April 11, 2018

TO:       THE HONORABLE SCOTT GLENN, DIRECTOR
           OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CONTROL
           DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

FROM:     JADE T. BUTAY
           DIRECTOR OF TRANSPORTATION

THRU:     EDWIN H. SNIFFEN
           DEPUTY DIRECTOR, HIGHWAYS DIVISION

           DARRELL T. YOUNG
           DEPUTY DIRECTOR, HARBORS DIVISION

           DAVIS K. YOGI
           HARBORS ADMINISTRATOR

SUBJECT:  REQUEST TO PUBLISHDECLARATION OF EXEMPTION FOR MATSON
           TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS AT PIERS 51, 52 AND 53, SAND ISLAND,
           HONOLULU HARBOR

The Department of Transportation hereby transmits a copy of the above-referenced declaration of exemption from the preparation of an environmental assessment under the authority of Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes and Title 11-200, Hawaii Administrative Rules for your files. We request that this declaration of exemption be published in the next available issue of The Environmental Notice. The project is situated at the following Tax Map Keys: (1) 1-5-041: portions of 049, 111, 115, 170, 181, 185, 200, 313, 320, 321 and 324.

If there are any questions, please have your staff contact Mr. Carter Luke, Engineering Program Manager at (808) 587-1862.

Enclosure
DECLARATION OF EXEMPTION

SUBJECT: Exemption Declaration from the preparation of an environmental assessment under the authority of Chapter 343, HRS and Chapter 11-200, HAR

DATE: October 12, 2017

AGENCY OR APPLICANT ACTION

Check applicable box

☐ This exempted action is an agency action as defined by Section 343-5(b), HRS, and Section 11-200-5, HAR

☒ This exempted action is an applicant action as defined by Section 343-5(c), HRS, and Section 11-200-6, HAR

SPECIFY EXEMPTION CLASS:

Check applicable box

☒ The Exemption Declaration for the action described below is based on the Exemption List for the Department of Transportation, reviewed and concurred to by the Environmental Council on November 15, 2000.

- Exemption List Class 2
- Item Number 5
- Applicable language from the exemption list:
  Exemption Class 2. Replacement or reconstruction of existing structures and facilities where the new structure will be located, generally on the same site, and will have substantially the same purpose, capacity, density, height and dimensions as the structure replaced.
  5. Replacement or repair of existing deteriorated and/or damaged structures to their original/better condition within areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation such as piers, mooring buoys, single story office buildings, warehouses, sheds, comfort station, and shelters.

☒ The Exemption Declaration for the action described below is based on the consultation process prescribed by Section 11-200-8(a), Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), Exemption Class 2
DESCRIPTION OF ACTION

Proposing Agency or Applicant: Matson Terminals, Inc. ("Matson")

Project Name & Address/Location: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52 and 53), Sand Island, O‘ahu

Anticipated Start Date: January 2018

Anticipated End Date: February 2020

Island and District: Island of O‘ahu, District of Honolulu

Tax Map Key(s): (1) 1-5-041: portions of 049, 111, 115, 170, 181, 185, 200, 313, 320, 321 and 324

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates: 21° 18' 48" N; 157° 52' 57" W

All Necessary Permits and Approvals: FAA Form 7460-1; FAA Form 7460-2; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit; Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permit Minor Modification; Zoning Waiver; HDOT-HAR approval of project plans and specifications; Building permit, if needed

NARRATIVE

Describe the action and why it qualifies for the exemption:

As part of improvements to the Sand Island marine container terminal owned by the State of Hawai‘i Department of Transportation – Harbors Division (HDOT-HAR), Matson is proposing to replace three (3) aging dockside cranes and demolish a fourth crane located at Piers 51C, 52 and 53 of Honolulu Harbor. See Figure 1. The three cranes to be replaced are nearing the end of their operational lifespan and need to be replaced to maintain and improve crane reliability, modernize harbor facilities, and ensure commercial harbor activities continue uninterrupted. Moreover, the existing cranes have insufficient lift height and/or outreach to load and unload containers from the new, larger Aloha and Kanaloa Class vessels that will start joining the Matson fleet in late 2018. Thus, taller cranes with greater outreach and lift height are needed.

The project site is comprised of land owned and administered by HDOT-HAR for use as a marine container terminal. HDOT-HAR provides the land to Matson, which owns and operates the existing cranes that move goods and materials required by the businesses and consumers of the State of Hawai‘i. The project fulfills essential cargo functions on land controlled and managed by HDOT-HAR. It is therefore a use that fulfills a function, activity or service for public benefit in accordance with public policy.

The cranes to be replaced/demolished are the Alliance C6788, Alliance C6790, Paceco 710 and Paceco 711. See Figure 2. The Alliance cranes are a low-profile, shuttle-boom design and were built in 1975, have a lift height of 68 feet, overall height of 123 feet 9 inches and outreach of 116 feet. The Paceco cranes were built in 1976, have a lift height of 102 feet, stowed position height of 247 feet 8 inches and outreach of 125 feet. The Paceco cranes have a boom that is hinged at the base and stowed in an upright position. For both the Alliance and Paceco cranes,
must also be obstruction marked and lighted. The cranes operated by Matson continue to operate under these provisions today based on this determination.

The existing cranes have been permitted and approved to operate on rails at Piers 51C, 52, and 53 for several decades. The proposed project will result in a net reduction of one crane; three existing cranes are proposed to be replaced with three new cranes and a fourth crane is proposed to be demolished. The three new cranes, at 320 feet above ground level, are proposed to be 20 feet higher in the stowed position height than the existing MGM cranes that will remain on-site at 300 feet. Pursuant to Exemption Class 2, Item 5, the new cranes will be generally on the same site, and will have substantially the same purpose, capacity, density, height and dimensions as the structures replaced.

RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT
Describe the site, including any impacts on the receiving environment:
Sand Island is for the most part a man-made island created from the deposition of material during the dredging of Honolulu Harbor and Ke‘ehi Lagoon. The island is home to a variety of land uses including, but not limited to, private shipping container terminal facilities that occupy State-owned lands, the Sand Island State Recreation Area (SRA), the U.S. Coast Guard’s Sand Island facility, the City and County of Honolulu's Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), and the University of Hawaii’s Marine Education Training Center (METC). An industrial use area is also situated on the southern portion of the island and is comprised of various individual businesses/tenants.

The project site is used primarily to operate cranes that facilitate the movement of containerized cargo between container ships and the landside terminal facility for delivery on O‘ahu and transshipment throughout the state and to various destinations across the Pacific. Nearby coastal waters include the Kapalama Basin and Kapalama Channel of Honolulu Harbor. No streams or wetlands are located near the project site. There are also no federally designated critical habitats located within the immediate vicinity of the project site. Species protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) may occur or transit through the vicinity of the project area. However, with avoidance and minimization measures incorporated into the project design, no adverse effects on threatened or endangered species are anticipated.

Potential effects of the proposed project on the receiving environment include temporary impacts on air and water quality associated with the construction phase of the project. Air and water quality impacts will be avoided or minimized by compliance with applicable State Department of Health (DOH) rules and regulations and implementation of appropriate best management practices (BMPs) including erosion and sedimentation control measures. No cultural resources or historic properties are anticipated to be affected by the proposed project. However, should cultural materials or human remains be found during construction, disturbance will cease in the area of the find and the State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD) will be contacted. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and compliance with applicable Federal,
due to their age, their remaining service life and reliability is diminished. Therefore, three new cranes are proposed to be purchased. The new cranes will be delivered fully erect. They will have a lift height of 120 feet, stowed position height of 320 feet above ground level (or 329 feet above mean sea level), and outreach of 145 feet. Similar to the existing Paceco cranes, the new cranes would also have a hinged boom that is raised and stowed in an upright position.

Three existing cranes, the MGM 1129, MGM 1130 and MGM 1131, will be retained on-site and upgraded from 2.4 kV (bus-bar) to 11.5 kV (cable reel) power supply and with fiber optic cabling (for electronic tracking of containers and remote maintenance troubleshooting). One of these cranes will be relocated from Pier 52/53 to Pier 51C to accommodate the new cranes. The MGM cranes were built in 1991, have a lift height of 104 feet, stowed height of 300 feet above ground level (or 309 feet above mean sea level), and outreach length of 140 feet. Like the Paceco cranes, the MGM cranes have a hinged boom that is raised and stowed in an upright position.

Replacement of the cranes will require associated civil and electrical improvements. Civil improvements involve installing a new tie down system, including installation of new piles along the landside girder of Piers 51 to 53, new stowage hardware, and new crane stops. The cranes move longitudinally on the pier along two parallel gantry rails (waterside and landside) spaced 100 feet apart. These improvements will prevent the inadvertent movement of the cranes during high wind events. In addition to the civil improvements, electrical upgrades are necessary to support the increased operating voltage of the new and existing cranes. Improvements involve installation of a new 11.5 kV electric power cable reel system on the new and existing cranes; a power cable trench located inland of the landside crane rail at Piers 51C, 52 and 53; and cable termination vaults and one crane substation each at Pier 51C and Pier 52/53. The existing 2.4 kV bus-bar crane power system will be removed and existing utilities relocated. Backup electrical power generators along with redundant switchgear will also be installed on the terminal to improve the reliability and resiliency of power to all cranes. It is noted that the civil and electrical improvements are being funded in part by a capital advancement contract (CAC) with HDOT-HAR pursuant to Chapter 266-19.5, HRS, Private Financing of Harbor Improvements.

Matson completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Negative Declaration pursuant to Chapter 343, HRS, for the Matson Container Yard Improvements at Piers 51, 52 and 53 at Honolulu Harbor (April 1990). Improvements included changing the layout of the container storage yard to accommodate new cranes and larger cargo containers, an office expansion, a new tower to direct cargo handling, and modernization of the automobile shipment area. Notably, the EA included an assessment of three new cranes with a stowed position height of 300 feet (above ground level). These are the MGM cranes noted in the foregoing paragraph which were built in 1991. The potential impact of the cranes to air navigation was also assessed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) through a 1989 Aeronautical Study (No. 89-AWP-457-0E). A Determination of No Hazard (DNH) to air navigation issued on April 3, 1991 provided that neither of the cranes shall be placed west of a point defined as latitude 21°18'54"/longitude 157°52'52", and raised to a height greater than 235 feet AMSL. When the cranes are to be placed in the stowed position 309 feet AMSL, they must be west of that position. The cranes
State, and Local statutes, ordinances and regulations, minimal to no adverse impacts on the receiving environment are anticipated with the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
I have considered the potential effects of the proposed project and all related activities against the criteria checked below:

- Land Use and Zoning Conformance
- Traffic (Vehicles, Bicycles, Pedestrian)
- Infrastructure (Roads, Buildings, Utilities)
- Air Quality Pollutant Emissions
- Noise Emissions
- Solid, Hazardous, and Liquid Waste Management
- Social
- Economic
- Health and Safety
- Recreation
- Public Beach Access
- Cultural Resources and Practices
- Visual/Aesthetic
- Environmental Justice
- Rare, Threatened, and/or Endangered Species
- Surface and Ground Water Resources
- Wetlands
- Floodplains
- Riparian/Coastal Resources
- Other

Not Applicable

Comments/summary of impact analysis:

**Land Use and Zoning Conformance:** A discussion of the project's conformance with the Hawai'i State Plan, Chapter 226, HRS, and Coastal Zone Management, Chapter 205A, HRS, is attached as Appendix A.

