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
Homeless Center
Tax Map Key: 1-5-7:50

Please publish a Negative Declaration in the April 8, 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 Municipal Building, 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,

Jail Kaito
director

Enclosures
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

FOR THE

HOMELESS CENTER

Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
March 1992
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

A. Name of Project: Homeless Center
B. Type of Action:  
   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, Director

C. Approving Agencies:
   
   Department of Housing and Urban Development
   Seven Waterfront Plaza, Suite 500
   500 Ala Moana Boulevard
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

   State of Hawaii
   Office of Environmental Quality Control
   220 South King Street, 4th Floor
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

D. Environmental Assessment Prepared by:
   
   Department of Housing and Community Development
   March 1992

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

A. Proposed Actions:  
   X  Single Activity
   ___ Aggregation of Activities
   ___ Multi-year Activities

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 RESULTING FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A. Environmental Findings

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

_ An Environmental Impact Statement is required.

B. Agencies/Interested Parties Consulted

(See Appendix B.)

C. Publication Notification

1. Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment and Request Release of Funds (Combined Notice)

   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

PROPOSED PROJECT

The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is proposing to acquire a 14,807 square foot property located in Iwilei (see location map attached as Appendix A) for lease to the Institute for Human Services (IHS) for an emergency shelter for homeless families with children. The property contains a three-story structure totaling 31,242 square feet which will be renovated to serve a maximum of 175 homeless persons and contain dormitories, administrative offices, a health care room, multi-purpose rooms, and a child care center. Approximately 12-15 parking stalls will be provided on site.

NEED FOR PROJECT

There is an overall need on Oahu to provide appropriate emergency shelter and services for the increasing numbers of homeless families with children. This group represents the fastest growing and the most vulnerable segment of the homeless population. Whereas, prior to the 1970s, the homeless population originally did not include families with children, families with children now compromise approximately 26.5% of all homeless cases on Oahu, according to a 1990 study of Hawaii's homeless by SMS Research, Inc.; women comprise 30% of Oahu's homeless population.
The proposed project is being developed in response to the need for IHS to provide expanded and more suitable facilities to accommodate the growing numbers of its homeless clients who are single-parent families with children.

IHS, a Hawaii nonprofit corporation, is the only open-door, unrestricted shelter for homeless men, women and children on the island of Oahu. Founded in 1978 by the Rev. Dr. Claude DuTei in a small vacant store in the old Chinatown area of Honolulu, IHS has grown from a small "Peanut Butter Ministry" providing sandwiches and coffee to street people to becoming a major shelter for the homeless in Honolulu. IHS currently serves over 5,000 meals a week, provides sleeping space for over 300 individuals and families each night and arranges for emergency medical and mental health care, housing and welfare assistance for them.

In 1986, the City and County of Honolulu, in cooperation with the Pu'uhonua Nonprofit Corporation, constructed a building especially for IHS at 350 Summer Street in Wiliel, situated adjacent to the Honolulu waterfront commercial warehouse district. The population of homeless families appearing at the doors of IHS has increased substantially. Daily, from 80 to 100 women, 30 to 60 children (i.e., 15 to 30 families) seek emergency shelter and crisis assistance at IHS. These families now represent over one-third of the total IHS homeless population. The second floor of IHS is reserved primarily for the use of the growing population of homeless families and women.

In addition to the need to relieve existing overcrowding conditions, there is a need to provide more appropriate accommodations for homeless families with children because the Wiliel Shelter was designed primarily to serve single individuals. There are also concerns that the mixture of all elements of the homeless population at the Wiliel shelter, including chronically mentally ill and substance abusers, creates an unsafe and unsuitable environment for women and families with children. Development of a separate facility for families with children will ensure the safety and security of the most vulnerable segment of the homeless population.

Proposed Action

The Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) proposes to acquire a privately owned parcel on Kaaahi Street, in Wiliel, and renovate an existing three-story building containing 31,242 square feet on the property. The Institute for Human Services will lease the facility from the City and provide an emergency shelter for homeless families with children at the Kaaahi Street site. The building will be occupied in phases. Initially, the building will be used as a temporary relocation facility for 250-270 homeless persons from IHS's Summer Street shelter while the Summer Street parcel is being renovated. New office space for program activities and IHS administration, restroom facilities and child care space will be constructed at the Kaaahi Street site which will eventually serve as an emergency shelter for approximately 150 homeless people. Total land acquisition and rehabilitation costs are estimated at approximately $5 million. City Special Needs funds will be used for land acquisition and IHS may need to obtain their own source of funds for rehabilitation. However, Community Development Block Grant funds may be used in the later stages of the project development if IHS does not have a source of funding.
Alternatives Considered

1. Alternative location. For prospective clients of the shelter, the project site is conveniently located relative to public and private social service providers, employment centers, schools, retail stores and public transportation. It is also in close proximity to the existing IHS shelter in Iwilei, which will facilitate the coordination of services and administration of the facility by IHS. Additionally, preparation of all meals will be done at the Iwilei Shelter. Finding another developable site in a similarly convenient location and of a suitable size would delay the project and add unnecessary costs, which could undermine the feasibility of the proposed undertaking. Twelve additional sites were previously considered and rejected by IHS.

2. Higher density use. The project site could be developed to a maximum floor area ratio of 2.5 and height of 150 feet. However, such development would add unnecessary cost to the project, is incompatible with existing development in the area and would be in excess of IHS's needs for the type and number of clientele to be served by the proposed project.

3. No project. Should this project not be implemented, overcrowding conditions and the same unsuitable mixture of client groups that poses safety and security threats to families with children will continue to exist at the existing IHS facility in Iwilei. Homeless women and families with children will be forced to continue to seek shelter at the Iwilei facility or remain unsheltered and face continued obstacles to the receipt of urgently needed shelter and supportive services. The positive social benefits of the proposed project far outweigh the project’s potential negative environmental impacts.

Based on an analysis of the alternative considered, it is determined that there are no practical alternatives other than to develop the project as proposed at the subject site.

SITE INSPECTION

A site inspection was conducted on January 31, 1992 by Karen Iwamoto, Planner, and Bonnie Arakawa, Architect, both of the Department of Housing and Community Development, Reverend Lee Kiefer and Reverend Allison Dingley of the Institute for Human Services and Stephen Morse of the Institute for Affordable Housing.

SITE DATA

Tax Map Key: 1-5-7: 50
Ownership: Von Hamm Textiles, Inc.
Location: Iwilei
Land Area: 14,607 Square Feet

Land Use Data

State Land Use District: Urban
Development Plan
Designation: Industrial
Zoning: IMX-1-Commercial Mixed Use
Existing Use: Textile company.
Flood Zone: HFA zone X (unshaded), outside the 500-year flood plain.
Special Management Area: Not in SMA.
Height Limit: 150'
Surrounding Uses: Commercial, light industrial, retail, residential.

IMPACT CATEGORIES:
The following criteria is used to rate the level of impact the project will have on the various categories:

1 - Potentially beneficial impact.
2 - No impact anticipated.
3 - Minor adverse impacts anticipated.
   a. Short Term
   b. Long Term
4 - Adverse impact. Requires mitigation.
5 - Adverse impact. Requires modification to project/activity.

A. Land Development
1. Conformance with Comprehensive Plans and Zoning
   Rating: 4 - Adverse impact. Requires mitigation measures.
   Sources:
   Department of Land Utilization letter received on March 30, 1992
   Department of General Planning letter dated March 20, 1992
   State Land Use Commission letter dated March 9, 1992

The project site is within the State Land Use Urban District, is designated for Industrial use on the City's Primary Urban Center Development Plan Land Use Map, and is zoned IMX-1, Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use District. The Department of General Planning noted that a Development Plan Land Use Map (DPLM) amended would be required to support such a housing project. The Department of Land Utilization classifies the proposed project as a "group living facility" because a State license is required to operate the facility and care services will be provided to clients. DHCD will seek exemptions from these development regulations including allowable parking and possibly Park Dedication requirements, under the provisions of Chapter 201E, Hawaii Revised Statutes, provided that such exemptions do not jeopardize public health and safety.
2. Compatibility and Urban Impact

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


Kalihi-Palama Community Council public meeting on March 2, 1992

Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board meeting on March 18, 1992

The following are among the concerns raised by elected representatives and residents of the Kalihi-Palama area regarding the social impact of the proposed project.

- Over-concentration of facilities for special need groups in Kalihi-Palama.

Concerns were expressed that Kalihi-Palama is being used as a "dumping ground" for low-income housing and community facilities by public and social service agencies. The existing IHS Iwilei facility is viewed as a magnet for homeless people from all over the island, and it is feared that the proposed facility would only increase the area's attractiveness to homeless people.

It is felt that social services, particularly those for homeless people, should be "spread around" to other communities.

- Incompatibility of the Proposed Project with the Surrounding Community

Concerns regarding the desirability of the proposed facility as a neighbor have also been raised. The ability of IHS to effectively manage the project is at question. It was pointed out that the Iwilei facility is not a good neighbor because of crime and loitering and fears that such management problems would be duplicated at Kaaahi Street have been expressed.

In May 1991, the planning firm, Earthplan, completed a social impact assessment for the City for an emergency shelter for homeless women and children on Akepa Lane, two blocks away from Kaaahi Street (Appendix C). The study area for the assessment was the "Iwilei-Palama" area which includes the current project site. The assessment will thus be used as a reference for this document. Earthplan undertook a detailed analysis to explore whether the "dumping ground" perception is an accurate portrayal of what is really occurring in this community. To explore this perception, (1) the types of
public and social-related facilities currently located in Kalihi-Palama and (2) socio-economic characteristics which may be indicators of need for these facilities were examined and the following conclusions were made:

There are three types of social-oriented facilities in the study area.

- Facilities which are specifically designed to accommodate the larger islandwide community and have very little direct service value to the Kalihi-Palama community. Examples include the Oahu Community College Correction Center and the Keehi Lagoon and Honolulu Harbor maritime facilities.

- Facilities which are intended for the larger region or even islandwide need, and can be used by Kalihi-Palama residents as well. For example, the Honolulu Community College and Sand Island Regional park can be enjoyed by Kalihi-Palama residents around the island, including those in Kalihi-Palama.

- Facilities which are in the area to specifically serve Kalihi-Palama residents. These facilities such as immigration services, housing assistance programs, job training, health clinics, public assistance agencies and so on.

Population statistics show that growth in the study area has been very moderate, yet there continues to be an increase in agencies and facilities. That the existing community warrants at least some of these agencies appears to be supported by the following statistics:

- Kalihi-Palama has more children and more elderly people than the islandwide community, thereby needing certain services, such as affordable health, child and elderly care, more than other parts of Oahu.

- The district has proportionately more immigrants than other areas, thereby indicating a need for immigrant services, language programs and cultural assimilation and access activities.

- Education and job training programs are needed, since less people completed high school and more people are not actively participating in the labor force.

- High poverty levels and low family incomes increase the need for public assistance programs.
Housing is expensive but rent is high, thereby creating greater financial burden on residents.

Earthplan concluded that residents are correct in saying that Kalihi-Palama has an inordinate share of social service agencies but that what is not often articulated is the distinction between the different types of agencies or facilities.

Earthplan found that the greatest degree of resentment is generated by the prison and other island-oriented facilities which have little direct value for Kalihi-Palama residents but cause direct impacts on the surrounding community. Unfortunately, it is these very types of facilities over which the nearby community has limited, if any, input. Thus the “dumping ground” syndrome is perpetuated by these statewide and islandwide facilities.

It was also found that social service facilities established specifically to assist Kalihi-Palama residents generate the least amount of community opposition because there is obvious need for these agencies, as suggested by the socio-economic indicators discussed earlier.

The facilities which are intended for the larger region but are also accessible to Kalihi-Palama residents are often the target of criticism. Though they may be valuable and necessary for the community's elderly population, care homes are no longer welcome in Kalihi-Palama, for example.

Earthplan concluded that whether the project will further contribute to this “dumping ground” syndrome will depend on how the service population of the proposed Homeless Center is perceived.

The Project as an Islandwide Facility

The IHS Iwilei facility serves an islandwide need and is not intended to only serve Kalihi-Palama residents. Community members have expressed frustration similar to that expressed regarding the Oahu Community Corrections Center. This frustration is especially acute if one believes that Kalihi-Palama had very few homeless people until IHS moved into Iwilei. For these people, the facility was responsible for increasing the number of homeless people in Kalihi-Palama, and therefore, another homeless shelter, i.e., the proposed Homeless Center, would perpetuate the dumping ground syndrome and would be an unwelcome addition to the community.

The project as an Islandwide and Kalihi-Palama (Iwilei) Facility

For those who believe that homelessness exists in Kalihi-Palama for the same reason as it does everywhere else, the project will be likely viewed as a solution to an existing community problem. The presence of social service agencies does not encourage the immigration of poor people but rather assists the already existing
population, and, therefore, the proposed Homeless Center is a solution to a community problem already existing in Kaliihi-Palama.

For the most part, the social service facilities and agencies in Kaliihi-Palama are present because many of the clients live nearby or rent is low enough for non-profit agencies to afford. As the 1980 Census indicates, the socio-economic problems of the area. Further, not building the proposed project will not solve the problem of homeless families already present in the area.

Inasmuch as regional organizations dislike many of the social service facilities, Earthplan stressed that removing these agencies and facilities from Kaliihi-Palama will not eliminate the current socio-economic problems of the area. Further, not building the proposed project will not solve the problem of homeless families already present in the area.

Earthplan concluded that what is needed is a concerted effort by government, the regional organizations and social agencies to work together to improve the quality of life for all residents in the area. The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children previously proposed was identified as a step in the right direction inasmuch as the homeless clientele will need, first and foremost, shelter, and, second, training in life skills to successfully function in the larger society.

The social impact assessment examined community concerns regarding the compatibility of the proposed project with the surrounding area as follows:

The compatibility of the Homeless Center with surrounding environs depends on analysis of three factors: (1) the area's existing character, (2) a possible future for the area, and (3) what exactly will the proposed Homeless Center add to the area. These factors will determine what subsequent attributions the Homeless Center will have on the existing area.

* Existing Character

The variety of types of business activities and uses in the immediate vicinity and the diversity of residents' housing, attest to the area's cultural heterogeneity. Nearby structures area visited and used by:

- students and immigrants attending nearby service centers, programs, schools and training centers;
- church official and parishioners;
- health clinic professionals, workers and clients;
- parents and children attending day care centers;
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homeless men, women and children from Ala Park and Iwilei;

residents of nearby apartments and housing projects.

In addition, commuters who cannot find parking in Downtown reportedly park in Kaliihi-Palama and bus to work. Shoppers heading to Chinatown markets and retail shops pass through the vicinity on a regular basis by foot or bus. There is great diversity of ages and ethnicity living and working in the area.

Possible Future for the Area. Two potential projects are planned in the immediate vicinity of the project site. There may be a transit station within the vicinity of the Kaahahi Street property and a civic center providing a one-stop shopping center with social, housing, employment, education, and health services at the Old Oahu Railway and Land Terminal Building on King Street and Iwilei Road.

What the Homeless Center for Families with Children will Add to the Area.

