving the project traffic.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City & County of Honolulu, Department of Housing and Community Development, is proposing to build the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment project in downtown Honolulu on Oahu, Hawaii. Figure 1 shows the location of the project site and the surrounding roadway network.

Currently, the project site is being used as a municipal parking lot with 130 parking spaces and a two-story commercial structure. The parking lot has one entrance on Smith Street. The existing land uses will be removed.

The project consists of a child care facility for 150 children, 44,300 gross square feet of commercial/office area, a 330 stall parking garage, and a passive park. Of the total 330 parking stalls, 129 will replace the stalls that currently exist in the municipal parking lot.

The project will have one driveway along Beretania Street. Figure 2 shows the site plan of the proposed development. Completion of construction and occupancy of the project is expected by the year 1993.

The potential users of the child care facility are expected to be parents that work in the downtown area. The market for the commercial area is expected to be small retail shops for pedestrian traffic. The office space will be used by City & County agencies.
Figure 1. Project Location Map
Figure 2. Site Plan
EXISTING CONDITIONS

An inventory of existing conditions was conducted to better ascertain the potential traffic impact of the proposed project. The review included the land uses in the area, roadway facilities, and existing traffic conditions.

Land Uses

The project site is located just outside and west of the Honolulu central business district (CBD). The CBD is generally bounded by Nimitz Highway, Richards Street, Beretania Street, and Bethel Street. The CBD has a wide variety of land uses including offices, retail stores, banks, and restaurants. Many of the offices are located in high-rise buildings of over twenty stories. Parking is at a premium in the CBD.

The project site is located in the historic Chinatown area. The density in this area is generally lower, buildings range from two to three stories with high-rise apartment buildings being the exception. The land uses in this area are generally the same as in the central business district except for a somewhat higher amount of residential uses.

Roadway Facilities

The roadway network in the area is a grid system of one-way streets. Figure 3 shows the roadway network in the downtown area. The H-1 Freeway and Nimitz Highway are the main arterials carrying through traffic. Beretania Street and King Street are typical "downtown" streets providing access to local businesses.
Streets and Highways

The H-1 Freeway is a State highway with 3 lanes in each direction in the vicinity of the project. The posted speed limit on this highway is 50 miles per hour (mph).

Nimitz Highway is a State maintained highway with 4 lanes in each direction in the project vicinity. The posted speed limit on this highway is 35 miles per hour (mph).

Beretania Street is a 5-lane one-way street, maintained by the City & County. There are bus stops along the mauka side of the street. In this area, no on-street parking is allowed. The posted speed limit on this street is 25 mph.

King Street is a 5-lane one-way street, maintained by the City & County. There are bus stops along the makai side of the street. In this area, no on-street parking is allowed. The posted speed limit on this street is 25 mph.

Nuuanu and Smith Streets are one way streets in the project vicinity. On-street parking is allowed in certain areas. The speed limit on these streets is 25 mph.

Study Intersections

The traffic signals at intersections along Beretania Street as well as King Street are synchronized. All study intersections are signalized and the layouts are shown in Figure 3.
The synchronized traffic signal system along King Street is a two phase system. First, vehicles from all the side streets to enter or cross King at the same time. Second, the through movement along King is released in succession starting from the upstream intersections and then the cycle starts again.

The synchronized system along Beretania Street is similar to King Street. It allows vehicles from all the side streets to enter Beretania at the same time and then releases the through movements.

Traffic Conditions

A review of 1989 State Department of Transportation (DOT) traffic count data indicated that the weekday commuter peak hours along Beretania Street in the vicinity of the project occur between 7:00 to 8:00 in the morning and 3:45 to 4:45 in the afternoon. These peak hours were used to determine traffic impacts, since the project traffic would impact surrounding roads the most during these time periods.

Manual traffic counts were taken at the intersections of Beretania Street with Smith Street and Nuuanu Avenue and the intersections of King Street with Smith Street and Nuuanu Avenue during the weekday morning and afternoon peak periods. These counts were used as the baseline condition upon which future estimated traffic volumes were added.

Figures 4 and 5 show the present volume of traffic at the study intersections for the observed peak hours.
Figure 4. Existing Morning Peak Hour Traffic
Figure 5. Existing Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic
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Observed Traffic Conditions

During the morning peak hour, King Street was observed to operate at congested traffic conditions. Though congested, traffic flowed in a constant manner and there were no observed breakdowns in traffic flow. The ability of vehicles to select their own speed was impaired due to the presence of other vehicles. The ability of vehicles to maneuver within the traffic stream was also impaired due to the presence of other vehicles.

The synchronized signal system operated such that there were minimal delays to vehicles along King Street. Field measurements of vehicle delay at the study intersections indicated from 3 to 9 seconds of stop-delay per vehicle.

Other observed factors that contributed to the congestion were drivers dropping off passengers and blocking the right lane, pedestrian traffic, and the volume of side street traffic, which filled the storage space between intersections.

During the afternoon peak hour, King Street was operating with the middle two lanes congested, the outer two lanes were less congested. Average running speed was slightly higher than the morning. As in the morning, the synchronized signal system operated very well resulting in minimal delays to vehicles along King Street. Measurements of average vehicle stop-delays at signalized intersections indicated about 3 seconds delay per vehicle.

During the morning peak hour, Beretania Street with the synchronized signal system operated very well resulting in minimal delays to vehicles along Beretania Street.
During the afternoon peak hour, Beretania Street was congested due to the downstream conditions. A major movement in this area is the movement of traffic attempting to get to Vineyard Boulevard and the H-1 Freeway via Nuuanu Street and Maunakea Street. Vehicle queues occurred along Nuuanu, Maunakea, and in the mauka right turn lanes of Beretania due to this movement.

The Maunakea Street queue backed up from Vineyard to Beretania for about 20 minutes of the peak hour. Nuuanu Street also backed up at times during the peak hour. Many vehicles from Bethel turn onto Beretania to Nuuanu towards Vineyard, filling the lanes along Beretania between Bethel and Nuuanu. These vehicles blocked the intersection and the through traffic along Beretania Street at times during the peak hour.
FUTURE CONDITIONS

Research of approved planned developments and improvements to transportation facilities was conducted to estimate future traffic conditions at the study intersections.

Land Uses

Traffic generated by the following approved developments, as shown in Table 1 below, will impact the study intersections by the year 1993:

Table 1. Future Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pan Pacific Plaza</td>
<td>495,000 sq ft of office, bank, and retail use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alii Place</td>
<td>325,000 sq ft of office retail uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway Plaza</td>
<td>200 apartments &amp; 30,000 sq ft of commercial use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River-Nimitz Housing</td>
<td>90 apartments &amp; 9,000 sq ft of retail use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Park Place</td>
<td>637 apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Alakea Plaza</td>
<td>198,000 sq ft of office and retail uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Court</td>
<td>37,600 sq ft of commercial use, 220,600 sq ft of office use, &amp; 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>condominum units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td>159 apartments, 13,600 sq ft of retail, 178 public parking stalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td>234 apartments, 16,000 sq ft of commercial use, &amp; 418 public parking stalls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway Facilities

Other than re-paving on Nimitz Highway, there are no roadway improvements planned in the vicinity of the project for either King Street, Smith Street, Nuuanu Avenue, or Beretania Street. This finding is based on information received from the Department of Transportation Services.
PROJECTED TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Future traffic was forecasted for the without project and with project conditions. Traffic forecasts were made for 1993 when the project is expected to be completed.

Future Traffic Without Project

Future traffic without the project was forecasted by adding the following: (1) existing peak hour traffic volumes and (2) traffic generated by other developments that will be completed by 1993. The resultant traffic forecast without the project are shown in Figures 6 and 7 for the morning and afternoon peak hours.

Traffic From Other Developments

The three-step procedure of trip generation, trip distribution and traffic assignment was used to estimate peak hour traffic from other proposed developments within the immediate area of the project.

The trip generation step estimates the number of trips that would be generated by the developments as shown in Table 1. The trips generated by each development are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The number of trips were estimated based on the amount of land uses for each project and data from the ITE Trip Generation Report1 (Fourth Edition, 1987). The calculations for trip generation are shown in Appendix A.

Figure 6. 1993 Morning Peak Hour Traffic Without Project
Figure 7. 1993 Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic Without Project
Since the downtown area contains various mixed land uses, the trip generation rates were reduced to account for the high number of trip purposes which can be satisfied within the downtown area. Trips generated by office and commercial related land uses were reduced by a factor of 90% and residential land uses were reduced by 70%.

The Trip Generation Report indicates that apartment units close to the Central Business District (CBD) have a smaller trip generation rate than units farther away from the CBD. Office land uses were reduced because the Trip Generation Report indicates that larger office buildings have smaller trip generation rates. The retail land uses were reduced to account for the high pedestrian traffic and the internal capture of apartment/retail/commercial buildings.

The trip distribution step assigns trips to their expected origins and destinations. Trip distribution for the other developments was based on the distribution of population and employment on Oahu. The trips were generally distributed as follows: 50% to/from the Pearl City direction (West), and 50% to/from Diamond Head (East).

The traffic assignment step assigns trips to a specific route on the roadway network that will take the driver from origin to destination. Traffic was assigned based on the shortest route or travel time from origins to destinations. Trips from downtown developments were generally assigned to the roadway network as follows: 1) 50% along H-1 Freeway/Vineyard, 2) 10% along Beretania, 3) 10% along King, and 4) 30% along Nimitz.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trip Rates</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Adjusted Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Pacific Plaza/First Interstate</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alli Place</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking 75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>stalls</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River-Nimitz Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Park Place Condominium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium 637</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Alakea Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail 220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment 238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trip Rates</th>
<th>Trips</th>
<th>Adjusted Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pan Pacific Plaza/First Interstate Tower Office</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>0.24 1.26</td>
<td>119 623</td>
<td>107 561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alii Place Office</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>0.26 1.35</td>
<td>84 440</td>
<td>76 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown Gateway Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.46 0.22</td>
<td>93 44</td>
<td>65 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>6.73 7.03</td>
<td>202 211</td>
<td>182 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parking</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>stalls</td>
<td>0.11 0.17</td>
<td>8 13</td>
<td>8 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River-Nimitz Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.71 0.33</td>
<td>64 30</td>
<td>45 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu Park Place Condominium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.23 0.14</td>
<td>147 90</td>
<td>103 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Alakea Plaza Office</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>0.28 1.47</td>
<td>56 291</td>
<td>50 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.16 0.10</td>
<td>20 12</td>
<td>14 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>0.70 2.03</td>
<td>154 446</td>
<td>139 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekaulike-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.57 0.27</td>
<td>90 43</td>
<td>63 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>0.38 1.93</td>
<td>5 27</td>
<td>5 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Maunakea Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.27 0.17</td>
<td>64 41</td>
<td>45 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1.98 0.30</td>
<td>7 36</td>
<td>6 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>908 2062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Traffic With Project

Future traffic with project was forecasted by adding the without project traffic to the traffic generated by the proposed project. The resultant forecast traffic with project are shown in Figures 9 and 10 for the morning and afternoon peak hours.

The three step procedure of trip generation, trip distribution, and traffic assignment was used to estimate peak hour traffic from the proposed project. The number of trips from the project was estimated based on 10,700 square feet of commercial space, 33,600 square feet of office space, a 10,000 square feet day care center, and data from the Trip Generation Report. Table 4 shows the trip rates derived from the trip generation data and the number of trips generated. The calculations for trip generation are shown in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trip Rates</th>
<th>Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Trip Rates</th>
<th>Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1000 Sq. Ft</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

na - not applicable
Figure 8. 1993 Morning Peak Hour Traffic With Project
Figure 9. 1993 Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic With Project
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During our field observations on November 20, 1990, the existing parking lot was not fully utilized during the peak hours of 7:30 to 8:30 am and 4:30 to 5:30 pm. It was assumed that the number of vehicles using the parking garage would remain the same as existing since there are no other new land uses in the immediate vicinity that would generate additional parking demand.

Trip distribution for the project was generally based on the percentage distribution of population and employment on Oahu as described in the trip distribution for other developments in the prior section.

Trips generated by the project were assigned to the roadway network based on the shortest route or travel time from origins to destinations. The assignment of project traffic is shown in Figures 11 and 12.

**Incremental Increase**

Based upon the assignment of project traffic, Table 5 shows the increase in traffic volumes by movements at the study intersections generated by the project.
Figure 10. Morning Peak Hour Traffic Assignment
Figure 11. Afternoon Peak Hour Traffic Assignment
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Table 5. Project Generated Traffic at Study Intersections
1993 Forecast Peak Hour Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>1993 Without Project</th>
<th>1993 With Project</th>
<th>1993 Incremental Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North King Street with Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North King Street with Bethel Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>2349</td>
<td>2118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street with Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street with Nuuanu Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TRAFFIC IMPACTS ANALYSIS

Analyses were conducted for segments of Beretania Street and King Street, and for 5 signalized intersections along with the project's entrance to determine the relative impact of the proposed project on the local roadway system. Each road segment and intersection were analyzed for existing, 1993 forecasts without project, and 1993 forecast with project traffic conditions. Analysis for projected traffic conditions was based on the existing roadway network.

Analysis Methods

Beretania Street, King Street and the study intersections were analyzed using methods outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual.

Segments of Beretania Street and King Street were analyzed using methods for analyzing urban arterials. This method uses average travel speed (including delays at signals, etc.) to measure traffic operational conditions. Slower speeds indicate poorer levels-of-service (LOS).

The existing signalized intersections were analyzed using an Operational Analysis and observed field measurements. Operational analysis uses the average delay per vehicle to measure traffic operational conditions at the intersection. Longer delays per vehicle indicate poorer LOS.

The project access was analyzed using unsignalized intersection analysis. This analysis method is based on the estimated number of vehicle
turning movements which could proceed through a conflicting traffic stream. The LOS is determined by the amount of delay expected for the average vehicle desiring to cross or enter the major road. Longer delays per vehicle indicate poorer LOS.

LOS is divided into six categories ranging from LOS A to LOS F. A detailed description of LOS for urban arterials, signalized intersections, and unsignalized intersections are provided in Appendix B.

The LOS derived for arterial streets and signalized intersections are not directly comparable, since the first is based on travel speed while the second is based upon seconds of delay. Signalized intersections decrease the average speed along arterial streets by stopping traffic on the major street to allow minor street traffic to enter or cross the arterial.

Analysis Results

The results of the analysis for the morning and afternoon peak hours generally indicate that:

- Presently, King Street and Beretania Street operate at LOS D or E.
- Even without the project, there will be increased delays along King Street, Beretania Street and at the study intersections.

The results of the arterial analysis along King Street and Beretania Street are shown in Table 6, while the results of the signalized intersection analysis are shown in Table 7.
Table 6. Arterial Analysis of King Street and Beretania Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>1990 AM</th>
<th>1990 PM</th>
<th>1993 Without Project AM</th>
<th>1993 Without Project PM</th>
<th>1993 With Project AM</th>
<th>1993 With Project PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KING STREET (Between Maunakea &amp; Bethel Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound (to Honolulu)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERETANIA STREET (Between Maunakea &amp; Bethel Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound (to Ewa)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Operational Analysis for Signalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KING &amp; MAUNAKEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| KING &amp; BETHELM        |          |         |                          |                          |                      |                      |
| Eastbound             | B        | B       | B                        | B                        | B                    | B                    |
| Avg. Veh. Delay (sec) | 9.9      | 8.8     | 12.3                     | 10.6                     | 12.5                 | 10.9                 |
| Northbound (Bethel)   | C        | C       | C                        | D                        | C                    | D                    |
| Avg. Veh. Delay (sec) | 16.9     | 20.7    | 17.4                     | 26.2                     | 17.8                 | 28.7                 |
| Overall Intersection LOS | B        | B       | B                        | B                        | B                    | C                    |
| Avg. Veh. Delay (sec) | 11.0     | 11.8    | 13.0                     | 15.0                     | 13.3                 | 15.9                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th></th>
<th>1992</th>
<th></th>
<th>1992</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERETANIA &amp; MAUNAKEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Maunakea)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERETANIA &amp; SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound (Smith)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERETANIA &amp; NUUANU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound (Nuuanu)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Intersection LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Veh. Delay (sec)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arterial Streets

King Street (Between Maunakea Street and Bethel Street)

- Presently, King Street is operating at LOS D during the afternoon and at LOS E during the morning peak hour.
- By 1993 without project, King Street will operate at LOS E during both peak hours. The analysis indicates that average running speed will decrease.
- By 1993 with project, the LOS for King Street will continue to operate at LOS E during both peak hours. The analysis indicates that average running speed will decrease slightly.

Beretania Street (Between Nuuanu Avenue and Maunakea Street)

- Presently, Beretania Street is operating at LOS D during the morning and at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour.
- By 1993 without project, Beretania Street will continue to operate at LOS D and LOS E during the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively. The analysis indicates that average speed will decrease slightly.
- By 1993 with project, Beretania Street will continue to operate at LOS D and LOS E during the morning and afternoon peak hours respectively. The analysis indicates that average speed will decrease slightly.