The proposed project conforms to the existing land use and zoning designations of the surrounding area. The project site is within the State's Urban Land Use District and is predominantly zoned within the Waterfront Industrial District (I-3)—an area which permits a full range of facilities necessary for successful and efficient performance of port functions. Remaining portions of the project site are zoned within the Restricted Preservation District (P-1) or Federal and Military Preservation District (F-1). Part of the site zoned F-1 (Parcels 320 and 321) has been removed from Federal jurisdiction and is subject to the P-2 General Preservation District standards. Pursuant to Section 266-2.2, HRS, HDOT-HAR is exempt from Conservation District rules in commercial harbors.
The project site is also located in the County's Special Management Area (SMA). A SMA Use Permit (No. 90/SMA-46) was granted on August 8, 1990 under City Resolution 90-356 for construction of the cranes and other Matson container yard improvements. In addition, a zoning variance was approved on April 15, 1991 to allow the cranes to exceed the permitted maximum heights and to increase nonconformity. The proposed improvements are consistent with already permitted uses in the area and will have substantially the same purpose, capacity, density, height and dimensions as the structure replaced.

Traffic (Vehicles, Bicycles, Pedestrian): Access to the project site is via Sand Island Access Road (State Highway 64) which becomes Sand Island Parkway after crossing the Bascule Bridge. Temporary increases in traffic related to the movement of construction workers and heavy equipment is anticipated during the construction phase of the proposed project. However, any associated adverse impacts would be negligible as these increases will be temporary in nature and all construction activity would occur within the limits of the Matson container terminal facility away from any public right-of-way.

No long-term impacts on traffic are anticipated with the project. A traffic assessment prepared by Wilson Okamoto Corporation on September 8, 2017 (see Appendix B) concluded that the proposed improvements are not expected to generate additional trips in the project vicinity due to shifting industry trends towards longer containers which is expected to keep constant or possibly slightly decrease the total number of containers processed at the site. Recommended measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on traffic have been considered and are discussed in the following "Mitigation" section.

Infrastructure (Roads, Buildings, Utilities): No adverse impacts on electrical systems are anticipated with the project. The majority of the utility improvements will occur underground within existing or new electrical easements. All electrical improvements will be coordinated with the Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (HECO) prior to construction to determine the ability of the electrical systems in the area to support any increases in demand. Following construction, HECO will continue to have access to their existing easements and facilities for maintenance purposes.

No significant adverse impacts on the existing wastewater system are anticipated with the project as no additional demand will be placed on the existing wastewater system. There is an existing wastewater dual force main that runs directly beneath the project site at Pier 52 and across the Matson container yard towards the Sand Island WWTP. The dual force main replaces an older force main that is located nearby and has since been abandoned in place. New piles are proposed to be installed along the landside girder of Piers 51 to 53. The project will be designed to avoid adverse effects on existing wastewater facilities from pile driving, soil stock piling, soil compaction and other ground movement activities.

No adverse impacts on the existing potable water system are anticipated with the proposed project as no additional water demands are required. It is noted that coordination will be undertaken with the Honolulu Fire Department regarding on-site fire protection requirements.

Air Quality Pollutant Emissions: Air quality at the project site is consistent with its urban setting due to the industrial sources of air pollution in the Sand Island area. Short-term impacts on air
quality, including generation of fugitive dust and emissions from construction equipment and vehicles, are expected as a result of construction activities and associated increases in traffic. However, these impacts are anticipated to be negligible due to the temporary nature of construction activities. No impacts on air quality are expected from the operation and installation of additional backup generator sets as they are not expected to be operated on a regular basis and will only be used as necessary to maintain service in the event of an emergency. Measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on air quality have been considered and are discussed in the following "Mitigation" section. In the long-term, air quality may be improved as diesel generators used to power the cranes at Pier 51C will no longer be used and cranes will be powered electrically.

**Noise Emissions:** The existing noise environment at the project site is characteristic of an urban, industrial setting and consists predominantly of ambient noise from industrial activities, vehicular traffic, and aircraft overflights. Noise generated by temporary construction activities will be similar in character and intensity to existing noise conditions and is not anticipated to have an adverse effect to overall noise levels. No long-term impacts to noise levels are anticipated with the operation and maintenance of the proposed project.

**Solid, Hazardous, and Liquid Waste Management:** Construction and demolition (C&D) waste generated by the project may include metal, plastic, concrete, and excavated soil. The contractor will be responsible for proper disposal of all waste and debris generated by construction of the project and will be subject to applicable rules and regulations governing waste management. No adverse impacts on waste management are anticipated with the project.

**Socio-Economic:** No adverse impacts to the socio-economic environment are anticipated with the proposed project. In the short-term, construction expenditures will provide positive benefits to the local economy. This would include creation of some construction and construction support jobs, and the purchase of materials from local suppliers, as well as indirect benefits to local retail businesses resulting from construction activities. In the long-term, the proposed improvements will continue to provide a positive public benefit by maintaining the level of service required to transport a substantial portion of the goods and materials needed to support the State's population and businesses as well as sustain the quality of life in the islands. Hawaii's economy is highly dependent on its commercial harbors as ocean surface transportation remains one of the only viable means to service the majority of the state's economic needs. A vast majority of all consumer goods enter the state through the commercial harbor system.

**Health and Safety:** The proposed cranes would be situated approximately 3 miles east of the main HNL airport facility and approximately 1.8 miles east of the end of HNL's Reef Runway. With a proposed height of 320 feet in the stowed position (boom up), a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" (Form 7460-1) was filed for a total of six crane locations encompassing Piers 51C, 52 and 53 in accordance with the provisions of 49 U.S. Code, Section 44718 and Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 77. As part of Form 7460-1, an aeronautical study was conducted for each of the six crane locations. The aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical
facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures.

The results for each of the aeronautical studies revealed that the proposed structures would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. A final airspace determination of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" was issued on July 7, 2015 for each of the six crane locations and was confirmed valid by letter dated August 10, 2017. See Appendix C. In compliance with the final airspace determination and to minimize potential impacts to air safety, the proposed project will not exceed 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level) and the cranes will be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights – Chapters 3 (Marked), 4, 5 (Red), & 12. No adverse impacts to health and safety are anticipated with the long-term operation of the proposed project.

With the original determination for 309 feet AMSL cranes on Sand Island in 1991, a condition was imposed that Matson, in concert with FAA’s Honolulu Control Facility (HCF), establish a letter of agreement when the cranes were operated at full height. This was accomplished and over a period of two decades, the letter of agreement was modified several times. On January 11, 2010 Matson received a letter from the Manager of the HCF rescinding the letter of agreement with no further action required on the part of Matson. The determinations issued to Matson for the new cranes operating from Piers 51C, 52, and 53, at 320 feet have no conditional use requirements for notification to the HCF.

**Recreation and Public Beach Access:** The SRA and the surrounding coastal waters support a range of recreational activities in the vicinity including boating, fishing, and swimming. However, these activities are limited within Honolulu Harbor itself given the amount of commercial harbor activity and large vessel traffic in the area. No adverse impacts or increased demand on recreational facilities in the project vicinity as a result of the project are anticipated. Public access and use of the park, shoreline and nearshore water areas at Sand Island will remain unaffected by project activities. No mitigation measures are proposed or anticipated to be required.

**Cultural Resources and Practices:** The project site is not used for traditional, customary, or cultural practices. It is located on piers and artificially created land and has been used as a container yard for several decades. Therefore, construction of the proposed project improvements is not likely to disturb traditional sacred sites or traditional cultural objects. In addition, the project will not result in the degradation of resources used by native Hawaiians for subsistence or traditional cultural practices; will not obstruct culturally significant landforms or way-finding features; and, will not result in loss of access to the shoreline or other areas customarily used by Native Hawaiians or others for resource gathering or traditional cultural practices. No mitigation measures are proposed or anticipated to be required.

**Visual/Aesthetic:** The proposed project is consistent in appearance and visual character with the existing uses of the site and with other industrial facilities on Sand Island. The tallest cranes currently in use at the project site are 300 feet in the stowed position (boom up); the new cranes will be 20 feet taller in the stowed position. This increase is minimal in comparison to the overall height of the crane and to the context of development in the surrounding downtown Honolulu area.
new cranes will continue to be subordinate to the Honolulu skyline and its mountain backdrop. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to adversely affect scenic and visual resources in the project area. The project is also not anticipated to degrade existing lateral coastal views or mauka-makai views from Sand Island Parkway, the Sand Island SRA, or other areas in the vicinity of the site. No mitigation measures are proposed or anticipated to be required.

**Environmental Justice:** The project is located in an urban, industrial part of O‘ahu and would not disproportionately burden any one segment of the population or geographic area with environmental and/or health impacts resulting from development, construction, operations, and/or use of natural resources. The proposed project would contribute towards improved efficiency in the shipment of goods and materials that are distributed across the state to communities of a range of incomes.

**Rare, Threatened, and/or Endangered Species:** Consultation with the FWS by letter dated March 2, 2017 indicates that there is no federally designated critical habitat within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. However, federally listed species such as Newell’s shearwater (*Puffinus newelli*) and the threatened Green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) may occur or transit through the project vicinity. In addition, seabirds protected under the MBTA such as the Wedge-tailed shearwater (*Puffinus pacificus*), may also occur in the vicinity of the proposed project area. The principal potential impact to Hawaiian seabirds that may traverse the project area at night comes from outdoor lighting that could result in seabird disorientation, fallout, and injury or mortality. No adverse effect to federally protected species is anticipated with the proposed project as no additional permanent light sources would be added and no work is proposed within coastal waters or along beaches. Measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts to federally protected species that may occur in the project area have been considered and are discussed in the following “Mitigation” section.

No adverse impacts are anticipated with regard to botanical resources since the project site is significantly developed and located within a highly urbanized area.

**Surface and Ground Water Resources and Wetlands:** Sand Island has no natural aquatic features and no streams or wetlands are within close proximity of the project site. Therefore, no adverse impacts to surface or ground water resources, including wetlands, are anticipated with the operation and maintenance of the proposed project.

**Floodplains:** According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the area (Community Panel Number 15003C0353G and 15003C0361G), the landside portion of the project site is designated Zone X, an area determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance (500-year) floodplain. There are no base flood elevations or depths shown within this zone. Narrow portions of the project site along the shoreline, including parts of the piers, are designated Zone AE, which is an area subject to the 1% annual chance (100-year) flood. The base flood elevations in this area range between 5 feet and 8 feet. No adverse impacts on flood hazards in the project area are anticipated as the proposed improvements are not anticipated to increase flood risks or cause any adverse flood-related impacts at the project site or lower elevation properties.

