July 25, 1995

The Honorable Gary Gill, Director
Office of Environmental Quality Control
220 South King Street, 4th Floor
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Gill:

CHAPTER 343, HRS
Environmental Assessment/Determination
Negative Declaration

Recorded Owner:
Applicant : C. Q. Yee Hop & Company, Ltd.
Agent : Sueda & Associates, Inc.
Location : 128 North Nimitz Highway, Chinatown, Oahu
Tax Map Key : 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 and 50
Request : Chinatown Special District Permit
Proposal : Demolition of a Historic Property and Construction of a Parking Lot within the Chinatown Historic District
Determination : A Negative Declaration Is Issued

Attached and incorporated by reference is the Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) prepared by the applicant for the project. Based on the significance criteria outlined in Chapter 200, State Administrative Rules, we have determined that preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Subsequent to filing of the Draft Environmental Assessment and partly in consideration of comments which were received during the 30-day public comment period, the applicant withdrew his request to demolish the two historic buildings on the property. We expect that this change will reduce project impacts.
The Honorable Gary Gill, Director
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We have enclosed a completed OEQC Bulletin Publication Form and four copies of the FEA. If you have any questions, please contact Ardis Shaw-Kim of our staff at 527-5349.

Very truly yours,

PATRICK A. ONISHI
Director of Land Utilization

PTO:am
Enclosures

g:conegdoc.ask
FINAL

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

FOR

C.Q. YEE HOP PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT

BUILDING DEMOLITION & PARKING CONSTRUCTION

CHINATOWN, HONOLULU, HAWAII

T.M.K. NO.: 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 & 50

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.
905 MAIHAHI WAY, MAUKA SUITE
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96826

JUNE, 1995
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

C.Q. YEE HOP BUILDING DEMOLITION & OPEN PARKING DEVELOPMENT

I. APPLICANT: C.Q. Yee Hop & Company, Ltd.
   Owner's Agent: Sueda & Associates, Inc.
   905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96826
   Phone: (808) 949-6644

II. APPROVING AGENCY: City & County of Honolulu
    Department of Land Utilization
    650 South King Street
    Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

III. AGENCIES CONSULTED: City & County of Honolulu
     Department of Land Utilization
     Planned Development-Urban Design
     Environment Impact Statement
     City & County of Honolulu
     Department of Land & Natural Resources
     State Historic Preservation Division
     City & County of Honolulu
     Department of Transportation Services
     Engineering Division
     State of Hawaii
     Department of Transportation
     Traffic Branch

IV. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

   A. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

   C.Q. Yee Hop and Company, Ltd. proposes to demolish three of
the five dilapidated structures and develop an open, landscaped parking area within the Chinatown District,
Honolulu, Hawaii. The project site, as shown on Exhibit A,
is located mauka of Honolulu Harbor Pier 15, on the block
bounded by Kekaulike Street, King Street, Maunakea Street
and North Nimitz Highway.

   C.Q. Yee Hop & Company, Ltd., may at a later date with a new
demolition permit request to demolish the two remaining
structures.
The proposed parking development is intended for private use. The parking area will replace existing dilapidated structures and provide much needed parking for the Chinatown area. This project is intended to serve the owner during an interim period, whereafter, future mixed use redevelopment of the total site is contemplated.

B. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

The site is comprised of five contiguous parcels on a town block within the Chinatown District (see Exhibit B). It is by large made up of Parcels 13 and 14 which are in the Makai Precinct of the district. These parcels are generally bounded by North Nimitz Highway on the west side and similar commercial/light industrial lots on its remaining sides. Parcels 24, 44 and 50 are smaller parcels abutting Parcels 13 and 14 and are within the Haunka Precinct. Parcel 24 has street frontage along Haunakea Street. Both Parcels 44 and 50 provide service access to lot interiors from Haunakea Street and King Street, respectively. Parcel 44 is an existing open driveway and Parcel 50 is gated service lane.

The proposed action will involve demolition of three structures located on Parcels 13 and 14 (see Exhibit C). The following is a brief description of the existing buildings with photographic documentation. Refer to Exhibit C for building number identification and to determine the perspective of each photograph.

Building No. 1 - Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU) Warehouse

This structure is an office and storage addition to Building 4 (not being demolished) and is of concrete masonry unit construction. A metal frame shed with corrugated metal sheet roof is attached to this building and is used for parking (see Exhibit I). These structures are visible from Nimitz Highway and have no significant historic value.

Building No. 2 - Gouvéa Building

The Gouvéa Building is a 2-story structure also constructed of CMU (see Exhibit J). Similar to Building No. 1, an attached metal frame parking shed fronts the building along Nimitz Highway. In a portion beneath the shed, mechanical/electrical equipment is located in a chain-link fence area. These structures have no significant historic value.

Building No. 3 - Metal Warehouse

Building No. 3 is a typical warehouse structure of metal frame construction with corrugated metal siding and roofing (see Exhibit K). This structure has no historic value.
C. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

In the proposed action, the applicant intends to demolish three of the five warehouse/commercial type structures on the project site. In its present condition, the structures are unusable and have inevitably become vacant and remain in disrepair. Demolition of these structures will make room for the parking development and future mixed use revitalization of the project site.

The Chinatown District represents an old part of Downtown Honolulu that is historically significant because of its unique business community and ethnic population. Architecture has played a significant role in terms of the unique mix of retail, office and residential uses that may be attributed to the building design. Future commercial and residential development on the site will help promote and sustain the long-term economic viability of the Chinatown district. The composition of ground floor commercial spaces and residential units in future buildings will positively contribute to dynamic community life.

District guidelines together with a shared interest to develop and retain the Chinatown character will ensure a viable, desirable urban redevelopment.

In the present economic down-market, the applicant proposes to develop an open landscaped parking development during this interim period. The short-term impact of the proposed development will provide parking for the Chinatown area and will eliminate current vacancy and decayed state. The parking area will be an on-grade asphalt parking surface for approximately 67 cars. The lot will have tree-lined interior median where possible and generous perimeter landscape buffers (see Exhibit H).

The parking plan proposes vehicular access to the site from an existing driveway located along Maunakea Street. Egress will be demarcated by a right turn only from Nimitz Highway.

The project is intended for private parking rental and will be monitored during hours of operation. Lighting and secured enclosures are proposed for safety and off-hours.

D. LAND USE PLANS, POLICIES AND CONTROLS FOR THE AREA

State Land Use District

The property is within the State Land Use Urban District.

City & County of Honolulu General Plan and Zoning

The county of Honolulu zoning map designates the project site as Commercial and is zoned Central Business Mixed Use, BMX-4.
The proposed parking development is generally consistent with all land use plans, policies and controls for the area. Parking use within the BMR-4 zone and the Chinatown Special Design District is a permitted use as defined by Chapter 21, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A. PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Topography of the site is relatively flat and ultimately will remain in an unchanged state. Following demolition of the 3 existing buildings and removal of the existing foundations and debris, the site will be leveled to the approximate existing grade.

B. EXISTING FLORA

No endangered species of flora are known to exist on the site.

C. EXISTING FAUNA

No endangered species of fauna are believed to inhabit the project site. Localized fauna such as birds should not be affected by the proposed action.

D. AIR QUALITY

Minimal impact to air quality are expected to be caused by the proposed demolition. All possible measures will be executed to reduce fugitive dust during the demolition and construction. Refer to mitigated measures for discussion.

E. EXISTING UTILITIES

The proposed project use will require lower capacity demand and usage on water, sewer, electrical and drainage, and therefore, existing infrastructure will not be affected.

F. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

No sites of archaeological significance are known to exist on the site.

