January 15, 1992

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

Dear Mr. Choy:

Subject: Negative Declaration
Child and Family Service - Shelter for Abused Spouses and Children in Ewa

Please publish a Negative Declaration in the January 23, 1992 OEQC Bulletin for the subject project. The OEQC Form for Publication and four copies of the subject document are enclosed.

The Environmental Assessment prepared for the project indicated that there were no significant effects on the quality of the environment. The assessment is on file with the Department of Housing and Community Development at the Honolulu Municipal Building, 650 South King Street, 5th Floor, Honolulu, and is available for inspection by the public during regular office hours between 7:45 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

E. JAMES TURSE
Acting Director

Enclosures
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Administrative Information

A. Project: Child and Family Service
   Shelter for Abused Spouses and Children in Ewa

B. Type of Action: 
   Applicant
   X Agency

   Department of Housing and Community Development
   City and County of Honolulu
   650 South King Street, 5th Floor
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
   E. James Turse, Acting Director

C. Approving Agencies:

   U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
   Seven Waterfront Plaza, Suite 500
   500 Ala Moana Boulevard
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-4918

   State of Hawaii
   Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC)
   Central Pacific Plaza
   220 South King Street, 4th Floor
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

D. Environmental Assessment Prepared by:

   Department of Housing and Community Development
   January 1992

Description of Proposed Actions

A. Proposed Activity

   X Single activity;
   ___ Aggregation of activities;
   ___ Multi-year activity.

Proposed Project

The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) proposes to provide Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to Child and Family Service (CFS) in order to rehabilitate a 5 bedroom home which was moved from Kahala to Ewa. Rehabilitation work shall include major roof repairs, physically handicapped accessibility
modifications, basic interior and exterior renovation work and installation of a septic system. The estimated cost will be $120,000. The house will be operated by CFS as an emergency shelter for abused spouses and children.

Need for Project

During 1990, approximately 1,200 women and children sought emergency shelter in homes operated by CFS, the primary provider of this type of service on Oahu. While CFS has a policy of not turning needy clients away, the result has been overcrowded shelters.

The proposed project directly addresses this need by creating another shelter, which will provide five additional bedrooms for the aid of abused spouses and children. A supportive setting, including child care and counselling services, will be provided to clients in order to help them adjust to their new environment.

Basic Data

Location: Ewa
Tax Map Key: Confidential *
Land Area: 5.486 acres (Portion)
Land Owner: Child and Family Service
Description: Fairly level, rectangular-shaped lot
State Land Use: Urban
Development Plan: Residential
Zoning: R-5 Residential
Existing Land Use: Parcel contains several buildings used for social services

* Note: Agencies or persons requiring the exact location of the project site for environmental review purposes may request the tax map key identifier from the Department of Housing and Community Development.

Background

The land parcel in Ewa was donated to CFS several years ago and contains several dwellings which CFS uses as homes for different groups needing social services. The Kahala house was moved to the site in early 1990 and placed on a temporary foundation. Due to a lack of funding, CFS was unable to renovate the house and make it habitable. The house has deteriorated since it was moved, largely due to the leaky roof, and repair costs will escalate the longer the rehabilitation is put off.
Alternatives Considered

A. Alternative Sites

While CFS is pursuing development or acquisition of dwellings which would increase shelter space for abused women and children at other sites on Oahu, the need remains high and other suitable parcels are limited. Because the need is so great, development of other sites will be pursued in addition to this site. However, it is likely that costs will be higher at any additional sites and community acceptance may be lacking.

B. No Project

By not implementing the project, none of the adverse environmental impacts would occur, however, none of the positive social benefits, including expanded emergency shelters for abused women and children, would be realized.

The anticipated social benefits of this project far outweigh the potential environmental impacts which can easily be mitigated.

Environmental Assessment Prepared for Compliance with HUD Requirements and Environmental Review Requirements of Other Levels of Government as follows:

A. X State of Hawaii, Supplemental Form EA-S-SOH
B. ___ Guam, Supplemental Form EA-S-GUAM
C. ___ Northern Mariana Islands, Supplemental Form EA-S-NMI
D. ___ Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, Form EA-S-TTPI
E. ___ American Samoa, Supplemental Form EA-S-ASG

Findings and Conclusions from the Environmental Review

A. Environmental Findings

X Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment (FONSI)

An Environmental Impact Statement is required.