According to the Center for Island Climate Adaptation and Policy, Hawai‘i is expected to experience sea-level rise by one foot by 2050 and three feet by the end of the century. The project site sits at
approximately 9 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, a rise in sea levels by three feet is unlikely to adversely affect overall operation of the Sand Island Matson Terminal. However, if sea level rise were to exceed these predicted values, possible impacts may include submersion of harbor infrastructure, weakened drainage systems that remove storm water runoff from harbor facilities; and delayed shipments, higher shipping costs, and loss of operational time. These impacts would occur with or without the project.

Riparian/Coastal Resources: The nearest coastal water to the project site is Honolulu Harbor which is classified as Marine Sub-Tidal Unconsolidated Bottom Sub-tidal Excavated (M1UBLx). Pursuant to Chapter 11-54, HAR, this coastal water is also classified as Class A marine water. Class A marine waters are recognized as waters providing “recreational purposes and aesthetic enjoyment to be protected. These waters shall not act as receiving waters for any discharge which has not received the best degree of treatment or control compatible with the criteria established for this class.” No construction work or access to construction work will take place within streams, rivers, wetlands or nearby coastal waters. Runoff from the project site during construction may result in temporary impacts on water quality during construction. BMPs including erosion and sediment control measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on water quality have been considered and are discussed in the following "Mitigation" section. No long-term impacts on water quality are anticipated with the operation and maintenance of the proposed project.

Secondary Impacts: The proposed project will not have any adverse secondary, indirect or induced impacts on the receiving environment. The site has been utilized as a marine container terminal facility for decades. The proposed project involves minor changes and upgrades to aging equipment. Hence, there will be no induced changes in the pattern of land use. Although shipping industry trends show the use of longer containers will be favored over shorter ones, the number of trucks entering and leaving should be the same or even decrease slightly as documented in the Traffic Assessment attached as Appendix B. Secondary traffic impact resulting from the proposed project is not anticipated. There are no anticipated secondary impacts upon health and safety. The cranes that load and unload cargo for commercial harbor use have been in place for decades as well. Small increases in the stowed position (boom up) height have been approved by the FAA. There is no federally designated critical habitat in the vicinity of the project. However, measures to avoid potential impacts to endangered species which may fly over or swim by the site will be undertaken. Specific erosion control and best management practices will also be undertaken to mitigate possible impacts on riparian/coastal resources and floodplains.

Cumulative Impacts: The project will replace existing crane structures and facilities to their original/better condition. The new cranes will be generally on the same site, and will have substantially the same purpose, capacity, density, height and dimensions as the structure replaced. The project will not alter the capacity or intensity of existing land uses at the project site, nor will it result in any additional impacts to the receiving environment. Therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated with the proposed project.

MITIGATION
Describe all mitigation measures and best management practices planned to address impacts during the project activities and after project completion:
Traffic: Construction of the proposed project will be phased so as to minimize disruption to normal terminal operations. Temporary increases in traffic during construction will be avoided or minimized by coordinating on-site construction activities with ship arrival, container handling activities, and road transport activities. With the anticipated industry trends favoring longer container lengths, chassis servicing these containers are also expected to increase in length. Therefore, measures will be taken to ensure on-site operations and queuing do not affect the adjacent public roadways. These measures include providing sufficient turning radii at the main cargo entrance to avoid or minimize vehicle encroachments to oncoming traffic lanes and providing adequate space for on-site vehicle queuing.

Air Quality: During construction, the contractor will be responsible for complying with DOH Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 60.1 regarding "Air Pollution Control" specifically Section 11.60.1-33 regarding fugitive dust and the prohibition of visible dust emissions at property boundaries. Mitigation measures to minimize the amount of particulate and fugitive dust generated by construction activities include frequent wetting down of loose soil with water, using dust palliatives, restricting the daily disturbed soil areas, and if necessary, curtailing activities during dry, high wind conditions. Following construction, exposed soils at the project site will be paved over.

Noise Emissions: Noise generated by temporary construction activities will be similar in character and intensity to existing noise conditions and is not anticipated to have an adverse effect to noise levels. However, the contractor will be responsible for complying with the conditions of the noise variance and any other State DOH Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 46, "Community Noise Control" regulations, as applicable.

Health and Safety: In compliance with the final airspace determination and to minimize potential impacts on air safety, the proposed project will not exceed 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level) and the cranes will be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory Circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3 (Marked), 4, 5 (Red), and 12.

Rare, Threatened, and/or Endangered Species: Potential impacts on federally threatened protected seabird species that may overfly the project area will be mitigated during construction by utilizing fully shielded lights so the bulb can only be seen from below bulb height, thereby eliminating any direct uplight. If large flood/work lights are used during construction, they would be placed on poles that are high enough to allow the lights to be pointed directly at the ground and would utilize the lowest wattage bulbs necessary. To minimize potential impacts to sea turtles in near-shore and open ocean habitats, measures will be developed and in place to minimize debris falling in the marine environment during demolition, removal, and installation of the new cranes. Fueling of project-related vehicles and equipment will take place away from the aquatic environment and a contingency plan to control petroleum products accidentally spilled during the project will be developed.

Floodplains: Coordination with the appropriate agencies during permitting and construction will be undertaken to ensure that the proposed project will not result in adverse impacts related to flood hazards. Following implementation, Matson will continue to coordinate with DOT-HAR regarding
efforts to develop adaptation strategies to address the long-term impacts of climate change.

**Riparian/Coastal Resources:** Impacts on coastal resources will be mitigated by implementing appropriate BMPs and erosion and sedimentation control measures. Compliance with State DOH Administrative Rules, Title 11, Chapter 54, "Water Quality Standards" and Title 11, Chapter 55, "Water Pollution Control" will be required. In addition, an NPDES permit will be required for discharges of wastewater, including stormwater runoff, into State surface waters. Specific BMPs to avoid and minimize impacts to surface and groundwater resources during construction may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

1. Project construction-related materials should not be stockpiled in, or in close proximity to aquatic habitats and should be protected from erosion (e.g. with filter fabric, etc.) to prevent materials from being carried into waters by wind, rain, or high surf.

2. Avoid or minimize the amount of debris that falls into the aquatic environment during demolition, removal, and installation of the new cranes. A salvage plan should be developed to address the potential for this to occur.

3. Fueling of project-related vehicles and equipment should take place away from the aquatic environment and a contingency plan to control petroleum products accidentally spilled during the project should be developed. The plan should be retained on site with the person responsible for compliance with the plan. Absorbent pads and containment booms should be stored on-site to facilitate the clean-up of accidental petroleum releases.

4. All deliberately exposed soil or under-layer materials used in the project near water should be protected from erosion and stabilized as soon as possible with geotextile, or filter fabric or native or non-invasive vegetation matting, hydro-seeding, etc.

5. Turbidity and siltation from project related work should be minimized by curtailing work during flooding or adverse tidal and weather conditions.

6. Types of spill control measures should be identified and employed during construction, particularly for work occurring directly over waters. Ensure all staff are trained regarding the deployment and access of these control measures.

7. Routine maintenance and regular inspection of BMPs. Ensure maintenance and inspection is being performed by adequately trained personnel.

**CONSULTATION**

In preparation of a draft environmental assessment for the project, a pre-assessment consultation letter was mailed to all parties listed in the table below. However, subsequent to mailing of the letters, HDOT-HAR determined that the proposed project falls within the classes of action exempt from preparing an environmental assessment in accordance with Section 11-200-8, HAR. Written comments received as part of the consultation process were addressed and formal responses were sent. Those parties who provided comments are indicated in the table below with a checkmark. A copy of the consultation comment letters and responses is provided in Appendix D.
The following parties have been consulted about this project (Name, title, affiliation, consultation date):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>CONSULTATION DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Tosatto</td>
<td>Regional Administrator</td>
<td>NOAA-NMFS</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tunis McElwain</td>
<td>Acting Chief</td>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mary Abrams</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark McClardy</td>
<td>Division Manager</td>
<td>FAA - Western Pacific Region Airports Division</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lorraine Herson-Jones</td>
<td>Acting Airports District Office Manager</td>
<td>FAA - Honolulu Airports District Office</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roderick Becker</td>
<td>Comptroller</td>
<td>DABS</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Daniel Orodenker</td>
<td>Executive Officer</td>
<td>DBEDT - Land Use Commission</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Luis Salaveria</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>DBEDT</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leo Asuncion</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>DBEDT - Office of Planning</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major General Arthur Logan</td>
<td>Adjutant General</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Virginia Pressler</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>DOH</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alec Wong, P.E.</td>
<td>Branch Chief</td>
<td>DOH - Clean Water Branch</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stuart Yamada, P.E.</td>
<td>Division Chief</td>
<td>DOH - Environmental Management Division</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Laura McIntyre</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>DOH - Environmental Planning Office</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suzanne Case</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>DLNR</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alan Downer</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>DLNR - State Historic Preservation Division</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ford Fuchigami</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Blaine Miyasato</td>
<td>Co-Chairperson</td>
<td>Airlines Committee of Hawai‘i</td>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Turner Maynor</td>
<td>Co-Chairperson</td>
<td>Airlines Committee of Hawai‘i</td>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roderick Aoki</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>AvAirPros</td>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scott Glenn</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>OEQC</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kamanaopono Crabbe</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joey Manahan</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>Honolulu City Council</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kimberly Marcos Pinc</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Honolulu City Council</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ernest Lau, P.E.</td>
<td>Manager and Chief Engineer</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Kroning, P.E.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Design and Construction</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Melvin Kaku</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Emergency Management</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lori Kahikina, P.E.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Services</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>CONSULTATION DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ross Sasamura, P.E.</td>
<td>Director and Chief Engineer</td>
<td>Department of Facility Maintenance</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Michele Nekota</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Department of Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kathy Sokugawa</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>Department of Planning and Permitting</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Manuel Neves</td>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>Honolulu Fire Department</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Cary Okimoto</td>
<td>Acting Chief of Police</td>
<td>Honolulu Police Department</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alan Oshima</td>
<td>President and CEO</td>
<td>HECO</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scott Barber</td>
<td>President and CEO</td>
<td>Hawaiian Telecom</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gregg Fujimoto</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Oceanic Time Warner Cable</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ryan Mandado</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Kalihi-Palama Neighborhood Board No. 15</td>
<td>February 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of written comments and responses:

1. On March 8, 2017, Ms. Rebecca Frager from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) noted that based on the information provided, USACE has determined the proposed activity does not affect the course, capacity, condition or location of a Navigable Water of the U.S. as defined by Section 10 and would not result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404. Therefore, a Department of the Army (DA) permit will not be required. USACE recommended use of BMPs to avoid and minimize impacts to the aquatic resource.

Response: Matson acknowledged that a DA permit will not be required and noted that BMPs will be used throughout implementation of the project. It was also noted that the project will comply with all other Federal, State, or Local statutes, ordinances and regulations.

2. On March 2, 2017, Mr. Aaron Nadig from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service noted that the federally threatened Newell’s shearwater and the threatened Green sea turtle are known threatened or endangered species that may occur or transit through the vicinity of the proposed project area. In addition, seabirds protected under the MBTA such as the Wedge-tailed shearwater, may also occur in the vicinity of the proposed project area. It was additionally noted that there is no designated critical habitat present in the vicinity of the proposed project area. Conservation measures were recommended to avoid or minimize impacts to federally listed species.