G. HISTORICAL/CULTURAL SITE

The physical condition of buildings located on the project site can be generally described as run-down and under-utilized. The existing condition and present use does not exemplify development that is in the best interest of the district. Demolition and redevelopment of the entire project site will greatly enhance Chinatown and achieve overall goals and objectives established for this special district.
VI. SUMMARY OF MAJOR IMPACTS AND MITIGATIVE MEASURES

The potential environmental impact on the site by the proposed demolition and improvements were evaluated. Key considerations in the evaluation, first, was the nature and ultimate demolition of the buildings involved and secondly, the construction and proposed use of the parking development.

The following environmental impacts were identified:

NOISE

Noise impacts of the proposed action are temporary or short term in nature and related to demolition and improvements made to the site. Construction-related noise will be typical and generated by non-explosive demolition, removal of debris, operation of construction equipment and site work. Noise control measures will adhere to the administrative rules and regulations in Chapter 43, Noise Control for Honolulu.

ASBESTOS MATERIALS

Asbestos containing materials were identified in a survey conducted by Coralco Corporation (see Exhibit N). The survey involved a bulk sampling of materials throughout the site that were likely to contain asbestos. The materials sampled included vinyl tile flooring, acoustical ceiling tile, paint, wall plaster, black mastic and other types of pipe insulation. It was found that the suspect materials did contain levels of asbestos and although majority of the materials were categorized as non-friable (damaged), it was recommended that all asbestos containing materials be removed prior to demolition.

Removal of all materials containing hazardous removal will strictly adhere to procedures setforth by the EPA regulations. It is noted that the survey conducted was a non-destructive test and only entailed an evaluation of Building No. 1, the lava rock warehouse. The applicant realizes the extent of the survey and will execute all necessary surveys and mitigative measures prior to demolition.

BUILDING DEMOLITION

The Department of Land and Natural Resource (DLNR) has reviewed the five buildings presented for demolition in the proposed action. Per DLNR review, the proposed action to demolish (Bldg. 4) the 1919 lava rock warehouse, and (Bldg. 5) would have an impact to the Chinatown district. DLNR comments that demolition of this building would result in the loss of a structure considered to be culturally significant. We, therefore, have deferred the demolition of these two buildings.

It is noted that the 1919 lava rock warehouse and the other four buildings are listed on the State or National Register of Historic Buildings.
FLORA AND FAUNA

Endangered flora and fauna are believed not to exist on the site, and therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.

Landscaping buffers and canopy trees for the proposed parking area will have a direct positive impact. Increased flora on the site will expectedly result in a rise of localized fauna, such as birds, visiting or inhabiting the site.

VISUAL

The proposed action to demolish the existing buildings on the project site will have a positive visual impact. The dilapidated condition of the existing buildings are highly visible from Nimitz Highway and do not offer any aesthetic value (refer to Exhibit I). At present, the existing buildings are set back from Nimitz Highway and is fronted by an asphalt paved area and chainlink fence along the entire property line.

Redevelopment of the project site for both the immediate proposed parking use and future mixed use will have a major positive impact. The proposed parking development would incorporate landscaping along the entire Nimitz Highway property line. Visual impact of future development would tie in with the recent redevelopment projects along Nimitz Highway and offer visual continuity in the streetscape.

SOCIO/ECONOMIC

The immediate and future proposed uses for the project site will have a positive socio/economic impact. In the proposed parking project, provisions for parking will be made available in the Chinatown district. Although small in nature, the immediate economic impact in comparison to current use of the project exists. There is potential for a positive socio/economic growth realized by future development considered for the project site. A future mixed-use project involving commercial, office and residential spaces will stimulate and perpetuate dynamics of the living and working environment of Chinatown.

TRAFFIC

Minimal traffic impact on the site and surrounding environment is expected as a cause and result of the proposed parking development. The small scale of the project was determined to not cause significant impact to surrounding traffic patterns. To mitigate the potential magnitude of the impact, the project will utilize only existing driveway access points and permit ingress/egress as recommended by state and city agencies. In addition, necessary clearance dimensions for stacking as recommended, will be incorporated into the proposed parking layout.
Preservation of the warehouse would entail major work to correct or rebuild the structural integrity of building (see Exhibit O for structural evaluation.) The evaluation has determined that an interior structural framework would be required to stabilize the rock walls. It was also determined that existing windows along the south property line would no longer be permitted in order to meet present code requirements. Additionally, due to its obscure location, the warehouse is not marketable as a commercial space. Continued use of the structure as a warehouse would not justify the preservation efforts or be in the best interest for total redevelopment of the site. With this evaluation, the applicant is put in an economic position whereby restoration and reuse of the warehouse is not feasible.

VII. DETERMINATION

STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF LAND & NATURAL RESOURCES

In a letter dated August 10, 1994, from Don Hibbard, SHPD administrator, the agency recommends against the demolition of the 1919 lava rock warehouse on parcel 13 and the two-story building on parcel 24. The letter states, "the 1919 building is an exceptional example of a warehouse using rock construction for that period and we recommend against the demolition of that building." The letter also states, "We also recommend against the demolition of the two-story building on the 1-7-03:24 parcel since it is a building that contributes to the overall character of Chinatown." See Exhibit P. We have therefore, deferred the request to demolish those two buildings.

In later letter received from DLNR, dated November 9, 1994, it is restated that they do not concur with the demolition of the 1919 building, however, will not pursue condemnation proceedings (see Exhibit Q). Therefore, the applicant is not legally bound to preservation regulations.

CITY AND COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

In preliminary review with Ernie Nogawa, Operations Division, a proposed parking layout was presented (see Exhibit R). It was discussed that proposed use of the existing driveway along Mauanakea Street is acceptable. DTS recommended that two stalls adjacent to the street should be eliminated to provide an area for stacking. It was noted that clear site distances would not be required for the existing driveway.

DTS was informed that the existing right-of-way along King Street will remain as a gated service driveway and will not affect existing traffic conditions.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

In preliminary review with Paul Hamamoto and Doug Miller, Traffic Division, the following comments regarding the proposed parking
development was received. The Department of Transportation (DOT) will permit use of the existing driveway along Nimitz Highway. Provisions for a 2-car storage (approximately 50 feet) should be incorporated into the parking layout. Utilizing the existing driveway along Maunakea Street, it is recommended that the traffic pattern designate entry only along Maunakea Street and exit only along Nimitz Highway.

VIII. FINDINGS

This Environmental Assessment notes the absence of major adverse environmental impact.

Demolition and construction involved in the proposed action pose minor impacts, as noted. All possible alternatives and mitigative measures were evaluated to minimize impact to the environment. It is also noted that short and long term impact of both the immediate and future proposed actions will ultimately result in positive major impacts.

It is the suggestion of this Environmental Assessment, that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed action is not required.

IX. AGENCIES CONSULTED IN EIS

Requirement for an EIS has not yet been determined.
Mr. Patrick Onishi  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
650 S. King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813  

Re: Response to Draft Environmental Assessment for Demolition of Existing Building and Construction of a Parking Lot  
Tax Map Key: 1-7-2; 13, 14, 24, 44 & 50  

Dear Mr. Onishi:  

After receiving your letter 95/ED-003 (ASK) and discussing this matter with the owners, we have come up with a modified proposal.  

We are therefore, proposing to amend the initial scope of the Environmental Assessment. Our new proposal will be:  

A. Demolition of Buildings 2, 3, & 4.  

1. CMU Building confronting the existing Stone Bldg. 1 (New Environmental Assessment)  

2. The concrete & cmu bldg., known as the Gouvea Bldg. - Bldg. 2 (New Environmental Assessment).  

3. Open metal warehouse - Bldg. #3 (New Environmental Assessment).  

"We are proposing to maintain the two (2) remaining buildings; the Stone Bldg. (Bldg. #1) former E.A. and the two story retail bldg. fronting Maunakea Street. We would like to still keep our option open where as at a later date the Owner may then file for a demolition of these two bldgs.  