B. Agencies/Interested Parties Consulted

(See Appendix 2)

C. Public Notification

a. Date FONSI/RROF published in local newspaper
b. Last day for recipient to receive comments:
c. Last day for HUD to receive comments
d. Date FONSI transmitted to Federal, State or local governmental agencies or interested groups or individuals

e. Date HUD released grant conditions

2. Negative Declaration (Hawaii Only)
   a. Date Negative Declaration published in OEQC Bulletin
   b. Date on which 60-day waiting period expires
   c. Documentation attached:  X Yes  __ No

A. Land Development

1. Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning
   Rating:*  2 - No Impact Anticipated
   Sources:  City and County Zoning Map #13
             Department of General Planning letter dated December 11, 1991
             Department of Land Utilization letter dated December 16, 1991

   The Department of General Planning has stated that the proposed project is in line with its General Plan, and the State Land Use Commission has confirmed that the site is in the Urban District. The zoning designation for this property is R-5, Residential, and will not require rezoning.

Impact Categories

  * Note: Rating of environmental factors are as follows:
  1. Potentially beneficial impact.
  2. No impact anticipated.
  3. Minor adverse impacts anticipated.
  4. Adverse impact requires mitigation.
  5. Adverse impact requires modification to project/activity.
2. Compatibility and Urban Impact

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Existing Land Use Map

Site Inspection by Eric Stoetzer, DHCD Staff Planner, May 24, 1991

The proposed project will not significantly alter existing land use patterns in the neighborhood. The house is situated such that it is not visible from the nearest road, and it is of similar architectural characteristics as to blend in and be compatible with the surrounding area in terms of land use density, scale, mass, texture and architectural design.

3. Slope, Erosion and Soil Suitability

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The United States Soil Conservation Service classifies the soil at the project site as Honolulu Clay (HxA), consisting of basic igneous materials developed in alluvium. For this series, elevations range from 15 to 125 feet with annual rainfall of 18 to 30 inches. The soil has the characteristics of moderately slow permeability, slow runoff and no more than slight erosion hazard. The slope of this property is less than 5% (level). Workability is slightly difficult because of the very sticky and plastic clay.

4. Hazards, Nuisance and Site Safety

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

Telephone conversation with Mike Miyasaki of the Department of Health, January 13, 1992

A site inspection revealed no indication of natural hazards such as geologic faults, flooding, volcanic
activity, or landslide. There is no evidence of any man-made hazards such as inadequate separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, lack of traffic control, or the presence of toxic materials or explosives. Mike Miyasaki indicated that there was no record of hazardous waste at the project site, based on the database of hazardous waste maintained by the Department of Health.

5. Energy Consumption

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The project will receive electric and telephone service from the respective utility companies.

B. Environmental Design and Historic Values

1. Visual Quality - Coherence, Diversity, Compatible Use and Scale

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

Existing Land Use Map

The complex will blend well with the existing single family housing development pattern in the area.

C. Socio-Economic

1. Demographic/Community Character Changes

Rating: 3 - Minor Adverse Impact Anticipated

The proposed project will provide emergency shelter for as many as five families of abused spouses and children and will not significantly alter the existing demographic profile of the community. The proposed project is not expected to affect any community institutions such as churches, schools or community centers.

2. Displacement

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The Kahala house already exists onsite, on a temporary foundation. Therefore, the proposed project will not
require or result in the displacement of any residences or businesses.

3. Employment and Income Patterns

Ratings: 1 - Potential Beneficial Impact (Short Term)
2 - No Impact Anticipated (Long Term)

The project will result in the creation of temporary employment in construction related trades during the renovation of the project.

The proposed project will not significantly alter the community's employment and income patterns. The residents of the project are expected to be of low or moderate income.

D. Community Facilities and Services

1. Educational Facilities

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Department of Education letter dated November 15, 1991

The project will not affect existing public schools as residents will only remain at the shelter for a limited time and remain in the school system they attended prior to coming to the shelter.

2. Commercial Facilities

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Existing Land Use Map

Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The West Loch Shopping Center, approximately one mile away, is in the process of being developed, and the Pearl Ridge and Waipahu Shopping Centers, both containing many retail, commercial and professional services are within five miles. All of these facilities are accessible by City bus.

3. Health Care

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Source: Existing Land Use Map

The St. Francis Medical Center in Ewa is located approximately one mile from the project site. In addition to providing a full range of medical services, St. Francis Medical Center also provides 24-hour emergency health care and ambulance services.

4. Social Services

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Satellite offices of several State social service agencies are located in Ewa Beach, Pearl City and/or Waipahu. The residents of the proposed project are not anticipated to impact on the need for social services in the area.

5. Solid Waste

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The Department of Public Works, Refuse Division, provides twice weekly refuse collection service to the project site.

6. Wastewater

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Department of Public Works letter dated December 2, 1991

Department of Health letter dated January 7, 1992

There is no public sewer system for the immediate project area; each of the other buildings on the property are connected to a central cesspool. A septic tank or other individual wastewater system (IWS) will be provided in accordance with Department of Health regulations. A new sewer line is being installed to serve various portions of the Ewa area, including the West Loch Subdivision and the North-West portion of Ewa Estates, but there are no immediate plans to extend that service to the project site. When this sewer system becomes available to the site, the Kahala House will be connected to it.
7. Storm Water

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The proposed project will marginally reduce the available percolation area of the parcel. Grassing and landscaping will be installed to prevent the erosion of topsoil by storm water runoff.