Response: Information regarding federally listed species and critical habitats will be considered and the recommended conservation measures will be incorporated into the project design, as applicable. It was noted that the NMFS was consulted and Matson intends to work cooperatively with them to avoid and minimize potential impacts to sea turtles in near-shore and open ocean habitats.

3. On March 2, 2017, Mr. Roderick Becker from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Accounting
and General Services commented that DAGS has no facilities near the project area and has no comments or concerns regarding the project at this time.

Response: Matson acknowledged that DAGS has no comments or concerns regarding the project at this time.

4. On March 7, 2017, Mr. Leo Asuncion from the State of Hawai‘i Office of Planning provided comments related to the applicability of and compliance with HAR Section 11-200-10, HRS Chapter 226, coastal zone management (CZM) area rules and regulations, and special management area (SMA) rules and regulations. It was noted that the project may benefit from reviewing the OP’s Stormwater Impact Assessment document to assist in integrating stormwater impact assessment within the planning and environmental review process of a project.

Response: A discussion of the project’s consistency with various state environmental, social, economic goals, and policies for land use as well as with Chapter 226, the Hawai‘i State Planning Act, is included in this exemption declaration as Appendix A. An assessment of how the project conforms to the goals and objectives of the Hawai‘i CZM program is also provided. It was noted that the DPP was consulted on the project and Matson will continue to work cooperatively with their office and DOT-Harbors regarding all applicable rules and regulations. Additionally, a summary of the potential impact to near-shore marine resources and actions proposed to ensure the coastal ecosystems are protected and potential hazards mitigated is included in this exemption declaration. The OP’s Stormwater Impact Assessment will be used as a resource to identify mitigation measures and BMPs that can be applied to protect water quality and the marine ecosystem.

5. On March 8, 2017 and March 10, 2017, Mr. Alec Wong from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Health Clean Water Branch provided comments related to the applicability and compliance with HAR Chapters 11-54 and 11-55. It was noted that a NPDES permit may be required for discharges of wastewater, including storm water runoff into State surface waters. Coordination with USACE was recommended if the project involves work in, over, or under waters of the U.S. The State’s position on water quality and beneficial uses of State waters in addition to recommendations related to storm water management and protection of water quality was provided.

Response: Matson intends to comply with applicable rules and regulations pertaining to water quality and water quality standards. BMPs will be implemented to ensure no adverse impacts to the aquatic environment or habitat result from the proposed construction activity. Applicable observation/monitoring measures shall also be implemented to properly document the adequacy of the implemented BMPs. Matson acknowledged that a NPDES permit may be required for the proposed project. It was noted that the USACE has been consulted and Matson intends to work cooperatively with their office regarding permitting and regulatory requirements. Guidelines regarding reducing, reusing, and recycling to protect, restore, and sustain water quality and beneficial use of State waters will be considered in project planning efforts and implemented, as applicable.
6. On February 16, 2017, Ms. Laura McIntyre from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Health Environmental Planning Office recommended reviewing State and Federal environmental health land use guidance in the development and implementation of the project. It was noted that projects are required to adhere to all applicable standard comments. It was also recommended that the regulatory requirements of the DOH CWB and USACE be reviewed. Information was provided regarding the availability of the environmental GIS website, Hawai‘i Environmental Health Portal, OEQC viewer, EPA EJSCREEN tool, and projected sea level rise for use during in project planning.

Response: Matson intends to adhere to all applicable standard comments and utilize the resources provided in the review and design of the project. It was noted that the DOH-CWB and the USACE were consulted and Matson intends to work cooperatively with these agencies to fulfill all applicable permitting and regulatory requirements.

7. On March 13, 2017, Mr. Russell Tsuji from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Land and Natural Resources provided comments from the (a) Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation, (b) Office of Conservation & Coastal Lands, and (c) Land Division – O‘ahu District on the project. All offices had no comments. However, the OCCL did note that HDOT-HAR is exempt from Conservation District Rules in commercial harbors pursuant to HRS Section 266-2.2.

Response: Matson acknowledged that DLNR has no comments at this time and notes that DOT-Harbors is exempt from Conservation District Rules in Commercial Harbors pursuant to HRS Section 266-2.2.

8. On March 30, 2017, Mr. Ford Fuchigami from the State of Hawai‘i Department of Transportation provided comments from the (a) Airports Division, (b) Harbors Division, and (c) Highways Division. Airports Division noted the project area is located approximately 1.8 miles from the end of runways 26L and 26R of Honolulu International Airport and that the submittal of FAA Form7460-1 would be required for the project as codified in Title 14, Part 77.9 of the Code of Federal Regulations. It was recommended that all cranes should be stored in the lowest possible position when not in use and crane operational use should be coordinated with HNL Air Traffic Control Tower. In addition, it was noted that it is the duty of the State and County agencies to implement the Technical Advisory Memo related to this project and all projects within 5 miles of an airport. Harbors Division noted their strong support for the proposed action to modernize its commercial harbors and required that Matson continue to coordinate and submit plans for its improvements with HDOT-HAR in compliance with applicable rules and regulations. Mr. Fuchigami noted that the proposed diesel generator set may require an Air Emissions permit and it was recommended that the DOH be contacted to determine their requirements before any such equipment is operational. The applicability of NPDES permit requirements was also noted. Highways Division noted that a Traffic Assessment would be required.


Response: Airports Division (DOT-AIR)

1. Matson acknowledged that the project area is located approximately 1.8 miles from the departure end of runways 8L and 8R of the Daniel K. Inouye International Airport (HNL), formerly known as the Honolulu International Airport.

2. On April 3, 1991, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued Matson a Determination of No Hazard under 14 CFR Part 77. This determination was for a height of 309 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). With the original determination for 309 feet AMSL cranes on Sand Island in 1991 a condition was imposed that Matson, in concert with FAA's Honolulu Control Facility (HCF), establish a letter of agreement when the cranes were operated at full height. This was accomplished and over a period of two decades, the letter of agreement was modified several times. On January 11, 2010 Matson received a letter from the Manager of the HCF rescinding the letter of agreement with no further action required on the part of Matson. The gantry cranes operated by Matson operate at this height today and do so based on this determination.

Based on the need for new cranes and related infrastructure, Matson applied for new determinations on October 22, 2014. The height filed for these determinations was 329 feet AMSL, 20 feet higher than the no hazard determinations issued back in 1991. The FAA determined that a public notice would be required to fully consider Matson's request. This public notice was issued on February 3, 2015. This comment process period was open to both the HDOT and airline industry at HNL. On July 7, 2015, Matson received Determinations of No Hazard to operate cranes at a height of 329 feet AMSL. These determinations have no special requirement for coordination with the Honolulu HCF.

Through this entire process, Matson has enlisted the support of a professional consultant, familiar with rules applicable to United States Code Title 49 and 14 CFR Part 77.

3. Matson understands the duties of the State and County agencies to implement the Technical Advisory Memo (TAM) related to this and all projects within 5 miles of an airport.

Harbors Division (DOT-HAR)

1. Matson acknowledged that a structural analysis has been performed in order for the existing pier superstructure to carry additional loads. As such, Matson will continue to coordinate plans and specifications for its improvements with the DOT-HAR.
2. Complete plans will be submitted and all approvals will be obtained as necessary to meet the DOT-HAR’s requirements and its Capital Advancement Contract requirements in accordance with Hawai‘i Revised Statutes Section 266-19.5.

3. If required, Matson will work cooperatively with the Department of Health to fulfill applicable regulatory requirements before the generator sets are operational.

4. Matson acknowledged a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) may be required for the proposed project and intends to work cooperatively with the DOH toward fulfilling applicable regulatory requirements.

Highways Division (DOT-HWY)

1. A Traffic Assessment (TA) has been prepared for the proposed project. The study concluded that no long term impacts on traffic are anticipated with the project. Proposed improvements are not expected to generate additional trips to the project vicinity due to shifting industry trends towards longer containers which is expected to keep constant or possibly slightly decrease the total number of containers processed at the site.

9. On February 24, 2017, Mr. Ernest Lau from the Board of Water Supply commented that the existing water system is adequate to accommodate the proposed development, but the final decision on the availability of water will be confirmed when the building permit application is submitted for approval. It was also noted that the on-site fire protection requirements should be coordinated with the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Honolulu Fire Department.

Response: Matson acknowledged that the existing water system is adequate to accommodate the proposed development and understands that the final decision on the availability of water is confirmed when a building permit application is submitted for approval. Matson intends to coordinate with the Honolulu Fire Department regarding on-site fire protection requirements.

10. On March 14, 2017, Mr. Robert Kroning from the City and County of Honolulu Department of Design and Construction responded that the DDC has no comments at this time.

Response: Matson acknowledged that the DDC does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

11. On March 8, 2017, Ms. Lori Kahikina from the City and County of Honolulu Department of Environmental Services noted the location of the Hart Street Wastewater Pump Station force mains that run beneath the project site and requested the location of these force mains be disclosed and measures to ensure the force mains are protected from potential ground movement activities be described.

Response: Matson acknowledged the presence of the Hart Street Wastewater Pump Station force mains that run beneath the project site. Matson noted that new piles are proposed to be installed along the landside girder of Piers 51 to 53. The project will be designed to avoid adverse effects
on existing wastewater facilities from pile driving, soil stock piling, soil compaction and other
ground movement activities.

12. On March 2, 2017, Mr. Ross Sasamura from the City and County of Honolulu Department
of Facilities Maintenance responded that DFM has no facilities or easements on the subject
property and has no comments at this time.

Response: Matson acknowledged that DFM does not have any specific comments or concerns at
this time.

13. On March 15, 2017, Ms. Michele Nekota from the City and County of Honolulu Department
of Parks and Recreation responded that the DPR has no comment as the proposed project will
have no impact on any program or facility of the Department.

Response: Matson acknowledged that DFM does not have any specific comments or concerns at
this time.

14. On March 6, 2017, Ms. Kathy Sokugawa from the City and County of Honolulu Department
of Planning and Permitting commented that the project will require a SMA Use Permit pursuant
to ROH Chapter 25 and a Zoning Variance for structures which exceed the 60-foot height limit
in the I-3 Waterfront Industrial District pursuant to ROH Chapter 21. It was requested that a
discussion on sea level rise and its possible implications on the overall operation of the Sand
Island Matson Terminal be included. It was noted that further comment would be provided when
a Draft EA document is submitted.

Response: Matson responded that it will work with the Department of Planning and Permitting
on complying with applicable permitting requirements. A discussion of sea level rise and its
possible implications on the overall operation of the Sand Island Matson Terminal was provided.
The letter noted that after review of possible project impacts, HDOT has determined that the
project is exempt from preparation of an Environmental Assessment under Exemption Class 2,
Item No. 5.