"Therefore, our new proposals is to construct a parking lot on the remaining parcel, incorporating the two remaining bldgs. See new site plan. The Maunakea Street access will be an entry only; the parking lot will be totally concealed by the two story retail bldg. The Nimitz access will be an exit only, with heavy landscaping in the setback area to help screen out the cars from the highway.  

Lloyd T. Sueda, AIA  
Michael R. Wong, AIA Associate  
Byron T. Tsunoda, AIA Associate  
Robert S. Nitta, AIA Associate  

Sueda & Associates, Inc./ Architects and Planners  
July 3, 1995  

905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite • Honolulu, Hawaii 96826-2869 • Telephone (808) 949-6644 • FAX (808) 949-6707
Mr. Patrick Onishi  
July 3, 1995  
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At this time the owners have no idea as to what might occur on this parcel, other than the proposed parking lot. Although, it is zoned for mixed use, timing & economics will dictate the final development of this parcel.

*The proposed three (3) bldgs. are in need of repair and are in fairly bad shape, especially bldg. 1 & 3.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me.

Very truly yours,

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

___ Lloyd T. Sueda

LTS:dm
June 2, 1995

Mr. Lloyd T. Sueda  
Sueda and Associates, Inc.  
905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826-2869

Dear Mr. Sueda:

Draft Environmental Assessment for  
Demolition of Existing Buildings and Construction  
of a Parking Lot  

Tax Map Key: 1-7-2: 13, 14, 24, 44, and 50

We are forwarding copies of all comments we have received relating to the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the above referenced project.

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 343; HRS, you must respond in writing to these and any other comments which were received during the 30-day comment period which began with the publication of a notice of availability of the DEA in the Oahu Bulletin on March 23, 1994. The Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) must include these comments and responses, as well as revised text. The following are our concerns and comments which must also be addressed in the FEA.

We are concerned that the proposed demolition, including that of the 1919 stone warehouse and the two-story building along Maunakea Street may result in the loss of a significant cultural resource, and thus require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Further, the proposal is not consistent with Special District Guidelines found in the Land Use Ordinance. As such, we would be unable to accept and process the Special District Permit Application for the project in its current form.
Mr. Lloyd T. Sueda  
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We recommend that the proposal be modified to better preserve the cultural resource and conform to the Special District Guidelines. You should work with the State Historic Preservation Division and our Urban Design Branch to develop an acceptable project.

We encourage an alternative that would preserve at least part of the 1919 stone building (Building No. 1) and an exterior/interior renovation of the two-story building along Maunakea Street (Building No. 5) which would be in keeping with the architectural intent of the district. Other viable options may exist.

The FEA should note that the Chinatown Special District Guidelines recognize Building No. 1 as having high preservation value and Building No. 5 as having medium preservation value in its contribution to the District. Buildings with a high contribution value should be retained, if structurally sound.

In addition, the above-mentioned guidelines discourage on-grade parking lots exposed to street frontages. They recommend that at-grade parking areas be placed behind commercial storefronts or false facades in order to preserve the continuity of the streetscape and create a pedestrian-oriented retail environment.

We do not concur with the conclusion found in Section V.G of the DEA which states that the proposal will "greatly enhance Chinatown and achieve overall goals and objectives for this special district." While we will not object to the demolition of Building Nos. 2, 3 or 4, the loss of two contributing structures is not justified by an on-grade parking lot which is discouraged by the District Guidelines and does not contribute to enhancing the pedestrian environment of Chinatown.

Prior to acceptance of the Special District Permit, the proposal must be modified to better conform to Special District Guidelines.

Section 11-200-12 State Administrative Rules requires an evaluation of the cumulative effects of an action. Section IV, C of the DEA states demolition "will make room for the parking development and future mixed use revitalization of the project site." Any contemplated future use of the site if known, should be disclosed during the Chapter 343, HRS process. Development beyond what is disclosed in the current DEA will be subject to a separate review under Chapter 343, HRS.
Mr. Lloyd T. Sueda
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If you have any questions regarding Chapter 343, HRS requirements,
please contact Ardis Shaw-Kim of our staff at 527-5349.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

PATRICK T. ONISHI
Director of Land Utilization

PTO:fm
Enclosures
A:sueda2.as7
G:sueda2.ask
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Mr. Patrick Onishi  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
650 S. King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C. Q. Yee Hop – Chinatown Demolition  
Comment from D.U.U. – Urban Design Branch

Dear Mr. Onishi,

The owners have at this time reevaluated the project scope and are proposing to demolish only the three (3) insignificant bldgs. The two buildings – the 1919 rock bldg. and the two story retail on Haunakea Street will remain.

The remaining three buildings are in very poor condition and has no use or rental value. They are presently vacant. It really comes down to economics, with the high land value and property taxes, with virtually no chance for rental income. The owner have very little options, but to demolish the building and at least generate some income from this property.

The parking lot is only an interim solution. It would be totally unfair for the owners to commit to a mix use project at the time, due to the conditions of the State’s economy.

The future development of this property will be based on demand and economics.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda  
Sueda & Associates, Inc.

cc: Department of Land Utilization – Urban Design Branch
MEMO TO FILE

Department of Land Utilization

File No. cpy072621

Urban Design Branch

To: Ardis, ERB

From: Patrick, UDB Date: 3/9/95

Via:

Re: C.O. Yee Hop / Draft EA

The applicant should note that the Chinatown Special District Guidelines recognize building no.1 as having high preservation value and building no. 5 as having medium preservation value in its contribution to the District. Buildings with a high contribution value should be retained, if structurally sound.

In addition, the above mentioned guidelines discourage on-grade parking lots exposed to street frontages. It recommends that at grade parking areas be placed behind commercial storefronts or false facades in order to preserve the continuity of the streetscape and a pedestrian oriented retail environment.

We cannot concur with the conclusions of item V.G. While we will not object to the demolition of buildings no. 2, 3 or 4, we do not feel that the loss of two contributing structures is justified by an on-grade parking lot which is discourage by the District Guidelines and does not contribute to enhancing the pedestrian environment of Chinatown.

Since, there are no detailed discussions of a mixed-use project, we cannot use this as a basis for comparison to the demolition action, only the parking lot. If the applicant wishes to provide greater rationale for why building no. 1 or 4 should be demolished, then detailed plans of the mixed-use proposal should be integrated into this application.

We would encourage a solution that would preserve at least part of the 1919 stone building (building no.1) and a sensitively done exterior/interior renovation of the two story building along Maunakea Street (building no. 5). Evaluation of the on-grade parking lot will be reassessed after a proposal which preserves these two structures is presented.
July 7, 1995

Mr. Patrick Onishi
Director
Department of Land Utilization
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.Q. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition
Comment from Department of Transportation Services.

Dear Mr. Onishi:

In response to Charles Swanson Memo:

1. The Haunakea Street driveway is one way - entry only.

2. The existing driveway adjacent to the 2-story retail is too narrow to plant any landscaping.

3. The existing building at the Haunakea entry will not cause any visual problems, since it is an entry only. The Nimitz Highway exit will be open & clear to meet necessary site distances.