Signalized Intersections

Intersection of King Street & Maunakea Street

- Presently, the overall operation of this intersection is LOS B during both morning and afternoon peak hours.
- By 1993 without project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B. The average delays per vehicle will increase slightly.
• By 1993 with project, the LOS for this intersection will continue to operate at LOS B. The average delays per vehicle will increase slightly.

Intersection of King Street & Bethel Street
• Presently, this intersection is operating overall at LOS B during both morning and afternoon peak hours.
• By 1993 without project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during both peak hours. Delays per vehicle will increase slightly.
• By 1993 with project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning peak hour, and at LOS C during the afternoon peak hour. Delays per vehicle will increase slightly.

Intersection of Beretania Street & Maunakea Street
• Presently, this intersection is operating overall at LOS B during both peak hours.
• By 1993 without project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning and at LOS C during the afternoon peak hour. Delays per vehicle will increase slightly.
• By 1993 with project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning peak hour and at LOS C during the afternoon. Delays per vehicle will generally remain the same.

Intersection of Beretania Street & Smith Street
• Presently, this intersection is operating overall at LOS B or better.
• By 1993 without project, the intersection will operate at LOS B during both morning and afternoon peak hours. Delays per vehicle will increase slightly.
• By 1993 with project, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning peak hour and at LOS C during the afternoon. Delays per vehicle will generally remain the same or
improve slightly during both the morning and afternoon peak hours due to changes in travel patterns resulting from the project.

*Intersection of Beretania Street & Nuuanu Avenue*

- *Presently*, this intersection is operating overall at LOS B during both peak hours.
- *By 1993 without project*, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning and at LOS C during the afternoon peak hour. Delays per vehicle will increase slightly.
- *By 1993 with project*, the intersection will continue to operate at LOS B during the morning peak hour and at LOS C during the afternoon. Delays per vehicle will generally remain the same.

*Unsignalized Intersections*

*Intersection of Beretania Street & Project Access*

- *By 1993 with project*, vehicles exiting the project access will experience little delays (LOS B) during the morning and very long delays (LOS E) during the afternoon. Drivers will experience long delays especially if they attempt to get to Beretania Street's mauka lane to turn right into Maunakea Street.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment project, when completed in 1993, will have a slight impact on traffic conditions. The project will increase delays slightly in the study area.

Presently, traffic flow through the central business district is congested during the morning and afternoon peak hours. This is due to the limited capacity of the roadway system within the CBD and the relatively large number of vehicles circulating within the area. Added vehicle delays are also caused by buses stopping to drop off passengers, pedestrians, and cars stopping to pick up or drop off passengers in the travel lane.

Our analysis and field observations of King Street indicates that traffic is presently operating near capacity, LOS E, during the morning peak hour and at LOS D in the afternoon. Arterial analysis was used to analyze a segment of King Street between Kekaulike Street and Bethel Street. The average speed to traverse this segment (which includes delays caused by stop lights, pedestrians, or other vehicles) was used to determine level-of-service (LOS).

Analysis and field observations of Beretania Street indicates that traffic is currently operating at LOS D during the morning and at LOS E during the afternoon peak hour. Beretania Street was analyzed between Bethel Street and Maunakea Street. The major cause for LOS E during the afternoon was the downstream congestion along Beretania Street, Maunakea Street and Nuuanu Street.

LOS for arterial streets and signalized intersections are not directly comparable, since the first is based on speed and the last on seconds of
delay. Signalized intersections decrease the average speed along arterial streets by stopping traffic on the major street to allow minor street traffic to enter or cross the arterial.

The signalized intersection analysis indicates that study intersections along King Street are presently operating at LOS B or better. This LOS is due to the synchronized traffic signal system along King Street as well as the four-lane one-way operation. The intersections along Beretania Street are operating overall at LOS B or better, due to the synchronization of signals and the five-lane one-way operation.

Without the project by 1993, King Street and Beretania Street will continue to operate at the same LOS as existing, except during the afternoon along King Street which will drop from LOS D to LOS E. The LOS for some of the minor street approaches at the study intersections will drop from LOS C to LOS D.

With the project, the LOS for road segments along King and Beretania Streets will remain the same as the without project case. The LOS at study intersections will remain the same except for some minor street approaches which will drop from LOS C to LOS D. Vehicles exiting the project access onto Beretania Street will operate with little delays, LOS B, during the morning peak hour. During the afternoon, drivers exiting the project will experience very long delays, LOS E, especially if they attempt to get to Beretania Street's mauka lane to turn right into Maunakea Street. The long delays are expected to occur only during the afternoon peak period. Due to the delays and weaving action caused by drivers attempting to across Beretania Street to get to Maunakea Street, we recommend that left turns exiting the project be restricted from crossing Beretania Street to turn right into Maunakea Street, during the weekday afternoon peak period, using appropriate signage and/or striping.
It is possible that the peak periods along Beretania Street and King Street will lengthen slightly as the LOS at the study intersections declines with increases in traffic resulting mostly from other projects scheduled for completion by 1993. Since the LOS without or with the project is the same, no improvements are recommended for the existing roadways serving the project traffic.
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TRIP GENERATION
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TRIP GENERATION EQUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Ind Var</th>
<th>Total Number of Trips</th>
<th>Enter</th>
<th>Exit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>AM $T = 0.50xA + 4.0$</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM $T = 0.39xA + 59.0$</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Park</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>AM $T = 2.431xA$</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM $T = 3.370xA$</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>1000 Sq Ft.</td>
<td>AM $T = 11.365xA$</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM $T = 12.302xA$</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Rise Residential Condo</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>AM $T = 0.29(A)+29.0$</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM $T = 0.34(A)+20.0$</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, Office/Retail &amp; Retail</td>
<td>1000 Sq Ft.</td>
<td>AM $T = \exp(0.86x\ln(A)+1.34)$</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM $T = \exp(0.83x\ln(A)+1.46)$</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T = \text{Total number of trips}$

$A = \text{Quantity of independent variable}$

Note: Trip generation for Commercial land use were obtained from land use Shopping Center (820), Table 1. Shopping Center Vehicle Trip Generation, of the ITE's Trip Generation, fourth edition, 1988.

Trip generation for the land use Public Parking were obtained using data from the Smith Maunakea Parking Structure.
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Definition of Level-of-Service
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Signalized Intersections,

Unsignalized Intersections,
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Urban and Suburban Arterials
DEFINITION OF LEVEL-OF-SERVICE
FOR
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

Level of service for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay. Delay is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. Specifically, level-of-service criteria are stated in terms of the average stopped delay per vehicle for a 15-minute analysis period.

Level-of-service A describes operations with very low delay, i.e., less than 5.0 sec per vehicle. This occurs when progression is extremely favorable, and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.

Level-of-service B describes operations with delay in the range of 5.1 to 15.0 sec per vehicle. This generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.

Level-of-service C describes operations with delay in the range of 15.1 to 25.0 sec per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear in this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping.

Level-of-service D describes operations with delay in the range of 25.1 to 40.0 sec per vehicle. At level D, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or a high v/c ratios (volume of cars to capacity of intersection). Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.

Level-of-service E describes operations with delay in the range of 40.1 to 60.0 sec per vehicle. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.
These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle length, and high $v/c$ ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.

Level-of-service F describes operations with delay in excess of 60.0 sec per vehicle. This is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with oversaturation, i.e., when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high $v/c$ ratios below 1.00 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.

DEFINITION OF LEVEL-OF-SERVICE
FOR
UN SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

For unsignalized intersections, the traffic most impacted will be the minor or cross-street with the stop or yield control. The major roadway will have the right-of-way. The level-of-service is the amount of delay expected for the average vehicle desiring to cross or enter the major road. The following gives a general description of the measure.

The concept of levels of service is defined as a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/or passengers. A level of service definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety.

Six levels of service are defined for each type of facility for which analysis procedures are available. They are given letter designations, from A to F, with level-of-service A representing the best operating conditions and level-of-service F the worst.

Level-of-Service definitions--In general, the various levels of service are defined as follows for uninterrupted flow facilities:

Level-of-service A represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.

Level-of-service B is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is slight decline in the freedom to
maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.

Level-of-service C is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.

Level-of-service D represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.

Level-of-service E represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuver. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.

Level-of-service F is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go wave, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion. Level-of-service F is used to describe the operating
conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of the vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow which causes the queue to form, and level-of-service F is an appropriate designation for such points.

These definitions are general and conceptual in nature, and they apply primarily to uninterrupted flow. Levels of service for interrupted flow facilities vary widely in terms of both the user's perception of service quality and the operational variables used to describe them.

DEFINITION OF LEVEL-OF-SERVICE
FOR
URBAN AND SUBURBAN ARTERIALS

The arterial level of service is based on the average travel speed for all through-vehicles along the segment, section, or entire arterial roadway under consideration. The average travel speed is computed from the running time on the arterial segments and the intersection approach delay.

There is a distinct set of arterial level-of-service values established for each arterial class. These are based on the differing expectations drivers are judged to have for the different classes or arterial roadways. In general, the arterial levels of service are based on the smooth and efficient movement of the through traffic along an entire arterial roadway. Table A-1 shown below provides a description of average travel speed and level of service by each arterial class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arterial Class</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of Free Flow Speeds (mph)</td>
<td>45 to 35</td>
<td>35 to 30</td>
<td>35 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Free Flow Speed (mph)</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>33 mph</td>
<td>27 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SERVICE</th>
<th>AVERAGE TRAVEL SPEED (mph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≥ 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>≥ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>≥ 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>≥ 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>≥ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt; 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-1. Arterial Level Of Service
**Description of Levels-of-Service**

**Level-of-service A** describes primarily free flow-operations at average travel speeds usually about 90 percent of the free flow speed for the arterial class. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Stopped delay at signalized intersections is minimal.

**Level-of-service B** represents reasonably unimpeded operations at average travel speeds usually about 70 percent of the free flow speed for the arterial class. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted and stopped delays are not bothersome. Drivers are not generally subject to appreciable tension.

**Level-of-service C** represents stable operations. However, ability to maneuver and change lanes in midblock locations may be more restricted than in LOS B, and longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average travel speeds of about 50 percent of the average free flow speed for the arterial class. Motorists will experience an appreciable tension while driving.

**Level-of-service D** borders on a range on which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in approach delay and, hence, decreases in arterial speed. This may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or some combination of these. Average travel speeds are about 40 percent of free flow speed.

**Level-of-service E** is characterized by significant approach delays and average travel speeds of one-third the free flow speed or lower. Such operations are caused by some combination or adverse progression, high signal density, extensive queuing at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.
Level-of-service F characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds below one-third to one-quarter of the free flow speed. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high approach delays resulting. Adverse progression is frequently a contributor to this condition.
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1.0 SUMMARY

The City and County of Honolulu is proposing to redevelop much of a square-block area in downtown Honolulu bounded by Smith Street, Beretania Street, Nuuanu Avenue and Pauahi Street. The 144-stall municipal parking lot and two-story building currently occupying the project site will be replaced with a 313-stall underground parking garage, a child care facility, a park and a three-story office building. Project completion is expected sometime during 1993. This study examines the present air quality of the project area and the potential air quality impacts that could result from construction and use of the proposed facilities. Mitigative measures to lessen project impacts are suggested where possible and appropriate.

Both federal and state standards have been established to control ambient air quality. At the present time, six parameters are regulated including: particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone and lead. Hawaii state air quality standards are more stringent than the comparable national limits except for the standards for sulfur dioxide. State and national standards for sulfur dioxide are the same.

Regional and local climate together with the amount and type of human activity generally dictate the air quality of a given location. The climate of downtown Honolulu is very much affected by its leeward and coastal situation. Winds are predominantly trade winds from the northeast except for occasional periods when Kona storms may generate strong winds from the south or when the trade winds are weak and landbreeze-seabreeze circulations may develop. Wind speeds typically vary between about 5 and 15 miles per hour providing relatively good ventilation much of the time.
Temperatures in the leeward Oahu area are generally very moderate with average daily temperatures ranging from about 70°F to 84°F. The extreme minimum temperature recorded at nearby Honolulu International Airport is 53°F, while the extreme maximum temperature is 94°F. Rainfall in the downtown Honolulu area can be highly variable. Monthly rainfall has been measured to vary from as little as a trace to as much as 20 inches. Average annual rainfall amounts to about 24 inches with summer months being the driest.

Air quality in the vicinity of the project is mostly affected by emissions from vehicular, industrial and/or natural sources. Beretania Street, adjacent to the project site, is a major arterial roadway that carries heavy volumes of traffic. Emissions from motor vehicles traversing Beretania Street tend to be carried over the project site by the prevailing winds. Several blocks to the southwest is the Honolulu Power Plant operated by Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO). Emissions from the two chimneys associated with this facility may presently affect the air quality of the area on occasion; however, HECO plans to close the plant sometime between 1994 and 1995. Natural sources of air pollution that may affect the air quality of the site include the ocean, plants, wind-blown dust and distant volcanoes.

The State Department of Health operates a network of air quality monitoring stations located at various places around Oahu and elsewhere in the state. Based on data from these stations, it appears likely that both state and national ambient air quality standards are currently being met in the project area except possibly for occasional exceedances of the more stringent state regulations pertaining to ambient ozone and carbon monoxide concentrations.
If the proposed project is given the necessary approvals to proceed, it is inevitable that some short- and long-term impacts on air quality will occur either directly or indirectly as a consequence of project construction and use. Short-term impacts from fugitive dust will likely occur during the project construction phase. To a lesser extent, exhaust emissions from stationary and mobile construction equipment, from the disruption of traffic, and from workers' vehicles may also affect air quality during the period of construction. State air pollution control regulations require that there be no visible fugitive dust emissions at the property line. Hence, an effective dust control plan must be implemented to ensure compliance with state regulations. Fugitive dust emissions can be controlled to a large extent by watering of active work areas, use of wind screens, preventing trucks from tracking dirt onto paved roads, and by covering of open-bodied trucks. Paving and landscaping early in the construction schedule will also reduce dust emissions. Exhaust emissions can be mitigated by moving construction equipment and workers to and from the project site during off-peak traffic hours.

After construction, long-term impacts on air quality could potentially occur indirectly as a result of emissions emanating from vehicular traffic coming to and from the development. Vehicles coming to and from the proposed project will use Beretania Street and/or King Street along with intersecting roadways running mauka-makai from the project area. To assess the impact of emissions from these vehicles, an air quality modeling study was undertaken to estimate current ambient concentrations of carbon monoxide along roadways leading to and from the project area and to predict future levels of air pollution both with and without the proposed project. Based on the modeling results, present carbon monoxide concentrations were estimated to be well within the
national 1-hour ambient air quality standard but may occasionally exceed the 8-hour national limit as well as the more stringent 1-hour and 8-hour state standards during coincident adverse traffic and meteorological conditions. Because the state standards are set at such stringent levels, it is likely that they are exceeded at many locations in the states that have even moderate traffic volumes. In the year 1993 without the project, concentrations were predicted to remain about the same or decrease slightly at most locations even though traffic is expected to increase; this is due to the effects of newer motor vehicles equipped with more efficient emission control devices. Worst-case concentration levels will continue to occasionally exceed the state standards and also the national 8-hour standard in small "hot spot" areas near congested intersections; the national 1-hour standard will continue to be met. In the 1993 with project scenario, maximum concentrations will likely be only a few percent higher compared to the without project case and vary from about 10 percent lower to about 10 percent higher (depending on location) compared to existing conditions. This assumes per the project traffic assessment report that no roadway improvements will be implemented. Due to the minimal air quality impacts from project traffic that were predicted, no measures were recommended to mitigate these emissions. After 1993, motor vehicle emissions will continue to decrease year by year on an average per vehicle basis due to older vehicles leaving the city's roadways. If the continued decrease in motor vehicle emissions exceeds the increase in traffic, air pollution levels could potentially improve in the future.

Carbon monoxide within basement parking areas will be controlled by mechanical ventilation equipment. Calculations indicate that the 1.5 cubic feet per minute of mechanical ventilation per square foot of floor space required by state design guidelines for enclosed parking garages will be more than adequate to sufficiently
dilute motor vehicle emissions within the underground parking areas. To conserve energy and if approved by government officials, carbon monoxide sensors could be used to regulate the flow of ventilation equipment. Exhaust vents should be located as far away from pedestrian areas as is practicable and so as to obtain a dilution factor of at least five to ten. Venting garage air from the roof of the proposed three-story office/retail building should dilute any emissions reaching ground level by at least a factor of about 30. Prevailing winds will carry emissions from the vent away from the park at least 90 percent of the time. Sufficient ingress/egress capacity will help to minimize air pollution from queued vehicles entering and leaving parking facilities. Emergency procedures and equipment should be provided to counter any potential problems arising from power outages and/or ventilation failure.