15. On October 2, 2017, Ms. Kathy Sokugawa from the City and County of Honolulu
Department of Planning and Permitting provided a supplemental response based on additional
information received since their letter dated March 6, 2017. The letter notes that the project can
be processed as a minor modification to SMA Permit No. 90/SMA-46 and the project height
could be modified under a Zoning Waiver.

16. On March 7, 2017, Mr. Socrates D. Bratakos from the Honolulu Fire Department provided
comments related to compliance with all applicable codes and standards of the National Fire
Protection Association (NFPA) 1 Uniform Fire Code (UFC)™, 2012 Edition. In addition, it was
requested that civil drawings be submitted to HFD for review and approval.

Response: The project will comply with all applicable codes and standards of the National Fire
Protection Association (NFPA) 1 Uniform Fire Code (UFC)™, 2012 Edition, including
standards related to access roads and water supply. In addition, civil drawings will be submitted for Honolulu Fire Department review and approval during the design phase of the project.

17. On February 21, 2017, Mr. Mark Tsuyemura from the City and County of Honolulu Police Department noted that the project should have no significant impact on the services or operations of the Honolulu Police Department at this time.

Response: Matson acknowledged that the project should have no significant impact on the service or operations of the HPD at this time.

18. On March 3, 2017, Mr. Rouen Liu from Hawaiian Electric Company noted that HECO has no objection to the project and continued access for maintenance of HECO facilities will be needed if there are any existing HECO easements or facilities on the subject property.

Response: Matson acknowledged that HECO has no objection to the project. Matson, in coordination with DOT-Harbors will ensure continued access for maintenance of HECO facilities should there be any existing easements and facilities on the subject property. Matson also intends to keep HECO informed further along in the design process in order to better evaluate the effects of the project on HECO’s system facilities.

19. On March 7, 2017 Mr. Les Loo from Hawaiian Telcom noted that Hawaiian Telcom does not have any comments to offer at this time.

Response: Matson acknowledged that Hawaiian Telcom has not specific comments or concerns at this time.

EXEMPT DECLARATION

The direct, cumulative, and potential impacts of the action described above have been considered pursuant to Chapter 343, Hawaii Revised Statutes and Chapter 11-200, Hawaii Administrative Rules. I declare that the action described above will have minimal or no significant impact on the environment and is therefore exempt from the preparation of an environmental assessment.

FORD L. FUCHIGAMI
Director of Transportation

DATE

☐ This document will be on file in our office and is available for public review.
☐ A copy of this document will be forwarded to the Office of Environmental Quality Control for their record.

c: Darrell Young, Deputy Director-Harbors Division
    HAR-PM
    HAR-DE
RECENT SITE PHOTOS

MATSON TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS (PIERS 51C, 52, AND 53)
APPENDIX A

Discussion of Conformance with Hawai‘i State Plan and Coastal Zone Management Provisions
The following discussion pertains to the relationship of the Hawai‘i State Plan, Chapter 226, HRS, and Coastal Zone Management, Chapter 205A, HRS to the project

**Hawai‘i State Plan**

The Hawai‘i State Plan, Chapter 226, HRS, provides goals, objectives, policies, and priorities for the State. The Hawai‘i State Plan also provides a basis for determining priorities, allocating limited resources, and improving coordination of State and County Plans, policies, programs, projects, and regulatory activities. It establishes a set of themes, goals, objectives, and policies that are meant to guide the State’s long-range growth and development activities. The project is consistent with the following applicable objectives and policies:

Sec. 226-11 Objectives and policies for the physical environment – land-based, shoreline, and marine resources.

(a) Planning for the State’s physical environment with regard to land-based shoreline, and marine resources shall be directed towards achievement of the following objectives:

(1) Prudent use of Hawaii’s land-based, shoreline, and marine resources.

(2) Effective protection of Hawaii’s unique and fragile environmental resources.

(b) To achieve the land-based, shoreline, and marine resources objectives, it shall be the policy of this State to:

(3) Take into account the physical attributes of areas when planning and designing activities and facilities.

(4) Manage natural resources and environs to encourage their beneficial and multiple use without generating costly or irreparable environmental damage.

(6) Encourage the protection of rare or endangered plant and animal species and habitats native to Hawai‘i.

(8) Pursue compatible relationships among activities, facilities, and natural resources.

**Discussion**

The project site sits on piers located along the northwestern shoreline of Sand Island directly adjacent to waters of the Kapalama Basin and the Kapalama Channel. This area, over both land and water, has long been used to support various industrial and commercial harbor activities; including ocean
transportation, ship building & repair, commercial fishing, ocean recreation, and other support industries. The project is consistent with these activities and the existing use of the project site as a marine container terminal.

No short- or long-term direct impacts on surface and/or coastal waters in the project vicinity are anticipated during construction and operation of the project. There are no streams or wetlands on or within proximity to the project site and the project will not involve work within nearby coastal waters. Coordination will be undertaken with the appropriate agencies during permitting and construction to ensure that the project will not result in adverse impacts on surface and coastal waters. Site-specific BMPs will also be implemented to avoid or minimize potential impacts to the marine habitat as a result of land-based activities.

A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water runoff from construction activities may be required for the project. Any discharges related to project construction or operation activities will comply with applicable State Water Quality Standards as specified in Hawai‘i Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-54 and 11-55 Water Pollution Control, Department of Health.

No listed or protected plant species are known to occur in the project area. The project site is completely developed with little suitable area for vegetation growth. Rare, threatened, or endangered fauna are not known to utilize the site for either habitat or foraging purposes. Construction activities may result in direct temporary noise level impacts which may disrupt routine behaviors of faunal species in the immediate vicinity of the project area. However, given the existing high level of activity at the project site, minimal disruption to these species is anticipated. There is no designated critical habitat present in the vicinity of the project.

While there is no evidence of seabird species using the project site for breeding or habitation, some threatened or endangered species are known to occur or transit through the vicinity of the project area, including the federally threatened Newell’s shearwater (Puffinus newelli), and the threatened Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas). In addition, seabirds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) such as the Wedge-tailed shearwater (Puffinus pacificus), may also occur in the vicinity of the project. Potential impacts on federally threatened protected seabird species that may overfly the project area will be mitigated during construction by utilizing fully shielded lights so the bulb can only be seen from below bulb height, thereby eliminating any direct uplight. If large flood/work lights are used during construction, they would be placed on poles that are high enough to allow the lights to be pointed directly at the ground and would utilize the lowest wattage bulbs necessary. To minimize potential impacts to sea turtles in near-shore and open ocean habitats, measures will be developed and in place to minimize debris falling in the marine environment during demolition, removal, and installation of the new cranes. Fueling of project-related vehicles and equipment will take place away from the aquatic
environment and a contingency plan to control petroleum products accidentally spilled during the project will be developed.

Sec. 226-17 Objectives and policies for facility systems – transportation.

(a) Planning for the State’s facility systems with regard to transportation shall be directed towards achievement of the following objectives:

(1) An integrated multi-modal transportation system that services statewide needs and promotes the efficient, economical, safe, and convenient movement of people and goods.

(2) A statewide transportation system consistent with planned growth objectives throughout the state.

(b) To achieve the transportation objectives, it shall be the policy of this State to:

(8) Increase the capacities of airport and harbor systems and support facilities to effectively accommodate transshipment and storage needs.

Discussion

The project involves harbor facility upgrades that are needed to effectively accommodate transshipment of containerized cargo throughout the State. Hawai‘i is highly dependent upon commercial harbors and ocean transportation services to bring in the vast majority of goods essential to sustaining the State’s economies and lifestyles. Within this system, cranes form the critical interface between container ships and the landside container handling facility as they facilitate the receipt of Hawai‘i’s essential cargoes. Therefore, the project improvements are necessary to promote the efficient, economical, safe, and convenient movement of goods.

Hawai‘i Coastal Zone Management Program

The National Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program was created through passage of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. Hawai‘i’s Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program, established pursuant to Chapter 205A, HRS, as amended, is administered by the State Office of Planning (OP) and provides for the beneficial use, protection and development of the State’s coastal zone. The objectives and policies of the Hawai‘i CZM Program encompass broad concerns such as impact on recreational resources, historic and archaeological resources, coastal scenic resources and open space, coastal ecosystems, coastal hazards, and the management of development. The Hawai‘i CZM area includes all lands within the State and the areas seaward to the extent of the State’s management jurisdiction. Hence, the project site is within the CZM area. A discussion of the project’s consistency with the objectives and policies of the CZM Program is provided below.
(1) Recreational Resources

Objective:
Provide coastal recreational opportunities accessible to the public.

Policies:
(A) Improve coordination and funding of coastal recreational planning and management; and
(B) Provide adequate, accessible, and diverse recreational opportunities in the coastal zone management area by:
   (i) Protecting coastal resources uniquely suited for recreational activities that cannot be provided in other areas;
   (ii) Requiring replacement of coastal resources having significant recreational value, including but not limited to surfing sites, fishponds, and sand beaches, when such resources will be unavoidably damaged by development; or requiring reasonable monetary compensation to the state for recreation when replacement is not feasible or desirable;
   (iii) Providing and managing adequate public access, consistent with conservation of natural resources, to and along shorelines with recreational value;
   (iv) Providing an adequate supply of shoreline parks and other recreational facilities suitable for public recreation;
   (v) Ensuring public recreational use of county, state, and federally owned or controlled shoreline lands and waters having recreational value consistent with public safety standards and conservation of natural resources;
   (vi) Adopting water quality standards and regulating point and nonpoint sources of pollution to protect, and where feasible, restore the recreational value of coastal waters.
   (vii) Developing new shoreline recreational opportunities, where appropriate, such as artificial lagoons, artificial beaches, and artificial reefs for surfing and fishing; and
   (viii) Encouraging reasonable dedication of shoreline areas with recreational value for public use as part of discretionary approvals or permits by the land use commission, board of land and natural resources, and county authorities; and crediting such dedication against the requirements of section 46-6.

Discussion
No direct impacts to coastal or recreational resources are anticipated with the construction and operation of the project. The project site sits on piers located along the northwestern shoreline of Sand Island fronting the Kapalama Channel and Kapalama Basin of Honolulu Harbor. The project site has long been used as a marine container terminal facility consistent with the use of the area for industrial and commercial harbor activities. The project would not affect public access to or adversely affect coastal recreational opportunities in the area.
(2) **Historic Resources**

**Objective:**
(A) Protect, preserve and, where desirable, restore those natural and
manmade historic and prehistoric resources in the coastal zone
management area that are significant in Hawaiian and American history
and culture.

**Policies:**
(A) Identify and analyze significant archaeological resources;
(B) Maximize information retention through preservation of remains and
artifacts or salvage operations; and
(C) Support state goals for protection, restoration, interpretation, and display of
historic resources.

**Discussion**
The project is not expected to result in any adverse effects on archaeological
resources and no historic properties are expected to occur in the project area. In
the event of unexpected discovery of historic or archaeological resources,
however, the State Historic Preservation Division will be immediately notified for
appropriate response and action.