The project will add to the diversity of the area and will likely be a compatible addition to the neighborhood since the site is conveniently located near the Sumner Street shelter. The project has the potential to add up to 175 people to the area if operating at capacity, and in addition, resident staff and day staff workers and volunteers. The precise number is not presently known because some of the clients of the Homeless Center will include families relocated from the temporary quarters at the Ala Park Emergency Shelter.

Most families will probably be comprised of homeless single parents with children, though two parent families with dependent children will be accommodated. Their children are expected to be quite young or school-aged. These families will have low incomes or be agency-dependent and probably will have experienced some crisis, eviction, abuse, divorce, personal or family tragedy.

The Homeless Center for Families with Children will increase the number of people in the area, particularly women and children, and thus the potential for crime which is already present in the area. Male/female relationships may develop, considering the high concentration of single men in nearby apartments.

The Homeless Center for Families with Children and its clients are expected to be compatible with nearby residents, businesses and social agencies. Nearby residents and small business owners, who were interviewed by Earthplan, felt the
Homeless Center for Women and Children on Akepo Lane would have little effect on the neighborhood and would be an improvement over what is there now. Most businesses had their own clientele and felt that the project would not have any bearing on their trade. Of concern, however, was the effect of the stereotypical homeless person. Interviewers mentioned that they were wary of their own personal safety at night if homeless loiterers started hanging around their businesses and parking lots. The project's concept and scope conjured up a facility like the IHS Iwilei shelter ("peanut butter ministry flop-house").

It was discussed at the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board meeting that IHS has also maintained on-going communication with surrounding businesses and neighbors of the Sumner Street site. IHS staff attends the Iwilei Improvement Association meetings and facilitated communication with their former neighbor Home Improvement Warehouse in caring for the neighborhood.

Clients of the proposed project will have no distinguishing feature or quality which will identify them as homeless families. They will have on-site dining, showering and laundry facilities for personal nourishment, grooming and hygiene. They will possess no collective characteristics which will cause disruption or incompatibility, although a few may be problematic as would be the case in any grouping of people.

The clients may attend nearby churches and patronize nearby shops. They may go to the neighboring physicians and may use the professional services of nearby offices, although IHS will have medical physicians and social workers on site to provide medical exams and counseling for the clients. If there are domestic problems or noise, these instances will be similar to those already occurring in the neighboring apartments. In short, project clients will blend in with an existing mix of people.

The increased presence of children is not expected to be a problem. Supervised child care will be available on-site and students will attend nearby schools during the day. Clients will also have convenient access to nearby social agencies.

The perception of increased crime and actual incidence of crime or personal victimization are polemic issues and must be documented and factually substantiated before law enforcement activity or beat patrol increases. It remains an empirical question whether more homeless women and children in well managed vicinity will act as bait to attract more undesirable behavior or criminal activity.
Finally, the proposed project is not expected to decrease the value of nearby properties. In a recent study for another homeless facility, real estate appraisers and agents were contacted for a general idea of the effect of social agencies on neighboring property values. Those interviewed indicated that federal regulations and professional ethics contend that no property can be devalued because of its proximity to religious, ethnic, class dominated structures. In appraising value, comparable properties are the usual criterion. For example, commercial properties in one vicinity would be appraised at a similar rate, regardless if one of these properties was adjacent to a social service agency. Those interviewed knew of no commercial property that has been devalued as the result of a social service facility being contiguous to it. It was pointed out that the property values around IHS, both in its current and former locations, have not been negatively affected (Earthplan, 1990).

The Kalihi-Palama Community Council did not vote on whether or not to support the site at their March 2, 1992 meeting. In addition, the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood board decided to further investigate the proposal at their March 18, 1992 meeting.

3. Hazards, Nuisances and Site Safety

Rating: 4 - Adverse Impact. Requires mitigation.

Sources:

Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

"Preliminary Site Assessment, 546 Kaahai Street, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii," Damas and Moore, December 1991

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development letter dated March 19, 1992

A site investigation revealed no evidence of the presence of thermal or explosive hazards near the project site. The site is not located in an airport clear zone. There is no evidence of natural hazards such as geologic faults, flooding, volcanic activity or landslide. However, a preliminary site assessment prepared by Damas and Moore for the Watumull Brothers and Alexander and Ewart, indicated that there is evidence of a small amount of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in the floor tile used at the ground floor entrance to the warehouse and in the restrooms and office space located on each floor of the building. Results of the chain-of-custody and lab reports indicated that the beige floor tile is 2% percent chrysotile (a form of asbestos fiber). The tiles may become friable or emit dust if damaged by force during renovation and may present a possible health risk. DHCD will seek mitigative measures and comply with applicable federal requirements that regulate procedures for abating asbestos when a building undergoes renovation and...
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Finally, the proposed project is not expected to decrease the value of nearby properties. In a recent study for another homeless facility, real estate appraisers and agents were contacted for a general idea of the effect of social agencies on neighboring property values. Those interviewed indicated that federal regulations and professional ethics contend that no property can be devalued because of its proximity to religious, ethnic, class dominated structures. In appraising value, comparable properties are the usual criterion. For example, commercial properties in one vicinity would be appraised at a similar rate, regardless if one of these properties were adjacent to a social service agency. Those interviewed knew of no commercial property that has been devalued as the result of a social service facility being contiguous to it. It was pointed out that the property values around IHS, both in its current and former locations, have not been negatively affected (Earthplan, 1990).

The Kalihi-Palama Community Council did not vote on whether or not to support the site at their March 2, 1992 meeting. In addition, the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood board decided to further investigate the proposal at their March 18, 1992 meeting.

3. Hazards, Nuisances and Site Safety

Rating: 4 - Adverse Impact. Requires mitigation.

Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

"Preliminary Site Assessment, 546 Kaaahi Street, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii," Dames and Moore, December 1991

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Letter dated March 19, 1992

A site investigation revealed no evidence of the presence of thermal or explosive hazards near the project site. The site is not located in an airport clear zone. There is no evidence of natural hazards such as geologic faults, flooding, volcanic activity or landslide. However, a preliminary site assessment prepared by Dames and Moore for the Watumull Brothers and Alexander and Ewart, indicated that there is evidence of a small amount of asbestos-containing materials (ACM) in the floor-tile used at the ground floor entrance to the warehouse and in the restrooms and office space located on each floor of the building. Results of the chain-of-custody and lab reports indicated that the beige floor tile is two percent chrysotile (a form of asbestos fiber). The tiles may become friable or emit dust if damaged by force during renovation and may present a possible health risk. DHCD will seek mitigative measures and comply with applicable federal requirements that regulate procedures for abating asbestos when a building undergoes renovation and.
disposal of asbestos-containing materials to eliminate possible health risks.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development requires that structures built prior to 1978 be inspected for lead-based paint. The Von Hamm Textile building was built in 1974 and if lead-based paint is found in excess of one milligram per square centimeter, mitigative measures will be taken prior to occupancy of the building in accordance with 24 CFR Part 35.

4. Slope, Erosion and Soil Suitability

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


The United States Soil Conservation classifies the soil at the project site as Ewa silty clay loam, moderately shallow, 0 to 2 percent slopes.

The Ewa soil series consist of well-drained soils on alluvial fans on the islands of Maui and Oahu. These soils formed in alluvium derived from basic igneous rock. They are nearly level to moderate sloping. Elevations range from near sea level to 150 feet. The annual rainfall amounts to 10 to 30 inches.

Ewa silty clay loam, moderately shallow, 0 to 2 percent slopes is found on alluvial fans and terraces. In a representative profile, the surface layer is dark reddish-brown silty clay loam about 18 inches thick. The subsoil, about 20-50 inches thick, is dark reddish-brown and dark-red silty clay loam that has subangular blocky structure. The substratum is coral limestone, sand, or gravelly alluvium. Permeability is moderate, runoff is very slow, erosion hazards is no more than slight, shrink-swell potential is moderate.

5. Energy Consumption

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

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

6. Noise

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The future traffic noise levels associated with project traffic are anticipated to be very low. Due to the nature of the project and limited number of on-site parking stalls proposed, risks of adverse noise impacts from project generated traffic noise are considered to be low and should not cause adverse noise impacts along the roadways in the immediate vicinity of the project. For these reasons, special traffic noise mitigation measures are not considered necessary.

There is some risk of adverse noise impacts on future tenants of the Center due to the proximity of the project to Dillingham Boulevard. Because of relatively small buffer distances from Dillingham Boulevard, exterior traffic noise levels at some of the windows are expected to exceed the FHA/HUD noise standard for residences of 65 Ldn. However, the project's building materials of concrete and masonry can be expected to act as a partial noise buffer. In addition, because the project may be considered to be temporary lodging, with average occupancies of 6 months per tenant, the 65 Ldn noise standard of FHA/HUD is not strictly applicable to this project. Traffic noise levels as high as 70 Ldn are common in urbanized Honolulu, with many residential and apartment buildings located within these high noise areas. For these reasons and because of the charitable nature of the project, special noise mitigation measures are not considered mandatory for the residential element of the project.

C. Air Quality

Rating: 3 - Minor Adverse Impacts Anticipated


Ambient concentrations of air pollutants are regulated by State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). State of Hawaii AAQS are in some cases considerably more stringent than the comparable national limit. AAQS have been established for six air pollutants: particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone and lead.

The State Department of Health (DOH) operates a network of air quality monitoring stations at various locations around Oahu. Each station, however, does not monitor the full compliment of air quality parameters.

Sulfur dioxide is measured by the DOH at an air quality monitoring station at Campbell Industrial Park several miles west of the project site. There were no exceedances of the State AAQS from 1985 to 1988.

Total particulate concentrations were monitored at the DOH building in downtown Honolulu, approximately 1-1/4 mile from the project site. During
the 1985 to 1988 reporting period, there were no exceedances of the State AAQS. The nearest monitoring station for particulates 10 microns or less in diameter (PM-10) is located at Kauluwela School, about 1/4 mile from the project site. The State of Hawaii has not established a PM-10 standard. During the 1985 to 1988 reporting period, no exceedances of the National AAQS for PM-10 was recorded.

The nearest carbon monoxide measurements were made at the DOH building in downtown Honolulu. During 1988, no exceedances of the State one-hour AAQS were recorded. During 1985 to 1987, 1 to 3 exceedances of the State one-hour AAQS were recorded each year. During the 1985 to 1987 reporting period, no exceedances of the State 8-hour AAQS were recorded.

The nearest ozone measurements were obtained at Sand Island. Three exceedances of the State AAQS were recorded in 1985; however, no exceedances were recorded in 1986 and 1987.

The closest available measurements of ambient lead concentrations were made at the downtown Honolulu monitoring station. During the 1985-87 reporting period, 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 be 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 particulates, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and lead are currently being met at the project site. The ozone AAQS has not been exceeded during the past two years for which data are presently available (1990 and 1991) 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.

The major short-term air quality impact will be the potential emission of fugitive dust during the building rehabilitation phase of the project. During construction, there could also be occasional short-term impacts from engine exhaust emissions (primarily carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen) emanating from slow-moving construction equipment or from large trucks traveling to and from the project site. Temporary traffic disruptions due to construction activities may also result in temporary increases in emissions from local traffic.

The primary long-term air pollution impacts in the project vicinity, particularly increased levels of carbon monoxide, arise from increased motor vehicle traffic associated with other projects in the area. Any contribution from the proposed project is expected to be negligible. The U.S. EPA 8-hour standard for carbon monoxide, however, may be exceeded
occasionally near the intersection of King and Liliha Streets either with or without the project by the year 1993 when the project is completed; current levels may also exceed this standard. The more stringent State of Hawaii ambient air quality standard for carbon monoxide may be exceeded at times during the year 1993 at some locations in the study area. The State standards are set so low, however, that they are probably exceeded at many intersections in the State that have even moderate traffic volumes. It is worth noting here that, 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.

Some long-term impacts could also potentially occur due to indirect emissions from power generating facilities supplying the project with electricity and from the burning of waste materials generated by the project. Quantitative estimates of these impacts were not made but it appears likely that any impacts will be negligible since indirect emissions from supplying the project with electrical power and solid waste disposal service will be much less than one percent of current Oahu emissions.

Strict compliance with State of Hawaii Air Pollution Control Regulations regarding establishment of a regular dust-watering program (where possible) and covering of open-bodied trucks hauling loose materials from or to the project site will be required to effectively mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Increased vehicular emissions due to disruption of traffic by construction equipment can be alleviated by moving equipment to the site during off-peak traffic hours.

On the long term, after the project is completed, traffic-related impacts on air quality in the project area are expected to be significant but the proposed project will generate almost no traffic itself. Thus, no specific mitigation measures are proposed for this development. Options available to other developments or organizations responsible for the problem are to improve roadways, reduce traffic or reduce individual vehicular emissions. Aside from improving roadways, air pollution impacts from vehicular emissions can be mitigated by reducing traffic through the use of mass transit and car pooling and/or by adjusting local school and business hours to begin and end during off peak times. Although it is conceivable that the efficiency of motor vehicle engines and/or emission control equipment will be improved or that vehicles will be developed which burn cleaner fuels at some point in the future, it is not likely that these developments will occur before project completion in 1993. With regard to cleaner burning fuels, vehicles burning methanol or compressed natural gas or powered by electrical motors are some of the possibilities for technological development that are currently being contemplated. Lastly, even without technological breakthrough, it is also possible that at some point in the future, the State may decide to adopt more stringent motor vehicle emission limits or possibly a motor vehicle inspection and maintenance program which would ensure that emission control devices are properly maintained and thereby reduce emissions.
Any air pollution impacts from burning solid waste from the project could be reduced substantially if the incinerator is fitted with pollution control equipment, i.e., electrostatic precipitators or fabric filters. Conservation and recycling programs could also reduce solid waste which would reduce any related air pollution emissions proportionately. Quite likely, solid waste from the project will be processed by the H-Power garbage-to-energy facility which is fitted with fabric filters to control air pollution. Use of solid waste to generate power offsets emissions that would otherwise occur from fossil-fueled power plants.

D. Environmental Design and Historic Values

1. Visual Quality - Coherence, Diversity, Compatible Use and Scale
   
   Rating: 1 - Positive Impacts Anticipated
   
   Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992
            Building Department letter dated March 4, 1992
            Department of Land Utilization letter received March 30, 1992

   The proposed project will be designed to compliment the street frontage and the street level activities previously lost to asphalt parking. The height and scale of the structure will remain as it is and be complementary with neighboring structures. The Building Department and Department of Land Utilization have also reviewed the information and have no adverse comments.

2. Historic, Cultural and Archaeological Resources
   
   Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
   
   Sources: Department of Land and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Division letter dated March 23, 1992
            State of Hawaii Hawaiian Homes Lands letter dated March 16, 1992

   The project site and surrounding properties have been in urban uses for years. The property contains a three-story concrete structure used as a textile manufacturing warehouse since 1974. There is no evidence of any surface archaeological or historic sites and, given the uses of the properties, there are not expected to be any subsurface archaeological or historic sites. The Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Land and Natural Resources stated that the proposed project will have no effect on historic properties.
E. Socio-Economic

1. Demographic/Community Character Impacts

Rating: 3 - Minor Adverse Impacts Anticipated


Kaumakapili Church letter dated March 11, 1992

The study area for the social impact assessment is the entire area of Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15, which includes the following:

* Sub-District 1 is bounded by River Street north to North School Street, west to Kalihi Street, south to North King than east to Waiakamilo Street and south encompassing Sand Island. Geographically, it is the largest of the sub-districts and includes Census Tracts 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57. The project site is in Census Tract 57.