8. Water Supply

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Board of Water Supply letter dated December 18, 1991

There is a 16-inch water main on the street bordering the project. The Board of Water Supply (BWS) has indicated that the area's water system is adequate to service the proposed project. Construction plans will be coordinated with BWS and submitted for final review and approval.

9. Public Safety

a. Police

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Honolulu Police Department letter dated November 29, 1991

The Honolulu Police Department states that the proposed project will not have a major impact on police services in the area. The project will be served primarily by the Pearl City Station. No figure for response time was given due to the nature of the patrol car system.

b. Fire Protection

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Honolulu Fire Department letter dated December 2, 1991

The Honolulu Fire Department considers existing fire protection services and facilities to be adequate to service the proposed project. The nearest fire station is in Waipahu, within three miles of the project site. All fire apparatus and
safety equipment will be in conformance with existing codes and standards.

c. Emergency Medical
   Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
   See Section B(3) Health Care.

10. Open Space, Recreation and Cultural Facilities
   Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
   Sources: Existing Land Use Map
            Department of Parks and Recreation letter dated November 22, 1991

   There are numerous open space and recreational areas in the vicinity of the project. The West Loch Golf Course and the West Loch Shoreline Park are within one mile of the project, and the West Loch District Park, which is expected to open within 18 months, will be located within half a mile of this project. In addition, much of the 5.5 acre parcel is available as open and recreational space.

11. Transportation
   Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
   Sources: Department of Transportation letter dated November 25, 1991
             Department of Transportation Services letter dated November 29, 1991
             Existing Land Use Map
             Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

   The site is served by City bus routes directly across from the project. There is adequate vehicular access to the site via Fort Weaver Road. Off-street parking spaces are available directly adjacent to the house as well as various locations on the parcel. The Department of Transportation noted that the project will not impact the State highway facilities.
E. Natural Features

1. Water Resources

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Oahu Water Plan, July 1982
         Site Inspection, May 24, 1991
         Board of Water Supply letter dated December 18, 1991

The project is located in the Board of Water Supply's Ewa District. In 1980, the Ewa District imported all of its water from the Pearl Harbor district. The housing projects in the Ewa district have brought with them an improved water infrastructure, and the BWS has stated that this project will not affect the water supply. Since the project is located in the Special Aquifer district, the Environmental Protection Agency has been consulted regarding the project.

2. Surface Water

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

See Section D(7) Storm Water.

Statutory Checklist/HUD Standards

1. Historic Properties

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Department of Land and Natural Resources
         letter dated November 22, 1991
         Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The Department of Land and Natural Resources states that while the Kahala House itself is not historically significant, several of the buildings located in the immediate vicinity are significant sites which are eligible for or listed on the Hawaii or National Registers of Historic Places. Since the Kahala House fits into the general architectural style of the surrounding buildings, DLNR did not have any objections to the project. If any architectural or skeletal remains
are uncovered during construction, the contractor will be required to stop work and notify the DLNR immediately.

2. Floodplain Management

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Department of the Army letter dated November 22, 1991

Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Flood Insurance Rate Map, City and County of Honolulu," Panel No. 150001-0110C

The site is located in Flood Zone D, an area in which flood hazards are undetermined. Flood insurance is not required. Since the site of the project is confidential, agencies or persons requiring the exact location for environmental review purposes may request the tax map key identifier from the Department of Housing and Community Development.

3. Wetlands Protection

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Department of the Army letter dated November 22, 1991

Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The project is not located in an area near a wetland. A Department of the Army permit is not required.

4. Coastal Zones

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 205A

The proposed project does not conflict with the objectives of the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program as provided in Chapter 205A, HRS. The appropriate forms have been included with this document.

5. Endangered Species

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Source: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

There are no rare or endangered species which will be affected by the proposed project.

6. Farmlands Protection

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Existing Land Use Map
Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The project site is not classified as prime agricultural land.

7. Air Quality

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

Existing Land Use Maps

The project site is located in a residential subdivision, away from major, heavily used roadways which would indicate the presence of high levels of vehicle-generated airborne pollutants. A site visit revealed no evidence of stationary sources of air pollutants such as power plants, sugar mills or industrial manufacturing. However, the site is close to agricultural lands used for sugar production. These fields are occasionally burned as part of the harvesting cycle. The prevailing trade winds normally carry this smoke away from the project, but there is a remote chance that the site would be adversely affected by sugar cane burning on those days of burning when different wind conditions exist.