(3) **Scenic and Open Space Resources**

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

**Policies:**
(A) Identify valued scenic resources in the coastal zone management area;
(B) Ensure that new developments are compatible with their visual
environment by designing and locating such developments to minimize the
alteration of natural landforms and existing public views to and along the
shoreline;
(C) Preserve, maintain, and, where desirable, improve and restore shoreline
open space and scenic resources; and
(D) Encourage those developments which are not coastal dependent to locate
in inland areas.

**Discussion**
The project is coastal dependent (marine terminal facility) and could not be
located inland. The project is not expected to adversely affect scenic and visual
resources in the project area. The new cranes will replace existing cranes that
currently dominate the visual character of the area and will be placed in the same
location. The vertical components of the crane are consistent with the visual
character of the surrounding industrial uses. The new cranes are expected to be
approximately 20 feet higher than the tallest crane currently used at the project site. This increase in height is marginal when compared to the overall height of the existing structure. The new cranes would still be subordinate to the Honolulu skyline and nearby development within approximately one mile east of the project site. The new cranes would also be subordinate to the mauka backdrop and Diamond Head views from various significant panoramic viewpoints as discussed in the City and County of Honolulu’s Primary Urban Center (PUC) Development Plan.

(4) Coastal Ecosystems

Objective:
(A) Protect valuable coastal ecosystems, including reefs, from disruption and minimize adverse impacts on all coastal ecosystems.

Policies:
(A) Exercise an overall conservation ethic, and practice stewardship in the protection, use, and development of marine and coastal resources;
(B) Improve the technical basis for natural resource management;
(C) Preserve valuable coastal ecosystems, including reefs, of significant biological or economic importance;
(D) Minimize disruption or degradation of coastal water ecosystems by effective regulation of stream diversions, channelization, and similar land and water uses, recognizing competing water needs; and
(E) Promote water quantity and quality planning and management practices that reflect the tolerance of fresh water and marine ecosystems and maintain and enhance water quality through the development and implementation of point and nonpoint source water pollution control measures.

Discussion
The project site sits on piers located along the northwestern shoreline of Sand Island fronting the Kapalama Basin and Kapalama Channel of Honolulu Harbor.

No short- or long-term impacts on surface and/or coastal waters in the project vicinity are anticipated during construction and operation of the project. There are no streams or wetlands on or within proximity to the project site and the project will not involve work within nearby coastal waters. Coordination will be undertaken with the appropriate agencies during permitting and construction to ensure that the project will not result in adverse impacts on surface and coastal waters. Site-specific BMPs will also be implemented to avoid or minimize any potential impacts to the marine habitat as a result of land-based activities.

A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water runoff from construction activities may be required for the project. Any discharges related to project construction or operation activities will comply with
applicable State Water Quality Standards as specified in Hawaii’s Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-54 and 11-55 Water Pollution Control, Department of Health. As applicable provisions of the County’s grading ordinance pertaining to excavation and grading will be adhered to.

(5) **Economic Uses**

**Objective:**
(A) Provide public or private facilities and improvements important to the State’s economy in suitable locations.

**Policies:**
(A) Concentrate coastal dependent development in appropriate areas;
(B) Ensure that coastal dependent developments such as harbors and ports, and coastal related development such as visitor facilities and energy generating facilities, are located, designed, and constructed to minimize adverse social, visual, and environmental impacts in the coastal zone management area; and
(C) Direct the location and expansion of coastal dependent developments to areas presently designated and used for such developments and permit reasonable long-term growth at such areas, and permit coastal dependent development outside of presently designated areas when:
   (i) Use of presently designated locations is not feasible;
   (ii) Adverse environmental effects are minimized; and
   (iii) The development is important to the State’s economy.

**Discussion**
The project site has historically been used for the transshipment of essential cargo throughout the state. In the long-term, the project will provide efficient ocean transportation services that support a critical life line for Hawaii’s economy.

(6) **Coastal Hazards**

**Objectives:**
(A) Reduce hazard to life and property from tsunami, storm waves, stream flooding, erosion, subsidence, and pollution.

**Policies:**
(A) Develop and communicate adequate information about storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, subsidence, and point and nonpoint source pollution hazards;
(B) Control development in areas subject to storm wave, tsunami, flood, erosion, hurricane, wind, subsidence, and point and nonpoint pollution hazards;
(C) Ensure that developments comply with requirements of the Federal Flood Insurance Program;
(D) Prevent coastal flooding from inland projects.

Discussion
According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), (Community Panel Number 0353G) prepared by FEMA, the landside portion of the project site is designated Zone X, an area determined to be outside of the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. There are no base flood elevations or depths shown within this zone. Narrow portions of the project site along the shoreline, including parts of the piers, are designated Zone AE, which is an area subject to the 1% annual chance (100-year) flood. The base flood elevations in this area range between 5 feet and 8 feet. The project site is located 9 feet above mean sea level.

In the short- and long-term, no significant impacts on flood hazards in the project area are anticipated as the improvements are not expected to increase flood risks or cause any adverse flood-related impacts at the project site or lower elevation properties.

(7) Managing Development

Objective:
(A) Improve the development review process, communication, and public participation in the management of coastal resource and hazards.

Policies:
(A) Use, implement, and enforce existing law effectively to the maximum extent possible in managing present and future coastal zone development;
(B) Facilitate timely processing of applications for development permits and resolve overlapping or conflicting permit requirements; and
(C) Communicate the potential short- and long-term impacts of proposed significant coastal developments early in their life cycle and in terms understandable to the public to facilitate public participation in the planning and review process.

Discussion
The consultation process for this project has provided information regarding the project to facilitate public participation in the planning and review process.

(8) Public Participation

Objective:
(A) Stimulate public awareness, education, and participation in coastal management.

Policies:
(A) Promote public involvement in coastal zone management processes;
(B) Disseminate information on coastal management issues by means of educational materials, published reports, staff contact, and public workshops for persons and organizations concerned with coastal issues, developments, and government activities; and

(C) Organize workshops, policy dialogues, and site-specific mediations to respond to coastal issues and conflicts.

Discussion
The consultation process for this project provided opportunities to submit comments on the project. The site has been developed and used as a marine terminal facility for several decades. The project will not alter the character or use of the area as such. Additional review of the project will occur in the planning and permitting phase of the project.

(9) Beach Protection

Objective:
(A) Protect beaches for public use and recreation.

Policies:
(A) Locate new structures inland from the shoreline setback to conserve open space, minimize interference with natural shoreline processes, and minimize loss of improvements due to erosion;

(B) Prohibit construction of private erosion-protection structures seaward of the shoreline, except when they result in improved aesthetic and engineering solutions to erosion at the sites and do not interfere with existing recreational and waterline activities; and

(C) Minimize the construction of public erosion-protection structures seaward of the shoreline.

Discussion
The project site sits on piers located along the northwestern shoreline of Sand Island fronting the Kapalama Basin and the Kapalama Channel of Honolulu Harbor. The new cranes are not intended as an erosion-protection structure and no hardening of the shoreline is proposed. The project is consistent with existing uses of the shoreline to operate dockside cranes. No seaward structures beyond the existing condition are proposed.

(10) Marine Resources

Objective:
(A) Promote the protection, use, and development of marine and coastal resources to assure their sustainability.
Policies:
(A) Ensure that the use and development of marine and coastal resources are environmentally sound and economically beneficial;
(B) Coordinate the management of marine and coastal resources and activities to improve effectiveness and efficiency;
(C) Assert and articulate the interests of the State as a partner with federal agencies in the sound management of ocean resources within the United States exclusive economic zone;
(D) Promote research, study, and understanding of ocean processes, marine life, and other ocean resources in order to acquire and inventory information necessary to understand how ocean development activities relate to and impact upon ocean and coastal resources; and
(E) Encourage research and development of new, innovative technologies for exploring, using, or protecting marine and coastal resources.

Discussion
The project site sits on piers located on the northwestern shoreline of Sand Island fronting the Kapalama Basin and the Kapalama Channel of Honolulu Harbor.

No short- or long-term direct impacts on surface and/or coastal waters in the project vicinity are anticipated during construction and operation of the project. There are no streams or wetlands on or within proximity to the project site and the project will not involve work within nearby coastal waters. Coordination will be undertaken with the appropriate agencies during permitting and construction to ensure that the project will not result in adverse impacts on surface and coastal waters. Site-specific BMPs will also be implemented to avoid or minimize any potential impacts on the marine habitat as a result of land-based activities.

A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for storm water runoff from construction activities may be required for the project. Any discharges related to project construction or operation activities will comply with applicable State Water Quality Standards as specified in Hawai‘i Administrative Rules, Chapter 11-54 and 11-55 Water Pollution Control, Department of Health. Excavation and grading activities will be regulated by provisions of the County’s grading ordinance, as applicable.
APPENDIX B

Traffic Assessment
Mr. Paul Johnescu  
Vice President, Facilities and Equipment Engineering  
Matson Terminals, Inc.  
1411 Sand Island Parkway  
Honolulu, HI 96813  

Subject: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51C, 52, and 53)  
Traffic Assessment  
Sand Island, Oahu, HI

Dear Mr. Johnescu,

As requested, we have conducted a traffic assessment of the proposed facility improvements at the Matson terminal facility located at Piers 51C, 52, and 53 on Sand Island, to assess potential impacts to existing traffic operations in the vicinity of the project site. The following is a summary of our assessment.

The proposed project entails replacing and upgrading existing cranes currently located at the Matson terminal facility. The planned improvements are needed to modernize harbor facilities and replace aging harbor equipment nearing the end of its operational lifespan. Replacing the cranes is anticipated to maintain and improve crane reliability while preventing potential disruptions in commercial harbor activities. In addition, taller cranes with greater outreach and lift height are needed to service the new, larger Aloha and Kanaloa Class ships joining Matson’s existing Hawaii fleet. Two new vessels are expected to be operational by the second half of 2018 with the remaining vessels added by year 2020. As such, Matson plans to replace three aging dockside cranes with three new cranes and demolish a fourth crane at Piers 51C, 52, and 53. In addition, an existing crane will be relocated on-site from Pier 52/53 to 51C. Associated infrastructure improvements are also planned to support the installation of the new cranes including an upgrade to the electrical system that powers the cranes and improvements to existing tie-down systems that stabilize the crane structure.

Project Location

The Matson terminal facility is located on Sand Island, Oahu, which serves as a gateway to the Honolulu Harbor. The facility occupies the northwest portion of Sand Island with access provided via multiple driveways off Sand Island Parkway which transitions to Sand Island
Access Road near the Bascule Bridge. The driveway designated for cargo trucks (hereinafter referred to as the “cargo driveway”) that serve the piers affected by the proposed project (Piers 51C, 52, and 53) is located northeast of the Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Facility. At this T-intersection, the eastbound approach of Sand Island Parkway consists of two through lanes and one left-turn lane, while the westbound approach consists of one shared through and right-turn lane. The southbound approach is comprised of the cargo driveway which has one stop-controlled lane that serves right and left-turn movements. Figure 1 shows the project location.

**Field Investigation**

Field investigations were conducted on May 11, 2017. This consisted of manual turning counts at the project driveway during the commuter peak hours between 6:00 AM and 9:00 AM in the morning and 3:00 PM and 6:00 PM in the afternoon and a survey of traffic operations at the controlled cargo access gate located within the terminal facility. The existing traffic count data is included in the attachments.