* Sub-District 2 is bounded by Waiakamilo Street, Nimitz Highway and Kapalama Basin on the east boundary, North School Street on the northern side, Middle Street on the west and south by the ocean over to Kapalama Basin. It includes Census Tracts 61 and 62.

* Sub-District 3 is bounded by Kalihi Street on the east, mauka by North School Street, Ewa by Middle Street and makai North King Street. It comprises Census Tracts 61 and 62.

The study area encompasses neighborhoods easily accessible to the proposed project and includes a variety of private residences, public housing projects, public and private social service centers, and commercial and business developments.

The study area lies on the fringe of Palama near Iwilei. This "Iwilei-Palama" area is primarily characterized by the following uses:

* light manufacturing;
* very few large retail operations;
* multi-family and single family housing, including large public housing projects; and
* small convenience and mom-and-pop stores.

The recently completed Kingsgate Shopping Center at the corner of Dillingham Boulevard and North King Street is the largest retail shopping center within the immediate area. Two fast food franchises are also located within one block of the project site. The study areas's proximity to Chinatown via two main traffic arteries
(Dillingham Boulevard and North King Street) allows easy bus access to larger commercial and retail centers.

There are no immediate plans for large private or public projects in the immediate area of the site at present. The most recent large development in the area is the light manufacturing building built about ten years ago makai of the project site; it houses four enterprises. The nearby Palama Theater site was recently sold to a Korean religious sect which has plans to convert the property into a religious prefecture after the current lessees relocate in about five years.

In 1985, the Kalihi-Palama area contained approximately 30,269 jobs. Nearly 51 percent, or over 15,500 jobs, were located in Sub-District 1, which includes Sand Island and the project site. Over 60 percent of the jobs in (1) government, (2) transportation, communication and utility, and (3) service were found in Sub-District 1. Further, more than 60 percent of industry jobs were in Sub-District 1.

Sub-District 3 is the most residential district of the study area. Sub-Districts 1 and 2 had respectively 15 and 13 times more jobs than did Sub-District 3.

The following summarizes the types of jobs by Sub-Districts:

* Sub-District 1 had job trends similar to the overall study area.

* Sub-District 2 had large representation in areas of industry, retail and service jobs. Almost as many jobs were found in Sub-District 2 as in Sub-District 1.

* Reflecting a predominant residential character, Sub-District 3 was largely under-represented in all job categories. Government jobs provided the district with its largest job share.

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. Oahu's 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.

By comparison, the study area population is very stable in terms of growth in the 1980s. Based on preliminary 1990 census figures, the total study area population remained virtually the same between 1980 and 1990. Housing units experienced a negligible increase of about 330 units.
Within the study area, according to preliminary 1990 census figures, there was a slight decrease in population in Sub-District 2 and minor population growth in Sub-Districts 1 and 3. According to 1990 preliminary census figures, Sub-District 1 experienced almost no growth, whereas Sub-District 3 experienced a 2.2 percent population increase over 1980. The population overall changed very little between 1980 and 1990 but there were gains in every sub-district in the number of housing units.

The 1990 preliminary census figures are lower than estimates of the Department of General Planning. This "underestimation" appears to be a statewide trend, and the census figures may yet undergo further corrections.

The remaining discussion in this section focuses on more detailed population and housing estimates provided by the Department of General Planning for 1989. Specific population trends are as follows:

* Sub-District 1 encompasses the largest area of Kalihi-Palama and a major portion is in light manufacturing and industrial use. There was a five percent increase in housing units between 1980 and 1989. This increase was in multi-family units, with a slight decrease in single-family units. This Sub-District had nearly three times more multi-family units than single-family units.

* Sub-District 2 experienced a slight decrease in population and negligible increase in housing. This area has experienced few major changes in residential or commercial development.

* Sub-District 3 is the smallest in area of the three sub-districts. From 1980 to 1989, both population and housing experienced a slight decrease. Of all sub-areas, this district had proportionally the most single-family units, which accounted for more than half of the housing stock.

Over 97 percent of the study area's total dwelling units were occupied in 1980; in 1989, over 98 percent. All Sub-Districts showed an increase in occupancy between 1980 and 1989, with an average of 98 percent for each Sub-District in 1989; this low vacancy rate is consistent with island and statewide shortage of housing units.

The study area had a significantly large number of residents living in group quarters. In 1988, approximately 5.3 and 5.9 percent lived in group quarters in Sub-Districts 1 and 2, respectively. By comparison, 4.3 percent of Oahu's population reside in group quarters.

The proposed project is not a residential project. For practical purposes, however, it will increase the study area's residential
population by a maximum of approximately 175 people who will live in the area. The project is well within the City General Plan population guidelines for the Primary Urban Center, which call for between 450,775 to 497,751 persons by the year 2010 (based on State's Series M-K population projects).

The Kaumakapili Church supports the Homeless Center in providing families with a decent place to live until more permanent housing is available. Kaumakapili Church also provides food and social services to homeless families and individuals.

2. Displacement

Rating: 1 - Potentially Beneficial Impact
Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

State Housing Finance and Development Corporation letter dated March 23, 1992

The owner has been planning to scale back his operations and discontinue the printing and warehousing functions on the island. The property has been listed for sale by the owner for over one year and is being purchased by the City through voluntary acquisition procedures. The owner will be entitled to receive relocation benefits for eligible costs if the property is acquired under eminent domain procedures.

The project will also have beneficial impacts in that clients receiving emergency shelter at the proposed center may have been displaced due to rent increases, redevelopment activities, condominium conversions or other economic or family crisis.

3. Employment and Income Patterns

Ratings: 1 - Positive Benefits Anticipated (Short Term)
3 - Minor Adverse Impact Anticipated (Long Term)

Source: State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism letter dated March 6, 1992

The proposed project will result in short term employment in construction related trades during the construction of the project. However, a long term decrease of textile related employment over the life of the project will occur due to the closing of the small Von Hamm Textile Company.

Project residents are expected to be of very low income. However, because of the small number of residents to be served by the project relative to the Iwilei - Kalihi-Palama population, income patterns should not be significantly affected. The State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism considers this project to
be an important part of the ongoing efforts to provide shelter for the homeless.

F. Community Facilities

1. Educational Facilities

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Department of Education letter dated March 27, 1992

The proposed project may generate the following student enrollment at schools in the area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Projected Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kailulani Elementary</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Intermediate</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Intermediate and McKinley High Schools are expected to be able to accommodate the growth. The Department of Education indicates that the proposed project will have no additional impact on the student enrollment of the public schools in the area.

2. Commercial Facilities

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism letter dated March 6, 1992

There are several commercial areas within close proximity to the project site including the Iwilei Business area, Downtown-Fort Street Mall area and Chinatown. The Ala Moana Shopping Center is easily accessible by public transportation. The State Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism's letter does not provide adverse comments relating to the businesses in the area.

3. Health Care

4. Emergency Medical

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

Department of Health letter dated April 2, 1992

Existing Land Use Map
The project site is located within 1.5 miles of several major medical centers including Queen's, St. Francis, Kuakini and Straub Hospitals. These medical centers can provide 24-hour emergency services as well as a full range of medical services. Public health care is also available at the Lanakila Health Center which is accessible by public transportation. Physicians will be on duty at the facility during working hours to conduct medical evaluations and physical exams on IHS clients.

5. Social Services

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Sources: Department of Human Resources letter dated March 10, 1992

Existing Land Use Map

The project site is conveniently located in close proximity to many public and private social service agencies including the Department of Human Services, Hawaii Housing Authority, Department of Health and City and County offices.

The project’s social service coordinator will assist IHS clients in obtaining a wide range of social services including welfare, housing assistance, job training and education. The project’s location will make obtaining these services faster and more convenient for project residents.

The Department of Human Resources letter states that there is a need for emergency shelters like this project which will provide immediate short-term assistance to homeless families with children and anticipates no adverse impact.

6. Sanitary Sewer and Solid Waste

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated
Sources: Department of Public Works letter dated March 19, 1992 and Application for Sewer Connection approved March 5, 1992

Department of Health letter dated April 2, 1992

The Department of Public Works and Department of Health have indicated that the existing sewer system in the area is adequate to serve the proposed project. Sewer connections will be made to the existing sewer lateral on Dillingham Boulevard. No individual wastewater systems or wastewater treatment works will be constructed.
7. Storm Water

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Department of Public Works letter dated March 19, 1992

Storm water runoff collected by curbs and gutters along Kaaahi Street flows into a catch basin located at the southwest corner of the property. If additional improvements are needed, it shall be in accordance with the Department of Public Works standards.

8. Water Supply

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Board of Water Supply letter dated March 23, 1992

The Board of Water Supply (BWS) stated that the existing water system should be adequate to handle estimated water demands for the proposed project. There is existing water service to the property from a one-inch water meter which is connected to a 12-inch water main on Kaaahi Place. If additional water is required, the availability will be confirmed when the building permit is submitted to the BWS for its review and approval. If additional water is made available, the BWS's water system facilities charges for the additional service will be paid.

9. Public Safety

a. Police

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Source: Honolulu Police Department letter dated March 16, 1992

The Police Department does not expect a substantial increase in calls for police service as a result of the proposed project. 24-hour management and private security personnel is planned for the project to enhance public safety and ensure security of the residents at the center.

b. Fire

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


Honolulu Fire Department letter dated March 13, 1992
Response to a major fire at the project site would come from the Kuakini Fire Station (engine and ladder company) and Central Fire Station (engine and battalion). Backup would be provided by the Likiliki, Nuuanna and Kakaako Fire Stations. As mandated by the Fire Department, all access for fire apparatus, water supply and building renovation shall be in conformance with existing fire codes and standards.

10. Open Space, Recreation

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Department of Parks and Recreation letter dated March 10, 1992

Department of Parks and Recreation "Index of Parks and Facilities," October 1988

Department of Human Resources letter dated March 10, 1992

The proposed project is subject to compliance with the City's Park Dedication Ordinance No. 4261. The project will include a child care center and landscaped outdoor areas. DHCD will coordinate the proposed project's compliance with the Departments of Parks and Recreation and Land Utilization. If the planned amenities are determined to not meet park dedication requirements, exemptions to the requirements may be requested pursuant to Chapter 201E-210, H.R.S. The Department of Parks and Recreation concurs with the project which will ease the pressure on the Aala Park and provide a suitable living place for the homeless.

The nearest public recreation areas are the Aala Park and Beretania Community Park which are located approximately 1/2 mile from the project site. The 6.40-acre Aala Park contains a bandstand, 1 basketball court, a skating rink, children's play apparatus and 2 comfort stations. The Department of Human Resources anticipates that IHS will provide for the homeless population residing at Aala Park so that Aala Park may be returned to its intended use as a passive recreational facility. The 5.4-acre Beretania Community park contains 2 lighted basketball courts, 2 lighted volleyball courts, 1 lighted softball field, children's play apparatus, a recreation building that contains classrooms, meeting and multi-purpose rooms, 63 parking stalls and 2 handicapped parking stalls.

The 76-acre Ala Moana Beach Park is the nearest regional park in the area and contains a wide range of facilities and an excellent swimming beach.

11. Transportation

Ratings: 3 - Minor Adverse Impact Anticipated (Short Term)
2 - No Impact Anticipated (Long Term)

Sources: Department of Transportation Services letter dated March 27, 1992
          Department of Transportation letter dated March 12, 1992

The State Department of Transportation stated that the proposed project is not expected to adversely affect state highway facilities.

The project will include approximately 12 - 15 staff parking and loading stalls to be used primarily by IHS staff and service providers. The proposed project is not anticipated to generate more traffic than the current use as the existing parking stalls are insufficient to accommodate the business and the actual usage is much greater than the nine stalls indicate. A traffic assessment requested by the Department of Transportation Services (DTS) will therefore not be undertaken.

Based on experience of existing shelters in the Downtown Honolulu area, the rate of automobile ownership by homeless families is expected to be low. An exemption from residential parking requirements will be requested pursuant to Chapter 201E, H.R.S.

The project site is located close to bus lines on King Street and Dillingham Boulevard, making public transportation easily accessible to project residents.

A transit station is planned to be placed on Kaaahi Street.

G. Natural Features

1. Water Supply

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Board of Water Supply, "Oahu Water Plan," July 1982
          Board of Water Supply letter dated March 23, 1992

The proposed project is located in the Board of Water Supply's Honolulu Water Use District which encompasses 88 square miles from Makapuu Point to Moanalua. The Honolulu Water Use District is reliant on water developed in other water use districts and imported via the BWS's transmission system.

The proposed project is not located near any streams, lakes, rivers or wells and does not involve the discharge of wastewater into the ground which could affect water quality or yields.

2. Floodplain Management
Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

Sources: Department of the Army letter dated March 25, 1992

Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Flood Insurance Rate Map, City and County of Honolulu," Panel No. 150001 0115B

The project site is located in flood zone X, an area determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain. According to the Department of the Army, a permit under the Clean Water Act will not be required.

3. Wetlands Protection

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

The proposed project is located in an area which has been in urban use for an extended period of time and there are no wetlands or other important wildlife in the area.

4. Coastal Zone Management

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated

The Office of State Planning's concurrence with DHCD's determination that the proposed project is consistent with the Hawaii Coastal Zone Management Program has been requested.

5. Unique Natural Features

6. Vegetation and Animal Life

Rating: 2 - No Impact Anticipated


Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

The project site and surrounding area has been in urban use for an extended period of time. As the entire area has been developed, there are no endangered and threatened species or unique natural features in the project area.

7. Agricultural Lands

Rating: 2 - No Impacts Anticipated
Sources: Site Inspection, January 31, 1992

The proposed project is in an area which has been in urban use for an extended period of time. The proposed project will not result in the conversion of agricultural lands to nonagricultural uses.

DETERMINATION

It is determined that the proposed actions will have no significant impact on the human environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The reasons supporting this determination are as follows:

1. The number of units to be emplaced by the proposed 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.

2. The proposed project will not generate a significant amount of additional vehicular traffic which would result in an increase in vehicle generated air pollution or ambient noise levels.

3. Short term increases in ambient noise levels generated by construction activities will be mitigated through compliance with Title II, Department of Health Administrative rules, Chapter 43, "Community Noise Controls for Oahu."

4. The escape of fugitive dust into the environment will be mitigated by frequent watering of the project site.

5. The project, a housing project situated in an industrial use area, will require a Development Plan and Land Use Map amendment (DPPLUM). DHCD will seek 20IE, HRS, exemptions from the required permits.

6. The project is located in an area that has long been urbanized and is expected to have no historic sites. However, should such sites be found, an amended environmental assessment will be filed.