Temporary adverse conditions may be felt during construction activities due to dust and heavy equipment. Frequent watering of the site during grading and excavation in accordance with Title 11, Department of Health Administrative Rules, Chapter 60, "Air Pollution Controls," Section 5, "Fugitive Dust," will minimize the release of fugitive dust into the immediate environment.

The proposed project does not include activities or uses which will significantly degrade ambient air quality in the project area.
8. Water Quality

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Source: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The site does not contain any bodies of standing water. The proposed project does not include activities or uses which will significantly degrade ambient water in the project area.

9. Noise

Ratings: 3 - Minor Adverse Impacts Anticipated (Short Term)
2 - No Impact Anticipated (Long Term)
Source: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

There are no high speed or highly used roadways near the project site which would indicate the presence of high levels of vehicular noise. A site inspection revealed no evidence of stationary noise sources such as industrial or construction machinery.

Short term increases in ambient noise levels resulting from construction related activities are anticipated. The building contractor will be required to comply with Title 11, Department of Health Administrative Rules, Chapter 43, "Community Noise Controls for Oahu."

The proposed project does not include activities or uses which will significantly affect noise levels in the project area.

10. Thermal/Explosives

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Source: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

The proposed project does not include activities or uses for thermal/explosives. A site visit revealed no evidence of thermal/explosives in the project area.

11. Airport Clear Zones

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991
Memorandum and map from Frank Johnson of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, dated March 25, 1991

The proposed project does not include activities or uses which would influence airport clear zones. The site lies outside of the flight path.

12. Solid Waste Disposal

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

See Section C(6) Wastewater

13. Toxic Chemicals and Radioactive Wastes

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, May 24, 1991

Telephone conversation with Mike Miyasaki of the Department of Health, January 13, 1992

The proposed project does not include activities or uses for toxic chemicals and radioactive wastes. A site visit revealed no evidence of toxic chemicals and radioactive wastes in the project area. Mike Miyasaki indicated that there was no record of hazardous waste at the project site, based on the database of hazardous waste maintained by the Department of Health.

Determination

It is determined that the proposed action will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The bases for this determination are as follows:

A. The number of units emplaced by the project is far below the threshold (2,500 units) which would require the preparation and dissemination of an Environmental Impact Statement under the provisions of Section 58.37 Federal Register, Volume 47, No. 70 dated April 12, 1982.

B. The potential environmental impacts of this project are easily mitigated or are evaluated as not significantly affecting the quality of the human environment:

1. Short term increases in noise levels attributable to construction related activities will be mitigated through
compliance with Title 11, Administrative Rules, Department of Health, Chapter 43, "Community Noise Controls for Oahu."

2. Escape of fugitive dust into the environment will be minimized by frequent watering of the project site during clearance and excavation.

3. The impacts of the project on public services and facilities, and the visual impacts of the project on the neighborhood are evaluated as minimal and not significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

C. The project will have the positive social benefit of providing emergency shelter for abused spouses and families.

A Negative Declaration will be filed with the State Office of Environmental Quality Control and a Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment will be published in a newspaper of general circulation.
RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Objective: Provide coastal recreational opportunities accessible to the public.

Policies

1) Improve coordination and funding of coastal recreation planning and management.

2) Provide adequate, accessible, and diverse recreational opportunities in the coastal zone management area by:

   a) Protecting coastal resources uniquely suited for recreational activities that cannot be provided in other areas;

   b) Requiring replacement of coastal resources having significant recreational value, including but not limited to surfing sites and sandy beaches, when such resources will be unavoidably damaged by development; or requiring reasonable monetary compensation to the State for recreation when replacement is not feasible or desirable;

   c) Providing and managing adequate public access, consistent with conservation of natural resources, to and along shorelines with recreational value;

   d) Providing an adequate supply of shoreline parks and other recreational facilities suitable for public recreation;

   e) Encouraging expanded public recreational use of County, State, and Federally owned or controlled shoreline lands and waters having recreational value;

   f) Adopting water quality standards and regulating point and non-point sources of pollution to protect and where feasible, restore the recreational value of coastal waters;

   g) Developing new shoreline recreational opportunities, where appropriate, such as artificial reefs for surfing and fishing; and

   h) Encouraging reasonable dedication of shoreline areas with recreational value for public use as part of discretionary approvals or permits by the land use commission, board of land and natural resources, County planning commissions; and crediting such dedication against the requirements of section 46-6.
Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

1. Will the proposed action involve or be near a dedicated public right-of-way?  
   Yes  No  X
2. Does the project site abut the shoreline?  
   X
3. Is the project site near a State or County park?  
   X
4. Is the project site near a perennial stream?  
   X
5. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a surf site?  
   X
6. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a popular fishing area?  
   X
7. Will the proposed action occur in or affect a recreational or boating area?  
   X
8. Is the project site near a sandy beach?  
   X
9. Are there swimming or other recreational uses in the area?  
   X

Discussion
HISTORIC RESOURCES

Objective: Protect, preserve, and where desirable, restore those natural and man-made historic and pre-historic resources in the coastal zone management area that are significant in Hawaiian and American history and culture.