4. The control gate at the entry will be set back so that we will have approximately 3 car staging conditions.

5. All construction plans, including the topo, will be submitted for review.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

cc: Department of Transportation Services
MEMORANDUM

TO: PATRICK T. ONISHI, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: CHARLES O. SWANSON, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: C. Q. YEE HOP PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
TMK: 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 AND 50

This is in response to your memorandum 95/ED-003 (ASK) dated March 8, 1995 requesting our comments on the subject project.

We have the following traffic concerns:

1. The Maunakea Street driveway should be widened if it is to accommodate two-way traffic.

2. Any landscaping in the vicinity of the driveway should be the type that will not obstruct visibility for vehicles and pedestrians.

3. Clear sight distances will be required for the existing driveway.

4. If the entrance is to be controlled by a card reader or security, it should be located as far away from the street as practical.

5. Construction plans, including the topography along Maunakea Street, should be submitted to our department for review as they become available.

Should you have any questions, please contact Wayne Nakamoto of my staff at local 4190.
March 9, 1995

Mr. Lloyd T. Sueda
Sueda & Associates, Inc.
905 Nalihiki Way, Mauka Suite
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96826-2869

Dear Mr. Sueda:

Subject: North Nimitz Highway - Maunakea Street/Yee Hop
Pre Environmental Assessment
THK: 1-7-92: 13, 14, 24, 44 and 50

This is in response to your letter dated February 6, 1995 requesting our comments on the subject project.

We have the following traffic concerns:

1. The Maunakea Street driveway should be wide enough to accommodate two-way traffic.

2. The first two stalls at the entrance to Maunakea Street should be eliminated.

3. Any landscaping in the vicinity of the driveways should be the type that will not obstruct visibility for vehicles and pedestrians.

4. If the entrance is to be controlled by a card reader or security gate, it should be located as far from the street as practical to eliminate the potential for queuing on any public street.

5. Construction plans, including the topography along Maunakea Street, should be submitted to our department for review as they become available.

Should you have any questions, please contact Wayne Nakamoto of my staff at 523-4190.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

CHARLES O. SWANSON
Director
Sueda & Associates, Inc./Architects and Planners

July 3, 1995

Mr. Patrick Onishi
Director
Department of Land Utilization
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.Q. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition
Comments from the Department of Land & Natural Resources

Dear Mr. Onishi:

In response to D.L.N.R. comments, the owners have at this time, re-evaluated the project scope and are proposing to demolish only the three (3) insignificant building. The 1919 rock warehouse and the two-story retail bldg on Maunakea Street will remain. However, D.L.N.R. should be made aware that the Owners would like to keep their options open and may come in for another demolition permit for the existing two buildings.

Archaeological concerns will be considered during the construction of the parking lot. Any possible findings will be resolved in an official manner.

Future development on this property is undetermined at this time. Need & economic will dictate further developments of this parcel.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

LTS:dm

cc: Department of Land & Natural Resources
April 4, 1995

Mr. Patrick T. Onishi, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Onishi:

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA), Chapter 343, HRS Projects Within the Chinatown Historic District: C. Q. Yee Hop Property Development, 128 North Nimitz Highway, Chinatown, O'ahu
Honolulu, Kona, O'ahu

Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEA for this project. The DEA correctly cites previous correspondence from our office that the demolition of the 1919 lava rock warehouse and the two story building on parcel 24 would have a "negative effect" on the historic character of the Chinatown district. Our office does not concur with the decision to demolish the 1919 warehouse and would like to see the parcel developed with a large part of the stone building intact.

The DEA correctly states that there are no known archaeological sites at the project location. However, no archaeological inventory survey has been conducted for these parcels. Recent redevelopment projects in Chinatown have uncovered historic sites found buried under fill soils and it is likely that historic sites remain in subsurface deposits at this site. This project proposes demolition of existing buildings and development of an open on-grade asphalt parking surface. If no subsurface disturbance occurs during this phase, we believe that there will be "no effect" on archaeological sites.

We have noted in Section C of the DEA that future commercial and residential development is planned for the site. Since the future development of the project will likely require subsurface excavation (i.e. foundations) an archaeological inventory survey will need to be conducted (prior to that development) and an acceptable report submitted to this office in order to ensure that
there be no "adverse effect" on significant historic sites.

If you have any questions please call Elaine Jourdane at 587-0015.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
Historic Preservation Division

EJ: amk
August 10, 1994

Mr. Lloyd Sueda
Sueda and Associates
905 Makahiki Way
Honolulu, HI 96827

Dear Mr. Sueda:

SUBJECT:  C.Q. Yee Hop Warehouse and Building

TMK:  1-7-03-013, 024, Chinatown, Honolulu, Oahu

The 1919 lava rock building on the 1-7-03-013 parcel is an exceptional example of a warehouse using rock construction for that period and we recommend against the demolition of that building or any renovation that may detract from its historic character. Since the building is fairly void of historic elements on the interior, a major interior renovation would not meet with any objections from our office. Renovation or an addition to the makai side of that building which is filled in with CMU walls would also be acceptable.

We also recommend against demolition of the two story building on the 1-7-03-024 parcel since it is a building that contributes to the overall character of Chinatown. However, our office would be amenable to sensitively done exterior and interior renovations on the two story building.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above site. Should you have any questions, please call Tonia Moy at 587-0005.

Very truly yours,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

TM:jk
November 9, 1994

Mr. Michael F. O'Connor
Tam, O'Connor & Henderson
220 South King Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. O'Connor

SUBJECT: C.Q. Yee Hop Warehouse and Building
TMK: 1-7-03;013, 024, Chinatown, Honolulu

We have received your formal notice dated October 26, 1994 but do not concur with the decision to demolish the 1919 stone warehouse building. Condemnation proceedings will not be pursued. However, we would still like to meet with your client and the architects to work out a viable solution to keep at least a part of the 1919 stone building incorporating it into what could be a profitable development. We feel that parking spaces can still be developed with a large part of the stone building intact.

Please call Tonia Moy at 587-0005 to arrange for a meeting or if you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

TM: sb

EXHIBIT C
Sueda & Associates, Inc./Architects and Planners

July 3, 1995

Mr. Patrick Onishi
Director
Department of Land Utilization
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.Q. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition
Comment from Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism

Dear Mr. Onishi:

In response to D.B.E.D.T., we have reassessed the project and will be proposing to demolish only the three (3) insignificant building on this parcel.

The proposed parking lot is only an interim solution. Future development on this parcel has not yet been determined.

When this parcel is developed, the owner will be sensitive to the surrounding environment and historic theme of The Chinatown & Honolulu Waterfront.

If and when the parking lot is constructed, the owners will be aware of the possible subsurface archaeological conditions of this site.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda

LTS: dm

cc: Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism
March 21, 1995

Mr. Patrick T. Onishi
Director of Land Utilization
City & County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Onishi:

Environmental Assessment, Chapter 343, HRS
Projects within the Chinatown Historic District
C.Q. Yee Hop Property Development

The Department offers the following comments.

The Land Use Commission staff confirms that the project site as shown on Exhibit A is located within the State Land Use Urban District.

The Honolulu Waterfront Project offers the following comments from a waterfront revitalization perspective:

1. The proposed parking lot and future mixed-use redevelopment efforts for the project site should facilitate and preserve unique views toward the waterfront area and provide design solutions to break down existing barriers between the waterfront and adjoining areas of the city as well as strengthen historic linkages. As such, we recommend that the applicant consider the following:

   a. the preservation of significant historic buildings and structures as well as archaeological sites on the property (as determined by the State Historic Preservation Officer) which establishes a link between the growth of Honolulu's maritime industry and the Central Business District;

   b. utilize design elements which are sensitive to the surrounding environment and which capture the historic themes of Chinatown and the Honolulu Waterfront; and

   c. examine design options to increase mauka/makai linkages and public access to the waterfront area.
2. The analysis provided for Section V, Description of the Affected Environment, Subsection F, Archaeological Sites indicates that there are no archaeological significant sites existing on the project site. However, it should be clarified that potentially significant subsurface archaeological sites may exist and will be further researched prior to future planned mixed-use development of the project site.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments.