2.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City & County of Honolulu through the Department of Housing and Community Development is proposing to redevelop the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot and an adjacent parcel of land located on the block bounded by Beretania, Smith and Pauahi Streets in downtown Honolulu (see Figure 1). Presently, the 57,865 square foot site contains 144 parking stalls and an eating and drinking establishment all at street level. Redevelopment of the site will result in the removal of the existing facilities and the construction of a 315-stall underground parking structure, a child care center, a public park and a three-story building for retail shops and offices. Current plans call for construction work to begin during the latter part of 1991 and for the project to be completed sometime during 1993.
The purpose of this study is to describe existing air quality in the project area and to assess the potential short-term and long-term direct and indirect air quality impacts that could result from the removal of the existing facilities and the subsequent construction of the proposed development. Measures to mitigate these impacts are suggested where possible and appropriate.

3.0 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

Ambient concentrations of air pollution are regulated by both national and state ambient air quality standards (AAQS). National AAQS are specified in Section 40, Part 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), while State of Hawaii AAQS are defined in Chapter 11-59 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules. Table 1 summarizes both the national and the state AAQS that are specified in the cited documents. As indicated in the table, AAQS have been established for six air pollutants. These regulated air pollutants include: particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone and lead. National AAQS are stated in terms of primary and secondary standards. National primary standards are designed to protect the public health with an "adequate margin of safety". National secondary standards, on the other hand, define levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from "any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant". Secondary public welfare impacts may include such effects as decreased visibility, diminished comfort levels, or other potential injury to the natural or man-made environment, e.g., soiling of materials, damage to vegetation or other economic damage. In contrast to the national AAQS, Hawaii State AAQS are given in terms of a single standard that is designed "to protect public health and welfare and to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality".
Each of the regulated air pollutants has the potential to create or exacerbate some form of adverse health effect or to produce environmental degradation when present in sufficiently high concentration for prolonged periods of time. The AAQS specify a maximum allowable concentration for a given air pollutant for one or more averaging times to prevent harmful effects. Averaging times vary from one hour to one year depending on the pollutant and type of exposure necessary to cause adverse effects. In the case of the short-term (i.e., 1- to 24-hour) AAQS, both national and state standards allow one exceedance per year.

State of Hawaii AAQS are in some cases considerably more stringent than comparable national AAQS. In particular, the State of Hawaii 1-hour AAQS for carbon monoxide is four times more stringent than the comparable national limit.

Under the provisions of the Federal Clean Air Act [1], the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is required to periodically review and re-evaluate national AAQS in light of research findings more recent than those which were available at the time the standards were originally set. Occasionally new standards are created as well. Most recently, the national standard for particulate matter has been revised to include specific limits for particulates 10 microns or less in diameter (PM-10) [2]. The State of Hawaii has not explicitly addressed the question of whether to set limits for this category of air pollutant, but national AAQS prevail where states have not set their own more stringent levels.

Hawaii AAQS for sulfur dioxide were relaxed in 1986 to make them essentially the same as national limits. It has been proposed in
various forums that the state also relax its carbon monoxide standards to the national levels, but at present there are no indications that such a change is being considered.

4.0 REGIONAL AND LOCAL CLIMATOLOGY

Regional and local climatology significantly affect the air quality of a given location. Wind, temperature, atmospheric turbulence, mixing height and rainfall all influence air quality. Although the climate of Hawaii is relatively moderate throughout most of the state and most of the year, significant differences in these parameters may occur from one location to another. Most differences in regional and local climates within the state are caused by the mountainous topography.

Hawaii lies well within the belt of northeasterly trade winds generated by the semi-permanent Pacific high pressure cell to the north and east. On the island of Oahu, the Koolau and Waianae Mountain Ranges are oriented almost perpendicular to the trade winds, which accounts for much of the variation in the local climatology of the island. Downtown Honolulu, the site of the proposed project, is located in a coastal area leeward of the Koolau Mountains. Although large urban areas may create their own microclimates to some extent, long-term weather data available from the Honolulu International Airport, located about 4 miles to the northwest, is at least semi-representative of the project site.

Wind frequency data given in Table 2 for Honolulu International Airport show that the annual prevailing wind direction for this area of Oahu is east northeast. On an annual basis, 34.7 percent of the time the wind is from this direction, and nearly 75 percent
of the time the wind is in the northeast quadrant. Winds from the south are infrequent occurring only a few days during the year and mostly in winter in association with Kona storms. Wind speeds average about 10 knots (12 mph) and mostly vary between about 5 and 15 knots (6 and 17 mph). Surface winds in downtown Honolulu are similar to those recorded at the airport but are undoubtedly deviated and channeled at some locations by the many high-rise buildings.

Air pollution emissions from motor vehicles, the formation of photochemical smog and smoke plume rise all depend in part on air temperature. Colder temperatures tend to result in higher emissions of contaminants from automobiles but lower concentrations of photochemical smog and ground-level concentrations of air pollution from elevated plumes. In Hawaii, the annual and daily variation of temperature depend to a large degree on elevation above sea level, distance inland and exposure to the trade winds. Average temperatures at locations near sea level generally are warmer than those at higher elevations. Areas exposed to the trade wind tend to have the least temperature variation, while inland and leeward areas often have the most. Downtown Honolulu's coastal, leeward location results in a relatively moderate temperature profile compared to other locations around Oahu and the state. At the airport, average annual daily minimum and maximum temperatures are 70°F and 84°F, respectively [3]. The extreme minimum temperature was 53°F during February 1983, and the extreme maximum was 94°F during September 1988. Temperatures in the downtown area may be slightly higher compared to the airport due to urban effects.

Small scale, random motions in the atmosphere (turbulence) cause air pollutants to be dispersed as a function of distance or time from the point of emission. Turbulence is caused by both mechan-
ical and thermal forces in the atmosphere. It is often measured and described in terms of Pasquill-Gifford stability class. Stability class 1 is the most turbulent and class 6 the least. Thus, air pollution dissipates the best during stability class 1 conditions and the worst when stability class 6 prevails. In urbanized areas like downtown Honolulu, stability class 4 is generally the highest stability class that occurs, developing during the nighttime and/or during cloudy or windy daytime conditions.

Mixing height is defined as the height above the surface through which relatively vigorous vertical mixing occurs. Low mixing heights can result in high ground-level air pollution concentrations because contaminants emitted from or near the surface can become trapped within the mixing layer. In Hawaii, minimum mixing heights tend to be high because of mechanical mixing caused by the trade winds and because of the temperature moderating effect of the surrounding ocean. Low mixing heights may sometimes occur, however, at inland locations and even at times along coastal areas early in the morning following a clear, cool, windless night. Coastal areas also may experience low mixing levels during sea breeze conditions when cooler ocean air rushes in over warmer land. Mixing heights in the state typically are above 3000 feet (1000 meters). Low mixing heights in the downtown Honolulu area will tend to be inhibited by urban effects but may occur on occasion.

Rainfall can have a beneficial effect on the air quality of an area in that it helps to suppress fugitive dust emissions, and it also may "washout" gaseous contaminants that are water soluble. Rainfall in Hawaii is highly variable depending on elevation and on location with respect to the trade wind. Downtown Honolulu being a leeward location and near sea level experiences a rela-
tively dry climate. Average annual rainfall amounts to about 24 inches with summer months being the driest. Monthly rainfall may vary from as little as a trace to more than 20 inches.

5.0 PRESENT AIR QUALITY

Present air quality in the project area is mostly affected by air pollutants from vehicular, industrial and/or natural sources, and perhaps to a lesser and occasional extent from distant agricultural sources. Table 3 presents an air pollutant emission summary for the City and County of Honolulu that was compiled in 1980. These are the latest data that are available. Emissions are undoubtedly higher at this time, but the proportional relationships may continue to be about the same. The mineral products industry was the most significant source category for emissions of particulate matter. Sulfur dioxide emissions originated mainly from power plants, while motor vehicles accounted for much of the emissions of nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons.

North Beretania Street, adjacent to the project site, is a major arterial roadway that carries heavy motor vehicle traffic much of the time. Emissions from motor vehicles using this roadway, primarily nitrogen oxides and carbon monoxide, will tend to be carried over the project site by the prevailing winds. Congested traffic conditions occur throughout much of the area during peak morning and afternoon traffic periods.

The only major industrial source of air pollution located near the project site (several blocks to the southwest) is the Honolulu Power Plant operated by Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO). This steam-electric generating facility consists of two units fueled by
low sulfur oil. Existing air quality in the project vicinity may occasionally be affected by nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide emissions from the boiler chimneys, although most of the time the prevailing winds carry emissions from the plant out to sea. At the present time, HECO plans to close down this facility in the 1994-95 timeframe with no plans for replacement.

Natural sources of air pollution emissions that also could affect the project area but cannot be quantified very accurately include the ocean (sea spray), plants (aero-allergens), wind-blown dust, and perhaps distant volcanoes on the Island of Hawaii.

The State Department of Health operates a network of air quality monitoring stations at various locations on Oahu. Each station, however, typically does not monitor the full complement of air quality parameters. Table 4 shows annual summaries of air quality measurements that were made nearest to the project site for each of the regulated air pollutants for the period 1985 through 1989.

Sulfur dioxide is monitored by the State Department of Health at an air quality station located in Campbell Industrial Park at Barbers Point, several miles west of the project site. Monitoring consisted of measurements of 24-hour average sulfur dioxide concentration every sixth day. There were no exceedances of the state/national 24-hour AAQS for sulfur dioxide during the 5-year period. Concentrations monitored during the last 4 years reported were consistently low with daily mean values at or below 5 μg/m³.

Total suspended particulate concentrations were monitored at the Department of Health Building in downtown Honolulu, just a few
blocks south of the project site. During the 1985-89 reporting period, the highest 24-hour average total suspended particulate concentration measured was 61 μg/m³. Average daily concentrations were about 25 to 30 μg/m³. No exceedances of the state AAQS for this parameter were recorded.

The nearest PM-10 monitoring station is located about one-half mile northeast of the project site at Kauluwela School. Twenty-four hour average PM-10 concentrations monitored at this location ranged from 7 to 52 μg/m³ between 1985 and 1989. Average daily concentrations were generally less than 20 μg/m³. All values reported were within the national AAQS.

The nearest carbon monoxide measurements were made at the Department of Health building in downtown Honolulu. The average daily maximum 1-hour concentration measured at this location was about 2 mg/m³. During the most recent year reported, 1989, the daily maximum 1-hour concentration ranged from 0.3 to 7.8 mg/m³, and no exceedances of the state 1-hour AAQS were recorded. During previous years (1985-88), maximum 1-hour concentrations were higher, and one to three exceedances of the state 1-hour AAQS were measured each year. Daily maximum 8-hour values for 1988 and 1989 have not been reported at this writing, but concentrations for the 1985-87 period ranged from 0.1 to 4.7 mg/m³. The average of the daily maximum 8-hour values was about 1.3 mg/m³. No exceedances of the state 8-hour AAQS were recorded. Present concentrations of carbon monoxide in the project area are estimated later in this study based on air quality modeling of vehicular emissions.

The nearest available ozone measurements were obtained at Sand Island (about 3/4 mile west of the project site). Except for 1985,
the maximum 1-hour concentration each year during the past few years has averaged about 90 µg/m³. No exceedances of the state AAQS have been recorded since 1985.

The closest and most recent measurements of ambient lead concentrations that have been reported were made at the downtown Honolulu monitoring station between 1985 and 1987. Lead concentrations at this location had a downward trend, most probably reflecting the increased use of unleaded gasoline. Average quarterly concentrations were near or below the detection limit. No exceedances of the state AAQS have ever been recorded.

Nitrogen dioxide is no longer monitored by the Department of Health anywhere in the state. Concentrations of this pollutant were measured from 1971 through 1976 at Barbers Point, and annual mean values were found to vary from 11 to 29 µg/m³, safely inside the state and national AAQS.

Based on the data and discussion presented above, it appears likely that the State of Hawaii AAQS for particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and lead are currently being met at the project site. The ozone AAQS has not been exceeded during the past four years at the Sand Island monitoring station. Carbon monoxide readings from urban Honolulu indicate that the state AAQS for carbon monoxide may be exceeded at a rate of one to three times per year in traffic congested areas.
6.0 SHORT-TERM IMPACTS OF PROJECT

Short-term direct and indirect impacts on air quality could potentially occur due to project construction. For a project of this nature, there are two potential types of air pollution emissions that could directly result in short-term air quality impacts during project construction: (1) fugitive dust from demolition work and from vehicle movement and soil excavation; and (2) exhaust emissions from on-site construction equipment. Indirectly, there also could be short-term impacts from slow-moving construction equipment traveling to and from the project site and from a temporary increase in local traffic caused by commuting construction workers.

Fugitive dust emissions may arise from the demolition and removal of existing structures on the site and from the grading and dirt-moving activities associated with site preparation once the area is cleared. The emission rate for fugitive dust emissions from construction activities is difficult to estimate accurately because of its elusive nature of emission and because the potential for its generation varies greatly depending upon the type of soil at the construction site, the amount and type of dirt-disturbing activity taking place, the moisture content of exposed soil in work areas, and the wind speed. The EPA [4] has provided a rough estimate for uncontrolled fugitive dust emissions from construction activity of 1.2 tons per acre per month under conditions of "medium" activity, moderate soil silt content (30%), and precipitation/evaporation (P/E) index of 50. Uncontrolled fugitive dust emissions in the project area would likely be somewhat higher because the PE index for the downtown Honolulu area is probably less than 50 due to the relatively dry climate. In any case, State of Hawaii Air Pollution Control Regulations [5] prohibit visible emissions of fugitive dust from construction activities at the
property line. Thus, an effective dust control plan for the project construction phase is essential.

Adequate fugitive dust control can usually be accomplished by the establishment of a frequent watering program to keep demolition areas and bare-dirt surfaces in construction areas from becoming significant dust generators. Using wind screens may also be required. Control regulations further stipulate that open-bodied trucks be covered at all times when in motion if they are transporting materials likely to give rise to airborne dust. Haul trucks tracking dirt onto paved streets from unpaved areas is oftentimes a significant source of dust in construction areas. Some means to alleviate this problem, such as tire washing, may be appropriate. Paving of parking areas and/or establishment of landscaping as early in the construction process as possible can also lower the potential for fugitive dust emissions.

On-site mobile and stationary construction equipment also will emit air pollutants from engine exhausts. The largest of this equipment is usually diesel-powered. Nitrogen oxides emissions from diesel engines can be relatively high compared to gasoline-powered equipment, but the standard for nitrogen dioxide is set on an annual basis and is not likely to be violated by short-term construction equipment emissions. Carbon monoxide emissions from diesel engines, on the other hand, are low and should be relatively insignificant compared to vehicular emissions on nearby roadways.

Indirectly, slow-moving construction vehicles on roadways leading to and from the project site could obstruct the normal flow of traffic to such an extent that overall vehicular emissions are increased, but this impact can be mitigated by moving heavy
construction equipment during periods of low traffic volume. Likewise, the schedules of commuting construction workers can be adjusted to avoid peak hours in the project vicinity. Thus, most potential short-term air quality impacts from project construction can be mitigated.

7.0 LONG-TERM IMPACTS OF PROJECT

7.1 Roadway Traffic

By serving as an attraction for increased motor vehicle traffic on nearby roadways, the proposed project is considered to be an indirect air pollution source. Motor vehicles with gasoline-powered engines are significant sources of carbon monoxide. They also emit nitrogen oxides, and those burning leaded gasoline contribute lead to the atmosphere. The use of leaded gasoline in new automobiles is now prohibited. As older vehicles continue to disappear from the numbers of those currently operating on the state’s roadways, lead emissions are approaching zero. Nationally, so few vehicles now require leaded gasoline that the EPA is proposing a total ban on leaded gasoline to take effect immediately. Even without such a ban, reported quarterly averages of lead in air samples collected in urban Honolulu have been near zero since early 1986. Thus, lead in the atmosphere is not considered to be a problem anywhere in the state.

Federal air pollution control regulations require that new motor vehicles be equipped with emission control devices that reduce emissions significantly compared to a few years ago. Although the recently adopted Clean Air Act of 1990 passed by Congress does not require further reductions in carbon monoxide emissions, the current emission standard for new vehicles will lower carbon
monoxide emissions on a per vehicle basis by about 30 percent on the average by the year 1995 compared to the amounts now emitted due to the replacement of older vehicles with newer models. The new Clean Air Act of 1990 does, however, mandate that hydrocarbon emissions be cut by 40 percent and nitrogen oxides emissions be reduced by 60 percent over the amounts now permitted. Alternative-fueled cars and cleaner burning blends of gasoline are also required by the new law in cities with chronic air pollution problems.