Policies

1) Identify and analyze significant archaeological resources;

2) Maximize information retention through preservation of remains and artifacts or salvage operations; and

3) Support State goals for protection, restoration, interpretation, and display of historic resources.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

1. Is the project site within a historic/cultural district? Yes No X

2. Is the project site listed on or nominated to the Hawaii or National register of historic places? X

3. Does the project site include undeveloped land which has not been surveyed by an archaeologist? X

4. Has a site survey revealed any information on historic or archaeological resources? X

5. Is the project site within or near a Hawaiian fishpond or historic settlement area? X

Discussion

2 & 3. The project site includes several buildings which are listed as historically significant structures. This dwelling will fit architecturally with the other buildings.
SCENIC AND OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

Objective: Protect, preserve and, where desirable, restore or improve the quality of coastal scenic and open space resources.

Policies

1) Identify valued scenic resources in the coastal zone management area;

2) Insure that new developments are compatible with their visual environment by designing and locating such developments to minimize the alteration of natural landforms and existing public views to and along the shoreline;

3) Preserve, maintain and, where desirable, improve and restore shoreline open space and scenic resources; and

4) Encourage those developments which are not coastal dependent to locate in inland areas.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

1. Does the project site abut a scenic landmark? Yes No X

2. Does the proposed action involve the construction of a multi-story structure or structures? Yes No X

3. Is the project site adjacent to undeveloped parcels? Yes No X

4. Does the proposed action involve the construction of structures visible between the nearest coastal roadway and the shoreline? Yes No X

5. Will the proposed action involve construction in or on waters seaward of the shoreline? On or near a beach? Yes No X

Discussion

3. The project site is adjacent to a large tract of agricultural land used for sugar production.
COASTAL ECOSYSTEMS

Objective: Protect valuable coastal ecosystems from disruption and minimize adverse impacts on all coastal ecosystems.

Policies

1) Improve the technical basis for natural resource management;

2) Preserve valuable coastal ecosystems of significant biological or economic importance;

3) Minimize disruption or degradation of coastal water ecosystems by effective regulation of stream diversions, channelization, and similar land water uses, recognizing competing water needs; and

4) Promote water quantity and quality planning and management practices which reflect the tolerance of fresh water and marine ecosystems and prohibit land and water uses which violate State water quality standards.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

1. Does the proposed action involve dredge or fill activities?  Yes  No

2. Is the project site within the Shoreline Setback Area (20 to 40 feet inland of the shoreline)?  Yes  No

3. Will the proposed action require some form of effluent discharge into a body of water?  Yes  No

4. Will the proposed action require earthwork beyond clearing and grubbing?  Yes  No

5. Will the proposed action include the construction of special waste treatment facilities, such as injection wells, discharge pipes, or cesspools?  Yes  No

6. Is an intermittent or perennial stream located on or near the project site?  Yes  No

7. Does the project site provide habitat for endangered species of plants, birds, or mammals?  Yes  No

8. Is any such habitat located nearby?  Yes  No

9. Is there a wetland on the project site?  Yes  No

10. Is the project site situated in or abutting a Natural Area Reserve?  Yes  No
11. Is the project site situated in or abutting a Marine Life Conservation District?  
   
12. Is the project site situated in or abutting an estuary?  
   
Discussion

4 & 5. The project will include installation of a septic system in accordance with the Department of Health rules and regulations.
ECONOMIC USES

Objective: Provide public or private facilities and improvements important to the State's economy in suitable locations.

Policies

1) Concentrate in appropriate areas the location of coastal dependent development necessary to the State's economy;

2) Insure that coastal dependent development such as harbors and ports, visitor industry facilities, and energy generating facilities are located, designed, and constructed to minimize adverse social, visual, and environmental impacts in the coastal zone management area; and

3) Direct the location and expansion of coastal dependent developments to areas presently designated and used for such development and permit reasonable long-term growth at such areas, and permit coastal dependent development outside of presently designated areas when:
   a) Utilization of presently designated locations is not feasible;
   b) Adverse environmental effects are minimized; and
   c) Important to the State's economy.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
COASTAL HAZARDS

Objective: Reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion, and subsidence.