**Capacity Analysis Methodology**

The highway capacity analysis performed in this study is based upon procedures presented in the “Highway Capacity Manual,” Transportation Research Board, 2000, and the “Synchro” software, developed by Trafficware. The analysis is based on the concept of Level of Service (LOS) to identify the traffic impacts associated with traffic demands during the peak periods of traffic.

LOS is a quantitative and qualitative assessment of traffic operation. Levels of Service are defined by LOS “A” through “F”; LOS “A” representing ideal or free-flow traffic operating conditions and LOS “F” unacceptable or potentially congested traffic operating conditions.

**Existing Conditions**

Manual turning movement counts conducted at the intersection of Sand Island Parkway with the subject driveway suggests that the peak hours at this intersection occur between 6:00 AM and 7:00 AM in the morning and between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM in the afternoon. At this intersection, Sand Island Parkway carries 876 vehicles eastbound and 290 vehicles westbound during the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the overall traffic volume is lower, with 327 vehicles traveling eastbound and 573 vehicles traveling westbound. The eastbound left-turn
lane operates at LOS “B” during both peak periods. The project driveway carries 74 vehicles southbound during the AM peak period and 109 vehicles during the PM peak period. This approach operates at LOS “B” and LOS “D” during the AM and PM peak period, respectively. Traffic queues occasionally formed on the eastbound approach of Sand Island Parkway with the most significant queuing occurring during the AM peak period. During this time period, average queue lengths of 1-4 heavy vehicles were observed with a maximum queue length of 7 heavy vehicles along the left-turn lane leading to the project driveway.

Internal Operations

Trucks entering the Matson facility via the cargo driveway pass through two check points. Immediately upon entering, security personnel verify driver identification, a process that was observed to take not more than a few seconds. Approximately 400 feet after this initial security checkpoint is the processing station which is comprised of three lanes per direction. According to information provided by a representative from Matson Terminals Inc. (herein referred to as “Matson”), Lane 1 processes trucks with cargo to drop off while Lanes 2 and 3 are designated for trucks carrying empty containers (MTs). Based on field observations, trucks in Lane 2 took an average of 2 – 3 minutes to be processed while trucks in Lanes 2 and 3 took an average of 1 – 2 minutes. If queuing at the processing station extends to the adjacent roadway due to longer processing time or a high influx of vehicles, Matson typically reroutes trucks on-site to reduce on-site queue lengths and prevent blockage of the adjacent roadway. It should be noted that the distance between the two check points is approximately 400 feet.

Through Traffic Forecasting Methodology

The through traffic forecast is based upon historical traffic count data obtained from the State Department of Transportation (DOT), Highways Division at survey stations located in the vicinity of the project site. The historical data indicates a stable or declining growth in traffic and as such, an annual traffic growth rate of approximately 1.0% was conservatively assumed in the project vicinity. Using 2017 as the Base Year, a growth factor of 1.03 was applied to the existing demands in the project vicinity to achieve the projected Year 2020 traffic demands.

Projected Traffic Conditions

As previously discussed, the proposed project entails replacing and upgrading existing cranes along Piers 51C, 52, and 53 to modernize harbor facilities, replace aging harbor equipment, and accommodate the larger containerships joining Matson’s existing fleet. These improvements include replacing three aging dockside cranes with three new cranes; demolishing a fourth crane; relocating an existing crane on-site; and other associated infrastructure upgrades needed to support the cranes. While the new cranes are expected to have an increased outreach and lift height from the existing cranes, Matson anticipates that the new crane’s productivity will remain
similar to existing conditions and as such, the number of containers that can be processed by each crane is not expected to change. In addition, the total number of cranes at Piers 51C, 52, and 53 will be reduced by one crane and as such, the number of ships that can be serviced at one time is not expected to increase.

It should also be noted that although Matson plans to add larger vessels to its fleet, they also plan to reduce their fleet size from 11 ships to 9 ships. Since the larger Aloha and Kanaloa Class ships have a carrying capacity that is 40 percent greater than the existing ships, Matson is able to meet their customer demand with fewer vessels. In addition, a study conducted by Matson projects an overall decrease in the number of containers processed through the facility by 2020. Matson currently offers shipping services for four container sizes (20, 24, 40, and 45 feet). Although the standard 20 foot container is commonly used, the shipping industry has noticed a trend towards consolidation of shipments using longer containers. The study anticipates that customer demand for 40 and 45 feet containers will increase by 2020 thus resulting in an overall decrease in the total number of containers shipped. As a result of these anticipated changes in Matson’s fleet and shipping industry trends, the total number of containers processed at the site is expected to decrease with trucks entering and exiting the facility also projected to decrease. However, for the purpose of this study, the number of site-generated vehicles accessing the project site was conservatively assumed to remain similar to existing conditions. As such, the Year 2020 project conditions represent traffic operations without and with project conditions. Table 1 below summarizes the cumulative AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions with the proposed improvements at the Matson Terminal Piers 51C, 52, and 53. The analysis incorporates the anticipated ambient growth in traffic in the vicinity. The existing operating conditions are provided for comparison purposes.

Table 1: Existing and Projected Year 2020 LOS Traffic Operating Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Approach/ Critical Movement</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand Island Parkway/Cargo Driveway</td>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>LT-RT</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the traffic data, the following are recommendations of this study to be incorporated during the design phase of the project:

1. Provide sufficient turning radii at the cargo driveway to accommodate all vehicles to avoid or minimize vehicle encroachments to oncoming traffic lanes. With the anticipated
industry trends favoring longer container sizes, vehicles servicing these containers are also expected to increase in size.

2. Provide adequate space for on-site vehicle queuing to accommodate the anticipated changes in vehicle volume and size accessing the site.

3. Consider preparing a Traffic Management Plan for the Matson terminal to formalize procedures to ensure that on-site operations and queuing do not affect the adjacent public roadways.

Assessment Summary

The proposed project entails replacing three of the existing cranes with three new cranes, demolishing a fourth crane, and relocating an existing crane on site at Piers 51C, 52, and 53. In addition, associated infrastructure improvements are also planned to support the new cranes. The improvements are needed to modernize harbor facilities, replace aging harbor equipment and accommodate the new, larger vessels joining the Matson fleet. An assessment of the proposed improvements showed that the productivity of the new cranes is expected to remain similar to existing conditions, while shipping industry trends towards longer containers and anticipated changes to Matson’s fleet size is expected to reduce the total number of containers processed at the site. As such, the proposed improvements are not expected to generate additional trips to the project vicinity. With the implementation of the aforementioned recommendations, the traffic operations in the project vicinity are expected to remain similar to existing conditions.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 808-946-2277.

Sincerely,

Cathy Leong, PE

Enclosures:   Existing Traffic Count Data
             Capacity Analysis Calculations
## Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 S. Beretania Street Suite 400
Honolulu, HI 96826

Counted By: GH, BE  
Counter: TU-0650, D4-5673  
Weather: Clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Printed: Unshifted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matson Driveway</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southbound</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:15 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:45 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total %              | 12.0 | 0  | 263   | 1    | 276      | 0    | 713 | 53   | 0    | 766     | 0    | 330 | 1499 | 0    | 1829     | 0    | 2871 |
| Approach %                 | 4.3  | 0  | 95.3  | 0.4  | 94.6     | 0    | 93.1| 6.9  | 0    | 76.6    | 0    | 18.2| 82   | 0    | 15.8     | 0    | 2871 |
| Total %                    | 9.4  | 0  | 9.2   | 9.5  | 27.9     | 0    | 24.8| 1.6  | 0    | 26.7    | 0    | 11.5| 52.2 | 0.5   | 63.7     | 0    | 945  |

### Peak Hour Analysis
- **Start Time:** 06:00 AM to 06:45 AM
- **Peak Hour:** 08:00 AM
- **Volume:** 879 PHV
- **Percentage:** 63.7%

### Peak Hour Analysis for Entire Intersection
- **Start Time:** 06:00 AM
- **Peak Hour:** 08:00 AM
- **Volume:** 879 PHV
- **Percentage:** 63.7%
## Wilson Okamoto Corporation

1907 S. Borotania Street Suite 400
Honolulu, HI 96829

Counted By: GH, BE
Counter: TU-0650, D4-5673
Weather: Clear

---

### Group Printout: Unshaded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:30 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sand Island Driveway

#### Southbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Westbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:30 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Northbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sand Island Driveway

#### Eastbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Masuino Driveway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sand Island Driveway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Northbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:30 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:45 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Sand Island Driveway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Eastbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:15 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Peak Hour Analysis from 03:00 PM to 05:45 PM - Peak 1 of 1

**Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 03:00 PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % App Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Thru</th>
<th>R-Hlt</th>
<th>Peds</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

#### 4: Sand Island Pkwy & Matson Cargo Dwy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Volume (Veh/h)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pedestrians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lane Width (ft)</th>
<th>Walking Speed (ft/s)</th>
<th>Percent Blockage</th>
<th>Right turn flare (veh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median storage veh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream signal (ft)</td>
<td>pX, platoon unblocked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC, conflicting volume</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, single (s)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, 2 stage (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p0 queue free %</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cM capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Direction, Lane #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction, Lane #</th>
<th>EB 1</th>
<th>EB 2</th>
<th>EB 3</th>
<th>WB 1</th>
<th>SB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

| Average Delay | 2.0 |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 37.7% |
| ICU Level of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |

---
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### HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

#### 4: Sand Island Pkwy & Matson Cargo Dwy

**7/5/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Volume (Veh/h)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Speed (ft/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blockage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn flare (veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median storage veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream signal (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pX, platoon unblocked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC, conflicting volume</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, single (s)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, 2 stage (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tF (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p0 queue free %</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cM capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction, Lane #</th>
<th>EB 1</th>
<th>EB 2</th>
<th>EB 3</th>
<th>WB 1</th>
<th>SB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- Average Delay: 3.5
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 43.8%  ICU Level of Service A
- Analysis Period (min): 15

---

PM Existing Peak Hour of Traffic
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# HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

## 4: Sand Island Pkwy & Matson Cargo Dwy

### 7/5/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Volume (Veh/h)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly flow rate (vph)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Speed (ft/s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Blockage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right turn flare (veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median storage veh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream signal (ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pX, platoon unblocked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC, conflicting volume</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC1, stage 1 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vC2, stage 2 conf vol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vCu, unblocked vol</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, single (s)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tC, 2 stage (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tF (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p0 queue free %</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cM capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction, Lane #</th>
<th>EB 1</th>
<th>EB 2</th>
<th>EB 3</th>
<th>WB 1</th>
<th>SB 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Summary

| Average Delay             | 2.0  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 38.2% |
| ICU Level of Service      | A    |
| Analysis Period (min)     | 15   |

---

Year 2020 AM Peak Hour
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## HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis
### 4: Sand Island Pkwy & Matson Cargo Dwv

#### Lane Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WER</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Volume (Veh/h)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sign Control

- Free

#### Grade

- 0%

#### Peak Hour Factor

- 0.88

#### Hourly flow rate (vph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WER</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking Speed (ft/s)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pedestrians