To evaluate the potential long-term indirect air quality impact of increased roadway traffic associated with a project such as this, computerized emission and atmospheric dispersion models can be used to estimate ambient carbon monoxide concentrations along roadways leading to and from the project. Carbon monoxide is selected for modeling because it is both the most stable and the most abundant of the pollutants generated by motor vehicles. Furthermore, carbon monoxide air pollution is generally considered to be a microscale problem, whereas nitrogen oxides air pollution most often is a regional issue. This is reflected in the fact that the AAQS for carbon monoxide are specified on a short-term basis (1-hour and 8-hour averaging times) while the AAQS for nitrogen dioxide is set on an annual basis.

For this project, three scenarios were selected for the carbon monoxide modeling study: year 1991 with present conditions, year 1993 without the project, and year 1993 assuming the project is built and complete. To begin the modeling study, critical receptor areas in the vicinity of the project were identified for analysis. Generally speaking, roadway intersections are the primary concern because of traffic congestion and because of the increase in
vehicular emissions associated with traffic queuing. For this study, the four key intersections identified in the traffic study [6] were also selected for air quality analysis. These include: Beretania Street at Nuuanu Avenue, Beretania Street at Maunakea Street, King Street at Maunakea Street and King Street at Bethel Street. The traffic impact assessment report for the project describes the present and future conditions and configurations of these intersections in detail.

The main objectives of the modeling study were to estimate both current and projected levels of maximum 1-hour average carbon monoxide concentrations that could then be directly compared to the national and state AAQS. The traffic impact assessment report indicates that traffic volumes generally are or will be higher during the afternoon peak hour than during the morning peak period at most locations within the project area. Worst-case emission and meteorological dispersion conditions typically occur during the morning hours at many locations. However, due to possible effects from the queuing of vehicles at intersections and to vehicle cold-start considerations, both morning and afternoon peak traffic hours were examined to ensure that worst-case concentrations were identified.

The EPA computer model MOBILE4 [7] was used to calculate vehicular carbon monoxide emissions for each year studied. One of the key inputs to MOBILE4 is vehicle mix. Based on recent vehicle registration figures, the present and projected vehicle mix in the project area is estimated to be 91.9% light-duty gasoline-powered vehicles, 5% light-duty gasoline-powered trucks and vans, 0.5% heavy-duty gasoline-powered vehicles, 0.6% light-duty diesel-powered vehicles, 1% heavy-duty diesel-powered trucks and buses, and 1% motorcycles.
Other key inputs to the MOBILE4 emission model are the cold/hot start fractions. Motor vehicles operating in a cold- or hot-start mode emit excess air pollution. Typically, motor vehicles reach stabilized operating temperatures after about 4 miles of driving. For traffic operating within the project area, it was assumed that during the morning peak hour about 25 percent of all vehicles would be operating in the cold-start mode and that about 5 percent would be operating in the hot-start mode. During the afternoon peak hour, the cold/hot start percentages were assumed to be 50 percent and 10 percent, respectively. These operational mode values were estimated based on a report from the California Department of Transportation [8] and taking into consideration the likely different origins of morning/afternoon traffic in the project area. MOBILE4 idle emissions were adjusted to account for excess cold/hot-start emissions per a recent U.S. EPA memorandum [9].

Ambient temperatures of 59 and 68 degrees F were used for morning and afternoon peak-hour emission computations, respectively. These are conservative assumptions since morning/afternoon ambient temperatures will generally be warmer than this and emission estimates given by MOBILE4 are inversely proportional to the ambient temperature.

After computing vehicular carbon monoxide emissions through the use of MOBILE4, these data were then input to the latest version of the computer model CALINE4 [10]. CALINE4 was developed by the California Transportation Department to simulate vehicular movement and atmospheric dispersion of vehicular emissions. It is designed to predict 1-hour average pollutant concentrations along roadways.
based on input traffic and emission data, roadway/receptor geometry and meteorological conditions.

Input peak-hour traffic data were obtained from the traffic study cited previously. The traffic volumes given in the traffic study for the future scenarios include project traffic as well as traffic from other growth that is expected to occur in the area by the year 1993. Traffic queuing estimates were made based on the project traffic study, Transportation Research Board procedures [11], U.S. EPA guidelines [12], and traffic observations at the subject intersections. Vehicle speeds were assumed to be limited to 25 mph either due to posted speed limits or to congested traffic conditions. Deceleration and acceleration times of 10 and 12 seconds, respectively, were assumed.

Model roadways were set up to reflect actual roadway geometry, physical dimensions and operating characteristics. Pedestrian walkways in the project area are located very close to the traveled roadways as is typical of central business district locations. Thus, model receptor sites were located approximately 1 to 2 meters from the edge of the roadways near the intersections studied. All receptor heights were placed at 1.5 meters above ground to simulate levels within the normal human breathing zone.

Within the downtown Honolulu area, street canyons have been created at several locations by the construction of many low- and high-rise buildings close to the streets. This results in channeling of the wind at street level and may reduce the dispersion of air pollutants emitted by motor vehicles traversing the area. To account for this, CALINE4 was executed both with and without the street canyon option at the intersections where street canyons are formed,
and the higher of the two predicted concentrations was used as the final result.

Input meteorological conditions for this study were defined to provide "worst-case" results. One of the key meteorological inputs is atmospheric stability category. For these analyses, atmospheric stability category 4 was assumed for both morning and afternoon cases. This is the most conservative stability category that can be used for estimating pollutant dispersion in urban locations. A surface roughness length of 300 cm was assumed with a mixing height of 300 meters. Worst-case wind conditions were defined as a wind speed of 1 meter per second with a wind direction resulting in the highest predicted concentration.

Existing background concentrations of carbon monoxide in the project vicinity are believed to be at moderate levels. Hence, background contributions of carbon monoxide from sources or distant roadways not directly considered in the analysis were accounted for by adding a background concentration of 1 ppm to all predicted concentrations for both the 1991 and the 1993 scenarios.

Table 5 summarizes the final results of the modeling study in the form of the estimated worst-case 1-hour morning and afternoon ambient carbon monoxide concentrations. These results can be compared directly to the state and the national AAQS. Estimated worst-case carbon monoxide concentrations are presented in the table for three scenarios: year 1991 with existing traffic, year 1993 without project traffic and year 1993 with project traffic. The locations of these estimated worst-case 1-hour concentrations all occurred at or very near the indicated intersections.
As indicated in the table, worst-case concentrations for the present year within the project vicinity were estimated to be higher during the afternoon than during the morning at most locations. This is due partly to cold-start considerations and partly to the difference in morning/afternoon traffic patterns. Traffic volumes along Beretania Street are much higher during the afternoon peak hour, while morning and afternoon King Street traffic volumes are about the same. The estimated present (1991) highest worst-case 1-hour carbon monoxide concentration in the project area, 25.5 mg/m$^3$, occurs during the afternoon near the intersection of Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. Worst-case 1-hour values at other locations in the project vicinity for the 1991 scenario ranged from 12.0 to 23.8 mg/m$^3$. One note of interest is the large difference between worst-case morning concentrations along King Street. Concentrations are predicted to be much lower at Bethel Street compared to those at Maunakea Street. This is due to the synchronization of the traffic signals along King Street which results in reduced queuing at the King/Bethel intersection.

In the year 1993 without the proposed project, a worst-case 1-hour concentration of 22.4 mg/m$^3$ was predicted to occur during the afternoon peak-traffic hour near the intersection of Beretania and Maunakea Streets. Concentrations near this level also can be expected to occur in the vicinity of Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue during the afternoon. Morning concentrations near these two intersections were estimated to be about half the afternoon values. Peak morning and afternoon worst-case values at the other locations studied for the 1993 without project scenario ranged between about 12 and 20 mg/m$^3$. Compared to the 1991 scenario, concentrations are estimated to decrease slightly or remain about the same.
Predicted 1-hour worst-case concentrations for the 1993 with project scenario ranged from 13.1 mg/m$^3$ during the morning at King and Bethel Streets to 22.9 mg/m$^3$ during the afternoon at Beretania and Maunakea Streets. Compared to the without project case, predicted worst-case concentrations were generally only slightly higher. Compared to the existing case, predicted concentrations with the project range from about 10 percent lower to about 10 percent higher depending on location.

All estimated worst-case 1-hour carbon monoxide levels for all scenarios are within the national AAQS of 40 mg/m$^3$. It appears likely, however, that existing concentrations of carbon monoxide as well as future concentrations either without or with the project may exceed the State of Hawaii 1-hour AAQS of 10 mg/m$^3$ on occasion at several locations in the project area.

Worst-case 8-hour carbon monoxide concentrations were estimated by multiplying the worst-case 1-hour values by a persistence factor of 0.5. This accounts for two factors: (1) traffic volumes averaged over eight hours are lower than peak 1-hour values, and (2) meteorological dispersion conditions are more variable (and hence more favorable) over an 8-hour period than they are for a single hour. Based on monitoring data, 1-hour to 8-hour persistence factors for most locations generally vary from 0.4 to 0.8 with 0.6 being the most typical. One recent study based on modeling [13] concluded that 1-hour to 8-hour persistence factors could typically be expected to range from 0.4 to 0.5. EPA guidelines [12] recommend using a value of 0.6 to 0.7 unless a locally derived persistence factor is available. Recent monitoring data for Honolulu reported by the Department of Health [14] suggests that this factor may range between about 0.35 and 0.55
depending on location and traffic variability. Considering the location of the project and the traffic pattern for the area, a 1-hour to 8-hour persistence factor of 0.5 is probably most appropriate for this application.

The resulting estimated worst-case 8-hour concentrations are indicated in Table 6. For the 1991 scenario, the estimated worst-case 8-hour carbon monoxide concentration was 12.8 mg/m$^3$ at the intersection of Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. Other locations ranged downward from 11.9 mg/m$^3$ near Beretania Street at Maunakea Street to 9.0 mg/m$^3$ near King Street at Bethel Street. The predicted maximum values for the year 1993 without and with project scenarios were 11.2 and 11.4 mg/m$^3$, respectively; both occurred at the Beretania Street/Maunakea Street intersection. Other locations studied were generally in the 9 to 11 mg/m$^3$ range with or without the project. Either with or without the project, 1993 concentrations should be about the same or lower than existing concentrations. Comparing the predicted values for the existing case to the AAQS, it appears that both the state and the national 8-hour standard may be exceeded occasionally at several locations in the project vicinity. In 1993 with or without the project, worst-case concentrations will likely continue to exceed the state and the national 8-hour AAQS on occasion.

The results of this study reflect several assumptions that must be made concerning traffic movement and worst-case meteorological conditions. One such assumption concerning worst-case meteorological conditions is that a wind speed of 1 meter per second with a steady direction for 1 hour will occur. A steady wind of 1 meter per second blowing from a single direction for an hour is not very likely and may occur only once a year or less. With wind speeds
of 2 meters per second, for example, computed carbon monoxide concentrations would be only about one-half the values given above.

7.2 Parking Facilities

The existing parking lot currently located on the project site has a capacity of 144 stalls. Traffic ingress/egress for the public is via Smith Street, and a service entrance is provided on Pauahi Street. One hundred twenty-nine of the parking stalls are metered, and the remainder are reserved for the Smith Beretania Apartments.

The proposed redevelopment project provides for the replacement of the current 144 parking stalls while adding an additional 169 parking spaces for a total parking capacity of 313 stalls. The proposed parking facility will consist of two levels of basement parking which will underlie the proposed park and child care facility located at street level. Traffic will both enter and exit the parking facility from Beretania Street.

Although there are no specific air pollution standards pertaining to underground parking structures, the State Department of Health specifies ventilation design guidelines for enclosed parking garages in Chapter 11-39 of the Hawaii Administrative Rules. These guidelines require that each level of an enclosed parking structure be mechanically vented unless: (1) more than half the wall area is open along at least 40 percent of the perimeter; (2) there are no employees who normally work in the space; and (3) there is adequate natural ventilation. Mechanical ventilation equipment, either supply or exhaust, must provide a minimum of 1.50 cubic feet per minute (cfm) of outdoor air per square foot of space over the entire floor area. (These are the design criteria also currently
recommended by the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) for ventilating parking garages [15]. At locations where traffic congestion may occur, such as at exits, more ventilation capacity is required.

The state design guidelines referenced above also specify that an engineered system may be employed using the formula:

\[ Q = \frac{K \cdot n}{C} \]

where,

- \( Q \) = exhaust ventilation rate (cfm)
- \( K = 1,380,000 \)
- \( n \) = number of cars running at one instant
- \( C \) = allowable concentration (ppm)

For engineered systems, \( C \) must be selected with regard to the "threshold limit value" for carbon monoxide and as approved by the Director of the Department of Health.

Threshold Limit Values (TLVs) are set by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) and pertain to the air within the industrial workplace [16]. The ACGIH TLV for carbon monoxide is stated in terms of a time-weighted average (TWA) concentration of 55 mg/m\(^3\) (50 ppm) for an 8-hour period (40 hours per week). A TLV short-term exposure limit (STEL) of 440 mg/m\(^3\) (400 ppm) is also specified for a 15-minute period. Thus, compared to the state and the national AAQS (see Table 1), the ACGIH TLVs for carbon monoxide are much less restrictive.

The formula given above pertaining to the design of ventilation systems for enclosed parking facilities was promulgated in January
1983 when the state rule for air conditioning and ventilating was established. Motor vehicles in the 1990's emit less carbon monoxide on the average than they did during the early 1980's when this rule was adopted. Thus, use of this formula for designing parking garage ventilation systems for today's or future facilities probably will result in overly conservative ventilation requirements.

In 1993 when the proposed project will be complete, motor vehicles will emit a maximum of about 14 grams per minute each of carbon monoxide while idling or operating at low speeds in the parking garage in the cold-start mode. This assumes an ambient temperature of 59°F. Because Honolulu's average minimum temperature is 70°F and since emissions are inversely proportional to ambient temperature, cold-start emissions will usually be lower. Motor vehicles typically reach stabilized operating temperatures within about 7 to 8 minutes after a cold start. After reaching stabilized temperatures, emissions will amount to about 3 grams per minute per vehicle on the average. Shown in Table 7 are the estimated worst-case 15-minute average concentrations that will occur in the underground parking garage assuming that 1.5 cubic feet per minute (cfm) of outdoor air per square foot of space is provided. Worst-case concentration estimates assume that 25 percent of the capacity of the parking level operates continuously with 100 percent of the vehicles in the cold-start mode. As indicated in the table, worst-case concentrations within the project's underground parking facility are estimated not to exceed 232 mg/m³ on the first level and 256 mg/m³ on the second level. Thus, worst-case carbon monoxide levels within the underground parking facility should be well below the TLV-STEEL (440 mg/m³) even with the minimum required ventilation.
To comply with the state design guidelines as well as to provide an adequate margin of safety, a minimum ventilation capacity of 1.50 cubic feet per minute per square foot of floor space should be provided within the proposed underground parking facility. However, as suggested by ASHRAE and if approved by the Department of Health, carbon monoxide sensors could be used to reduce ventilation rates during inactive periods and thereby decrease energy consumption while maintaining carbon monoxide concentrations below the TLV-STEL.

Any air vented from the underground parking garage that impacts public areas will be subject to state and national AAQS. Exhaust vents should be located as far away from pedestrian areas as is practicable and so as to obtain a dilution factor of at least five to ten. Present project plans call for air from the underground parking garage to be exhausted from the roof of the proposed three-story retail/office building. With the park located to the northwest of the vent as planned, prevailing winds in the area will carry the vented emissions away from the proposed park more than 90 percent of the time. The highest concentrations occurring at ground level from the vented emissions will likely occur during periods of moderate to high wind speeds when an aerodynamic wake forms on the lee side of the building and the vented emissions are nearly completely drawn into the building wake. This phenomenon is called building downwash. Studies of roof-vented emissions from short, squat buildings like that of the proposed project show that a dilution factor of at least 30 can typically be expected at ground level during building downwash conditions [17]. As indicated above, the maximum concentration at the vent will be about 250 mg/m$^3$ if 1.5 cubic foot of air per minute per square foot of floor space is provided. Thus, with a dilution ratio of 30, emissions from the roof vent will contribute a maximum of about 8 mg/m$^3$ to the ground level concentration. Other nearby sources
may also contribute to the total concentration, but under the moderate to high wind conditions during which building downwash occurs, the contribution from other sources will likely be small. Hence, it is possible roof-vented carbon monoxide emissions could contribute to the exceedance of the state 1-hour AAQS (10mg/m$^3$) along the sidewalks nearby, but it is unlikely these emissions will cause exceedance of the national 1-hour AAQS (40mg/m$^3$).