Policies

1) Develop and communicate adequate information on storm wave, tsunami, flood erosion, and subsidence hazard;

2) Control development in areas subject to storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, and subsidence hazard;

3) Ensure that developments comply with requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program; and

4) Prevent coastal flooding from inland projects.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

1. Is the project site on or abutting a sandy beach?  
   Yes  No  X

2. Is the project site within a potential tsunami inundation area as depicted on the National Flood Insurance Program flood hazard map?  
   X

3. Is the project site within a potential flood inundation area according to a flood hazard map?  
   X

4. Is the project site within a potential subsidence hazard area according to a subsidence hazard map?  
   X

5. Has the project site or nearby shoreline areas experienced shoreline erosion?  
   X

Discussion

The project site is located in Flood Zone D, an area in which flood hazards are undetermined.
MANAGING DEVELOPMENT

Objective: Improve the development review process, communication, and public participation in the management of coastal resources and hazards.

Policies

1) Effectively utilize and implement existing law to the maximum extent possible in managing present and future coastal zone development;

2) Facilitate timely processing of application for development permits and resolve overlapping or conflicting permit requirements; and

3) Communicate the potential short- and long-term impacts of proposed significant coastal developments early in their life cycle and in terms understandable to the general public to facilitate public participation in the planning and review process.

Check either "Yes" or "No" for each of the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will the proposed activity require more than two (2) permits or approvals?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the proposed activity conform with the State and County land use designations for the site?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has or will the public be notified of the proposed activity?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has a draft or final environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment been prepared?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

3. The public will be notified by way of the published Negative Declaration in the OEQC Bulletin.

4. This document is attached to the Environmental Assessment.
FEDERAL CONSISTENCY
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FORM

Project/Activity Title or Description: Child and Family Service - Shelter for Abused Spouses and Children in Ewa

Island Oahu Tax Map Key No. Confidential* Est. Start Date: 5/92

APPLICANT OR AGENT

Name & Title Eric Stoetzer, Planner
Agency/Organization Department of Housing and Community Development
Telephone 523-4262
Address 650 South King Street, 5th Floor, Honolulu, HI Zip 96813

TYPE OF APPLICATION (check one only)

[ ] I. Federal Activity (statement "a")

"The proposed activity is consistent with and will be conducted in a manner consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program."

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

[ ] II. Permit or License (statement "b")

"The proposed activity complies with Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Program and will be conducted in a manner consistent with such a program."

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

[ ] III. OCS Plan/Permit

[XX] IV. Grants & Assistance

*Note - Agencies or persons requiring the exact location of the project site for environmental review purposes may request the tax map key identifier from the Department of Housing and Community Development.

- 39 -
# AGENCY RESPONSE

## Federal
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: 12/4/91
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: 11/22/91
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service: --

## State
- Department of Education: 11/15/91
- Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism: 12/4/91
- Office of State Planning, Governor's Office: 12/10/91
- Department of Health: 1/3/92
- Department of Land and Natural Resources: --
- Department of Land and Natural Resources, Historic Preservation Division: 12/16/91
- Department of Transportation: 11/25/91
- Department of Agriculture: --
- Housing Finance and Development Corporation: 12/6/91
- Hawaii Housing Authority: 11/15/91
- University of Hawaii Environmental Center: --
- Office of Environmental Quality Control: 11/18/91
- Land Use Commission: --

## City
- Department of General Planning: 12/11/91
- Department of Land Utilization: 12/16/91
- Department of Transportation Services: 11/29/91
- Building Department: 11/15/91
- Department of Public Works: 12/2/91
- Department of Parks and Recreation: 11/22/91
- Board of Water Supply: 12/18/91
- Honolulu Fire Department: 12/2/91
- Honolulu Police Department: 11/29/91
- Department of Human Resources: 12/4/91
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Honolulu Office
Seven Waterfront Plaza, Suite 500
500 Ala Moana Boulevard
Honolulu, HI 96813

DEC 4 1991

Ms. Gail Kaito
Acting Director
City and County of Honolulu
Department of Housing and
Community Development
650 South King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment
Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

This responds to your transmittal dated November 7, 1991, regarding the Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds that will provide Child and Family Services (CFS) with $85,000 for renovation of a five-bedroom house moved from Kahala to Ewa.

We have reviewed this project and submit the following comments that should be considered in your assessment.

1. A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would not be required by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

2. The depth of the environmental review should be guided by 24 CFR Part 88.33(a)(4) to determine if a full environmental assessment is required based on 75 percent of the total estimated cost of replacement after rehabilitation.

3. The State Historic Preservation Officer must be consulted and given an opportunity to comment on the potential effect the proposed action may have on historic properties per 36 CFR Part 800.