7. All infrastructure is available and adequate to support the proposed project.

8. Community services including social services, public transportation, medical care, police and fire protection are available to project residents. 24-hour management and security staff will be available at the project, which will enhance security for the center.

9. The project will provide approximately 15 staff parking and loading spaces for the shelter. The rate of car ownership among homeless families is relatively low. Therefore, an exemption from residential parking requirements will be requested pursuant to Chapter 20IE, H.R.S.

10. The project will have on-site recreation amenities and several parks are located in close proximity to the project site.
11. The proposed project is located in an area that has been in urban use for an extended period of time and will have no impact on fish and wildlife resources, vegetation, natural features and views.

12. The proposed project will have the positive benefits of providing support services and emergency shelter to homeless women and families with children.

13. All applicable procedures for abating asbestos and the disposal of materials will be followed if asbestos is found in the building.

A negative declaration will be published in the Office of Environmental Quality Control Bulletin and a Finding of No Significant Impact will be published in a newspaper of general circulation.
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AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
March 25, 1992

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

Dear Mr. Turse:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment preparation notice for a proposed Homeless Center in Iwilei, Honolulu, Oahu (TMK 1-5-7:50). 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 hazard designation (Zone X) which is cited on the Project Fact Sheet is correct.

Sincerely,

Kisuk Cheung, P.E.
Director of Engineering
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Honolulu Office
Seven Waterfront Plaza, Suite 500
500 Ala Moana Boulevard
Honolulu, HI 96813-4918

MARCH 19, 1992

Mr. E. James Turse
Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment for Homeless Center

This responds to your transmittal dated March 2, 1992, regarding the proposed action to acquire a property and lease the existing three-story building to the Institute for Human Services (IHS) for the operation of an emergency shelter for homeless women, children and families in the Iwilei area.

We have reviewed this project and submit the following comments that should be considered in your environmental assessment for a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) assisted activity.

1. A full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would not be required by HUD in accordance with 24 CFR Part 58.

2. 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. The Hawaii Historic Foundation should also be contacted if the property is listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

3. Noise generated by vehicular traffic on Dillingham Boulevard and King Street should be evaluated for consistency with 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B; Noise Abatement and Control.
4. The homeless shelter must be consistent with
24 CFR Part 8: Nondiscrimination Based on
Handicap in Federally Assisted Programs and
Activities of HUD and the Uniform Federal
Accessibility Standards.

5. If the structure was built prior to 1978, it
should be inspected for lead-based paint. If its
presence is found in excess of one milligram per
square centimeter, mitigation measures must be
taken prior to the occupancy of the building.
Guidance on lead-based paint mitigation may be
found at 24 CFR Part 35.

6. If the building is to be renovated prior to
occupancy and asbestos is found, there are federal
requirements that regulate procedures for abating
asbestos, where a building undergoes renovation or
demolition and the disposal of asbestos-containing
materials. You may contact the Clean Air Branch
of the State Health Department for guidance. You
may also want to request reports published by the
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as follows:

- Guidance for Controlling Asbestos-Containing
  Materials in Buildings, EPA 560/5-85-024
  June 1985

- Managing Asbestos in Place, 20T-2003,
  July 1990

These publications may be obtained from the local
office of the EPA in the Federal Building in
Honolulu.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to
call Frank Johnson, Community Planning and Development
Division, at (808) 541-1227.

Very sincerely yours,

Gordan Y. Furutani
Manager
Mr. E. James Turse  
Director  
Department of Housing and Community Development  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: Environmental Assessment - Homeless Center

Dear Mr. Turse:

The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the information received March 5, 1992, concerning your plans to prepare an Environmental Assessment for a proposed Homeless Center in Honolulu, Hawaii. The project will involve acquiring and renovating an existing building. The Service has not identified any wetlands, endangered and threatened species, or other important fish and wildlife resources in the project area.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

William R. Kramer  
Acting Field Supervisor  
Pacific Islands Office
March 23, 1992

Mr. B. James Turse
Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
650 South King Street, 5th floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

Re: Environmental Assessment for a Proposed Homeless Center in Iwilei

Thank you for providing preliminary information for the proposed homeless center in Iwilei.

It is unclear whether acquisition of the property will be through a voluntary purchase or through condemnation. If it is the latter, then relocation assistance should be addressed.

Additionally, the HFDC is responsible for monitoring the relocation assistance programs of state and county agencies pursuant to Chapter 111, HRS. Therefore, if applicable, we would appreciate receiving a copy of the relocation assistance plan for review.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Joseph K. Conant
Executive Director
March 6, 1992

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

Dear Mr. Turse:

Subject: Iwilei Homeless Center Environmental Assessment

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the subject project.

The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism considers this project to be an important part of the ongoing efforts of State and City to provide shelter for the homeless.

We have no other comments to offer at this time. If you should have any questions, please have your staff contact Ed Marcus at 586-2532.

Sincerely,

Murray E. Towill
March 9, 1992

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

Dear Mr. Turse:

Subject: Project Fact Sheet for a Proposed Homeless Center

We have reviewed the subject Fact Sheet for a proposed emergency shelter for homeless single parents and families transmitted by your letter dated March 2, 1992, and confirm that the property, tax map key 1-5-7: 50, is located in the State Land Use Urban District.

However, review of the tax map shows that the property consists of 14,807 square feet and not 14,870 square feet as stated by the subject Fact Sheet.

We have no further comments at this time. We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. If you should have any questions, please call me or Leo Asuncion of my staff at 587-3825.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ESTHER UEDA
Executive Officer

EU:th
Mr. E. James Turse, Director
Department of Housing
and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 9th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment
Homeless Center

Our review of the proposed emergency Homeless Center in
Iwilei indicates that it will have no additional impact on
the student enrollment of the public schools in the area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Charles T. Toguchi
Superintendent

CC: hy\(\text{hy}^{(\text{hy})}\)

cc: A. Suga
J. Kim

AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
E. James Turse, Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

Subject: Preliminary Information on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed Homeless Center in Iwilei

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject document. The Office of Environmental Control is responsible for assuring compliance with Chapter 343 of the Hawaii Revised Statutes. The following is enclosed to assist you in the preparation of the environmental assessment for the subject project.

- Environmental Assessments, Contents and Notice of Determination;
- Document for Publication Form #91-1.

If you have any questions, please call Margaret Wilson at 586-4185. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brian J.J. Choy
Director

BC:mm

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

Dear Mr. Turse:

Subject: Environmental Assessment
Homeless Center
586 Kalihi Street, Iwilei, Oahu
TMK: 1-3-07:50

Thank you for allowing us to comment on the subject project. We have the following comments to offer:

Wastewater

The subject project is located within the City sewer service system. As the area is served, we have no objections to the proposed homeless center provided that the project is connected to the public sewers.

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

Sanitation

If food is stored, prepared, or served at the proposed center, all requirements of the Department of Health Regulations, Chapter I-A, Food Services and Food Establishments shall be met.

Building plans should be submitted to the Department of Health, Sanitation Branch for review and approval prior to any construction.

If you should have any questions on this matter, please contact Mr. Craig Onaga, Sanitation Branch at 586-8000.
Mr. E. James Turse  
April 2, 1992  
Page 2

Solid Waste
This project should provide adequate space for internal recycling activities, as many homeless are involved in salvage as a means of deriving income. This project could even provide drop-off space for adjacent buildings to utilize in order to integrate the facility into the community and increase self esteem.

If you should have any questions on this matter, please call Mr. John Harder, Office of Solid Waste at 986-4237.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. LEWIN, M.D.  
Director of Health

c: Office of Solid Waste  
Sanitation Branch  
Wastewater Branch
Mr. E. James Turse, Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

Subject: Environmental Assessment
Homeless Center

The Hawaii Housing Authority appreciates your letter of
March 2, 1992 giving us the opportunity to comment on the proposed
homeless shelter in Iwilei.

We have reviewed the preliminary project information and find
no adverse effect on the Authority's programs at this time.

We appreciate your efforts in assisting the homeless in our
State.

Sincerely,

Leonard Paresa
Executive Director
E. James Turse, Director
Department of Housing and Urban Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 5th floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

SUBJECT: Homeless Center for Iwilei, TMK: 1-5-7:50, Honolulu

Our office believes that the proposed homeless center in an existing building in Iwilei will have no effect on historic properties. If you have any questions, please call Daina Penquinas at 587-0005.

Sincerely,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

DP:aal
Mr. E. James Turse, Director
Department of Housing and
Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Turse:

Environmental Assessment - Homeless Center
546 Kaaahi Street, Iwilei, TMK: 1-5-7: 50

Thank you for your letter of March 2, 1992, requesting our comments on the subject project. We do not anticipate that the proposed homeless center will affect our State highway system.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rex D. Johnson
Director of Transportation
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 MARCH 2, 1992 IN PREPARATION FOR AN
          ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED IWILEI
          HOMELESS CENTER, TMK: 1-5-07; 50, KAAHIL STREET

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed homeless center. We have the following comments to offer:

1. The existing water system is presently adequate to accommodate the proposed homeless center. There is an existing one-inch meter currently serving the property.

2. The availability of additional water will be confirmed when the building permit application is submitted for our review and approval. If additional water is made available, the applicant will be required to pay our Water System Facilities Charges for source-transmission and daily storage and any applicable meter installation charges.

3. If a three-inch or larger meter is required, the construction drawings showing the installation of the meter should be submitted for our review and approval.

4. The proposed development will be subject to Board of Water Supply cross-connectional control requirements prior to the issuance of the building permit.

If you have any questions, please contact Bert Kuioka at 527-5235.
March 4, 1992

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

FROM: HERBERT K. MURAOKA
DIRECTOR AND BUILDING SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
HOMELESS CENTER

This is in response to your memo dated March 2, 1992 relative to a proposed homeless center in Iwilei.

We have reviewed the preliminary information and have no comments to submit.

HERBERT K. MURAOKA
Director and Building Superintendent

cc: J. Harada
March 23, 1992

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

FROM: GLEN S. NONAKA, ACTING DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
HOMELESS CENTER

This is in response to your memorandum dated March 2, 1992, regarding the subject project. We have no comments or recommendations on this project.

GLEN S. NONAKA
Acting Director of Finance

GSN:jw
March 13, 1992

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

FROM: LIONEL E. CAMARA, FIRE CHIEF

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
HOMELESS CENTER

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.

Fire protection services provided from Central (Fort Street Mall Fire Station) and Kuakini engine companies with ladder service from Kuakini are adequate.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the project. Should you have any questions, please call Acting Assistant Chief Attilio Leonardi of our Administrative Services Bureau at 943-3838.

[Signature]

LIONEL E. CAMARA
Fire Chief

AKL:1m
March 20, 1992

MEMORANDUM

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

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

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR A HOMELESS CENTER AT
546 KAACHI STREET, IWILEI, HONOLULU, OAHU,
TAX MAP KEY: 1-5-7: 50

In response to your memorandum of March 2, 1992, we have reviewed
the subject proposal and offer the following comments:

We have no objection to the proposed project. However, the
subject area is designated Commercial-Industrial Emphasis Mixed
Use and a Development Plan Land Use Map (DPLUM) amendment
would be required to support a housing project as a principal use
unless an exemption under 201E HRS is requested.

Should you have any questions, please contact Tim Hata of our
staff at extension 6070.


BENJAMIN B. LEE
Chief Planning Officer

BBL:ft
March 10, 1992

MEMORANDUM

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

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

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT - HOMELESS CENTER

The Department of Human Resources has reviewed the subject matter cited above and offers the following comments:

(1) We support the Department of Housing and Community Development’s proposed acquisition and lease of an existing three-story building in Iwilei (TMK: 1-5-7:50) to the Institute for Human Services (IHS), which will be used as an emergency shelter for homeless women, children, and families. Presently, there is a critical need for emergency shelter facilities, which can provide immediate short-term assistance to the growing number of homeless families with children, in downtown urban Honolulu.

(2) We would like to request additional information on the projected timetable for the proposed Homeless Center and the further involvement of our department as the project continues to evolve. We hope that the proposed project will be able to absorb the needs of the homeless population currently residing in Aala Park (Aala Emergency Family Shelter and temporary Homeless Campsite) so that the park can return to its intended use as a passive recreational facility.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.
MEMORANDUM

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

FROM: DONALD A. CLEGG, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: HOMELESS CENTER
546 KAAHI STREET
TAX MAP KEY: 1-5-7; 60

March 30, 1992

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above referenced proposal. We support this effort to fulfill a serious need, and suggest that the following concerns be addressed in the environmental assessment for the project:

1. **Zoning:** The proposed use of the site for a group living facility is not a permitted use within the IMX-1 Industrial-Commercial Mixed Use District. If this project is to be exempted from zoning regulations under 201Z, HRS, this should be clearly stated in the environmental assessment.

2. **Plans:** Site and building plans for all uses proposed for the site should be included. Plans showing uses for each phase, Phase I (temporary relocation shelter) and Phase II (permanent homeless emergency shelter), should be shown. Landscape plans should also be included.

3. **Other:** a. Timespans for each phase of the project should be defined.
b. Project intensity. The proposed number of residents raises the issue of overcrowding, especially when the site is being used as a temporary relocation shelter.

c. Impacts on infrastructure and parking.

d. Impacts of renovation work on noise, air quality, etc.

If you should have any questions, please call Joan Takano of our staff at 527-5038.

DONALD A. CLEG
Director of Land Utilization

DAC:cct
March 10, 1992

TO: [Name]
   DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM: WALTER M. OZAWA, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
         HOMELESS CENTER
         LOCATION: 546 KAAHII STREET, IWILEI, OAHU, HAWAII
         TAX MAP KEY 1-5-07:50

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary information for the proposed Homeless Center project in Iwilei. We concur with this project which will help to ease the pressure on our parks and provide a more suitable place for the homeless.

Should you have any questions, please contact Lester Lai of our Advance Planning Branch at extension 4696.

WALTER M. OZAWA, Director

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

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

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: HOMELESS CENTER

This proposal should not result in a substantial increase in calls for police service in the area. We would encourage the operators of the facility to do whatever they can to ensure the security of the residents.

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

FROM: C. MICHAEL STREET, ACTING DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)
   HOMELESS CENTER
   TMK:1-5-7;50

March 19, 1992

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

1. We have no objections to the proposed Homeless Center in Iwilei.

2. Existing municipal sewers are adequate to accommodate the sewage flow.

3. Street improvements, if any, should be in accordance with the City standards.

C. Michael Street
C. MICHAEL STREET
Acting Director and Chief Engineer
MEMORANDUM

TO:  JAMES TURSE, DIRECTOR
      DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

FROM:  JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR., DIRECTOR

SUBJECT:  HOMELESS CENTER - KAAWI STREET
          ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
          TMK:  1-5-07;  50

March 27, 1992

This is in response to your memorandum dated March 3, 1992 requesting our comments on the subject project.

Due to the existing traffic conditions along Dillingham Boulevard in the vicinity of the proposed project, a traffic assessment should be prepared to address the anticipated impacts resulting from the homeless center. The assessment should primarily address traffic and parking requirements generated from the office space for program activities and the administration of the institute.