It should be noted that the estimated concentrations given in Table 7 pertain to the year 1993. In future years, concentrations will decrease as more and more older model vehicles are retired from the fleet. It also should be noted that the number of parking stalls, floor space and ventilation rates shown in the table are preliminary estimates and are subject to modification. However, it is unlikely that these figures will change significantly in the final design.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

The major short-term air quality impact will be the potential emission of significant quantities of fugitive dust during project construction. Uncontrolled fugitive dust emissions from construction activities can amount to about 1.2 tons per acre per month. Dust control measures required by state law will substantially reduce uncontrolled emissions. During construction phases, emissions from engine exhausts (primarily consisting of carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides) will also occur both from on-site construction equipment and from vehicles used by construction workers traveling to and from the project.
After the proposed development is constructed, potential long-term air pollution impacts from the project will arise from the increased motor vehicle traffic associated with project operations. Potential increased levels of carbon monoxide concentrations along roadways leading to and from the proposed development and from and within the underground parking structure itself will be the primary concerns. Based on mathematical modeling of vehicular traffic in the area and on atmospheric dispersion estimates of vehicular emissions, it is concluded that existing concentrations along sidewalks in the project vicinity may occasionally exceed both state and national AAQS due to congested traffic conditions. Without the project in 1993, worst-case air pollution concentrations will likely remain about the same or decrease slightly compared to the current year. If the project is built, maximum concentrations in 1993 will range from about 10 percent lower to about 10 percent higher than 1991 levels. With or without the project, 1993 worst-case carbon monoxide concentrations will likely continue to exceed the state 1-hour standard on occasion while meeting the national 1-hour limit. Continued exceedance of both state and national 8-hour standards may occur at some locations with or without the project. Sometime beyond 1993 either with or without the project, compliance with both 1-hour and 8-hour national standards may be achieved due to the attrition of older model vehicles, but the state standards will likely continue to be exceeded. The state standards are set so low, however, they are probably exceeded at many intersections in the state that have even moderate traffic volumes. It is worth noting here that, although the national AAQS allow higher levels of carbon monoxide, the national standards were developed after extensive research with the objective of defining levels of air quality that would protect the public health with an adequate margin of safety.
Carbon monoxide concentrations within the basement parking facilities will be well within safe levels if the prescribed 1.5 cubic feet per minute of mechanical ventilation per square foot of floor space is provided. Air circulated through the parking garage and vented from the roof of the office/retail building associated with the project will be carried away from the proposed park area more than 90 percent of the time by the prevailing winds. On windy days, an aerodynamic wake will likely form on the lee side of the building causing the vented emissions to be mixed down to the ground. During such conditions, emissions from the vent will be diluted by a factor of at least 30 at street level. Even so, these emissions may contribute to the exceedance of the state AAQS along adjacent sidewalk areas, but groundlevel concentrations during such conditions will not exceed the national standards.

9.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Strict compliance with State of Hawaii Air Pollution Control Regulations regarding establishment of a regular dust-watering program and covering of dirt-hauling trucks will be required to effectively mitigate fugitive dust emissions from construction activities. Twice daily watering is estimated to reduce dust emissions by up to 50 percent. Efforts should be made to minimize the tracking of dirt onto adjacent paved streets by trucks leaving the construction site. Paving of parking areas and establishment of landscaping early in the construction schedule will also help to control dust. Increased vehicular emissions due to disruption of traffic by construction equipment and/or commuting construction workers can be alleviated by moving equipment and personnel to the site during off-peak traffic hours.
Options available to mitigate traffic-related air pollution are to improve roadways, reduce traffic or reduce individual vehicular emissions. Estimates of carbon monoxide concentrations from emissions emanating from vehicular traffic associated with the completed development discussed earlier in this report include any roadway improvements recommended in the traffic impact study for the project. In this case, no roadway improvements were recommended by the traffic consultants because they were either deemed unnecessary or infeasible. Although carbon monoxide concentrations in the project area may exceed ambient air quality standards on occasion, estimated impacts from project traffic are minimal. Thus, no mitigation measures are recommended.

Carbon monoxide concentrations within the underground parking structure can be minimized by providing adequate mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation capacity conforming to ASHRAE standards will amply mitigate air pollution within the basement parking levels. Exhaust air from the mechanical ventilation system should be vented away from pedestrian areas and so as to avoid recirculation within the garage. Venting the air from the roof of the proposed office/retail building as planned should provide the most plausible means to mitigate against any impacts. Use of contaminant sensors within the parking garage to monitor air pollution concentrations and to control ventilation equipment will also lessen the potential for air quality problems and at the same time will conserve energy. Sufficient ingress/egress capacity to permit rapid entry and exit will further lessen air pollution impacts both within and adjacent to the facility. As an extra mitigative measure, emergency procedures and equipment should be provided to counter potential problems arising from power outages and/or ventilation failure.
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Figure 1. Project Location Map
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Maximum Allowable Concentration</th>
<th>National Primary</th>
<th>National Secondary</th>
<th>State of Hawaii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulate Matter</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>60ᵃ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150ᵇ</td>
<td>150ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matterᶜ</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>150ᵇ</td>
<td>150ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>365ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hours</td>
<td>365ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>365ᵇ</td>
<td>1300ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1300ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1300ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>mg/m³</td>
<td>8 Hours</td>
<td>10ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>40ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>235ᵇ</td>
<td>235ᵇ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>μg/m³</td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃGeometric mean
ᵇNot to be exceeded more than once per year
ᶜParticles less than or equal to 10 microns aerodynamic diameter
Table 2

ANNUAL WIND FREQUENCY FOR HONOLULU INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind Direction</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>11-16</th>
<th>17-21</th>
<th>22-27</th>
<th>28-33</th>
<th>34-40</th>
<th>&gt;=40</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSW</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNW</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Particulate</th>
<th>Sulfur Oxides</th>
<th>Nitrogen Oxides</th>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Hydrocarbons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steam Electric Power Plants</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>36,736</td>
<td>12,455</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Utilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Combustion in Agricultural Industry</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery Industry</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>7,096</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical Industries</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Products Industry</td>
<td>6,884</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Incineration</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>17,270</td>
<td>239,198</td>
<td>22,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Farm and Industrial Vehicles</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>5,594</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Field Burning</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,982</td>
<td>1,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>48,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>266,367</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,757</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Health
### Table 4
ANNUAL SUMMARIES OF AIR QUALITY MEASUREMENTS FOR MONITORING STATIONS NEAREST SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulfur Dioxide / Barbers Point</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of 24-Hr Samples</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of 24-Hr Values (µg/m³)</td>
<td>10-48</td>
<td>&lt;5-10</td>
<td>&lt;5-13</td>
<td>&lt;5-19</td>
<td>&lt;5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Value (µg/m³)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of State AQS Exceedances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Particulate / Downtown Honolulu** |      |      |      |      |      |
| No. of 24-Hr Samples           | 59   | 57   | 53   | 59   | 59   |
| Range of 24-Hr Values (µg/m³)  | 10-48| 11-61| 14-59| 12-45| 16-48|
| Average Daily Value (µg/m³)    | 24   | 25   | 25   | 26   | 30   |
| No. of State AQS Exceedances   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

| **PM-10 / Liliha** |      |      |      |      |      |
| No. of 24-Hr Samples | 10   | 51   | 42   | 53   | 55   |
| Range of 24-Hr Values (µg/m³) | 13-52| 7-35 | 10-33| 9-25 | 10-33|
| Average Daily Value (µg/m³)   | 23   | 18   | 17   | 17   | 16   |
| No. of State AQS Exceedances  | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   | NA   |

| **Carbon Monoxide / Downtown Honolulu** |      |      |      |      |      |
| No. of Days of 1-Hr Samples     | 342  | 348  | 345  | 360  | 323  |
| Range of Daily Max. 1-Hr Values (mg/m³) | 0.0-10.4| 0.2-13.5| 0.3-11.1| 0.2-10.4| 0.3-7.0|
| Avg. Daily Maximum 1-Hr Value (mg/m³) | 1.5  | 2.2  | 1.7  | 1.7  | 1.0  |
| No. of State 1-Hr AQS Exceedances | 1    | 3    | 1    | 1    | 0    |

| **Ozone / Sand Island** |      |      |      |      |      |
| No. of Days of 1-Hr Samples   | 341  | 346  | 342  | 362  | 342  |
| Range of Daily Max. 1-Hr Values (µg/m³) | 8-198| 10-88| 4-64 | 0-94 | 0-96 |
| Avg. Daily Maximum 1-Hr Value (µg/m³) | 43   | 39   | 38   | 13   | 15   |
| No. of State AQS Exceedances  | 3    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |

| **Lead / Downtown Honolulu** |      |      |      |      |      |
| No. of 24-Hr Samples          | 58   | 57   | 57   | -    | -    |
| Range of 24-Hr Values (µg/m³)  | 0.0-0.3| 0.0-0.2| 0.0-0.2| -    | -    |
| Average Quarterly Value (µg/m³) | 0.2  | 0.0  | 0.0  | -    | -    |
| No. of State AQS Exceedances  | 0    | 0    | 0    | -    | -    |

Source: State of Hawaii Department of Health
Table 5  
ESTIMATED WORST-CASE 1-HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS  
ALONG ROADWAYS NEAR SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT  
(milligrams per cubic meter)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Intersection</th>
<th>Year/Scenario</th>
<th>1991/ Present</th>
<th>1993/ Without Project</th>
<th>1993/ With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street at Nuuanu Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street at Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street at Maunakea Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street at Bethel Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hawaii State AAQS: 10  
National AAQS: 40
Table 6

ESTIMATED WORST-CASE 8-HOUR CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS ALONG ROADWAYS NEAR SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT (milligrams per cubic meter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Intersection</th>
<th>1991/ Present</th>
<th>1993/ Without Project</th>
<th>1993/ With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street at Nuuanu Avenue</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania Street at Maunakea Street</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street at Maunakea Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street at Bethel Street</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hawaii State AAQS:  5
National AAQS:  10
Table 7
ESTIMATED WORST-CASE 15-MINUTE CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS WITHIN SMITH-BERETANIA PROJECT UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Level</th>
<th>Number Parking Stalls</th>
<th>Approximate Floor Space (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Ventilation Rate (cfm)(^a)</th>
<th>Worst-Case Concentration(b,c) (mg/m(^3))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Based on 1.50 cubic feet per minute per square foot of floor space.

\(^b\)Includes background concentration of 1 mg/m\(^3\) and assumes ambient temperature of 59 degrees F.

\(^c\)Assumes 1/4 capacity of parking level operating throughout 15-minute period and average emissions of 14 grams per minute per vehicle (100% in cold-start mode during year 1993).

\(^d\)Threshold Limit Value/Short-Term Exposure Limit for carbon monoxide: 440 mg/m\(^3\).
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SUMMARY FOR EIS

Existing Acoustic Environment. The existing acoustic environment is controlled by Downtown traffic noise along Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. The existing traffic noise levels along the Rights-of-Way of Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue are high, and in the "Significant Exposure, Normally Unacceptable" category at approximately 70 to 75 Ldn along the Rights-of-Way. Along Smith and Pauahi Streets, traffic noise levels are lower at 60 to 65 Ldn and in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category along the Rights-of-Way. Because the project site is shielded from Nuuanu Avenue by existing buildings, traffic noise from Nuuanu Avenue is not greater than 65 Ldn and is in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category. On the proposed Park portion of the proposed redevelopment project, traffic noise levels decrease to the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category at approximately 120 FT or greater setback distances from Beretania Street. Because the proposed Child Care Facility is located along Pauahi Street and on the quieter section of the project site, it is considered to optimally sited in respect to potential adverse impacts from traffic noise.

Future Acoustic Environment. The future traffic noise levels are not expected to change significantly as a result of the proposed redevelopment project, and are expected to continue as the dominant noise sources in the project area. Increases in traffic noise associated with project generated traffic are predicted to be less than 0.5 Ldn, which is considered to be very low and difficult to measure. Noise from mechanical equipment, an underground parking garage, and an adolescent playground are potential new contributors to the future acoustic environment. Because State DOH noise regulations will limit future noise sources to levels at or below existing and future traffic noise levels, the future noise environment should not be significantly
altered by these new sources. The future noise levels in the project environs after project completion in 1993 should remain in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category at receptor locations removed from Beretania Street and Nuuanu Highway.

**Noise Mitigation Measures.** Recommended noise mitigation measures include the use of coarse driveway finishes in the parking garage to minimize tire squeal noise; quieting of all on-site mechanical equipment to levels which are in compliance with State DOH noise limits; use of administrative controls and design features to maintain playground noise levels within State DOH noise limits; and the use of properly muffled equipment and the use of State DOH noise permit procedures during project construction.
CHAPTER I. SUMMARY

The existing and future traffic noise levels in the vicinity of the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project were evaluated for their potential impacts along roadways which would service the project and their relationship to current FHA/HUD noise standards. The traffic noise level increases along the roadway sections in the immediate vicinity of the project site were calculated. Following project build-out by CY 1993, increases in traffic noise of 0.5 to 1.5 Ldn units are predicted to occur as a result of project plus non-project traffic. Future traffic noise level increases associated with project traffic are anticipated to be very low.

Along Beretania Street, traffic noise levels are expected to increase by 0.5 to 0.7 Ldn as a result of both project and non-project traffic. It was assumed that noise along Pauahi Street will not increase significantly by CY 1993. Traffic on Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue will continue to be the dominant sources of noise in the project area. Along Smith Street, where traffic noise levels are lower, traffic noise levels are expected to increase by approximately 1.5 Ldn by CY 1993 primarily as a result of non-project traffic. The increases in traffic noise levels resulting from project generated traffic are not considered to be significant.

Due to the relatively low volumes of anticipated project traffic, risks of adverse noise impacts from traffic noise are considered to be low, and the proposed project should not cause adverse noise impacts along the roadways servicing the redevelopment project. For these reasons, special traffic noise mitigation measures are not considered necessary.

Risks of adverse noise impacts from the underground parking garage are also expected to be low due to the containment of tire squeal and door slam noise below grade. The recommended use of asphalt, or brush concrete finish on the circulation driveways
within the parking garage should minimize the occurrences of tire squeal noise. The garage exhaust fans may require sound attenuation treatment, as may other on-site mechanical equipment. Compliance with State DOH noise regulations should minimize risks of adverse noise impacts from on-site equipment since State DOH noise limits are at or below existing background ambient noise levels.

Due to possible loud and boisterous activity in the proposed passive park, noise disturbances may occur. However, regulatory controls exist for minimizing the potential noise impacts from these types of activities at the park. In addition, opportunities for similar behavior are currently present in the existing municipal parking lot, and the proposed passive park does not represent a major change in this respect.

Potential noise impacts from activities in the outdoor playground of the proposed Child Care Center are possible and State DOH noise limits may be exceeded if monitoring and administrative controls are not employed. Additional noise mitigation measures which are recommended are: the location of the playground equipment toward the Pauahi and Smith Street end of the playground area; the use of natural or artificial grass cover over the playground area to minimize sound reflections upward toward the high-rise apartment units; and scheduling of playground activities after 9:00 AM to minimize sleep disturbances during the early and midmorning hours.

Unavoidable, but temporary, noise impacts will occur during the construction of the proposed project, particularly during the excavation and possible pile driving activities on the project site. Because construction activities are predicted to be audible within the project and at adjoining properties, the quality of the acoustic environment may be degraded to unacceptable levels during periods of construction. Mitigation measures to reduce construction noise to inaudible levels will not be practical in all cases, but the use of quiet equipment and State Department of Health construction noise permit procedures are recommended as standard mit-
igation measures.
CHAPTER II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this noise study was to predict and evaluate the traffic noise increases associated with motor vehicle traffic to and from the proposed Smith-Beretania Parking Lot Redevelopment Project. The proposed development is located on the site of the existing municipal parking lot at Smith and Beretania Streets in the Chinatown Special District, and will include an underground parking garage, a Child Care Facility, commercial and office space, and a public park atop the parking structure. Traffic noise level increases and impacts associated with the proposed development were to be determined within the project site as well as along the public roadways expected to service the project traffic. A specific objective was to determine future traffic noise level increases associated with both project and non-project traffic, and the potential noise impacts associated with these increases. Assessments of possible future impacts from short term construction noise and increased noise levels from on-site day care and recreational activities were also included as noise study objectives. Recommendations for minimizing potential noise impacts were also to be provided as required.
CHAPTER III. NOISE DESCRIPTORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The noise descriptor currently used by federal agencies (such as FHA/HUD) to assess environmental noise is the Day-Night Average Sound Level (Ldn). This descriptor incorporates a 24-hour average of instantaneous A-Weighted Sound Levels as read on a standard Sound Level Meter. By definition, the minimum averaging period for the Ldn descriptor is 24 hours. Additionally, sound levels which occur during the nighttime hours of 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM are increased by 10 decibels (dB) prior to computing the 24-hour average by the Ldn descriptor. A more complete list of noise descriptors is provided in APPENDIX B to this report.

TABLE 1, derived from Reference 1, presents current federal noise standards and acceptability criteria for residential land uses. Land use compatibility guidelines for various levels of environmental noise as measured by the Ldn descriptor system are shown in FIGURE 1. As a general rule, noise levels of 55 Ldn or less occur in rural areas, or in areas which are removed from high volume roadways. In urbanized areas which are shielded from high volume streets, Ldn levels generally range from 55 to 65 Ldn, and are usually controlled by motor vehicle traffic noise. Residences which front major roadways are generally exposed to levels of 65 Ldn, and as high as 75 Ldn when the roadway is a high speed freeway. The range of background ambient noise levels at other urbanized areas on Oahu are shown in FIGURE 2. In the project area, traffic noise levels associated with Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue are typically greater than 65 Ldn along the Rights-of-Way, and these two streets carry the dominant traffic noise sources in the project area.