Sincerely,

Shelley Mark
Senior Advisor
Mr. Patrick Onishi  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
650 S. King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96813  

Re:  C.Q. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition  
Historic Hawaii Foundation

Dear Mr. Onishi,

In response to the Historic Hawaii Foundation concerns. The Owners have re-evaluated the project scope & is proposing at this time to demolish the three (3) insignificant buildings. The 1919 rock bldg. & the 2-story retail bldg. will be retained at this time. The Historic Hawaii Foundation should be made aware that the owners would like to keep their option open and may at a later date propose to demo the remaining two (2) buildings.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda

Sueda & Associates, Inc.

cc: Historic Hawaii Foundation
April 10, 1995

Mr. Lloyd Sueda
Sueda and Associates
905 Makahiki Way
Honolulu, HI 96827

Dear Mr. Sueda:

Subject: C.O. Yee Hop Warehouses and Building
TMK: 1-70-03-013. Chinatown, Honolulu, Oahu

The Historic Hawai'i Foundation Preservation Committee has reviewed the draft environmental assessment for the C.O. Yee Hop property development, building demolition and parking construction in Chinatown, Honolulu. The following are comments on the adverse affect to certain properties in the assessment.

The 1919 lava rock building (8bdg. 1) on the 1-7-03-013 parcel should be preserved and should not be demolished. It is an exceptional example of a warehouse using rock construction for that period. The Committee recommends against the demolition of that building or any renovation that may detract from its historic character.

We recommend against the demolition of the two story building on the 1-7-03-024 parcel. This building contributes to the overall character of Chinatown, which is in a historic district.
The Historic Hawai‘i Foundation formally requests to be an interested party in this project with opportunities to comment on present and future plans, assessments and reports.

The Historic Hawai‘i Foundation is a 21-year-old, private statewide non-profit historic preservation organization dedicated to preservation of historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural heritage of the State of Hawaii. Please call me at 833-9564 if you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Dion Magrit Coschigano
Acting Executive Director

cc: Don Hibbard
    Gary Gill
    Ralph Portmore
    Patrick Onishi
    Preservation Committee members
Mr. Patrick Onishi  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
650 S. King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.O. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition  
Comment from Planning Department

Dear Mr. Onishi,

After reviewing the comments from Cheryl Soon of Planning Department, we have this response.

If & when we build the parking lot, we will abide by all of the requirements set forth by the Planning Department.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Lloyd T. Sueda

LTS:ds

cc: Planning Department
April 11, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: PATRICK T. ONISHI, DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: CHERYL D. SOON, CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (DEA), CHAPTER 343, HRS,
FOR THE C. Q. YEE HOP PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT,
TAX MAP KEYS: 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 AND 50,
HONOLULU, OAHU, HAWAII

In response to your memorandum of March 8, 1995, we have reviewed the subject DEA and offer the following comments.

1. The subject parcels are designated Commercial Emphasis Mixed Use on the Primary Urban Center Development Plan Land Use Map and not Commercial as indicated in the DEA.

2. The project site is within the Chinatown sub-area of the Downtown Special Area as specified under Section 24-2.2(b)(1)(c). As such, future redevelopment of the site should emphasize historical and architectural characteristics and adaptive reuse.

3. Section VI "Summary of Major Impacts And Mitigative Measures" does not address proposed mitigation measures to control fugitive dust and debris during demolition. The final EA should describe the non-explosive demolition measures to be employed and mitigation measures to ensure safety and control fugitive dust and debris.
4. The proposed 97-stall at-grade parking lot is deemed compatible with the surrounding uses and Chinatown in general. However, the final EA should state which of the two alternatives mentioned in Section IV "Alternatives to the Proposed Action" will be pursued. Additionally, future proposals for a mixed use project involving commercial, office and residential uses will require a separate EA and review.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Should you have any questions, please contact Tim Hata of our staff at 527-6070.

CHERYL D. SOON  
Chief Planning Officer

CDS:ft
Sueda & Associates, Inc./Architects and Planners

July 3, 1995

Mr. Patrick Onishi
Director
Department of Land Utilization
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.Q. Yee Hop – Chinatown Demolition
   Comments from Department of Housing & Community Development

Dear Mr. Onishi:

We are aware of the Marin Tower which is located across Maunakea Street.

The Department of Transportation Services requirement for Marin Tower to exit off Maunakea Street, should not impact our parking lot. Maunakea Street will be our only access and our exit will be off Nimitz Highway.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Lloyd T. Sueda

cc: Department of Housing & Community Development
MEMORANDUM

TO: PATRICK T. ONISHI, DIRECTOR
    DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: RONALD S. LIM, DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CHAPTER 343 HRS
        PROJECT WITHIN THE CHINATOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT

March 16, 1995

This is in response to your memorandum dated March 8, 1995 regarding the subject Draft Environmental Assessment for the C. Q. Yee Hop property development.

Please be aware that the Marin Tower project is located across Maunakea Street from the project site. DHCD, under the recommendation of the Department of Transportation Services, may alter the Marin Tower's parking garage exit onto Maunakea Street to improve traffic flow.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this matter. Should you have any questions, please contact Lesa Desat at X4162.

RONALD S. LIM
Director
Mr. Patrick Onishi  
Director  
Department of Land Utilization  
650 S. King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96813

Re: C.O. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition  
Comment from Department of Public Works

Dear Mr. Onishi,

We are very much aware of the Clean Water Act and will address these concerns when we finalize the design of the proposed parking lot.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Sueda

Lloyd T. Sueda, AIA
Michael R. Wong, AIA Associate  
Byron T. Tsuruda, AIA Associate  
Robert S. Nitto, AIA Associate
March 16, 1995

MEMORANDUM:

TO: PATRICK T. ONISHI, DIRECTOR
    DEPARTMENT OF LAND UTILIZATION

FROM: KENNETH E. SPRAGUE
      DIRECTOR AND CHIEF ENGINEER

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)
          C. Q. YEE HOP PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
          TMK: 1-7-02; 13, 14, 24, 44 AND 50

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

Under Section VI. "Summary of Major Impacts and Mitigation Measures", the EA should address the water quality measures to minimize the runoff of pollutants.

Should you have any questions, please contact Mr. Alex Ho,
Environmental Engineer, at Local 4150.
Sueda & Associates, Inc./Architects and Planners

July 3, 1995

Mr. Patrick Onishi
Director
Department of Land Utilization
650 S. King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: C.Q. Yee Hop - Chinatown Demolition
   Comments from State of Hawaii - Department of Health

Dear Mr. Onishi

We are very much aware of the possible existence of asbestos. A preliminary report was completed by Coralco (See attached report). However, when final demolition of the three (3) buildings occur, we will further monitor the possibility of existing asbestos and take all necessary precautions for proper removal.

We will also take the necessary precaution in regards to dust control, meeting all State and City requirements.