Our department will provide more specific comments upon our review of the environmental assessment.

Should you have any questions, please contact Mel Hirayama of my staff at local 4119.

JOSEPH M. MAGALDI, JR.
March 11, 1992

Mr. E. James Turse
Director
Department of Housing and Community Development
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street,
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817

Dear James and Gail,

I am encouraged again that we may have a homeless center for the families. It was disappointing that the "Rainbow" center planned on King Street did not materialize.

We need the homeless center in the proposed location because this community has homeless families living in parks and vehicles on the street with makeshift tents, tarps, and cardboard. Until we can provide permanent homes for these homeless not such centers are needed. Also because many live one paycheck from being homeless we will need emergency homeless centers for temporary housing.

The entire community will benefit when families have a decent place to live until more permanent housing is available. Our church supports the homeless with health services of the Kalihi-Palama Clinic, free food, clothing, and also with household items when they find a home to live in. We plan to continue to do this. We also have a Kamehameha traveling pre-school open to all families and not charge.

I wish you God's speed and blessings and this needed homeless center.

Sincerely yours,

David J. Twigg,
Senior Minister
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1 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description of This Report

The City and County of Honolulu is proposing to develop a dormitory-type facility in Kalihi. 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. Berna Cabacungan, principal of Earthplan, was the project manager, and principal researcher and writer. Independent contractor Michael P. Mays was principal interviewer; he also researched selected population and housing trends and provided writing assistance. Community Resources, Inc. researched 1980 census information.

This report contains five major sections. The remaining portions of Section 1 describes the proposed project. Section 2 provides a profile of the existing community to establish the social context in which project impacts may occur. Information includes employment, population and housing trends, housing and other social characteristics.

Section 3 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 proposed project are identified in Section 4. This section discusses the impact of the project on facilities for the homeless, regional implications, compatibility with the nearby community, and impacts on public services and facilities.

1.2 Project Description

1.2.1 Description of the Subject Property

The project site is located in Kalihi-Palama, at the corner of North King Street and Ahepe Lane. The area has a diversity of uses. Light manufacturing outfits and warehouses are adjacent to single family homes and low- and mid-rise walk-up apartments. Food processing plants are nearby, as well as schools, a health clinic, social service agencies and churches. Just mauka and abutting the project site are the old Palama theater, which houses a variety of commercial uses, and a four-story walk-up with a ground floor market and upstairs offices.

The site encompasses 29,564 square feet, or .68 acres. Owned by a private landowner, The site has currently three uses:

- Storage of plumbing material;
- A used car lot; and
- A demonstration model home for a construction company.

The latter two uses are on leased lands.
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
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1.2.2 The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children

The City Department of Housing and Community Development, hereby referred to as the City, is proposing to acquire and develop the project site into the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. The City will construct the facility and make all necessary physical improvements. The completed facility will be leased to the Institute for Human Services who will operate the emergency shelter.

The underlying concept of this facility, which is discussed further in the next section, is to provide an environment which will help homeless women and their children function in the mainstream society. The following structural components are proposed:

* Dormitories -- Approximately 6,650 square feet will be designed to provide segregated sleeping and bathing facilities for participants in the program. Included will be "Night Rooms" which will have bunk bed configurations, and bathrooms and showers.

* School -- This will include a child care area and family care area. The family care area will have spaces for family therapy, adult and remedial education, case management, psychological counseling, employment preparation and housing assistance. The total square footage for this school is 3,660.

* Work Experience Center -- Job training will occur here. Over 2,800 square feet will be designated for a thrift shop, coffee shop, mail area and money management.

* Health Care Center -- Approximately 550 square feet will be designed for health evaluations.

* Food Service Area -- Participants will be served three meals a day in a dining and multi-purpose room. The food service area will contain approximately 5,280 square feet.

* Administrative Offices and Entry/Security -- Almost 1,600 square feet will be reserved for offices, a conference room and support facilities. Controlled access and security will require 625 square feet.

* Outdoor Play Area -- An estimated 3,300 square feet will be used as an outdoor play area for children in the program (Ferraro Choi and Associates, Ltd., 1991).

1.2.3 Program Aspects

The Institute for Human Services (IHS) was founded in 1978 by Reverend Claude DuTiel. The agency started off as the "Peanut Butter Ministry," so named because Reverend DuTiel provided peanut butter sandwiches and coffee to street people in a small vacant store on Maunakea Street in Chinatown.
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
Social Impact Assessment

In 1986, the City and County of Honolulu constructed a building for IHS in Iwilei. Today, this IHS facility is O'ahu's largest open-door unrestricted shelter for homeless men, women and children. The agency is funded by churches, individuals community organizations, and businesses. The IHS Board of Directors comprises representatives of many denominations, professional associations and civic groups. Its core staff includes eleven employees, and medical and mental health care is provided by the staff of the Kalihi-Palama Medical Clinic operating on the premises.

IHS currently serves over 5,000 meals a week, provides sleeping space for over 300 individuals and families each night, and arranges for emergency medical and mental health care. The population of homeless families requesting IHS help has been increasing substantially. In the past, IHS's homeless population almost entirely comprised substance abusers and ambulatory schizophrenics. Over the last two years, there has been more and more employed persons unable to find affordable housing, abused women, single parent families with children headed by women, tenants evicted from units to be demolished and unemployed breadwinners.

IHS is proposing the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children to accommodate this growing group of homeless families, especially those headed by single female parents. The original name of this project was the "Rainbow Ohanā School," and was subsequently changed to the "Ohana School." Regardless of the name, the project's concept is clear. IHS hopes to use a comprehensive family-skills approach based on a cooperative self-help model. The "school for the entire family" provides a homeless family the opportunity for regaining self-esteem and a sense of self direction.

At the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children, IHS will train families back to self-sufficiency. The project will be designed to address basic strategies for cooperative education and rehabilitation. The four stages in the curriculum will include (1) crisis management and assessment; (2) stabilization and program planning; (3) revitalization; and (4) re-integration into the community and follow-up (Ferraro Choi and Associates, Ltd., 1991).

Potential participants in the program will include (1) any parent with children; (2) any couple with children and (3) single women. It is expected that most participants will be single-parent families headed by a woman. Further, the families will include at least one child; no childless couples will be allowed to participate.

It is currently estimated that staffing for the proposed project will include a director, three assistants, four additional staff, and three social workers. As with the IHS Iwilei facility, there will be many volunteers who will assist in daily operations. Note, however, that the proposed project is intended to be fairly independent from Iwilei facility (personal communication with Reverend Richard Rowe, Director-on-Leave, Institute of Human Services, March 6, 1991).
2 PROFILE OF THE EXISTING COMMUNITY

This section supplies a qualitative analysis of the community in which the proposed Homeless Center for Women and Children is planned. This information supplies some of the social fabric for understanding those who comprise the area’s residential and business community. It is paramount in understanding and identifying potential project impacts. Section 2.1 defines the study area, and Section 2.2 describes employment characteristics within the study area. Population trends and characteristics are discussed in Section 2.3. Section 2.4 describes population and family characteristics; labor force characteristics are presented in Section 2.5.

2.1 Definitions of the Study Area

The study area for this project is the entire area of the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15. Figure A portrays the geographical boundaries of the study area which includes the following:

* Sub-District 1 is bounded by River Street north to North School Street, west to Kalihi Street, south to North King then east to Waikamilo Street and south encompassing Sand Island. Geographically it is the largest of the sub-districts and includes Census Tracts 43, 54, 55, 56 and 57. The project site is in Census Tract 57.

* Sub-District 2 is bounded by Waikamilo Street, Nimitz Highway and Kapalama Basin on the east boundary, North School Street on the northern side, Middle Street on the west and south by the ocean over to Kapalama Basin. It includes Census Tracts 58, 59 and 60.

* Sub-District 3 is bounded by Kalihi Street on the east, mauka by North School Street, Ewa by Middle Street and makai North King Street. It comprises Census Tracts 61 and 62.

The study area encompasses neighborhoods easily accessible to the project and includes a variety of residential, public housing projects, public and private social service centers, and commercial and business developments.

The study area lies on the fringe of Palama near Iwilei. This “Iwilei-Palama” area is primarily characterized by the following uses:

* light manufacturing;
* very few large retail operations;
* multi-family and single family housing, including large public housing projects; and
* small convenience and mom-and-pop stores.
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When completed, a new shopping complex at the corner of Dillingham Boulevard and North King Street will be largest retail shopping center within the immediate area. Two fast food franchises are also located within two blocks of the project site. The study area's proximity to Chinatown via two main traffic arteries (Dillingham Boulevard and North King Street) allows easy bus access to larger commercial and retail centers.

There are no immediate plans for large private or public projects in the immediate area of the site at present. The most recent large development in the area is the light manufacturing building built about ten years ago makai of the project site; it houses four enterprises. The adjacent old Palama theater site was recently sold to a Korean religious sect which has plans to convert the property into a religious prefecture after the current lessees relocate in about five years.

2.2 Study Area Employment

In 1985, the Kalihi-Palama area contained approximately 30,269 jobs. Nearly 51 percent, or over 15,500 jobs, were located in Sub-District 1, which includes Sand Island and the project site. Over 60 percent of the jobs in (1) government, (2) transportation, communication and utility, and (3) service were found in Sub-District 1. Further, more than 60 percent of industry jobs were in Sub-District 1.

Sub-District 3 is the most residential of the study area. Sub-Districts 1 and 2 had respectively 15 and 13 times more jobs than did Sub-District 3.

Figure B shows the breakdown of study area jobs by study area and Sub-Districts. In the total study area, the category of industry jobs was the clear employment leader at 32 percent, followed by service and retail jobs at 19 and 18 percent, respectively. Nearly equal numbers of jobs were available in construction and transportation/communications/utilities at twelve and eleven percent, respectively.

The following summarizes the types of jobs by Sub-Districts:

- Sub-District 1 had jobs trends similar to the overall study area.
- Sub-District 2 had large representation in areas of industry, retail and service jobs. Almost as many jobs were found in Sub-District 2 as in Sub-District 1.
- Reflecting a predominant residential character, Sub-District 3 was largely under-represented in all job categories. Government jobs provided the district with its largest job share.

2.3 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).
Study Area Employment by Sub-District, 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>Total Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/C/U</td>
<td>3,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>9,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/I/R/E.</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct.</td>
<td>3,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T/C/U: Transportation, Communications, Utilities
F/I/R/E: Finance, Insurance, Real Estate

Source: City Department of General Planning, 1987,
The rate of the island's growth has been steadily decreasing over recent decades. O'ahu's 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.

By comparison, the study area population is very stable in terms of growth in the 1980s. Based on preliminary 1990 census figures, the total study area population remained virtually the same between 1980 and 1990. Housing units experienced a negligible increase of about 330 units.

Within the study area, according to preliminary 1990 census figures, there was a slight decrease in population in Sub-District 2 and minor population growth in Sub-Districts 1 and 3. According to 1990 preliminary census figures, Sub-District 1 experienced almost no growth, whereas Sub-District 3 experienced a 2.2 percent population increase over 1980. The population overall changed very little between 1980 and 1990 but there were gains in every sub-district in the number of housing units.

The 1990 preliminary census figures are lower than estimates of the City Department of General Planning. This "underestimation" appears to be a statewide trend, and the census figures may yet undergo further corrections.

The remaining discussion in this section focuses on more detailed population and housing estimates provided by the City Department of General Planning for 1989. Specific population trends are as follows:

* Sub-District 1 encompasses the largest area of Kalihi-Palama and a major portion is in light manufacturing and industrial use. There was a five percent increase in housing units between 1980 and 1989. According to information presented in Table 1, this increase was in multi-family units, with a slight decrease in single-family units. This Sub-District had nearly three times more multi-family units than single family units.

* Sub-District 2 experienced a slight decrease in population and negligible increase in housing. This area has experienced few major changes in residential or commercial development.

* Sub-District-3 is the smallest in area of the three sub-districts. From 1980 to 1989, both population and housing experienced a slight decrease. Of all sub-areas, this district had proportionally the most single-family units, which accounted for more than half of the housing stock.

Over 97 percent of the study area's total dwelling units were occupied in 1980; in 1989, over 98 percent. All Sub-District showed an increase in occupancy between 1980 and 1989, with an average of 98 percent for each Sub-District in 1989; this low vacancy rate is consistent with island and statewide shortage of housing units.
Table 1

Population and Housing Trends, 1980 to 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Study Area</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in households (%)</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in group quarters (%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSING UNITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Units</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>3,671</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Dwelling Units</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>10,607</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Housing Units</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLD SIZE</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch, 1990

Note: Preliminary census information was released during the writing of this report. The information included population and housing units, and did not include breakdowns contained above. Preliminary information is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>Sub-District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40,147</td>
<td>16,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11,107</td>
<td>5,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
Social Impact Assessment

The study area had a significantly large number of residents living in group quarters. In 1998, approximately 5.3 and 5.9 percent lived in group quarters in Sub-Districts 1 and 2, respectively. By comparison, 4.3 percent of O'ahu's population reside in group quarters.

2.4 Population and Family Characteristics

The 1980 census is the most recent comprehensive source of information regarding the demographics of the study area. Table 2 presents demographic characteristics of the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board area and the following are highlights:

- The dominant ethnic group was Filipino; there were three times more Filipinos than the City and County average. In contrast, there was almost four times fewer Caucasians in the study area than in O'ahu.

- The population in the study area tended to have more children and more elderly than O'ahu. This means that there were proportionally less people in the 18 to 64 year work force category.

- Compared to O'ahu, nearly two and a half times of the study area residents were foreign-born, and significantly fewer people were born in another state.

- Over one-third of the population did not graduate from high school, as compared to 14.4 percent islandwide. Only about 18 percent pursued some form of education after high school; on O'ahu, 40 percent had some post high school education.

Table 3 provides information regarding family characteristics and income, and the following summarizes these statistics:

- Kalihi-Palama residents are very family-oriented; 91 percent live in family situations, as compared to 86 percent on O'ahu.

- The proportion of families below poverty level was double that of the overall island. Further, nearly twice as many family heads of household were female in the study area, and twice as many households had income from public assistance.

- The median family income in Kalihi-Palama was nearly one-third less than that of O'ahu.
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of O‘ahu and Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O‘ahu Population</th>
<th>Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>762,565</td>
<td>40,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years old</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17 years old</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years old</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and older</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median age</strong></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Birth</strong> **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S.**</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence in 1975</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(people aged 5 or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same house</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same county</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other county</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other state</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(people aged 25 or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S.</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. graduate only</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post H.S.</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 4+ yr.</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** *Figures based on 15 percent sample; hence, numbers represent estimates
 includes persons born in U.S. territories, or born abroad or at sea to U.S. parent
 Includes Census Tracts 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 57.99, 58, 59, 59.99, 60, 61, 62.01, 62.02
 SOURCES: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1980*
Table 3

Family Characteristics and Income of O‘ahu and Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O‘ahu</th>
<th>Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Families</td>
<td>653,118</td>
<td>36,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>178,516</td>
<td>8,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband/Wife</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male only</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female only</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Own Children Under 18</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$23,554</td>
<td>$16,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Family Individuals</td>
<td>83,980</td>
<td>4,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% below poverty level</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Public Assistance</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: All figures (except “Persons in Families” and “Non-Family Households”) based on 15 percent sample; numbers represent estimates.