For the purposes of determining noise acceptability for funding assistance from federal agencies (FHA/HUD and VA), an exterior noise level of 65 Ldn or lower is considered acceptable. This standard is applied nationally (Reference 2), including Hawaii.
### TABLE 1

EXTERIOR NOISE EXPOSURE CLASSIFICATION
(RESIDENTIAL LAND USE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE EXPOSURE CLASS</th>
<th>DAY-NIGHT SOUND LEVEL</th>
<th>EQUIVALENT SOUND LEVEL</th>
<th>FEDERAL(1) STANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Exposure</td>
<td>Not Exceeding 55 Ldn</td>
<td>Not Exceeding 55 Leq</td>
<td>Unconditionally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Exposure</td>
<td>Above 55 Ldn But Not Above 65 Ldn</td>
<td>Above 55 Leq But Not Above 65 Leq</td>
<td>Acceptable(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Exposure</td>
<td>Above 65 Ldn But Not Above 75 Ldn</td>
<td>Above 65 Leq But Not Above 75 Leq</td>
<td>Normally Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Exposure</td>
<td>Above 75 Ldn</td>
<td>Above 75 Leq</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Federal Housing Administration, Veterans Administration, Department of Defense, and Department of Transportation.

(2) FHWA uses the Leq instead of the Ldn descriptor. For planning purposes, both are equivalent if: (a) heavy trucks do not exceed 10 percent of total traffic flow in vehicles per 24 hours, and (b) traffic between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM does not exceed 15 percent of average daily traffic flow in vehicles per 24 hours. The noise mitigation threshold used by FHWA for residences is 67 Leq.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single Family,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Outdoor Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multiple Family,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Outdoor Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi-Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Outdoor Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Classrooms, Libraries,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, Clinics, Nursing Homes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Related Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concert Halls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Shells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Golf Courses, Riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stables, Water Rec., Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Personal Services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Theaters, Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Wholesale, Some Retail,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind., Mfg., Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Farming, Animal Breeding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture (Except Livestock)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Natural Wildlife and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND USE COMPATIBILITY**
WITH YEARLY DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE SOUND LEVEL
AT A SITE FOR BUILDINGS AS COMMONLY CONSTRUCTED
(Source: American National Standards Institute S3.23-1980)

**FIGURE 1**
FIGURE 2
RANGE OF EXTERIOR BACKGROUND AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DAY-NIGHT SOUND LEVEL</th>
<th>OUTDOOR LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY NOISY</td>
<td>-90-</td>
<td>50 FT. from curb of H-1 Freeway at Campbell Industrial Park Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISY URBAN</td>
<td>-90-</td>
<td>Lanai of Waikiki Hi-Rise on Kuhio Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>-85-</td>
<td>50 FT. from centerline of Punchbowl Street at Queens Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN</td>
<td>-80-</td>
<td>Kalihi, Hickam Housing Areas, Camp Callin, Halsey Terrace, Fort Kamehameha, Mililani Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL TOWN QUIET SUBURBAN</td>
<td>-75-</td>
<td>Ewa Beach to Iroquois Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td>-70-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-65-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-60-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-55-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-50-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-45-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-40-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of our open-living conditions, the predominant use of naturally ventilated dwellings, and the relatively low exterior-to-interior sound attenuation afforded by these naturally ventilated structures, an exterior noise level of 65 Ldn does not eliminate all risks of noise impacts. Because of these factors, and as recommended in Reference 3, a lower level of 55 Ldn is considered as the "Unconditionally Acceptable" (or "Near-Zero Risk") level of exterior noise. However, after considering the cost and feasibility of applying the lower level of 55 Ldn, government agencies such as FHA/HUD and VA have selected 65 Ldn as a more appropriate regulatory standard.

For commercial, industrial, and other non-noise sensitive land uses, exterior noise levels as high as 75 Ldn are generally considered acceptable. Exceptions to this occur when naturally ventilated office and other commercial establishments are exposed to exterior levels which exceed 65 Ldn. Similar considerations apply to Child Care Facilities, with 60 Ldn considered to be the threshold for acceptable exterior noise levels without closure and air conditioning.

On the island of Oahu, the State Department of Health (DOH) regulates noise from fixed mechanical equipment, motor vehicles, and construction activities. Noise resulting from construction activities are regulated by the DOH through the issuance of permits for allowing excessive noise during limited time periods. Noise from other on-site sources, such as mechanical equipment, are also regulated by the State DOH. The State DOH noise regulations are expressed in maximum allowable property line noise limits rather than Ldn (see Reference 4). Noise sources on the project site must comply with the noise limits of Reference 4 along the project boundary lines. These limits are 60 dBA during the daytime hours of 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM, and 50 dBA during the remaining nighttime period. Although they are not directly comparable to noise criteria expressed in Ldn, State DOH noise limits for residential, commercial, and industrial lands equate to approxi-
mately 55, 60, and 76 Ldn, respectively. By Reference 4, "unreasonable noise," which includes noise from sound reproduction devices and from rowdism or other boisterous behavior, is controlled by the Honolulu Police Department. In those situations where unreasonable noise cannot be determined subjectively, the property line noise limits of Reference 4 shall then apply.

It should be noted that the noise compatibility guidelines and relationships to the Ldn noise descriptor may not be applicable to impulsive noise sources such as pile drivers. The use of penalty factors (such as adding 10 dB to measured sound levels or the use of C-Weighting filters) have been proposed. However, the relationships between levels of impulsive noise sources and land use compatibility have not been as firmly established as have the relationships for non-impulsive sources. The State DOH limits for impulsive sounds which exceed 120 impulses in any 20 minute period are 10 dB above the limits for non-impulsive sounds. If impulsive sounds do not exceed 120 impulses in any 20 minute time period, there are no regulatory limits on their sound levels under the State DOH regulations.
CHAPTER IV. GENERAL STUDY METHODOLOGY

Existing traffic and background ambient noise levels were measured at six locations in the project environs. These noise measurements were obtained to provide a basis for developing the project's traffic noise contributions along the roadways which will service the proposed development, and to determine the potential intrusiveness of noise from the project at the adjoining high-rise apartment complex. The locations of the measurement sites are shown in FIGURE 3. Noise measurements were performed during the months of December 1989, January 1990, and January 1991. Measurements at Sites A thru C were used for validating the traffic noise model, and measurements at Sites D, E, and F were used to determine daytime background ambient noise levels at the adjoining apartment complex. Traffic noise measurements were performed on a Wednesday and Thursday (December 6 and 7, 1989) during the AM peak traffic period as well as during the off-peak period in the morning. Because of high construction noise levels along Beretania Street during the weekdays, additional traffic noise measurements were also performed on a Sunday (January 28, 1990) at the Beretania Street measurement Site A.

The results of the traffic noise measurements were compared with calculations of existing traffic noise levels to validate the computer model used. The traffic noise measurement results, and their comparisons with computer model predictions of existing traffic noise levels are summarized in TABLE 2. The background ambient noise measurement results at Sites D, E, and F are shown in FIGURES 4 thru 7. The morning background ambient noise measurements at Sites D and F (FIGURES 4 and 5) contain the added noise from sandblasting at the nearby construction project across Beretania Street.

Traffic noise calculations for the existing conditions as well as noise predictions for the Year 1993 were performed using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Noise Prediction Model
### TABLE 2

**TRAFFIC NOISE MEASUREMENTS**

**(DECEMBER 1989 AND JANUARY 1990)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time of Day (HRS)</th>
<th>Ave.Speed (MPH)</th>
<th>——Hourly Traffic Volume——</th>
<th>Measured Leq (dB)</th>
<th>Predicted Leq (dB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. 45 FT from the center-line of Beretania St. (12/06/89).</td>
<td>0700 TO 0800</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 27 FT from the center-line of Paushi Street. (12/06/89).</td>
<td>0837 TO 0937</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 35 FT from the center-line of Nuuanu Avenue. (12/07/89).</td>
<td>0530 TO 0630</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 45 FT from the center-line of Beretania St. (1/28/90).</td>
<td>1328 TO 1428</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: * Noise level measurements along Beretania Street on 12/06/89 include construction noise from across the street.
FIGURE 4
BACKGROUND NOISE LEVELS
AT MONITORING SITE 'D'
(0945 HRS TO 1005 HRS)

DATE: January 10, 1991          METER RESPONSE: Slow

Lmax: 70.0 dBA  Measured Sound Level in dBA
L10:  64.0 dBA
Leq:  62.8 dBA
Lmin: 58.4 dBA
FIGURE 5
BACKGROUND NOISE LEVELS
AT MONITORING SITE 'F'
(1040 HRS TO 1100 HRS)

DATE: January 10, 1991  METER RESPONSE: Slow

Lmax: 74.2 dBA
L10: 68.0 dBA
Leq: 66.7 dBA
Lmin: 60.2 dBA
FIGURE 6
BACKGROUND NOISE LEVELS
AT MONITORING SITE 'D'
(1425 HRS TO 1439 HRS)

DATE: January 10, 1991
METER RESPONSE: Slow

L_{max}: 68.4 \text{ dBA}
L_{10}: 64.0 \text{ dBA}
L_{eq}: 62.4 \text{ dBA}
L_{min}: 58.2 \text{ dBA}
FIGURE 7
BACKGROUND NOISE LEVELS
AT MONITORING SITE 'E'
(1500 HRS TO 1515 HRS)

DATE: January 10, 1991  METER RESPONSE: Slow

L_{max}: 68.6 dBA
L_{10}: 64.0 dBA
L_{eq}: 62.3 dBA
L_{min}: 58.7 dBA
(Reference 5). Traffic data entered into the noise prediction model were: hourly traffic volumes, average vehicle speeds, estimates of traffic mix, and hard ground propagation loss factor. Data from the traffic study for the project (Reference 6), and City and County of Honolulu Department of Transportation Services counts on Beretania Street (Reference 7) were also used as additional sources of data inputs to the model. For existing and future traffic on all roadways in the project environs, it was assumed that the average noise levels, or Leq(h), during the AM peak hour were 2.2 dB less than the 24-hour Ldn. This assumption was based on computations of both the hourly Leq and the 24-hour Ldn of traffic noise on Beretania Street (see FIGURE 8).

Traffic noise calculations for both the existing and future conditions in the project environs were developed for ground level receptors without the benefit of shielding effects. Traffic noise levels were calculated for future conditions with and without the proposed redevelopment project. The forecasted changes in traffic noise levels over existing levels were calculated for both future scenarios, and noise impact risks evaluated. The relative contributions of non-project and project traffic to the total noise levels were also calculated, and an evaluation of possible traffic noise impacts was made.

Calculations of average exterior and interior noise levels from construction activities were performed for typical naturally ventilated and air conditioned dwellings. Predicted noise levels were compared with existing background ambient noise levels, and the potential for noise impacts was assessed. Potential noise impacts from the on-site parking garage, mechanical equipment, and Child Care Facility operations were also discussed, and mitigation measures recommended.
FIGURE 8

HOURLY VARIATIONS OF TRAFFIC NOISE AT 50 FT SETBACK DISTANCE FROM THE CENTERLINE OF BERETANIA STREET AT MAUNAKEA STREET
(October 25–26, 1990)
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CHAPTER V. EXISTING NOISE ENVIRONMENT

The existing traffic noise levels along the Rights-of-Way of Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue are high, and in the "Significant Exposure, Normally Unacceptable" category at approximately 70 to 75 Ldn along the Rights-of-Way. This condition is typical along major roadways of Oahu (see Figure 2). Along Smith and Pauahi Streets, traffic noise levels are lower at 60 to 65 Ldn and in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category along the Rights-of-Way. Traffic noise levels along the Beretania Street Right-of-Way represent the worst case (or highest) levels at 70 to 75 Ldn due to the close proximity of the Right-of-Way to the noise sources, and due to the significantly higher traffic volume on Beretania Street. Because the project site is shielded from Nuuanu Avenue by existing buildings, traffic noise from Nuuanu Avenue is not greater than 65 Ldn and is in the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category. On the proposed Park portion of the proposed redevelopment project, traffic noise levels decrease to the "Moderate Exposure, Acceptable" category at approximately 120 FT or greater setback distances from Beretania Street. Because the proposed Child Care Facility is located along Pauahi Street and on the quieter section of the project site, it is considered to be optimally sited in respect to potential adverse noise impacts from traffic noise.

Results of calculations of existing traffic noise levels along the streets in the project environs and during the AM peak hour period are shown in TABLE 3. The traffic volumes used for the AM peak hour period were obtained from Reference 6. TABLE 4 presents the calculated setback distances between the roadway centerlines and the iso-noise contours associated with the 60, 65, and 70 Ldn levels of existing traffic noise. The traffic noise levels shown in the tables only apply when unobstructed line-of-sight conditions exist to the roadways. These unobstructed line-of-sight conditions would generally occur along the Right-of-Way,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SPEED (MPH)</th>
<th>VPH</th>
<th>AUTO</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>ALL VEH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXISTING (CY 1990) AM PEAK HR. TRAFFIC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. SE of Nuuanu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. NW of Smith St.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. NE of Beretania</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. SW of Beretania</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CY 1993 AM PEAK HR. TRAFFIC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. SE of Nuuanu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. NW of Smith St.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. NE of Beretania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. SW of Beretania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Assumed traffic mix of 96.8% autos, 1.6% medium trucks, and 1.6% heavy vehicles used for existing and future conditions on Beretania and Smith Streets.

2. Assumed traffic mix of 96.0% autos, 2.0% medium trucks, and 2.0% heavy vehicles used for existing and future conditions on Nuuanu Avenue.
### Table 4
Existing and Future Distances to 60, 65, and 70 Ldn Contours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET SECTION</th>
<th>60 Ldn Setback (FT)</th>
<th>65 Ldn Setback (FT)</th>
<th>70 Ldn Setback (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. SE of Nuuanu</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. NW of Smith St.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. NE of Beretania</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. SW of Beretania</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. All setback distances are from the roadways' centerlines.
2. See TABLE 3 for traffic volume, speed, and mix assumptions.
3. Ldn assumed to be equal to AM Peak Hour Leq plus 2.2 dB along all roadways.
4. Setback distances are for unobstructed line-of-sight and hard ground conditions.
within any open space fronting the roadway, or at the upper levels of any man-made structure or natural terrain feature.

The existing traffic noise levels along Beretania Street are high (between 70 and 71 Ldn) at approximately 50 FT setback distance from the roadway's centerline. Maximum noise levels (I_{max}) associated with heavy truck traffic on Beretania Street are in the order of 80 to 85 dB at this setback distance. Minimum daytime background ambient noise levels of approximately 55 to 60 dB occur between periods of traffic flow.

At the base of the high-rise apartment complex which is east of the proposed Child Care Facility, minimum background ambient noise levels range between 58 to 60 dB (see FIGURES 4 thru 7). At the upper floor levels of the high-rise building, existing background ambient and traffic noise levels are equal to or higher than those measured at Sites D, E, and F. It should be noted that existing background ambient noise levels at the high-rise apartment probably exceed the State DOH daytime and nighttime limits of 60 and 50 dB, respectively, due to existing roadway traffic and other noise sources in the existing municipal parking lot.
CHAPTER VI. FUTURE TRAFFIC NOISE ENVIRONMENT

Predictions of future traffic noise levels were made using the traffic volume assignments of Reference 6. The future projections of project and non-project traffic on the roadways which would service the project are shown in TABLE 3 for the AM peak hour of traffic in CY 1993. TABLE 4 summarizes the predicted increases in setback distances to the 60, 65, and 70 Ldn traffic noise contour lines along the roadways servicing the project and attributable to increases in project and non-project traffic by CY 1993.

From TABLE 3, relatively small project plus non-project traffic noise increases of 0.5 to 0.8 dB are predicted to occur between the current period and 1993 along Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. As indicated in TABLE 5, increases in traffic noise along these two roadways attributable to project traffic range from 0 to 0.4 Ldn, which are considered to be minimal. The future traffic noise environment in the project environs will not be significantly changed by the proposed redevelopment project due to the relatively low volumes of traffic expected to be generated by the project. Future traffic noise levels on the project site and at Sites D, E, and F, should be similar to, or less than, those shown in FIGURES 4 thru 7, due to the replacement of the existing municipal parking lot with a passive park.