4. Rehabilitation of residential units with Federal funds must be consistent with 24 CFR Part 8: Non-Discrimination Based on Handicap in Federally Assisted Programs and Activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards.
If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Frank Johnson at (808) 541-1327.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Patty A. Nicholas
Director
Community Planning and Development Division
November 22, 1991

Ms. Gail M. Kaito
Acting Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment preparation notice for Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa, Oahu. The following comments are provided pursuant to Corps of Engineers authorities to disseminate flood hazard information under the Flood Control Act of 1960 and to issue Department of the Army (DA) permits under the Clean Water Act; the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899; and the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.

a. A DA permit is not required.

b. The flood zone designation stated on the Fact Sheet is correct.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kisuk Cheung, P.E.
Director of Engineering
Ms. Gail M. Kaito, Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment
Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

Our review of the subject project indicates that it will have no impact on the public schools in the area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent

CTT:jl

cc: A. Suga
    L. Chung
December 4, 1991

Ms. Gail M. Kaito, Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Subject: Environmental Assessment Fact Sheet for the Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families, Ewa, Oahu

The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism has referred your letter dated November 7, 1991 to our office for response.

We have reviewed the Environmental Assessment fact sheet for the subject renovation of a group home for abused spouses and families. Based on Map 427, Land Court Application No. 1069 provided by your office, we confirm that the 5.486 acre site of the group home is designated within the State Land Use Urban District.

We have no other comments to offer at this time. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this matter.

If you have any questions, please call me or Bert Saruwatari of our office at 587-3822.

Sincerely,

Esther Ueda
Executive Officer

EU:to

cc: DBED
December 10, 1991

Ms. Gail M. Kaito
Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Subject: Environmental Assessment for Renovation of Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii

We have reviewed the subject Environmental Assessment for the renovation of a five bedroom group home for abused spouses and families in Ewa. We understand the sensitive nature of the proposal, and the reason for excluding the location of the proposal. However, we are unable to evaluate the proposal adequately because the assessment does not include basic information. We refer to information regarding the number of residents that will be accommodated by the home, and a brief description of the shelter's operation. For example, would the spouses and other relatives or friends of the sheltered person or persons be allowed to visit the home? What are the traffic and noise impacts to be expected within the neighborhood? Finally, the assessment should include a section on the compatibility of the use within the neighborhood, and whether development permits are required.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Should you have any questions, please contact the Land Use Division at 587-2890.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Harold S. Masuzato
Director
Ms. Gail M. Kaito
Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Subject: Environmental Assessment
Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa
Ewa, Oahu

Thank you for allowing us to review the material on the subject project submitted by your office. The project is located above the Underground Injection Control (UIC) Line, in the "Pass" Zone, and within the critical wastewater disposal area. No new cesspools will be allowed in the subject area.

It has been determined that the subject project is not currently serviced by the County sewer system. Therefore, the Department recommends that a treatment individual wastewater system (IWS) be utilized for wastewater treatment and disposal.

All wastewater plans must conform to applicable provisions of the Department of Health’s Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-62, "Wastewater Systems", and we reserve the right to review those plans.

If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Ms. Lori Kajiwara of the Wastewater Branch at 586-4290.

In addition, as long as the residents prepare their own meals, the kitchen does not have to meet the requirements of Chapter 1-A, Food Service and Food Establishment Sanitation Code.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. LEWIN, M.D.
Director of Health
DEC 16 1991

FILE NO.: 92-295
DOC. NO.: 22258

The Honorable Gail Kaito
Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment - Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

Thank you for giving our Department the opportunity to review this project. Our Historic Sites section comments that because of the placement of the house on the site and the use of an older residential structure, we have no preservation concerns relating to the project. However, we recommend that all repairs to the house be compatible with the architectural character of the building.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. Please feel free to call me or Sam Lemmo at our Office of Conservation and Environmental Affairs, at 587-0377, should you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. PATY
Ms. Gail K. Kaito, Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Environmental Assessment, Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

Thank you for your letter of November 7, 1991, requesting our comment on the subject project.

The proposed project is not anticipated to impact our State highway facilities. Any construction work within the State highway right-of-way will require a permit from our Highways Division.

Very truly yours,

Edward Y. Hirata
Director of Transportation
Ms. Gail M. Kaito  
Deputy Director  
Department of Housing and  
Community Development  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

December 6, 1991

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Re: Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

Thank you for forwarding a fact sheet on the subject project. We are supportive of your efforts to increase supportive housing opportunities for special need groups.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Joseph K. Conant  
Executive Director
November 15, 1991

Ms. Gail M. Kaito, Acting Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

RE: Environmental Assessment
Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

We support in principle the above-referenced proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

MITSUO SHITO
Executive Director
November 18, 1991

Ms. Gail M. Kaito,
Acting Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Ms. Kaito:

Subject: Environmental Assessment
Renovation of a Group Home for Abused Spouses and Families in Ewa

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject assessment. Please be informed that we do not have any comments to offer at this time.