Includes Census Tracts 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 57.99, 58, 59, 59.99, 60, 61, 62.01, 62.02.

2.5 Housing Conditions

There is a major need for affordable housing in Kalihi-Palama. The housing vacancy rate in 1980 was very low at 2.8 percent in 1980. Further, as shown in Table 4, three-fourths of the occupied units were renter-occupied. This is indicative of a lower than average income and more transient population, when compared to islandwide figures.

Another indicator of the housing crunch is crowding. In 1980, 22.5 percent of the total units had 1.51 persons or more per room; only 7.4 percent of the islandwide households shared this condition. As expected, household sizes are higher than average at 3.54 persons.

In 1980, the comparative median value of owner occupied homes was about $33,000 less in Kalihi-Palama than on O'ahu. The percent of monthly income needed to pay the median monthly mortgage was nearly five percent higher in this area compared with the island as a whole.

2.6 Labor Force Characteristics of Kalihi-Palama

When compared to islandwide statistics, the study area has fewer participants in the labor force and only one-fifth as many people in the armed forces. Several notable characteristics of the comparison of the study area with City and County are highlighted as follows. Table 5 provides more detail.

- Almost twice as many people were employed in service related occupations.
- Nearly twice as many study area residents were employed as operators, fabricators, or laborers.
- There were almost two-thirds fewer people in higher-paid managerial, professional, technical, sales and administration categories.
- Almost twice as many are in manufacturing industries in the study area.

The Kalihi-Palama residents successfully participate in and are overly represented in occupations and industries that require less formal education, and are under-represented in higher paying professional occupations requiring advanced training and specialized skills.
Table 4

Housing Conditions of O‘ahu and Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>O‘ahu</th>
<th>Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Year–Round Housing Units</td>
<td>250,866</td>
<td>11,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (total)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant for sale</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant for rent</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held for occasional use</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Year–Round Occupied Units</td>
<td>228,656</td>
<td>10,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner–occupied</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter–occupied</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking some or all plumbing</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 or more persons/room</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Cash Rent (owner–occupied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of median family income**</td>
<td>$279</td>
<td>$192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Mortgage (owner–occupied homes)</td>
<td>$130,400</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of median family income**</td>
<td>$494</td>
<td>$411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: * Median values are for non-condominium housing units.
** Figures based on 15 percent sample; numbers represent estimates
Includes Census Tracts 33, 54, 55, 56, 57, 57.99, 58, 59, 59.99, 60, 61, 62.01, 62.02

Table 5

Labor Force Conditions of O'ahu and Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Labor Force</th>
<th>O'ahu</th>
<th>Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Aged 16+)</td>
<td>574,903</td>
<td>29,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>339,863</td>
<td>16,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed Civilian Labor Force Occupation</th>
<th>O'ahu</th>
<th>Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/professional</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, sales and administration</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming/fishing/forestry</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision/craft/repair</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators/fabricators/laborers</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected Industry

| Agriculture/forestry/fishing/mining             | 1.7%   | 1.1%                                 |
| Construction                                   | 6.6%   | 6.9%                                 |
| Manufacturing                                  | 7.7%   | 12.8%                                |
| Retail trade                                   | 20.5%  | 24.7%                                |
| Financial, insurance, real estate              | 8.1%   | 5.5%                                 |
| Personal, entertainment                        |        |                                      |
| and recreational services                      |        |                                      |
| Health, education and professional             | 8.1%   | 14.0%                                |
| Public administration                          | 18.5%  | 11.8%                                |
|                                              | 10.9%  | 6.5%                                 |

Commute to Work

| Mean travel (mins.)                           | 22.6   | 21.9                                 |

NOTES: All figures based on 15 percent sample; hence, numbers represent estimates.

Includes Census Tracts 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 57.99, 58, 59, 59.99, 60, 61, 62.01, 62.02

3 COMMUNITY ISSUES ON THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section explores potential community issues and concerns on the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. Section 3.1 identifies information sources used in this analysis. Section 3.2 extends the baseline data on the existing community by presenting issues and concerns independent of the proposed project. Section 3.3 describes informants' feelings about the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children.

3.1 Sources of Information

Three 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 study area residents, this study examined the minutes of the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15 over a two-year period, from January 1989 through March 1991. Section 3.2.1 discusses issues addressed by this Board.


   The City held three meetings with a committee comprising regional leaders and nearby landowners, residents and users. We reviewed these to identify issues related to the project.


   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.

   The interviews were conducted by telephone and in person. The purpose of the interviews was to isolate issues and identify personal and community concerns about the project. No attempt
was made to quantify responses since only a survey utilizing rigid sampling procedures could produce meaningful results. This was not within the scope of Earthplan's work in conducting a social impact assessment. The only time we make reference to the quantity of opinion is where there was a significant difference in numbers, such as "only one respondent," or "all of those interviewed."

Forty-four people were interviewed during this study and the list is presented in Table 6. 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 provided by the City and IHS.

Interviewees were first asked about the Kalihi-Palama area and their own neighborhood. They were asked to share their likes and problems/concerns about the region.

Next, they were asked about the project, beginning with their prior knowledge of the project. Those in regional organizations knew about the project, some of them are on the Design Advisory Committee. Few of the nearby residents knew about the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. On-site businesses knew about the project, as did nearby social agencies and churches.

After being given a brief summary of the proposed project, informants were then asked to provide their perspectives on how the proposed project might affect them personally, and affect nearby uses and the regional community; the question varied depending on appropriateness.

Those interviewed were not asked to represent the views of their organizations, although if the organization has taken a formal position, they were asked to discuss these positions.

The 44 people interviewed for this project represented a wide cross-section of interests. They were from four general categories, as follows. Note that the total does not equal 44 because some people were in more than one group.

- The largest group interviewed were the 14 nearby residents living on Akepo Lane. These interviews were held in person, and interviews with apartment dwellers were arranged by resident managers.
Table 6

List of Those Interviewed
These people were asked to provide their reactions and opinions about the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. They were not asked to take a position, but rather to provide insight as to potential benefits and conflicts. They were asked to discuss any organizational position in which they were involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Akamine</td>
<td>Member of Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Arakaki</td>
<td>Housing Program Specialist at the State Hawai‘i Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinney Act Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interagency Council, Liaison of Federal Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Arii</td>
<td>General manager of Pioneer Printers (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Babua</td>
<td>Reservations specialist at Acacia Tours and Travel (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddy Deshotel</td>
<td>Member of Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifico Dejulo</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Elder</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Espirit</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Fukuji</td>
<td>Secretary of Pacific Rim Housing (on-site business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo Ganitano</td>
<td>Owner of tailor shop (adjacent business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Giesting</td>
<td>Executive Director of Kalihi-Palama Health Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hino</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomua Ioane</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Jones</td>
<td>President of the Kalihi Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of the Kalihi–Palama Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Design Advisory Committee for this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kaaihue</td>
<td>Resident manager of nearby apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilian Kalaluhi</td>
<td>Resident manager of nearby apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindo Kinney</td>
<td>Member of Kalihi–Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lee</td>
<td>Motor Patrol Officer at the Kalihi Police Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Liu</td>
<td>Director of Homeless Aloha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Lum</td>
<td>Principal of Kaulani Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Mata</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Matias</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Morioka</td>
<td>Vice President of Honolulu Star Bakery (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Moroni</td>
<td>Program Director of the Spouse Abuse Shelter of Child and Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Morse</td>
<td>Community Development Specialist of the Institute for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tini Mossman</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Mow–Taira</td>
<td>Director of Advocacy of the Child and Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tin Myaing Thien</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Kalihi–Palama Immigrant Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marna Nohara</td>
<td>Office manager of Berkeley Engineering and Equipment Co. (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasa Tseugo Ogata</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Perkins</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Hawai‘i Ecumenical Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Richard Rowe</td>
<td>Director of Institute for Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Stauffer</td>
<td>Director of Homeless at the State Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Tadio</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Taum</td>
<td>Chair of Housing Committee of the Kalihi–Palama Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Design Advisory Committee for this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Tautua</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend David Twigg</td>
<td>Kaumakapili Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Uyehara</td>
<td>Executive President of Aloha Tofu Co. (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Vehemente</td>
<td>President of the Palama Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Yamamoto</td>
<td>Honolulu Shirt Shoppe (nearby business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Yamaoka</td>
<td>Owner of Oahu Used Cars (on-site business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Young</td>
<td>Member of Kalihi–Palama Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President of the Palama Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Young</td>
<td>Nearby resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliette Young</td>
<td>Senior Warden in Vestry at St. Elizabeth’s Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Design Advisory Committee for this project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* The second largest group were people involved in social service agencies, public services and churches. Fifteen people were in this category; five worked or operated near the project site. These interviews were either in person or via the telephone. Some of these people were personnel of public facilities or services and were knowledgeable in servicing the island's homeless needs. Others dealt specifically with families and related problems in the region and in Kalihi-Palama.

* Seven of those interviewed owned or operated nearby businesses. These were done in person.

* To obtain a regional perspective, we interviewed seven people who were part of regional organizations.

The responses from the informant interviews are presented in Sections 3.2.2 and 3.3. Because this is not a statistical survey, we do not quantify the frequency of responses, except in the case of extremes.

3.2 General Community Issues and Concerns

3.2.1 Neighborhood Board Issues and Concerns

Over the last two years, the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15 has been working to (1) improve the quality of life for existing residents and (2) change the community image.

For Board members, improving the quality of life means the timely and adequate maintenance of infrastructure, reducing traffic buildup, and receiving more attention and response from public agencies. Specific instances of Board concerns are as follows:

* Public facilities -- The redevelopment of Ke'ehi Lagoon and the proposed contra-flow lane for Likelike and Pali Highways were discussed. The Board voiced its opposition to the proposed contra-flow lane; members also expressed concerns about traffic and parking resulting from the overabundance of cars in Kalihi during morning peak traffic hours. Board members raised questions about emergency vehicles not being able to negotiate traffic with one lane in one tunnel.

The Board was very concerned that roads and sidewalks are not being maintained and repaired in a timely fashion.

* Police protection and youth gangs -- The Board feels that police protection needs to be increased to meet the community's needs. Board members are especially concerned about youth gang activities.

page 21
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
Social Impact Assessment

The image of Kalihi-Palama is of utmost importance to the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board. There was often a feeling that the region is used as a "dumping ground" for public facilities, such as the O'ahu Community Correctional Center, which are unwanted in other communities. To some Board members, the solution lies in opposing additional such public facilities in this region.

As a result, facilities such as care homes are highly scrutinized, as discussed below:

* A Care Home on McCandless Lane for the mentally retarded created concerns about traffic, parking, threats to residents and need to disperse these types of facilities. Care homes are needed in the communities their patients come from. Many felt Kalihi and its immediate environs already have too many care home facilities.

* The Board voted to support Neighborhood Board No. 14 in rejecting the building of a three-story, six-unit Spouse Abuse transitional home near Kuakini Hospital.

The Board voted to ratify the emergency shelter for the homeless at A'ala Park.

3.2.2 Comments on Kalihi-Palama in General Raised by Informants

To understand possible reasons behind the informants' reactions to the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children, we initiated the interviews by asking about their feelings regarding Kalihi-Palama and their immediate neighborhood.

Positive Aspects.

Underlying many of the comments about the positive aspects of Kalihi-Palama was an appreciation for the subtle mixture of social and contractual networks. Many of the nearby residents had lived in Kalihi-Palama all their lives, and were appreciative of the familiarity with people and places. They had favorite stores, and talked about relatives who live in other parts of Kalihi-Palama. They also liked the presence of social service agencies in proximity to their residences.

For the small business operators, it was felt that the business climate was good. Many of their customers lived in Kalihi-Palama which means a stable clientele. It was also felt that the area still offered affordable business rents, which allow the start-up of new businesses. Convenience to major bus lines and primary streets was seen as an asset for businesses.

It was felt that crime prevention was improving somewhat, though only in certain areas.

Concerns About Kalihi-Palama.

Those who were active in regional organizations were adamant in their desire to improve Kalihi-Palama's image. They felt that public officials and the islandwide community are locating too many care homes, social service agencies and generally undesirable public facilities in Kalihi-Palama. This

page 22
proliferation of social-oriented facilities perpetuates the region's image of
being a community of low-income people, and regional organization informants
preferred a greater diversity of facilities and residents.

Both business leaders and organization representatives felt Kaliihi-Palama was
being neglected by the City and State. Basically the perceived needs were not
being met. Several were outraged at the expansion of the prison and the halfway
house on Bannister Street; these were seen as examples of government arrogance
and power disregarding community objections to these projects.

Though residents felt comfortable in the vicinity of the project site, workers
in businesses and social service-related establishments felt unsafe. They
report drinking and loitering after work hours and occasionally witnessed, or
were victims of, crime.

3.3 Community Concerns About the Homeless Family Center

3.3.1 Summary of Issues and Concerns

Community issues are perceptions that a group of people feel toward something,
and whether the feelings or attitudes toward the issues endure over time depends
on the relative sentiment. Perceptions and sentiments can change over time and
those presented on the Homeless Family Center are those identified in March,

The vast majority of those interviewed felt that a homeless center for families
was needed. It was felt that current facilities were very inadequate for
emergency needs or transitional purposes. All interviewed believed that the
number of homeless was growing in Hawaii, and homeless families were becoming
more noticeable in their community. Nevertheless, there were strong concerns
about the possible effects of the project on Kaliihi-Palama, and the following
summarizes issues and concerns on the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children.

1. Islandwide Dispersal of Facilities for Homeless People.

This was a major concern among those interviewed. Informants
often complained that Kaliihi-Palama is being used as a "Dumping
Ground" by public and social service agencies. There is an
underlying feeling that the quality of life is decaying because
social service facilities attract undesirable nonresidents.

Informants were concerned that the IHS 'Iwilei facility was
bringing in people from all over the island, and the proposed
facility would only increase the area's attractiveness to
homeless people.

It was felt that social services, particularly those for homeless
people should be "spread around" to other communities. One
informant suggested that poor people from all over O'ahu come to
Kaliihi to live in care homes and shelter. Ideally, these people
should have been accommodated in their own community.
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It was occasionally pointed out that the State's efforts in locating cabins for homeless people was a good example of how to disperse such facilities.

2. Need for a Shelter for Homeless Women and Children.

For those who expressed some degree of opposition to the project, the term "homeless" often conjured up images of single men sleeping in doorways and eating from garbage cans. Often, this negative reaction changed or at least softened when the interviewer clarified that the project was primarily for women and children.

Informants agreed that something needed to be done for women and children who need shelter. They understood that the IHS Iwilei facility was inadequate and inappropriate for these people. They preferred that the project be built at another site, and insisted that if this site were chosen, there needs to be clear commitment to serving only women and children.

3. Relationship to Immediate Area.

Nearby residents and small business owners were nearly unanimously behind the concept and need for it. Most were not bothered by its location and felt it would improve the visual appearance of the area. One business person thought an alternative location should be sought for the sake of the clients.