Along Smith Street, larger increases of 1.5 dB are expected to occur, primarily due to non-project traffic. The proposed redevelopment project is expected to reduce the extent of the increase in traffic noise along Smith Street due to the planned closure of the existing entrance to the parking lot on Smith Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET SECTION</th>
<th>NOISE LEVEL INCREASES (Ldn) DUE TO PROJECT TRAFFIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. SE of Nuuanu</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beretania St. NW of Smith St.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. NE of Beretania</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuuanu Ave. SW of Beretania</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith St. Fronting Project</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER VII. DISCUSSION OF PROJECT RELATED NOISE IMPACTS AND POSSIBLE MITIGATION MEASURES

Traffic Noise. Adverse impacts from traffic noise are possible due to the high existing traffic noise levels along Beretania Street and Nuuanu Avenue. However, the sources of the high traffic noise levels are associated primarily with non-project traffic, and this situation will continue with or without the proposed redevelopment project. The proposed commercial, office, and Child Care Facility spaces within the proposed project building will probably be air conditioned, and this should be sufficient to mitigate any potential noise impacts from existing and future traffic sources. Minimum exterior-to-interior noise reductions of approximately 20 dB are possible through closure and air conditioning, and this level of exterior-to-interior noise reduction is not difficult to obtain with standard construction materials and methods.

Parking Garage and On-Site Machinery Sources. The parking garage is proposed to be located underground, which will help to minimize potential noise impacts on the nearby high-rise apartment building. Audible tire squeal noise from the circulation and parking areas of the garage can usually be controlled though the use of a brushed or other coarse finish on the circulation driveways. This type of treatment within the parking garage is recommended as a tire squeal mitigation measure.

Mechanical equipment, such as air conditioning chillers or cooling towers, kitchen exhaust fans, and garage ventilation fans are the primary on-site noise sources expected to be located on the project site. This equipment, singly or together, has the potential of exceeding the allowable property line noise limits of the State DOH noise regulations (Reference 4). The State DOH noise limits which apply along the property boundaries of apartment or business districts are 60 dB and 50 dB during the daytime and nighttime periods, respectively. Typical noise levels of un-
treated mechanical equipment are significantly higher (by at least 10 dB) than the allowable DOH noise limits, such that sound attenuation treatment of the mechanical equipment will probably be required for compliance with DOH regulations. In addition, compliance with the Octave Band limits as contained within Honolulu's Land Use Ordinance (Section 3.100) will be required. Because the residual background ambient noise levels in the project area are similar to or higher than the State DOH noise limits, compliance with the DOH noise limits should minimize risks of adverse noise impacts on neighboring properties and within the project area.

**Child Care Facility Playground.** The proposed Child Care Facility includes an outdoor playground whose fence is located 20 to 120 FT from the adjoining high-rise apartment complex toward the east. Typical average (or Leq) noise levels from a group of 25 children, ages 2.5 to 5 years, playing within the fenced-in area are predicted to range from 65 to 55 dB at the adjoining apartment complex. Highest noise levels of 65 to 60 dB are expected to occur outside those apartment windows which are within 80 FT slant distance to the eastern corner of the proposed playground. Predicted noise levels from children within the Child Care Facility's playground may exceed existing and future background ambient noise levels at those apartment units which are in the vicinity of Site D and within 80 FT of the eastern corner of the playground. Predicted noise levels from the children are not expected to exceed existing and future background ambient noise levels at those apartments which are beyond 80 FT distance from the eastern corner of the playground.

Potential noise impacts from the playground are possible if monitoring and administrative controls are not used at the Child Care Facility. However, it should be noted that the facility must also comply with existing State DOH noise regulations of 60 dB at the playground's east fence. So the use of administrative controls during playground periods will probably be required to comply with State DOH noise regulations. Under conditions of compli-
ance, noise emissions from the facility will be at or below existing and future background noise levels at the adjoining apartments, and noise impacts can be minimized. Additional noise mitigation measures which are recommended are: the location of the playground equipment toward the Pauahi and Smith Street end of the playground area; the use of natural or artificial grass cover over the playground area to minimize sound reflections upward toward the high-rise apartment units; and scheduling of playground activities after 9:00 AM to minimize sleep disturbances during the early and midmorning hours.

**Passive Park.** Potential disturbances from yelling, screaming, sound reproduction devices, or other boisterous activities are possible at the proposed passive park. The potential for these types of disturbances exist in all public places, including the existing municipal parking lot. By Reference 4, "unreasonable noise," which includes noise from sound reproduction devices and from rowdism or other boisterous behavior, is controlled by the Honolulu Police Department. In those situations where unreasonable noise cannot be determined subjectively, the property line noise limits of Reference 4 shall then apply. The potential for additional adverse noise impacts from the proposed passive park are not considered to be high.

**General Construction Noise.** Audible construction noise will probably be unavoidable during the entire project construction period. The total time period for construction is unknown, but it is anticipated that the actual work will be moving from one location on the project site to another during that period. Actual length of exposure to construction noise at any receptor location will probably be less than the total construction period for the entire project. Typical levels of exterior noise from construction activity (excluding pile driving activity) are shown in FIGURE 9. The impulsive noise levels of impact pile drivers are approximately 15 dB higher than the levels shown in FIGURE 9, while the intermittent noise levels of vibratory pile drivers are at the
ANTICIPATED RANGE OF CONSTRUCTION
NOISE LEVELS VS. DISTANCE

Distance from Operating Diesel Equipment in Feet

A-Weighted Sound Level in dB
upper end of the noise level ranges depicted in the figure. Typical levels of construction noise inside naturally ventilated and air conditioned structures are approximately 10 and 20 dB less, respectively, than the levels shown in FIGURE 9. The business establishments and apartment units within the neighboring buildings are predicted to experience the highest noise levels during construction activities due to their close proximity (within 100 FT) to the construction site. Adverse impacts from construction noise are not expected to be in the "public health and welfare" category due to the temporary nature of the work and due to the administrative controls available for regulation of construction noise.

Mitigation of construction noise to inaudible levels will not be practical in all cases due to the intensity of construction noise sources (80 to 90+ dB at 50 FT distance), and due to the exterior nature of the work (pile driving, grading and earth moving, trenching, concrete pouring, hammering, etc.). The use of properly muffled construction equipment should be required on the job site.

The incorporation of State Department of Health construction noise limits and curfew times, which are applicable on the island of Oahu (Reference 4), are other noise mitigation measures which are normally applied to construction activities. TABLE 6 depicts the allowed hours of construction for normal construction noise (levels which do not exceed 95 dB at the project's property line) and for construction noise which exceeds 95 dB at the project's property line. Noisy construction activities are not allowed on holidays, Saturdays, Sundays, during the early morning, and during the late evening periods under the DOH permit procedures.
TABLE 6
AVAILABLE WORK HOURS UNDER DOH PERMIT PROCEDURES FOR CONSTRUCTION NOISE

a. DOH PERMIT FOR NOISE EMISSIONS ≤ 95 dBA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME OF DAY</th>
<th>Wk dys</th>
<th>Sat/Sun</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midnight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Midnight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal Permit

b. DOH PERMIT FOR IMPACT PILE DRIVING ACTIVITIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME OF DAY</th>
<th>Wk dys</th>
<th>Sat/Sun</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midnight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Midnight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal Permit

Wk dys: Workdays
Sat/Sun: Saturday/Sunday
Weekly: Weekly
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APPENDIX B
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 LCdA with the LAdn.

Although not included in the tables, it is also recommended that "Lpn" and "Lp,n" be used as symbols for perceived noise levels and effective perceived noise levels, respectively.

It is recommended that in their initial use within a report, such terms be written in full, rather than abbreviated. An example of preferred usage is as follows:

The A-weighted sound level (LA) was measured before and after the installation of an acoustic treatment. The measured LA values were 85 and 75 dB respectively.

Descriptor Nomenclature

With regard to energy averaging over time, the term "average" should be discouraged in favor of the term "equivalent". Hence, Leq is designated the "equivalent sound level". For Ld, Ln, and Ldn, "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 characteristics 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, PNA, and EPNAB are not to be used. Examples of this preferred usage are: the Perceived Noise Level (Lpn was found to be 75 dB, Lpn = 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., deci). 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 Weighed Loss of Hearing" (PWL) shall be used consistent with CRAB Working Group 69 Report: Guidelines for Preparing Environmental Impact Statements (1977).
APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

TABLE I

A-WEIGHTED RECOMMENDED DESCRIPTOR LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A-Weighted Sound Power Level</td>
<td>$L_{WA}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maximum A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{max}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peak A-Weighted Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{Apk}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level Exceeded x% of the Time</td>
<td>$L_x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equivalent Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{eq}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Equivalent Sound Level over Time (T) (1)</td>
<td>$L_{eq(Y)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Day Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{dn}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Yearly Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{dn(Y)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sound Exposure Level</td>
<td>$L_{SE}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 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 a $L_{eq(WASH)}$ to mean the washing cycle noise for a washing machine).

SOURCE: EPA ACOUSTIC TERMINOLOGY GUIDE, BNA 8-14-78, NOISE REGULATION REPORTER.
APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

TABLE II
RECOMMENDED DESCRIPTOR LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>A-WEIGHTING</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE(1) A-WEIGHTING</th>
<th>OTHER(2) WEIGHTING</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>$L_{W}$</td>
<td>$L_{W}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Max. Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{max}$</td>
<td>$L_{Amx}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bmax}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peak Sound (Pressure) Level</td>
<td>$L_{Apk}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bpk}$</td>
<td>$L_{pk}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level Exceeded x% of the time</td>
<td>$L_x$</td>
<td>$L_{Ax}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bx}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Equivalent Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{eq}$</td>
<td>$L_{Aeq}$</td>
<td>$L_{Beq}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Equivalent Sound Level Over Time(T)</td>
<td>$L_{eq(T)}$</td>
<td>$L_{Aeq(T)}$</td>
<td>$L_{Beq(T)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Day Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_d$</td>
<td>$L_{Ad}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bd}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_n$</td>
<td>$L_{An}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bn}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{dn}$</td>
<td>$L_{Adn}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bdn}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Yearly Day-Night Sound Level</td>
<td>$L_{dn(Y)}$</td>
<td>$L_{Adn(Y)}$</td>
<td>$L_{Bdn(Y)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sound Exposure Level</td>
<td>$L_S$</td>
<td>$L_{SA}$</td>
<td>$L_{SB}$</td>
<td></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>$L_{Beq(e)}$</td>
<td></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>$L_{Bx(e)}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Average $L_x$ value</td>
<td>$L_{X}$</td>
<td>$L_{AX}$</td>
<td>$L_{BX}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) "Alternative" symbols may be used to assure clarity or consistency.

(2) Only B-weighting shown. Applies also to C,D,E,....weighting.

(3) The term "pressure" is used only for the unweighted level.

(4) Unless otherwise specified, time is in hours (e.g., the hourly equivalent level is L eq(T)). Time may be specified in non-quantitative terms (e.g., could be specified as Leq(WASH) to mean the washing cycle noise for a washing machine.)
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INTRODUCTION

An underground public parking with a child-care facility and public park on ground level is proposed for the redevelopment of the Smith-Beretania parking lot. The proposed project area is within the National Register and Honolulu City and County Special Chinatown District. In accordance with C & C of Honolulu Resolution 89-489 PD-1 adopted on November 22, 1989 to preserve the city historic and archaeological properties, the Public Archaeology Section of Bishop Museum Applied Research Group completed pre-field, historical data search under contract to Kajioka, Okada, Partners. The following report summarizes the findings of this first increment of preliminary archaeological procedures. The objectives of this data search was threefold:

1) To gain a chronological overview of the historical occupation of the project area.
2) To facilitate subsurface testing through the determination of archaeologically sensitive locales within the project area, and
3) To aid in the interpretation of subsurface features encountered.

SITE DESCRIPTION

Situated in Block 10 (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 12 January 1900:8:6) in the City of Honolulu, the Smith-Beretania parking lot is an L-shaped area bounded by Beretania Street (north), Smith (Lane) Street (west), Pauahi Street (south) and Nu'uanu Avenue (east) (Figure 1). Current building structures, including an U. S. Post Office, fringe the parking lot at the northeast corner of Beretania and along the length of Nu'uanu Avenue. One brick structure at the southeast corner at Nu'uanu and Pauahi is within the redevelopment area. A stone and cinder block retaining wall extends from the parking lot entrance near the southern end of Smith Street to the corner of Smith and Beretania, and fronts the parking lot along Beretania Street to the Post Office. The parking lot is graduated with fill material from street level at Pauahi Street attaining three or more feet above street level at Beretania Street. The area is paved with asphalt. No archaeological field survey has been done.
Figure 1: PROJECT SITE/SPECIAL DISTRICT (after Spencer Mason Architects)
AREAL BACKGROUND

The Smith-Beretania parking lot was historically settled as a residential area by a mixture of native Hawaiians and European immigrants from the early 1800's through Hawaii's land division claims of the 1840's and 1850's. By 1870, individuals associated with early settlement and land claims in this specific area had been replaced by predominantly Chinese businesses and residences. The historic Chinatown fire of 1889 was confined to the north and west of this area and did not directly impact the site. During the bubonic plague epidemic of 1899/1900, Block 10 was condemned by the Honolulu Health Department and the area was leveled by the Honolulu Fire Department on 20 January 1900 (Plate 1). Reconstruction of business structures at the northeast corner of Beretania Street, along Nu'uanu Avenue, and intermittently fronting Paushi, began in 1902. The remainder of the Smith-Beretania block, following the 1900 demolition, remained vacant until developed and used as a playground from 1911 until 1952. The brick structure located at the Nu'uanu Avenue and Paushi Street corner remains from 1902.

PRELIMINARY RESEARCH

Initial research for the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot focused on historic land use and development of this area from early settlement until this block was leveled by fire in early 1900. A chronology of maps showing land development of the Smith-Beretania lot from 1810 to 1900, and decline after 1900, was obtained. Land Commission land claim award and patent documents were researched to supplement map sources, along with native and foreign testimonies relating to these land claims. Other sources researched and associated with the map chronology included published Honolulu City directories, newspaper articles, histories, and archived photographs.
Plate 1: BUBONIC PLAGUE 1900. FROM NU‘UANU MAKAI OF BERETANIA STREET.
NE CORNER OF PROJECT AREA. (Hawaii State Archives)
PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Two previous archaeological excavations in the areas to the south of the Smith-Beretania Parking Lot were undertaken in 1984 and 1988. The 1984 investigation at a parking lot at Nu‘uanu, Hotel and Bethel Street intersection was conducted by Joseph Kennedy of Archaeological Consultants of Hawaii. Eight to ten feet of fill at this site (TMK 1-1-02:38 and 39) was determined to be imported backfill, and excavations were not continued. The second excavation at the northeast corner of Hotel and Bethel Streets conducted by the Bishop Museum (Project 389; Pantaleo, Ms. 031888) in 1988 documented a fill of historic materials underlain by volcanic ash with a coral substrate. Prehistoric features and/or materials were not noted from either project.

EARLY HISTORIC LAND USE

King Kamehameha I cultivated yam in neighboring fields (Pau Uhi) during his brief residence in Honolulu (1809-1812). These yam fields extended on a northern boundary along Nu‘uanu Street from King Street to Beretania Street. The Smith-Beretania Parking Lot is situated west across from these early yam fields. Immediately to the south of the parking lot in 1810 was a ma‘i‘a field (ancient Hawaiian game similar to bowling played with stones). Chief’s villages and warriors houses bordered the yam fields to the south and east which were intersected by major arterial trails (Figure 2). Native settlement of the yam fields and adjacent lands, including the parking lot area, followed King Kamehamehas’ change of residence from Honolulu, Oahu to Hawaii Island in 1812. Land claim award testimonies (following section) indicated that these vacated lands were soon thereafter occupied as house lots. One house lot specifically within the Smith-Beretania parking lot (L.C.A. 783) was occupied "from the time of the Russian" in 1816 (Native Register 1/2:440).

In 1842 the Smith-Beretania plot is shown as vacant (Figure 3), however this specific map of Honolulu (compiled for Charleston's land deed and filed with the Public Land Office in London) is apparently incomplete. Land Claim Awards testimonies shortly after compilation of this 1842 map state that seven land sections, including six house lots, in the Smith-Beretania block were occupied (Figure 4).
LAND CLAIM AWARDS AND ROYAL PATENTS

L.C.A. 128. The major portion of the Smith-Beretania parking lot, then seaward of Reverend L. Smith's Church on Beretania, encloses approximately two-thirds of the project area. This land claim covers all of the northern portion and the northwest areas of the parking lot. This land was owned by Konia and her husband, Abner Paki, parents of Bernice Pauahi Bishop. Inherited by Konia from her parents, this land is described in William Bell's (L.C.A. 1177) land survey as being "Paki's yard", and the land was not utilized as a residences or businesses in 1851. A. Paki, who was "the last of the family of old high chiefs" and a government official, died on June 18, 1855. His wife Konia died shortly afterwards in 1857 (Bennett 1869:43, 70). The Royal Patent for L.C.A. 126 (Patent Number 293) was registered on May 14, 1851 (Patents Upon Confirmation...2:241-243).