If you have any questions, please call and we can discuss this matter.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Lloyd T. Sueda

LTS:dm

cc: SOH - Department of Health
Mr. Patrick T. Onishi  
Director of Land Utilization  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Onishi:

SUBJECT: Comments on the "Proposed C.Q. Yee Hop Property Development Project," 128 North Nimitz Highway, Chinatown, Oahu  
TMK: 1-7-02: (POR) 13, 14, 24, 44, and 50

A Draft Environmental Assessment was submitted to the Department of Health for the proposed C.Q. Yee Hop Property Development Project. The project consists of demolishing five existing, dilapidated structures and developing an open, landscaped private parking area. The proposed project would provide needed parking in the chinatown area during an interim period, whereafter, use of the site would be contemplated. Included in the assessment were comments given by the State Historic Preservation Division of the Department of Land and Natural Resources recommending against the demolition of two of the structures due to their cultural significance; the lava rock warehouse on parcel 13 and the two-story building on parcel 24.

Demolition Involving Asbestos:

As a project that will entail demolition activity, the Federal Register, 40 CFR Part 61, National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants, Asbestos NESHAP Revision; Final Rule, November 20, 1990, requires inspection of all affected areas to determine whether asbestos is present.

In 1986, Congress enacted the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA, or TSCA Title II) which mandated a regulatory program to address asbestos hazards in schools. A part of AHERA (Section 2-6; 18 U.S.C. 2646) dealt with the mandatory training and accreditation of persons who perform certain types of asbestos-related work in schools.
Subsequently, in 1990, Congress enacted ASHARA (Pub. L. 101-637), which amended AHERA and extended the training and accreditation requirements to persons performing such work in public and commercial buildings.

To comply with the ASHARA requirements, the inspector, management planner, project designer, abatement supervisor, and abatement worker must have active AHERA certificates of training from an accredited training provider.

Under the NESHAP regulation, the project would be required to file an Asbestos Demolition/Renovation notification 10 working days prior to demolition of each building or the disturbance of regulated asbestos-containing material. All regulated quantities and types of asbestos-containing materials would be subject to emission control, proper collection, containerizing, and disposal at a permitted landfill.

If you have any questions regarding asbestos removal, please contact Mr. Thomas Lileikis at 586-4200.

Control of Fugitive Dust:

Due to the nature of the project, there is a significant potential for fugitive dust to be generated during the demolition and removal of debris, grading and construction activities for this project. The close proximity to neighboring business establishments, the large concentration of vehicles travelling along Nimitz Highway and the narrow streets of Keaulike and Maunakea may compound dust problems. In addition, if the two aforementioned structures remain, greater care may be needed to control and contain the generation of dust during the demolition and removal of debris. Therefore, implementation of adequate dust control measures during all phases of the project is warranted. Construction activities must comply with provisions of Chapter §11-60.1, Hawaii Administrative Rules, section §11-60.1-33 on Fugitive Dust.

Contractor should provide adequate means to control dust from road areas and during the various phases of construction activities, including but not limited to:

a. planning the different phases of construction, focusing on minimizing the amount of dust-generating materials and activities, centralizing material transfer points and onsite vehicular traffic routes, and locating potentially dusty equipment in areas of the least impact;

b. providing an adequate water source at site prior to startup of construction activities;
c. landscaping and rapid covering of bare areas, including slopes, starting from the initial grading phase;
d. control of dust from shoulders, project entrances, and access roads; and
e. providing adequate dust control measures during weekends, after hours, and prior to daily startup of construction activities.

If you have any questions regarding fugitive dust, please contact Mr. Timothy Carvalho at 586-4200.

Sincerely,

Wilfred K. Nagamine

WILFRED K. NAGAMINE, P.E.
Manager, Clean Air Branch

TL/TC: jm
Ref. No C-1108

March 23, 1995

The Honorable Patrick T. Onishi, Director
Department of Land Utilization
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Mr. Onishi:

Subject: Draft Environmental Assessment for the C.Q. Yee Hop Property Development Project

We have reviewed the environmental assessment for the proposed construction of an open, landscaped parking area in the Chinatown District and do not have any comments to offer at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory G.Y. Pai, Ph.D.
Director
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18 January, 1994

Dick Chun
P.O. 1579
Honolulu, HI 96806

Ref: 94B Maunakea, Asbestos Survey

Dear Mr. Chun:

On 11 January, we conducted an asbestos survey at 94B Maunakea St. on a verbal purchase order. The results of the survey are enclosed for your review. As you will note, there is a mix of materials, some of which are asbestos containing and some that are not. Exhibit A, Table I has the analysis results.

The survey was conducted under the direction of James R. Lee, EPA AHERA Asbestos Inspector Certification Number 7ME0410920101R.

If you have any questions about the survey, please do not hesitate to contact us. We thank you for this opportunity to be of service.

Sincerely,

Douglas Kendall
Sales/Estimator

Enclosure
C. Q. YEE HOP CO. BUILDING
ASBESTOS SURVEY
11 January 1994

SCOPE OF SURVEY

On January 11, 1994 Coralco Corporation conducted an asbestos survey at C. Q. Yee Hop Co. Building, 948 Maunakea. The survey was performed at the verbal direction of Y. H. Chun.

The purpose of survey was to identify environmental concerns relative to asbestos containing building materials. This survey was not intended to address other environmental issues including, but not limited to: PCB (polychlorinated biphenyls) containing electrical equipment, hazardous chemical materials, hazardous chemical wastes, underground storage tank systems, surface/subsurface contamination, fire/explosion hazards, biological concerns, public health/safety issues, community/worker right-to-know regulations, radiation hazards, or other environmental regulatory compliance requirements.

A preliminary walk-through was conducted by James R. Lee and Douglas Kendall to identify any potential asbestos containing materials. From that walk-through, a sampling plan was developed.

Given the nature of hazardous substances and the liabilities they often represent, Coralco will not provide guarantees that negative findings during this survey confirms the absence of all environmental contamination or liability. A more in-depth investigation involving extensive sampling and laboratory analysis would need to be requested by the client for such assurance. Coralco Corporation expressly disclaims any and all liability for representations, expressed or implied, contained in, or for omissions from this report, or any other written or oral communication transmitted to any party during the course of this survey which might be interpreted as establishing the total extent of all environmental liability present in the subject property/facility.
ASBESTOS SURVEY

The survey for asbestos containing building materials was performed by Douglas Kendall under the direction of James R. Lee, EPA Certified AHERA Building Inspector.

Bulk sampling for asbestos containing building materials was performed at 948 Maunakea. The purpose of the survey was to identify building materials which contain asbestos minerals. A systematic approach was used to accomplish this objective and consisted of the following elements:

1. A walk-through to visually evaluate readily accessible areas of the building for materials suspected of containing asbestos.
2. Bulk sampling of materials in accordance with recommended work practices established by EPA guidance documents.
3. A present condition assessment of suspect materials to determine friability.
4. Analysis of the bulk samples by a qualified laboratory using Polarized Light Microscopy and dispersion staining.
5. An evaluation of the general conditions and hazard potential of the asbestos containing materials identified.

The client should note that this survey provides a means to recognize obvious potential liabilities resulting from asbestos on the property. It should also be noted that destructive testing was not conducted in this survey. Therefore, not all asbestos containing materials present may have been identified.

SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

A total of fourteen samples were taken in locations throughout the building consisting of homogeneous materials likely to be asbestos containing. Materials identified as possible asbestos containing were as follows:

1. Vinyl Floor Tile, located in the office area.
2. Acoustic Ceiling Tile, located in office area.
5. Wall Plaster in Coolers and Upper Portion of Building.
6. Pipe Insulation in Chiller Mechanical Room.
Each material was assessed at the time of the survey according to use and population of each separate functional space. Non-friable miscellaneous materials were classified in either good or damaged condition. Friable materials were classified into one of three groups: good, damaged, or significantly damaged condition.

A hazard evaluation of asbestos containing materials was then made using two criteria, estimating friability and estimating the potential for exposure during demolition. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines friable material as one which hand pressure can crumble, pulverize, or reduce to powder when dry. Non-friable materials are ones which generally do not release asbestos fibers from the bonding matrix unless sanded, pounded, sawn, drilled, ripped, pulverized or otherwise demolished.