4. Safety of Facility Clients.

Informants warned that the area may not be safe for women and children. They remembered that Akepo Lane is sometimes the scene of dangerous crime, and cited incidents of stabbings, homicides, muggings and gang fights in the immediate vicinity. They strongly suggested on-site security to protect the facility's clients.

5. Ability of IHS to Operate the Facility.

One of the reasons opposing the project is that those interviewed doubted the ability of IHS to effectively manage the project. It was pointed out that the Iwilei facility is not a good neighbor because of crime and loitering. Further, people were wary of internal administrative conflicts. Regional and social service informants were afraid that such management problems would be duplicated at Akepo Lane.

It was also pointed out that IHS's strength is its ability at providing emergency shelter. Informants were unsure about the agency's ability to expand its services to include transitional
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ing housing, and preferred that the latter be left to those who are already providing mainstream services.

3.3.2 Trends Among the Different Groups of Informants

Several consistent themes emerged from the groups interviewed, and these are summarized as follows:

• Though they acknowledged a need for the proposed project, those belonging to regional organizations were the most vociferously opposed to the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. Their organizations have been opposing new care home or social service related housing projects in their district because it is believed that Kalihi-Palama has its share of such facilities. They were also concerned about what might happen if IHS lost their funding after five years; they did not want to see this facility become another Iwilei IHS.

Informants were frustrated that the project violated their publicly stated corporate position of no more social service facilities or care homes in their district.

In the April 1991 meeting the Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board deferred action of the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children. Some of the Board members will be learning more about the project in a special presentation, and they will report to the Board at a later meeting.

The Housing Committee of the Kalihi-Palama Community Council has taken a position in opposition to the project. The committee wanted alternative sites explored; all of those cited in the interview were outside Kalihi-Palama. The Council also expressed apprehension about IHS’s ability to operate a well-managed facility over a long period of time, particularly in light of funding requirements. The programmatic aspects were appreciated, and there was a desire to see the facility only serve women and children. Effective security was seen as a definite must.

• Nearby residents tended to agree that there was a need for such a facility, and felt that Kalihi-Palama was a suitable area. They indicated that other social service agencies were located nearby so the proposed site seemed suitable. Nearly all empathized with families in need of food and shelter. One said that she had been in similar straits and others had relatives or friends who had shared similar hardships.

• Business owners and employees in the immediate area felt there was a need for the facility but offered cautions over its proposed location based on their expectations or stereotypes of homeless people. Safety for women and children in that area was questioned; it was feared homeless women would attract men or unsavory elements. Others said they had never experienced any
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security or personal safety problems during their long tenure in the area. Several mentioned that anything would be an improvement to Akepo Lane.

* Social service related informants cited the long-standing need for food and shelter for homeless families. They offered evidence of the need from observations in the immediate project site neighborhood, such as families sleeping in cars behind a church.

There was concern, however, that the project would duplicate what already is being offered to homeless families. A few of those interviewed felt that IHS is good at operating emergency shelters, but would be duplicating existing services and experimenting with the school concept. Their concerns were focused on management and the breadth of the proposed educational and training program.

Social agency informants acknowledged there is some truth to the recent large influx of such facilities to Kalihi-Palama, but aptly pointed out that these facilities are needed proximate to those in need. To these informants, the Kalihi-Palama community has always been transitional, offering the low income families affordable housing, ethnic commercial and market services matching their cultural and financial status. It was suggested that “We need a community for the common person in Honolulu.”

* Public service representatives stated that the project site area was no different from other areas of Kalihi with regard to personal safety or property security. There have been no reported threats of physical harm to elementary school children traversing Akepo Lane or project site vicinity in there recent past. Police reported that the predominantly male Akepo Arms residents create few problems. They say the area has improved in recent years. Prostitutes and drug dealing find Downtown much more lucrative than Kalihi-Palama.
4 POTENTIAL SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

4.1 Impact on Facilities for Homeless Families

4.1.1 Assessment of Need

A homeless person is one who has no place to sleep on a given night, and must sleep in a car, on the beach, in a supervised shelter, in a doorway, or in any other place which might provide temporary shelter, but which is not home. It is estimated that on any given day in Hawai‘i, between 7,023 and 8,369 people are homeless. The following provides a profile of our homeless population:

- Seven out of ten homeless people are male, and the average age is 35 years. The average age of female homeless is 34.
- Thirty-seven percent of the homeless are Caucasian, followed by Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians at 28 percent.
- Sixteen percent are married, and another 14 percent live with someone but are not married.
- Almost one-fifth currently have a job. Of those who are unemployed, over half have been unemployed less than two years.
- Forty-two percent are high school graduates, three percent attended vocational school, and another 23 percent have at least some college education (SMS Research and Marketing Services, Inc., 1990).

Where do homeless people live? Only a small segment secures any type of shelter. In a study conducted for the Hawai‘i Housing Authority, one-fourth of the homeless slept in their car on the night preceding the interview. Another 23 percent slept on the beach and 18 percent in a park. Only nine percent slept in a shelter, and four percent found accommodations in a public facility.

The most visible of the homeless are often those who want to be. These visible homeless are the street people, and the majority are single males. They push shopping carts filled with their belongings and other items, rummage through trash bins for food, sometimes ask passersby for money and handouts, and are often unkempt and dirty (Hastings, 1989). Three primary problems affect this group: substance abuse, domestic violence and mental illness (Homeless Aloha, Inc., 1990).

However, these visible street people are only part of the homeless population, which includes:

- Families are the fastest growing segment of the homeless population. This is particularly so for the single parent families.
- The elderly population continues to increase, and is projected to comprise 20 percent of the 2000 population. Low fixed incomes, combined with the shortage of subsidized and low-income rentals put them in a high risk group.
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
Social Impact Assessment

- Youth runaways are increasingly being counted among the homeless.

- Native Hawaiians are also considered an at-risk group. The profile of the Native Hawaiian community suggests a youthful population, rapidly growing, generally under-educated, under or unemployed, with serious health problems, below average per capita income, a larger than average family unit, and an increasing number of single parent families (Homeless Aloha, Inc., 1990).

Another way to look at who is homeless is the "classification" compiled by the Special Needs Housing Task Force:

- The chronically homeless are the street people, who have chosen a life on the street, or who move from shelter to shelter. These are estimated to comprise between 20 and 30 percent of the homeless population.

- Situationally homeless people experience personal crises, such as domestic violence, eviction, divorce or death of a family member. This also includes households who lose homes because of natural disaster.

- Those who simply cannot make ends meet are the economically homeless, and include workers who are displaced or suddenly unemployed, or individuals whose incomes or public assistance is insufficient to afford housing.

- The potential or at-risk homeless are those who are living doubled or tripled-up in over-crowded conditions, or are paying disproportionate measures of their income for rent. These people often have subsistence incomes and any unexpected major expense has the potential to cause them to be homeless (Matsuoka, 1988).

As can be seen from these attempts at defining and categorizing homeless people, except for the street person, the only common distinctive feature separating a homeless person from the rest of the population is the lack of a home.

Services to shelter and help the homeless are grossly inadequate. In 1987, there were approximately 1,113 bedspaces which provided emergency shelter for homeless people (Matsuoka, 1988). Some of these have restrictions, some have fees, and, in discussions with service providers, all have waiting lists.

4.1.2 Project Impacts

Although public and private entities are currently trying to define and address the problem of Hawaii's increasing homeless population, actual shelter and systemic solutions are long-range at best. Although the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children will make only a small dent in providing for homeless families, it nevertheless will address a growing and vital need in the islandwide community, as well as in the study area.
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As discussed in the previous section, there are many different types of homeless people. The proposed project will target homeless women and children. A sample of facilities targeting this group and which may refer clients to the proposed facility are as follows:

* The Mary Jane Center is primarily for single, pregnant women between 14 and 28 years of age. The facility has space for 13 women. They get about 200 calls per year, but can only take 45 to 50 per year. Many of these women have difficulty in finding housing on Oahu when they leave this facility. Problems range from financial to social skills.

* The Spouse Abuse Center houses abused women and children in a confidential location. The facility contains seven bedrooms and the maximum stay is two months. The clients are single and married, and about 50 to 60 percent have children. Referrals come from schools, doctors, courts and State agencies. Funding come from Aloha United Way, though they mostly rely on federal funding.

* Women's Way includes a substance abuse and spouse abuse program conducted by the Salvation Army. The facility houses between twelve to 15 women and children, and the maximum length of stay is 18 months. The program includes day care for toddlers; preschool and school aged children attend off-site facilities.

At the Iwilei facility of IHS, between 80 to 100 women and 30 to 60 children, seek emergency shelter and crisis assistance every day. These women and children currently represent one-third of the total IHS population, and the second floor of the facility has been reserved solely for their use.

At IHS, the average family has 3.2 children, and the average age of the mother is 24.3 years. Almost two out of three are single parent families. Of the two-parent families, all have a history and are experiencing domestic violence and substance abuse dysfunction. The children are young. Sixty-eight percent are younger than nine years old (Ferraro Choi and Associates, Ltd., 1991).

4.2 Implications for the Kalihi-Palama Region

4.2.1 The "Dumping Ground" Syndrome

As discussed in Section 3, a major reason for community opposition to the this project is a belief that Kalihi-Palama already has a disproportionate share of facilities and agencies which target society's disenfranchised, poor and socially dysfunctional individuals. Community members feel that the presence of these facilities contribute to a poor community image both internally and throughout the island. Leaders feel that the community has been exploited in that too many undesirable community facilities are located in this district. These facilities often target islandwide needs, yet Kalihi-Palama must suffer any negative impacts resulting from the presence of these facilities.
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This section explores whether this "dumping ground" perception is an accurate portrayal of what is really occurring in this community. To explore this perception, this section looks at (1) the types of public and social-related facilities currently located in Kalihi-Palama and (2) socio-economic characteristics which may be indicators of need for these facilities.

1. Types of Public and Social-Related Facilities Currently Located in Kalihi-Palama.

There are three types of social-oriented facilities in Kalihi-Palama:

- The first are those facilities which are specifically designed to accommodate the larger islandwide community and have very little direct service value to the Kalihi-Palama community. Examples include the O'ahu Community Correction Center and the Ke'ehi Lagoon and Honolulu Harbor maritime facilities.

- The second type of facilities are those which are intended for the larger region or even islandwide need, and can be used by Kalihi-Palama residents as well. For example, the Sand Island Regional Park can be enjoyed by Kalihi-Palama residents. In the same vein, care homes are open to residents around the island, including those in Kalihi-Palama.

- Third are the facilities which are in the area to specifically serve Kalihi-Palama residents. These are facilities such as immigration services, housing assistance programs, job training, health clinics, public assistance agencies and so on.

2. Socio-Economic Characteristics Which May Indicate Need for Such Services.

Population statistics show that growth in Kalihi-Palama has been very moderate, yet there continues to be an increase in agencies and facilities. Does the existing community warrant at least some of these agencies? Consider the following statistics which are further elaborated in Section 2:

- Kalihi-Palama has more children and more elderly people than the islandwide community, thereby needing certain services, such as affordable health, child and elderly care, more than other parts of O'ahu.

- The district has proportionately more immigrants than other areas, thereby indicating a need for immigrant services, language programs and cultural assimilation and access activities.
Homeless Shelter for Women and Children
Social Impact Assessment

- Education and job training programs are needed, since less people completed high school and more people are not actively participating in the labor force.
- High poverty levels and low family incomes increase the need for public assistance programs.
- Housing is expensive and rent is high, thereby creating greater financial burden on residents.

Residents are correct in saying that Kalihi-Palama has an inordinate share of social service agencies. What is not often articulated, however, is the distinction between the different types of agency or facility.

This study finds that the greatest degree of resentment is generated by the first type of facility described earlier -- the prison and other island-oriented facilities which have little direct value for Kalihi-Palama residents, but cause direct impact on the surrounding community. Unfortunately, it is these very types of facilities over which the nearby community has limited, if any, input. Thus the "dumping ground" syndrome is perpetuated by these statewide and islandwide facilities.

It is also found that the third type of social service facility generates the least amount of community opposition. There is obvious need for these agencies, as suggested in socio-economic indicators discussed earlier.

The facilities which fall into the second category -- those intended for the larger region, but are also accessible to Kalihi-Palama residents -- are often the target of criticism. Though they may be valuable and necessary for the community's elderly population, care homes are no longer welcome in Kalihi-Palama, for example.

4.2.2 Project Effects

Whether the project will further contribute to this "dumping ground" syndrome will depend on how one perceives the service population of the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children.

1. The Project As An Islandwide Facility.

The IHS Iwilei facility serves an islandwide need, and is not intended to only serve Kalihi-Palama residents. Community members have expressed frustration similar to that expressed regarding the O'ahu Community Corrections Center.

This frustration is especially acute if one believes that Kalihi-Palama had very few homeless people until IHS moved into Iwilei. For these people, the facility was responsible for increasing the number of homeless people in Kalihi-Palama.
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For them, another homeless shelter, i.e. the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children, would perpetuate the dumping ground syndrome and would be an unwelcome addition to the community.

2. The Project As An Islandwide And Kalihi-Palama Facility.

For those who believe that homelessness exists in Kalihi-Palama for the same reason as it does everywhere else, the project will be likely viewed as a solution to an existing community problem. To these people, social service agencies are here because the service population and need are here. The presence of social service agencies does not encourage the in-migration of poor people, but rather assists the already existing population.

To these people, the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children is a solution to a community problem already existing in Kalihi-Palama.

For the most part, the social service facilities and agencies in Kalihi-Palama fall into the third category discussed in the previous section. These are present because many the clients live nearby or rent is low enough for non-profit agencies to afford. As the 1980 census indicates, the socio-economic conditions in Kalihi-Palama warrant the presence of many of these agencies.

Inasmuch as regional organizations dislike many of the social service facilities, it is stressed that removing these agencies and facilities from Kalihi-Palama will not eliminate the current socio-economic problems of the area. Further, not building the proposed project will not solve the problem of homeless women and children already present in the area.

What is needed is a concerted effort of government, the regional organizations and social agencies to work together to improve the quality of life for all residents in the area. This effort goes well beyond the proposed project, but the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children is certainly a step in the right direction. The homeless clientele will need, first and foremost, shelter, and, second, training in life skills to successfully function in the larger society.

4.3 Assessment of Project Compatibility with the Nearby Community

4.3.1 Overview of Existing Uses

The Homeless Family Center is in the midst of a diverse mixed use area. Nearest the project site are the following uses:

- Light manufacturing separated by several rows of homes and a three-story apartment complex are directly makai of the designated site.
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- Adjacent and 'Ewa lies the old Palama theater building currently used for light manufacturing of printing materials. There is a market, an herb shop, a former restaurant which is apparently being used as a residence, and a bakery.

- Also Jean's Market and upstairs offices are located on the mauka side of the project site.

- Akepo Arms, Madonna Apartments and Aloha Tofu Factory front Akepo Lane adjacent to the project. On street level in the Akepo Arms building fronting North King Street are a bakery/cafe, a travel agency, a tailor, a laundromat and a liquor/convenience store.