L.C.A. 788. Although not within the Smith-Beretania redevelopoment area, to obtain a full overview of the block, other parcels in the vicinity will be discussed. This L.C.A. was situated in the middle of the block fronting Nu'uanu Avenue. This lot was bordered to the west and to the north by Paki and Konia's land, and to the south by Issac Lewis' L.C.A. 585. A house site originally deeded to John Kellett by High Chief (Governor) Boki in 1826/27, L.C.A. 788 was sold to James Robinson, Robert Lawrence and Robert W. Holt in 1841 (Land Claim Awards 1:519). The Patent Number 642 was awarded July 19, 1852.

L.C.A. 585. Two improved house lots adjoining the Robinson-Lawrence-Holt claim to the south and fronting Nu'uanu Avenue (now the corner of Nu'uanu and Pauahi) was owned by a Hawaiian native, Issac Lewis. The mauka portion of the house lots situated in the Smith-Beretania area was, according to Issac Lewis's deposition, obtained from "the king" in about 1827 (Native Testimony, 269-272). L.C.A. 585 for Issac Lewis was filed on August 19, 1850 (Land Claim Awards 3:58) and patented (Number 1647) on April 17, 1854 (Patents Upon Confirmation...6:195).

L.C.A 549. A portion of a house lot adjoining Issac Lewis' property to the west, this L.C.A. was owned by Zaccheus Rodgers, a native of
Figure 3: CHARLTON'S LAND CLAIM

(Hawaii State Archives)
Figure 4: HONOLULU LAND CLAIM AWARDS
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Massachusetts residing in Tahiti on August 25, 1844 (Foreign Testimony, 128-129). This property was originally occupied by his attorney, Daniel P. True, when Zaccheus Rodgers took possession of the land in 1826/1827 and resided there until 1840. In 1840, Daniel P. True, having Rodgers’ power-of-attorney, reoccupied the premises and filed for the land claim on September 21 of 1848 (Land Claim Awards 1:325). The land Patent was awarded February 23, 1849 (Patents Upon Confirmation...1:65). A wall (coral?) is mentioned in the following L.C.A. 1177 land survey as being along the north boundary of Rodger’s property.

L.C.A. 1177. Currently set back from Pauahi Street, and in the middle of the western portion of the Smith-Beretania parking lot, house lot L.C.A. 1177 was purchased from William Stevens by Malaea, wife of British subject William Bell, in 1829. Malaea died in 1837 leaving this lot to her brother Palaha who later died in 1839. This lot was then left to William Bell (Land Claim Awards 1:560; Foreign Testimony 1/2:135). William Bell obtained a Royal Patent for this property on January 27, 1851 (Patents Upon Confirmation...1:609-610).

L.C.A. 783. Located to the south of Zaccheus Rodger’s property, L.C.A. 783 was owned by the native, Kuakolu. In Kuakolu’s 1847 testimony:

"I, Kuakolu, hereby tell you of my claim and how I got my house lot. It was not given by anyone, it is separate, and it is known at this time, of the length of time that my makuukane lived here, from the time of the Russian, being the year 1816,--from thence until the year 1846. I, Kuakolu am one of those in this bequest of Kealeau on his death, and John Il is the true witness for this lot." (Native Register 1/2:440).

L.C.A. 783 was filed for in 1846 and Patented on December 21, 1855 (Patents Upon Confirmation...10:53-54). This property is mentioned in Isaac Lewis’ survey as being fenced (Native Testimony 1/2:269-272).
L.C.A. 8001 which appears as "H" on Figure 4 was inherited by S. Kaspuiki in a written will from Hanaki (Native Register 5:471), date not given. Located now at the corner of Pauahi and Smith Street, this small house lot containing 0.04 acres does not appear to have been impacted for the straightening of Smith Street ca. 1880 (Greer 1966:35). The Land Claim Award for this parcel was filed April 6, 1853, and the Royal Patent (Number 1568) appears in Book 15, page 489 which has not been translated.

1869-1950 LAND USE

Four fire insurance maps for the Smith-Beretania block were located for the years between 1879 and 1950 (Figures 7-10). These maps show the basic perimeters and location of building structures. Honolulu City directories extant from 1869, and used in conjunction with the fire insurance maps, identify the occupants and businesses of these structures. Renumbering of street addresses occurred six times within this period.

The historic Chinatown fire of 1886 was confined south and west of the Smith-Beretania block and did not directly impact this area (Figure 5). On January 20, 1900, during the bubonic plague epidemic, the entire block was leveled by the Honolulu Fire department. While destroyed buildings along Nu'uanu and Pauhai were rebuilt after the 1900 demolition, five structures along Beretania Street (within the project area), most housing in the interior of Block 10, and businesses along Smith Street were not. The exception is a lodging house at the corner of Smith and Pauahi.

Beretania Street

Reconstruction of buildings and occupants along Beretania Street in 1869 was undertaken by Richard Greer according to C. C. Bennett's Honolulu Directory and Historical Sketch of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands published in 1869. Eight buildings, including corner stores at Smith/Beretania and Nu'uanu/Beretania are listed by Greer (Figure 6). Five of these structures were within the Smith-Beretania project area. Bennett (1869:770-86) lists these five as a mixture of residences and early businesses:
Figure 5: 1886 CHINATOWN FIRE EXTENTS
Ah Sam groceries (corner Smith and Beretania)  
Mrs. Emily (41 Beretania)  
Keahu (45 Beretania)  
A. Manuel, groceries (47 Beretania)  
Akuu, groceries (49 Beretania)  
P. Sotuma (53 Beretania)  
Ahluk, groceries (55 Beretania)  
Lan Kai (57 Beretania)

Renumbering of these premises occurred three times between 1869 and 1888, and there is some uncertainty in reconstruction of occupants in these structures from the Honolulu City directories during this period. Lion's Fire Insurance Map (Figure 7) in 1879 shows placement and configurations of these buildings. From a city directory published by J. E. Brown (1888:78-79) A total of fifteen structures and businesses on the makai side of Beretania Street are listed. Eight listings for the buildings within the project area are abstracted:

Tong Hop, fruit store (Corner Smith and Beretania)  
Vacant store (41 and 10 Beretania)  
Yee Fong, poi dealer (constructed between 1869 and 1879 - 43, 12 Beretania)  
Chong Kee, laundry (45, 50, 14 Beretania)  
Native Houses  
Dí Han, cabinet maker  
Yung Seong, Store (45, 50, 14 Beretania)  
Tin Mui, fruit dealer (47, 52, 16 Beretania)

Double occupancy and residences to the rear are included in this listing. These were not rebuilt after leveling in 1900.

Nu'uanu Avenue

Twenty-three mixed businesses and residences combined in ten buildings are listed by Bennett in 1869 along the ewa side of Nu'uanu to (the later) intersection of Paulehu Street (Figure 6). Three of the buildings towards
Figure 7: 1879 LION FIRE INSURANCE MAP
the intersection at Nu'uanu and Pauahi were within the Smith-Beretania redevelopment area and were photographed in 1900 (Plate 2).

68, 83, 85 Nu'uanu

Occupying the 1827 house site of Isaac Lewis (68, 83, 85 Nu'uanu), two adjoining frame structures (Plate 2) with two stories and a rear shed was established as a soda water works and residence by Hollister and Hyland in 1863 (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 10 March 1897, 1:1-2). In 1878 the soda works became a partnership (Hollister and Company) between Henry Hollister and his son-in-law, Howard A. Parmelee (Sheba 1913:105). Also in 1878 the workshop of Ahi, "a manufacturer and dealer in all kinds of furniture, bedding...[was located] on Nu'uanu above Hollister's Store" (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 18 May 1878:4.2). Hollister and Company Soda Works occupied the lower story of these two buildings until 1884 (and was the residence of Henry Hollister until 1888) (City Directories). Sections of the buildings were also occupied by Ah Yet, a rice and grocer, and by Lee Chong, Young Him and Kam Wo as residences and as Kam Wo and Company Tailors in 1884/85 (Baggott 1884/85: 75, 90, 146, 164, 226). Between 1892 and 1893, the general merchandise stores of Ah Hung, and Hi Young cigar manufacturer occupied the building (Husted 1892/93: 400, 411). No businesses operations at these addresses were located in the Honolulu City directories after 1893. At the time of demolition in 1900 the building is listed as vacant, however Odo and Sinoto show the buildings as bothel locations (1985:46).

Rebuilt in either 1902 or 1903, a Japanese language daily newspaper occupied the building lot (Figure 8) which was renumbered 1142/1146 Nu'uanu. Renumbered 1150 and 1154 Nu'uanu after 1927 this location is mapped as a storage area through 1950 (Figures 9, 10). Currently this building is a one and one-half story brick structures with a flat roof. A one story cinder block building with a composition tar roof has been extended from the rear of the building, the corner extension fronting Pauahi Street.
Plate 2: NU'UANU STREET 1900 PRIOR TO DEMOLITION. SE CORNER OF PROJECT AREA.
(Hawaii State Archives)
87, 1148, 1158 Nu'uanu Avenue

First listing located of occupation of this lot was for an undergarment store operated by Yung Chung in 1888 (Brown 1888:93). Further listings were not located in Honolulu City directories until 1892/1893 when the building was shared by Augusto Dias, a guitar maker, and operated as a coffee parlor by Ah Pat (Husted 1892/93:401, 419). Prior to being leveled by the Health Department in 1900, the structure is listed as vacant. A photo (Plate 2) taken of the building on January 12, 1900 shows the building as a small two-story wood-frame structure separated from Hollister's buildings to the south, and adjoining Ahí's wood-working shops. Rebuilt after the 1900 fire, the building was used for storage until after 1950 (Figures 9, 10).

89, 1164 Nu'uanu

Erected about 1880 by Ahí (Ahee, Ah H), a cabinet maker and building contractor, the premises was also occupied by Hee Ah (same person?), a coffin maker (Polk 1880:50, 74). This building also had an attached rear workshop (Figure 8). Functioning as Ahí's cabinet, furniture, and upholstery shop, the premises were also shared by Augusto Dias, a guitar maker (see 87 Nuuanu) between 1888 and 1890 (City Directories). A photograph taken of these buildings for the Board of Health on January 12, 1900 shows this structure as a two-story frame building with a second story balcony over the sidewalk separated by a small passageway from the Beehive Saloon. Roofing is corrugated tin (Plates 2 and 3). This building was rebuilt after the fire and was the furniture making shop of Fong Inn Company from 1903 until 1938 (City Directories). In 1950 the buildings were storage areas (Figure 10).

Pauahi Street

Pauahi Street was originally known as "New Street" when it was extended from Smith to Nu'uanu in 1879. Buildings at the corners on Smith and on Nu'uanu are mapped with this area being occupied by residences in 1879 (Figure 7). A storage-type building and interior "teneaments" were rebuilt after 1900 and are mapped in this location until 1927 (Figures 8 and 9).
Figure 9: 1914-1927 SANBORN FIRE INSURANCE MAP
35-37 (20-24) Pauahi Street was the central portion of Zaccheus Rodgers house lot claim settled about 1827. A small block of storage areas in a two story building was erected after 1900, and were removed before 1927 (Figures 8, 9). One section of the structure (24 Pauahi) was briefly occupied between 1910 and 1912 by C. Fujii, a charcoal dealer; and between 1912 and 1914 by N. Horuichi, a bottle and junk dealer (City Directories).

Number 36 Pauahi occupies the native land claim of Kakekula and was settled with Chinese residences by 1879 (Figure 7). This area appears to have been vacant from 1900 until 1927 when it became an auto stand (Figure 10). This space was occupied by R. T. Koga's Auto Repair in 1949 (Polk 1949:16) until removed for the current parking lot. A shed behind the auto repair was apparently associated with a storage facility facing 1153 Smith Street.

Smith Lane

Three buildings are noted along the east side of Smith Lane (Figure 6) and are listed by Bennett (1869) as personal residences of T. Silva at 19 Smith (corner Smith and Pauahi, Bennett 1869:85), Mrs. Maholona at 29 Smith (Bennett 1869:83), and Ah Chong at 31 Smith (Bennett 1869:77). Eight buildings and a shed were mapped along Smith Lane in 1879 (Figure 7). Brown (1888:97), however lists on the Waikiki Side of Smith Street the previous noted three 1869 structures as occupied by: Manuel Perry, lodging house at 19 Smith, Tong Lee poi factory at 29 Smith, and Yong Sing store at 31 Smith.

Corner Pauahi and Smith

Located on the homesite of S. Kaapuiki prior to 1850 (L.C.A. 8001/"H"), the residence of T. Silva in 1869, and Manuel Perry’s lodging house in 1888, this area is mapped as a series of three two story storage buildings after 1900. The corner structure (renumbered 1145-1151 Smith) was occupied by an unknown cartographer between 1902 and 1914, and a printing shop (Figure 9). Between the years 1927 and 1950 a restaurant with upstairs lodgings were mapped (Figure 10). These buildings were removed for the current parking lot.
Block 10 Interior

The southern part of the interior of the Smith-Beretania block was settled as housesites in the 1820's. Between 1869 and 1900 the area within the project boundaries became the largest and most densely populated of the Chinatown district (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 12 January 1900, 8:6). In 1879 this specific area is mapped as having over twenty buildings and sheds which are noted as "Native and Chinese Shanties" (Figure 7). "More quarters were being constructed for inhabitants when Block 10 was burned" on January 12, 1900 (Thrum 1901:101).

Ahi's Tenements occupied the southeast-central portion of the interior of the Smith-Beretania parking lot from the 1870's until 1927 (Figures 7-9). These tenements were on the house lot land claim purchased by William Bell's wife, Malaeia in 1829. Ahi's consisted of two double story frame buildings containing eight tenement rooms each separated by a single story cookhouse. Ahi, (the carpenter and building contractor at 89 Nu'uanu) is listed in association with these tenements from 1869 until 1895 (City Directories). On January 11, 1900 Ah Chow, a forty year old male Chinese from the Ahi premises was a victim of bubonic plague (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 12 January 1900, and on 20 January 1900 the entire block was condemned and burnt.

The major portion of Block 10 was developed into a playground area in 1911 (Plate 4) and used until relocated for the Smith-Beretania parking lot in 1952.
Plate 4: FREE KINDERGARDEN CHILDREN'S AID ASSOCIATION PLAYGROUND 1913
(Bishop Museum)
REDEVELOPMENT IMPACTS

During the bubonic plague epidemic early in January 1900 Honolulu city officials recommended that Chinatown be laid bare and not occupied for one year. During that year, the demolished areas were to be saturated with oil and reburied, the cesspools emptied and filled with earth and lime (Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 8 January 1900, 3:3).

Subsurface deposits associated with early housesites, businesses, and Chinese residences are predicted historical archaeological resources contained within the Smith-Beretania parking lot. Potential historical remains are features and foundations of early buildings and sheds, remnants of coral walls, and filled privies. Layered privy deposits provide dating time frames in which accidental loss and deliberate disposal of artifacts are confined within a small area. These layered resources indicate the activities, economics, and health of a community. Associated with building foundation and feature remnants, documentation of the overall early settlement, and the growth and development of this section of the Chinese community exists. Impacts of the demolition of the block by fire in 1900 and subsequent leveling indicate major mixing and charring of upper subsurface deposits. Possible prehistoric activities, such as agriculture, early in-situ historical structural remains, and intact privies are resources likely to be encountered during redevelopment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Currently an asphalt paved parking lot and two buildings occupy the proposed Beretania Smith redevelopment areas. Initial phases of archaeological testing include determining the presence and extent of archaeological features and material to be impacted during redevelopment. Because of the diversity and density of land use and known historical sites within the project area, three specific areas for initial archaeological testing is recommended prior to removal of the parking lot pavement and buildings. These areas include:

a) Deed of Transfer and document research to locate exact locations
and perimeters of early housesites and structures.

b) Monitoring and analysis of core sample fill material (to coral substrate) to determine depths of fill deposits, historical contents, and identifications of features.

c) Two archaeological test pits beneath the building currently at 1150 and 1152 Nu‘uanu prior to structural removal, or after removal of floor boards and subflooring.

Removal of the structures in the southeastern section of the project area may impact subsurface remains of the 1863 soda works and the early 1830’s historic house site. Foundations, water service and sewage pipes must be left in-situ after initial structure frame removal for minimal disturbance to archaeological resources.

Three or more feet of fill material, and leveling in the northern section of the parking lot, indicate that in-situ archaeological resources in this specific area will not be initially impacted during pavement removal. Significant charred stratigraphic features, remains of structures and privies are predicted to be encountered in the southern areas of the parking lot during pavement removal. Monitoring is recommended during removal of pavement in all areas of the Smith-Beretania parking lot.

Analysis of document research, core samples, and testing in combination with monitoring of surface pavement removal, will confirm areas of potential high density of archaeological features and deposits. Recommended final initial phase of archaeological testing, after removal of building frames and pavement, are backhoe assisted trenches placed in strategic areas indicated by analysis.

Serious illegal destruction of archaeological sites and removal of artifacts by artifact collectors are common in downtown Honolulu and usually occur during nighttime hours and weekends. High fencing, alarm systems, and patrol of the entire site is necessary at all times.
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