Estimating exposure potential is based on observations of the overall condition of the material and potential for damage. Some key elements associated with assignment of exposure potential include:

1. Friability.
2. Evidence of substrate deterioration.
3. Evidence of physical contact or water damage.
4. The potential for disturbance or erosion.
5. Proximity to air plenums.
6. Subjection to movement or vibration.

Each of these elements are evaluated for each separate functional space and homogeneous material with the functional space. Table I, Asbestos Analysis Results, and Table II, Friability and Exposure Potential is included in Exhibit A.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Asbestos containing materials identified in the survey are non-friable except for the pipe insulation located in the chiller mechanical room. Please see Table II for friability and exposure potential. It should be noted that the scope of this asbestos evaluation is limited and the observations should not be interpreted to imply that no other asbestos containing materials exist in the building. Inaccessible asbestos containing materials, for example, could be present behind wall/ceilings or in piping/ductwork/machinery/equipment insulation or as part of the sewer or water system in the form of transite pipe.
According to EPA guidelines, asbestos containing materials that are friable or are likely to become friable should be removed before demolition. All the asbestos containing materials identified in this survey fall within this requirement and should be removed before demolition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th>Description/Sample Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brown 12x12 Floor Tile/Office</td>
<td>1-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Red/Brown 9x9 Floor Tile/Office</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White Leveling Compound/Office</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dark Brown 9x9 Fiber Tile/Office</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>White 12x12 Ceiling Tile/Office</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silver Paint on Corrugated Tin/Warehouse</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Black Mastic on Pipe Fittings/Warehouse</td>
<td>20-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Black Mastic on Cork Insulation/Warehouse</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plaster on Cooler Wall/Large Walk-in-Cooler</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Black Mastic on Chiller Pipes/Large Walk-in-Cooler</td>
<td>40-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mortar from Smoker Fire Bricks/Sausage Factory</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6' High Lining of Cooler/Walk-in Cooler nearest Office</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>White Pipe Insulation/Chiller Room</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Blue Painted Plaster/2nd Level</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A result of ND (non-detectable) means that the sample contained less than 1% asbestos by weight.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th>Friability</th>
<th>Exposure Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-friable values for Friability range from 1 to 2: Good or Damaged.
Friable values for Friability range from 1 to 3: Good, Damaged, or Significantly Damaged.
Non-friable and friable Exposure Potential values range from 1 to 3: Poor, Good, or Excellent.
# POLARIZED LIGHT MICROSCOPY
## ANALYTICAL REPORT

**Contact:** Doug Kendall  
**Address:** Coralco Corp.  
500 Ala Kawa St., #216-A  
Honolulu, HI 96817  
**Job Site/No.:** CQ Yes Hop Co Bldg.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE ID</th>
<th>% ASBESTOS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NON-ASBESTOS</th>
<th>LOCATION / DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| #1        | 1-3%       | Chrysotile | Fibers:  
<1% None Detected  
Matrix: 97-99% Carbonate,Non fbr.Synth. | 1st Floor, Office, Brown 12x12 Fl. Tile |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-001 |      |             |                        |
| #2        | 5-16%      | Chrysotile | Fibers:  
<1% None Detected  
Matrix: 90-95% Carbonate,Non fbr.Synth. | 1st Floor, Office, Reddish brown 6x9 Fl. Tile |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-002 |      |             |                        |
| #3        | <1%        | None Detected | Fiber:  
1-3% Cellulose  
Matrix: 97-99% Gypsum,Carbonate,Misc.p | 1st Floor, Office, White Fl. leveling compoun |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-003 |      |             |                        |
| #4        | 10-20%     | Chrysotile | Fibers:  
<1% None Detected  
Matrix: 80-90% Carbonate,Serpentine,Misc. | 1st Floor, Office, Dark Brown Floor Tiles |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-004 |      |             |                        |
| #5        | <1%        | None Detected | Fiber:  
97-99% Cellulose  
Matrix: 1-3% Carbonate,Misc,particles | 1st Floor, Office, 12x12 Acoustic Ceiling Til |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-005 |      |             |                        |
| #6        | <1%        | None Detected | Fiber:  
1-3% Cellulose  
Matrix: 99-99% Opaque m-l,Adhesive,Misc | Warehouse, 1st Fl. Silver Paint on Tin |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-006 |      |             |                        |
| #7        | 20-30%     | Chrysotile | Fiber:  
3-5% Fiberglass  
Matrix: 55-77% Asphalt,Carbonate,Misc.p | Warehouse, 1st Fl. Black Mastic on Fitings |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-007 |      |             |                        |
| #8        | <1%        | None Detected | Fibers:  
<1% None Detected  
Matrix: 100% Asphalt,DIamons,Carbonate | Warehouse, 1st Fl. Black Mastic on Cork In |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-008 |      |             |                        |
| #9        | <1%        | None Detected | Fiber:  
<1% None Detected  
Matrix: 100% Carbonate,Misc,particles | 1st Floor, Plaster on Cooler Wall |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-009 |      |             |                        |
| #10       | 40-50%     | Chrysotile | Fiber:  
1-3% Fiberglass,Cellulose  
Matrix: 47-59% Asphalt,Misc,particles | 1st Floor, Black Mastic on Cork |
| Lab ID #  | 3-087-010 |      |             |                        |

---

**Lab Manager:** [Signature]  
**Analyst:** [Signature]

---

A.C.T. LABORATORY, INC., 1130 N. NIMITZ HWY., SUITE C-300, HONOLULU, HI 96817 (808) 845-1532
# POLARIZED LIGHT MICROSCOPY
## ANALYTICAL REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE ID</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ASBESTOS TYPE</th>
<th>NON-ASBESTOS</th>
<th>LOCATION / DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>Fiber: &lt;1% None Detected</td>
<td>2nd Floor, Mortar from smoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID #</td>
<td>3-087-011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix: 100% Carbonate, Misc. particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>Fiber: &lt;1% None Detected</td>
<td>1st Floor, 1st floor lining of cooler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID #</td>
<td>3-087-012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix: 100% Carbonate, Misc. particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>10-20%</td>
<td>Amosite</td>
<td>Fiber: &lt;1% None Detected</td>
<td>1st Floor, White pipe insulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID #</td>
<td>3-087-013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix: 70-85% Clay, Misc. particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>Fiber: &lt;1% None Detected</td>
<td>2nd level, Plaster Painted Blue, 2nd level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID #</td>
<td>3-087-014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matrix: 100% Carbonate, Paint, Misc. particles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lab Manager: [Signature]

A.C.T. LABORATORY, INC., 1130 N. NIMITZ HWY., SUITE C-300, HONOLULU, HI 96817 (808) 845-1532
1. Brown 12 x 12 Floor Tile
2. Redish Brown 9 x 9 Floor Tile
3. White Floor Leveling Compound
4. Dark Brown Floor Tile
5. White 12 x 12 Acoustic Ceiling Tile

Office Area, First Floor
NTS

C. Q Yee Hop Co. Bldg.
Asbestos Survey
Coralco Corporation.
January 11, 1994
6. Silver, 5 min on 11th
  8. Black mastic on cork insul. 1/8 thick, 6 high lining of
cork and foam insulated pipes, typical.
9. Plaster on cooler wall cooler.
10. Black mastic on cork insulated pipes, typical.
11. White pipe insulation

---

Warehouse, First Floor
NTS

C. Q. Yee Hop Co. Bldg.
Asbestos Survey
Coralco Corporation.
January 11, 1994
February 14, 1995

Sueda & Associates  
905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826  

Attn: Mr. Lloyd Sueda

Subject: Structural Investigation of Lava Rock Warehouse  
Building for C.Q. Yee Hop

Gentlemen:

As requested by Lloyd Sueda, we conducted an inspection of an  
existing lava rock warehouse building owned by C.Q. Yee Hop &  
Company, Ltd.. The structure is located on a parcel  
surrounded by King Street, Maunakea Street, Kekaulike Street  
and Nimitz Highway.