Robello Lane runs 'Ewa parallel to Akepo Lane. The project site does not directly front this street, but the uses will be near the proposed facility. Business activities and other uses on Robello Lane include a manufacturer of printing products, interiors shop, catering outfit; advertising offices, a costume shop, apartment buildings, an appliance company and a gas station.

On the mauka side of North King Street facing the project site block between Akepo Lane and Robello Lane are the Kaumakapili Church, Kalihi-Palama Health Clinic, St. Elizabeth's Episcopal Church and Kalihi-Palama Immigrant Service Center. Beyond Pua Lane moving Diamond Head are a gas station, auto parts store, a beauty shop, several small restaurants, a bar, sewing machine repair shop, convenience store and the Mayor Wright Housing Project.

Two new projects in the area are the Kingsgate Plaza Shopping Center, scheduled to open July, 1991, and a Korean Buddhist sect prefecture planned for the old Palama theater site.

The Kingsgate Plaza Shopping Center is a two-story building located at the corner of Dillingham Boulevard and North King Street.

Of note are the cottages on Akepo Lane, Akepo Arms, Madonna Apartments, and 954 Akepo Lane Apartment. Residents of these buildings will share Akepo Lane with the clients at Homeless Shelter for Women and Children.

A row of five cottages are contiguous to the rear boundary of the project site stretching from Akepo Lane to the Palama theater building. They are all very old and in disrepair. All are occupied by people of Samoan extraction. Three of the cottages' tenants were families. At the time of the interviews, there were many young children present inside the cottages.

Akepo Arms and Madonna Apartments are different apartment buildings located just Diamond Head of the project site. They offer the same basic facilities and are under the same management. Rent ranges from $285 to $330 a month. Akepo Arms has 312 studio units and Madonna has 123 units which are slightly larger than Akepo Arms. Each unit has its own bathroom with shower and kitchenette with sink, but no kitchen cooking facilities or refrigerators are provided. Residents are almost all men, many of whom are elderly and retired. Parking is available on a limited basis which is not problem because many of the pensioners, elderly, and welfare recipients do not own cars. Many tenants in both apartments are from one of these categories.
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The 954 Akepo Lane Apartment is located makai of the project site between a light manufacturing complex and the row of cottages. The three-story apartment is about 30 years old and has five one bedroom units per floor. The apartment faces the project site which will be visible from its second and third floors. Several tenants have one or more small children, and are on limited income or were receiving agency supplementary support. Each unit has one parking stall.

4.3.2 Project Impacts

The compatibility of the Homeless Families Center with surrounding environs depends on analysis of three factors: (1) the area's existing character, (2) a possible future for the area, and (3) what exactly will the proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children add to the area. These factors will determine what subsequent attributions the Homeless Center will have on the existing area.

- **Existing Character.**

  The variety of types of business activities and uses in the immediate vicinity and the diversity of residents' housing attest to the area's cultural heterogeneity. Nearby structures are visited and used by:

  - students and immigrants attending nearby service centers, programs, schools and training centers;
  - church officials and parishioners;
  - health clinic professionals, workers and clients;
  - parents and children attending day care centers;
  - homeless men, women and children from A'ala Park and Iwilei;
  - store keepers, business employees and shoppers; and
  - residents of nearby apartments and housing projects.

  In addition, commuters who cannot find parking in Downtown reportedly park in Kalihi-Palama and bus to work. Shoppers heading to Chinatown markets and retail shops pass through the vicinity on a regular basis by foot or bus. There is great diversity of ages and ethnicity living and working in the area.

- **Possible Future for the Area.** As discussed earlier, only two projects are planned in the immediate vicinity of the project site. A shopping center, now under development, and a Buddhist prefecture to begin construction in about five to six years on the old theater site.

- **What the Homeless Families Center Add to the Area.** The project will certainly add to the diversity of the area, and will likely be a compatible addition to the neighborhood. The project has
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the potential to add up to 175 people to the area if operating at
capacity, and in addition resident staff and day staff workers
and volunteers. The precise number is not presently known.

Most families will probably comprise homeless mothers with
children, though two parent families will be accommodated as will
fathers with dependent children.

Their children are expected to be quite young or school-aged.
These families will have low incomes or be agency-dependent and
probably will have experienced some crises, eviction, abuse,
divorce, personal or family tragedy. Some of the families may be
problematic for their neighbors, although this can be mitigated
by proper management.

The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children will increase the
numbers in the area, particularly women and children, and thus
the potential for crime. Potential for crime is already present
in the area because of high density. Male/female relationships
may develop, considering the high concentration of single men in
nearby apartments.

The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children and its clients are expected to be
compatible with nearby residents, businesses and social agencies. Nearby
residents and small business owners felt the project would have little effect on
the neighborhood and would be an improvement over what is there now. Most
businesses had their own clientele and felt the project would not having any
bearing on their trade.

Of concern, however, was the effect of the stereotypical homeless person.
Informants mentioned that they were wary of their own personal safety at night
if homeless loiterers started hanging around their businesses and parking
lots. The project’s concept and scope conjured up a facility like the IHS’
Iwilei shelter (“peanut butter ministry flop-house”).

Clients of the proposed project will have no distinguishing feature or quality
which will identify them as homeless families. They will have on-site dining,
showering and laundry facilities for personal nourishment, grooming and
hygiene. They will possess no collective characteristics which will cause
disruption or incompatibility, although a few may be problematic as would be
the case in any grouping of people.

The clients may attend nearby churches, and patronize nearby shops. They may go
to the neighboring physicians, and may use the professional services of nearby
offices. If there are domestic problems or noise, these instances will be
similar to those already occurring in the neighboring apartments. In short,
project clients will blend in with an existing mix of people.

The increased presence of children is not expected to be a problem. Supervised
child care will be available on-site and students will attend nearby schools
during the day. Clients will also have convenient access to nearby social
agencies.
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The perception of increased crime and actual incidence of crime or personal victimization are polemic issues and must be documented and factually substantiated before law enforcement activity or beat patrols increases. It remains an empirical question whether more homeless women and children in a well managed in the vicinity will act as bait to attract more undesirable behavior or criminal activity.

The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children may compete with several programs at the Immigrant Service Center and at Kaumakapili Church. The proposed coffee shop and thrift shop operations to train clients and generate operational income could compete with or take away trade from the Immigrant Service Center’s catering operations and job training placement programs. Kaumakapili Church gives away free clothing donated to them for the needy. The church also operates a day care facility thereby competing with the Homeless Families Center proposed thrift shop and day care facility.

Finally, the proposed project is not expected to devalue the property value of nearby commercial or residential sites. In a recent study for another homeless facility, real estate appraisers and agents were contacted for a general idea of the effect of social agencies on neighboring property values. Those interviewed indicated that federal regulations and professional ethics contend that no property can be devalued because of its proximity to religious, ethnicity, class dominated structures. In appraising value, comparable properties are the usual criterion. For example, commercial properties in one vicinity would be appraised at a similar rate, regardless if one of these properties were adjacent to a social service agency. Those interviewed knew of no commercial property that has been devalued as the result of a social service facility being contiguous to it. It was pointed out that the property values around IHS, both in its current and former locations, have not been negatively affected (Earthplan, 1990).

4.4 On-site Impacts
The Homeless Shelter for Women and Children will have the following positive impacts on its clients:

- Temporary Lodgings. The facility will provide a healthier and overall better alternative than living on the beach, in cars, or wherever the homeless family is living.
- Support Facilities. The living environment will include a kitchen and dining and laundry facilities, as well as a common recreational area. These on-site facilities will help provide comfort and alleviate inconveniences.
- On-site Education and Work Experience. These services will help clients learn about ways to re-enter the housing and job markets. There will also be strong support systems for dealing with personal conflicts.
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- Clean and Orderly Environment. An on-site resident manager and maintenance person will make sure that privacy is maintained, help resolve conflicts among the clients, and ensure that the facility is routinely cleaned.

Good management of the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children will have a two-fold benefit. It will provide a comfortable environment for the on-site clients, and address the concerns of the neighboring community. The key to good facility management is sensitivity. The clients will have come from disruptive, abusive or otherwise formidable situations, and they will need a supportive and accommodating environment. IHS also needs to be sensitive to the concerns of its neighbors, many of whom do not want this facility in their neighborhood. Simply put, if the Homeless Shelter for Women and Children clients are subject to facility or managerial inadequacies, then interface with the neighboring community will be antagonistic and non-productive.

What is needed is a good management program which will alleviate or mitigate the constraints identified in the previous section. The following are recommended as major components in the management of the proposed facility:

- House Rules. It is suggested that house rules be established to ensure that:
  - personal privacy and belongings are protected;
  - children are supervised by parents or appropriate care when they are not participating in a program;
  - common areas are kept clean and workable;
  - no illegal parking will be permitted;
  - noise levels are minimized; and
  - visiting hours and rules prevent loitering.

  These rules need to be designed sensitively and enforced consistently. The consequences of violating rules should be well understood and enforced.

- Schedule. An orderly environment needs regimen, and this is particularly important because of the sharing of common facilities. IHS should set up a schedule for dining, quiet time and other activities in the common areas.

- On-Site Security. The facility needs to be monitored 24 hours to ensure that on-site clients are provided a secure environment.
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4.5 Public Services and Facilities

4.5.1 Schools

If the homeless children follow the homeless families age trends compiled by IHS, about 38 to 40 percent would be elementary or intermediate school candidates, barring special education needs.

Elementary school-aged students living on-site would attend Kailulani Elementary School, which has a current 1990 enrollment of 510 and a capacity of 550 to 600. Kailulani Elementary is expected to have a big increase in enrollment by 1993 because of the recently constructed and projected new housing and apartment complexes in the Chinatown and Downtown areas. Any overflow would be sent to some suitable, under-utilized school in the area, such as Likelike Elementary School.

Those attending grades seven and eight would attend Central Intermediate School. Central Intermediate is also expected to swell in enrollment because these same housing projects, and the addition of a sixth grade. Royal Elementary and Kaliuwela Elementary Schools are transferring their sixth grade classes to Central Intermediate. Central’s enrollment is 344 for 1990, and the facility has a capacity of about 600 students.

Farrington High School is the only one serving Kalihi-Palama. It is unlikely that many students at the proposed project will be from this age group, except perhaps the mothers themselves. If statistical breakdown is similar to IHS’s, about 14 percent of the homeless children would be between 13 and 15 years old.

The project is not expected to negatively impact school facilities. No mitigation is required.

4.5.2 Police Protection

The new Kalihi Police Station opened on Kamehameha IV Road in 1990. The building houses all administrative offices, an arsenal, exercise room, assembly area, conference rooms and holding cells for both juveniles and adults.

The project area is located in Kalihi-Palama District 35, Beat 35. There is one beat officer per shift in Beat 35. Police officials indicated that the area is congested with people and traffic. Criminal activity in the area around the housing projects is cyclical. In the Akepo Arms, usually drinking incidents and arguments between tenants stimulate calls for the police. Akepo Lane is reasonably quiet.

Beat 35 also includes the IHS facility in Iwilei and Honolulu Community College. Homeless people can be found throughout these areas. They cause some vandalism or petty theft but generally any trouble created is among themselves, particularly at IHS. Sense of territory between the old clients and newer ones has caused fights and verbal disturbance. Trespassing is also a problem for neighbors who call the police. Homeless women and women with children are more often found in Sand Island, which is part of Beat 30.
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Near the project site, mauka of the Kaumakapili Church, is the site of occasional territorial skirmishes among neighboring youths (personal communication with Lieutenant Nelson Lum, Kalili Police Station, April 30, 1991).

The proposed Homeless Shelter for Women and Children is not expected to cause any undue strain on police protection services. On-site security personnel and equipment can help reduce the potential for crime.

4.5.3 Fire Protection

Response to a major fire on the project site would come from the Kuakini Fire Station (engine and ladder company) and Central Fire Station (engine and battalion). Backup would be provided by the Likelike, Nu‘uanu and Kaka‘ako Fire Stations. The Kuakini Fire Station would also respond to a small fire or smoke investigation (personal communication with Joe Zarembe, Acting Firefighter II, Fire Alarm Bureau, Honolulu Fire Department, April 30, 1991).

The project can be adequately served by existing facilities and no mitigation is recommended.
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Figure B.

Study Area Employment by Sub-District, 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>Total Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/C/U</td>
<td>3,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>9,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/I/R.E.</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct.</td>
<td>3,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr.</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T/C/U: Transportation, Communications, Utilities
F/I/R.E.: Finance, Insurance, Real Estate

Source: City Department of General Planning, 1987.
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The rate of the island's growth has been steadily decreasing over recent decades. O'ahu's 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.

By comparison, the study area population is very stable in terms of growth in the 1980s. Based on preliminary 1990 census figures, the total study area population remained virtually the same between 1980 and 1990. Housing units experienced a negligible increase of about 330 units.

Within the study area, according to preliminary 1990 census figures, there was a slight decrease in population in Sub-District 2 and minor population growth in Sub-Districts 1 and 3. According to 1990 preliminary census figures, Sub-District 1 experienced almost no growth, whereas Sub-District-3 experienced a 2.2 percent population increase over 1980. The population overall changed very little between 1980 and 1990 but there were gains in every sub-district in the number of housing units.

The 1990 preliminary census figures are lower than estimates of the City Department of General Planning. This "underestimation" appears to be a statewide trend, and the census figures may yet undergo further corrections.

The remaining discussion in this section focuses on more detailed population and housing estimates provided by the City Department of General Planning for 1989. Specific population trends are as follows:

- Sub-District 1 encompasses the largest area of Kalihi-Palama and a major portion is in light manufacturing and industrial use. There was a five percent increase in housing units between 1980 and 1989. According to information presented in Table 4, this increase was in multi-family units, with a slight decrease in single-family units. This Sub-District had nearly three times more multi-family units than single family units.

- Sub-District 2 experienced a slight decrease in population and negligible increase in housing. This area has experienced few major changes in residential or commercial development.

- Sub-District-3 is the smallest in area of the three sub-districts. From 1980 to 1989, both population and housing experienced a slight decrease. Of all sub-areas, this district had proportionally the most single-family units, which accounted for more than half of the housing stock.

Over 97 percent of the study area's total dwelling units were occupied in 1980; in 1989, over 98 percent. All Sub-District showed an increase in occupancy between 1980 and 1989, with an average of 98 percent for each Sub-District in 1989; this low vacancy rate is consistent with island and statewide shortage of housing units.
Table 1

Population and Housing Trends, 1980 to 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Study Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in households (%)</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons living in group quarters (%)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSING UNITS</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,228</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Units</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>10,813</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>5,228</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>3,671</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>1,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Dwelling Units</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>10,607</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,128</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Housing Units</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City Department of General Planning, Planning Information Branch, 1990

Note: Preliminary census information was released during the writing of this report. The information included population and housing units, and did not include breakdowns contained above. Preliminary information is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990 Preliminary Census</th>
<th>In Numbers</th>
<th>Sub-District</th>
<th>Annual Ave. Growth Rate: 1980 - 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Study Area</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40,147</td>
<td>16,311</td>
<td>12,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11,107</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>