Sincerely,

Brian J. J. Choy
Director
December 11, 1991

MEMORANDUM

TO: E. J. TURSE, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

SUBJECT: REVIEW AND COMMENTS TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NOTICE FOR RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWA

In response to your memorandum of November 7, 1991, we have reviewed the subject project and submit the following comments.

The current Development Plan Land Use designation for the proposed facility is "Public and Quasi-Public." The designation allows for general governmental activities including "religious, social, and social service institutions; and other public services."

The subject project would meet the objectives and policies of the General Plan related to the provision of Public Safety.

We have no further comments on the subject project at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Should you have any questions on the matter, please contact Brian Suzuki of our staff at 527-6051.


BENJAMIN B. LEE
Chief Planning Officer
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MEMORANDUM

TO: E. JAMES TURSE, DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: DONALD A. CLEGG, DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

SUBJECT: COMMENTS FOR A PROPOSED SPOUSE ABUSE SHELTER IN EWA

We have reviewed your fact sheet for the above described project and have no comments at this time. The proposed shelter is not within the Special Management Area. We understand that our Zoning District Changes Branch is currently processing a Conditional Use Permit, Type 2, for this project.

If you have any questions, please contact Dana Kohama of our staff at extension 4648.

DONALD CLEGG
DONALD A. CLEGG
Director of Land Utilization
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MEMORANDUM

TO: GAIL KAITO, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR., DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES—EWA
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

This is in response to your memorandum of November 7, 1991 requesting our review and comments on the above subject.

We understand that the access point for this project is not a City facility. We, therefore, have no objections or comments to offer at this time.

Should you have any questions, please contact Wayne Nakamoto of my staff at local 4190.

[Signature]

JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR.,
MEMO TO:  GAIL M. KAITO, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM:    HERBERT K. MURAOKA
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT - RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWA

This is in response to your memo dated November 7, 1991 relative to the subject project.

We have reviewed the fact sheet and have no comments to offer.

HERBERT K. MURAOKA
Director and Building Superintendent

cc:  J. Harada
MEMORANDUM

TO: MR. E. JAMES TURSE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: SAM CALLEJO, DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)
RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWA

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

1. Should a septic tank be used, approval from the State Department of Health is required.

2. When pumping of the septic tank is needed, a private pumping service will have to be arranged by the property owner since the City does not provide service for pumping septic tanks.

SAM CALLEJO
Director and Chief Engineer
November 22, 1991

TO: GAIL M. KAITO, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: WALTER M. OZAWA, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES
AND FAMILIES IN EWA

The proposed project will not have any impact on
recreation facilities or programs.

WALTER M. OZAWA, Director

WMO:ei
TO: E. JAMES TURSE, DIRECTOR  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

SUBJECT: YOUR MEMORANDUM OF NOVEMBER 7, 1991, REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED RENOVATION OF A GROUP LIVING FACILITY IN EWA

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed group living facility in Ewa. We have the following comments to offer:

1. The existing water system is presently adequate to accommodate the proposed project. Although the Board of Water Supply (BWS) maintains a water main fronting the parcel, there are no existing BWS water services to the site.

2. The availability of water from our system, will be confirmed when the building permit is submitted for our review and approval. When water is made available, the applicant will be required to pay our Water System Facilities and any applicable meter installation charges.

If you have any questions, please contact Bert Kuioka at 527-5235.
TO: MICHAEL N. SCARFONE, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: DONALD S. M. CHANG, FIRE DEPUTY CHIEF

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWA

We have reviewed the application and made an on-site assessment of the above subject request, and have no objections to the proposal.

Should additional information or assistance be required, you may contact Captain Michael Chung of our Fire Prevention Bureau at 523-4186.

DONALD S. M. CHANG
Fire Deputy Chief

DSMC/MC: kc
November 29, 1991

TO: GAIL M. KAITO, ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR RENOVATION OF A
GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWA

We have reviewed the fact sheet for the above project and find that the proposed renovation will not significantly increase the calls for police services.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MICHAEL S. NAKAMURA
Chief of Police

By
CHESTER E. HUGHES
Assistant Chief of Police
Support Services Bureau
MEMORANDUM

TO: E. JAMES TURSE, ACTING DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: VICTOR D. GUILLERMO, JR., ACTING DIRECTOR
   DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENT - RENOVATION OF A GROUP HOME FOR ABUSED SPOUSES AND FAMILIES IN EWALI

The Department of Human Resources has reviewed the above-cited request and offers the following comments:

(1) We support the Department of Housing and Community Development's provision of $85,000 in Federal Emergency Shelter Grant Funds to Child and Family Services for the renovation of a 5-bedroom house in Ewa to serve as a group home for abused spouses and families.

(2) There is a critical need for facilities of this nature which will not only give shelter to victims of abuse and domestic violence but more importantly provide much needed counseling services.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.