The purpose of this investigation is to determine the  
structural soundness of the existing structure and to  
estimate the cost of bracing the building, if required.

The building in question is approximately 48' wide x 75' long  
x 31' high (to the underside of the roof trusses). The  
existing perimeter walls are grouted, rock walls that vary  
from 18" to 12" in thickness. The ground level has a  
concrete slab floor. There had been 2 levels of wood  
flooring at 13' and 22' respectively above this ground level.  
According to the owners, these floors had been earlier  
removed due to extensive termite infestation.

In this existing condition, the structure is lacking in  
lateral resistance and would not meet Building Code  
requirements. After the demolition of the flooring was  
completed, there was an attempt to brace the perimeter rock  
walls. However, the temporary wood struts that were  
installed are very inadequate.

In our opinion, four structural steel frames should be  
installed at 15 feet apart with three steel beams installed  
horizontally between these frames. The frames and the  
horizontal beams need to be bolted securely into the rock  
walls. Based on our preliminary estimate the cost of such a  
bracing system would be approximately $123,300.00. This  
estimate does not include demolition of an existing 30' x 48'  
mezzanine that is in this space. The breakdown for this  
estimate is attached.
February 14, 1995
Page 2
Subject: Structural Investigation of Lava Rock Warehouse
Building for C.Q. Tse Hop

(con't)

If you have any questions regarding this report, please do
not hesitate to call me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Rodney T. Yamamoto, P.E.
### BREAKDOWN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Engineering design &amp; plan preparation</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Permit Fees</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) New Concrete Footing (Excavation, Reinforcing, Concrete)</td>
<td>$22,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Removal of existing wooden bracing</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Scaffolding/Lifting equipment</td>
<td>$54,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) New Steel Beams and Frames</td>
<td>$12,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Bolting to rock walls</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Final clean-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Contingency (Temporary power, Sanitary, Portable lights)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$123,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $123,300.00
August 10, 1994

Mr. Lloyd Sueda
Sueda and Associates
905 Makahiki Way
Honolulu, HI 96827

Dear Mr. Sueda:

SUBJECT: C.Q. Yee Hop Warehouse and Building

TMK: 1-7-03:013.024, Chinatown, Honolulu, Oahu

The 1919 lava rock building on the 1-7-03:013 parcel is an exceptional example of a warehouse using rock construction for that period and we recommend against the demolition of that building or any renovation that may detract from its historic character. Since the building is fairly void of historic elements on the interior, a major interior renovation would not meet with any objections from our office. Renovation or an addition to the makai side of that building which is filled in with CMU walls would also be acceptable.

We also recommend against demolition of the two story building on the 1-7-03:024 parcel since it is a building that contributes to the overall character of Chinatown. However, our office would be amenable to sensitively done exterior and interior renovations on the two story building.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above site. Should you have any questions, please call Tonia Moy at 587-0005.

Very truly yours,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

TM:jk

EXHIBIT P
The 1919 lava rock building on the 1-7-03-01 parcel is an exceptional example of a warehouse using rock construction for that period and we recommend against the demolition of that building or any renovation that may detract from its historic character. Since the building is fairly void of historic elements on the interior, a major interior renovation would not meet with any objections from our office. Renovation or an addition to the makai side of that building which is filled with CMU walls would also be acceptable.

We also recommend against demolition of the two story building on the 1-7-03-02 parcel since it is a building that contributes to the overall character of Chinatown. However, our office would be amenable to sensitively done exterior and interior renovations on the two story building.
November 9, 1994

Mr. Michael F. O'Connor
Tam, O'Connor & Henderson
220 South King Street, Suite 2000
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. O'Connor

SUBJECT: C.Q. Yee Hop Warehouse and Building
TMK: 1-7-03:013, 024, Chinatown, Honolulu

We have received your formal notice dated October 26, 1994 but do not concur with the decision to demolish the 1919 stone warehouse building. Condemnation proceedings will not be pursued. However, we would still like to meet with your client and the architects to work out a viable solution to keep at least a part of the 1919 stone building incorporating it into what could be a profitable development. We feel that parking spaces can still be developed with a large part of the stone building intact.

Please call Tonia Moy at 587-0005 to arrange for a meeting or if you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

DON HIBBARD, Administrator
State Historic Preservation Division

TM:ab
Mr. Kazu Hayashida
Director
Department of Transportation
State of Hawaii
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR AN OPEN PARKING AREA WITHIN
CHINATOWN SPECIAL DESIGN DISTRICT.

SUBJECT PROPERTY: YEE HOP PROPERTY
128 NORTH NIMITZ HIGHWAY
TMK NO.: 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 & 50

Dear Mr. Hayashida:

C.Q. Yee Hop & Company, Ltd. is preparing an Environmental Assessment for a proposed open parking development which will replace five vacant, dilapidated low-rise structures at the subject property. The proposed plan will provide approximately 97 on-grade stalls for private parking rental. A site plan is attached for your review and assessment of this proposed action.

The site plan proposes primary access along Nimitz Highway which will replace an existing two-way driveway and a secondary access at an existing driveway along Maunakea Street. As shown, the two driveways proposed along Nimitz Highway will be designated as ingress or egress only. The secondary entrance/exit at the existing driveway along Maunakea Street will be widened & improved. A portion of Gravier Lane, owned by Yee Hop Realty, Ltd. will remain as a gated access to service existing buildings.

Upon review of the attached site plan, please direct any comments to the undersigned. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Lloyd T. Sueda

LTS: dm
Enclosures

905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite • Honolulu, Hawaii 96826-2859 • Telephone (808) 949-6644 • FAX (808) 949-6707

EXHIBIT R
Mr. Charles Swanson  
Director  
Department of Transportation Services  
City & County of Honolulu  
Pacific Park Plaza  
711 Kapiolani Boulevard  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR AN OPEN PARKING AREA WITHIN CHINATOWN SPECIAL DESIGN DISTRICT.

SUBJECT PROPERTY: YEE HOP PROPERTY  
128 NORTH NIMITZ HIGHWAY  
TMK NO.: 1-7-02: 13, 14, 24, 44 & 50

Dear Mr. Swanson:

C.Q. Yee Hop & Company, Ltd. is preparing an Environmental Assessment for a proposed open parking development which will replace five vacant, dilapidated low-rise structures at the subject property. The proposed plan will provide approximately 97 on-grade stalls for private parking rental. A site plan is attached for your review and assessment of this proposed action.

The site plan proposes primary access along Nimitz Highway which will replace an existing two-way driveway and a secondary access at an existing driveway along Maunakea Street. As shown, the two driveways proposed along Nimitz Highway will be designated as ingress or egress only. The secondary entrance/exit at the existing driveway along Maunakea Street will be widened & improved. A portion of Gravier Lane, owned by Yee Hop Realty, Ltd. will remain as a gated access to service existing buildings.

Upon review of the attached site plan, please direct any comments to the undersigned. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

SUEDA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

LTS: dm

Enclosures

905 Makahiki Way, Mauka Suite • Honolulu, Hawaii 96826-2869 • Telephone (808) 949-6644 • FAX (808) 949-6707