- Lane Width (ft)
- Walking Speed (ft/s)
- Percent Blockage
- Right turn flares (veh)

#### Median type

- None

#### Median storage veh

#### Upstream signal (ft)

#### pX, platoon unblocked

### vC,

- vC1, stage 1 conf vol: 569
- vC2, stage 2 conf vol: 652

### tC, unblocked vol

- tC, single (s): 5.7
- tC, 2 stage (s): 8.4

### tF (s)

- 3.0
- 4.1

### p0 queue free %

- 93
- 98
- 55

### cM capacity (veh/h)

- 543
- 154
- 267

#### Direction, Lane #

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EB1</th>
<th>EB2</th>
<th>EB3</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>SB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Left</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cSH</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume to Capacity</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay (s)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

- Average Delay: 3.6
- Intersection Capacity Utilization: 44.6%
- ICU Level of Service: A
- Analysis Period (min): 15
APPENDIX C

Form 7460-1 Determinations
**DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION**

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

- **Structure:** Crane East 1
- **Location:** Honolulu, HI
- **Latitude:** 21-18-50.33N NAD 83
- **Longitude:** 157-52-56.89W
- **Heights:**
  - 9 feet site elevation (SE)
  - 320 feet above ground level (AGL)
  - 329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(RED),& 12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

- [ ] At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)
- [X] Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

- (a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-257-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8065-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498422-257053975
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.13 nautical miles (NM) east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published, with 1A certified survey.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abeam Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H20), or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianalee Highway until passing abeam Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

Structure: Crane East 2  
Location: Honolulu, HI  
Latitude: 21-18-46.42N NAD 83  
Longitude: 157-52-57.61W  
Heights: 9 feet site elevation (SE)  
320 feet above ground level (AGL)  
329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Read),& 12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

_____ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)  
____X____ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-267-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8066-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498423-257053721  (DNH)
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
Additional information for ASN 2014-AWP-8066-OE

The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.13 nautical miles (NM) east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 12 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published, with 1A certified survey.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abeam Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201, or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianaole Highway until passing abeam Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Case Description for ASN 2014-AWP-8066-OE

Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
**DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION**

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

Structure: Crane East 3  
Location: Honolulu, HI  
Latitude: 21-18-48.81N NAD 83  
Longitude: 157-52-47.52W  
Heights: 9 feet site elevation (SE)  
320 feet above ground level (AGL)  
329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Red),& 12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

- At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)  
- X Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-267-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8067-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498424-257052958
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.28 nautical miles (NM) east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published, with TA certified survey.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abeam Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201, or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianaole Highway until passing abeam Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Case Description for ASN 2014-AWP-8067-OE

Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION **

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

- **Structure:** Crane East 4
- **Location:** Honolulu, HI
- **Latitude:** 21-18-45.05N NAD 83
- **Longitude:** 157-52-49.15W
- **Heights:**
  - 9 feet site elevation (SE)
  - 320 feet above ground level (AGL)
  - 329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Red),&12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

- [X] Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-267-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8068-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498425-257051930
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.26 nautical miles (NM) northeast of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published, with 1A certified survey.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04L/08R Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abeam Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201, or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianoale Highway until passing abeam Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Case Description for ASN 2014-AWP-8068-OE

Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
**DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION**

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

Structure: Crane East 5  
Location: Honolulu, HI  
Latitude: 21-18-37.20N NAD 83  
Longitude: 157-52-29.48W  
Heights: 9 feet site elevation (SE)  
320 feet above ground level (AGL)  
329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Red),&12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

X At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)  
___ At 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-267-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantial adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8069-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498426-257050712 (DNH)
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
Additional information for ASN 2014-AWP-8069-OE

The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.58 nautical miles (NM) northeast of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (msl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet msl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abreast Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201, or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianaole Highway until passing abreast Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Case Description for ASN 2014-AWP-8069-OE

Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
**DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION**

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

Structure: Crane East 6  
Location: Honolulu, HI  
Latitude: 21-18-33.93N NAD 83  
Longitude: 157-52-31.88W  
Heights: 9 feet site elevation (SE)  
320 feet above ground level (AGL)  
329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure would have no substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on the operation of air navigation facilities. Therefore, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, it is hereby determined that the structure would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s) is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 K Change 2, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Red),&12.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

- [ ] At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)  
- [X] Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

Any height exceeding 320 feet above ground level (329 feet above mean sea level), will result in a substantial adverse effect and would warrant a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation.

This determination expires on 01/07/2017 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is subject to review if an interested party files a petition that is received by the FAA on or before August 06, 2015. In the event a petition for review is filed, it must contain a full statement of the basis upon which it is made and be submitted to the Manager, Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Ave, SW, Room 423, Washington, DC 20591.

This determination becomes final on August 16, 2015 unless a petition is timely filed. In which case, this determination will not become final pending disposition of the petition. Interested parties will be notified of the grant of any review. For any questions regarding your petition, please contact Airspace Regulations & ATC Procedures Group via telephone -- 202-267-8783 - or facsimile 202-267-9328.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration, including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

This aeronautical study considered and analyzed the impact on existing and proposed arrival, departure, and en route procedures for aircraft operating under both visual flight rules and instrument flight rules; the impact on all existing and planned public-use airports, military airports and aeronautical facilities; and the cumulative impact resulting from the studied structure when combined with the impact of other existing or proposed structures. The study disclosed that the described structure would have no substantive adverse effect on air navigation.

An account of the study findings, aeronautical objections received by the FAA during the study (if any), and the basis for the FAA's decision in this matter can be found on the following page(s).
If we can be of further assistance, please contact Karen McDonald, at (310) 725-6557. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8070-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498427-257045650 (DNH)
Mike Helvey
Manager, Obstruction Evaluation Group

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Case Description
Map(s)
The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways. Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.56 nautical miles (NM) northeast of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.
AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abreast Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201), or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianaole Highway until passing abreast Koko Head. Maintain 1500 feet while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.
- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
Case Description for ASN 2014-AWP-8070-OE

Permanent cranes, Matson Terminals. Cranes are used on Berth 52 & western half of Berth 53. Site map uploaded; tracks depicted in yellow are shown on map but not filed.
** DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AIR NAVIGATION ** (REVISED)

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and if applicable Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77, concerning:

Structure: Crane East 1  
Location: Honolulu, HI  
Latitude: 21-18-50.33N NAD 83  
Longitude: 157-52-56.89W  
Heights: 9 feet site elevation (SE)  
320 feet above ground level (AGL)  
329 feet above mean sea level (AMSL)

This aeronautical study revealed that the structure does exceed obstruction standards but would not be a hazard to air navigation provided the following condition(s), if any, is(are) met:

As a condition to this Determination, the structure is to be marked/lighted in accordance with FAA Advisory circular 70/7460-1 L Change 1, Obstruction Marking and Lighting, paint/red lights - Chapters 3(Marked),4,5(Red),&12.

Any failure or malfunction that lasts more than thirty (30) minutes and affects a top light or flashing obstruction light, regardless of its position, should be reported immediately to (877) 487-6867 so a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) can be issued. As soon as the normal operation is restored, notify the same number.

It is required that FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, be e-filed any time the project is abandoned or:

_____ At least 10 days prior to start of construction (7460-2, Part 1)  
___X___ Within 5 days after the construction reaches its greatest height (7460-2, Part 2)

See attachment for additional condition(s) or information.

This determination expires on 02/10/2019 unless:

(a) the construction is started (not necessarily completed) and FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, is received by this office.
(b) extended, revised, or terminated by the issuing office.
(c) the construction is subject to the licensing authority of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and an application for a construction permit has been filed, as required by the FCC, within 6 months of the date of this determination. In such case, the determination expires on the date prescribed by the FCC for completion of construction, or the date the FCC denies the application.

NOTE: REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF THIS DETERMINATION MUST BE E-FILED AT LEAST 15 DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE. AFTER RE-EVALUATION OF CURRENT OPERATIONS IN THE AREA OF THE STRUCTURE TO DETERMINE THAT NO SIGNIFICANT AERONAUTICAL CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED, YOUR DETERMINATION MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR ONE EXTENSION OF THE EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

This determination is based, in part, on the foregoing description which includes specific coordinates, heights, frequency(ies) and power. Any changes in coordinates, heights, and frequencies or use of greater power except those frequencies specified in the Colo Void Clause Coalition; Antenna System Co-Location; Voluntary Best Practices, effective 21 Nov 2007, will void this determination. Any future construction or alteration including increase to heights, power, or the addition of other transmitters, requires separate notice to the FAA. This determination includes all previously filed frequencies and power for this structure.

This determination does include temporary construction equipment such as cranes, derricks, etc., which may be used during actual construction of the structure. However, this equipment shall not exceed the overall heights as indicated above. Equipment which has a height greater than the studied structure requires separate notice to the FAA.

This determination concerns the effect of this structure on the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of compliance responsibilities relating to any law, ordinance, or regulation of any Federal, State, or local government body.

If we can be of further assistance, please contact our office at (907) 271-5863, or robert.van.haastert@faa.gov. On any future correspondence concerning this matter, please refer to Aeronautical Study Number 2014-AWP-8065-OE.

Signature Control No: 232498422-340528563 (EBO)
Robert van Haastert
Specialist

Attachment(s)
Additional Information
Map(s)
Revision

2014-AWP-8065 through 8070-OE were originally issued Determination of No Hazard letters on 7 July 2015. The Determinations have expiration dates of 7 January 2017 and were subject to review if an interested party filed a petition that would have been received by the FAA on or before 6 August 2015.

Actual construction notices have been received by the FAA on 31 January 2017 indicating construction on the piers for the new harbor cranes has started. The extension letters issued on 3 March 2017 and on 27 April 2017 were issued in error. This action vacates the extension letters and restores the original Determination.

--------------- Original Determination Additional Remarks -----------------------------

The project, submitted by Matson Terminals, Inc., constructs ten permanent 320-ft above ground level (agl), stowed height container crane locations used on a track on Berth 51, 52 and 53, Piers 51A and 51B on the north side of Sand Island, Honolulu, Hawaii. The crane stowed height is described as the highest point the tip of the container crane arm can reach vertically above the container crane while working on loading and offloading cargo from the ship in the berth. Sand Island is east of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) runways.

Sand Island has historically been used for permanent container crane use to offload cargo from ships at these Piers; and a view of the satellite map shows existing images of container cranes running on tracks on the north running northeast of the island. The project filing is to accommodate replacement container crane heights in accordance with new physical design standards of manufactured container cranes.

The FAA attempted negotiation with the sponsor to lower the height of the cranes. These cranes are on a track for the purpose of unloading containers from cargo ships, and the overall stowed height could not be lowered.

The sponsor has uploaded certified 1A surveys of the latitude/longitude points for each of the ten location filings of this project.

Each of the ten locations will be issued an individual final airspace determination.

The site point for this specific crane location is approximately 2.56 nautical miles (NM) northeast of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL) airport reference point (ARP). The HNL Field Elevation (FE) is 13 feet above mean sea level (amsl). HNL is the closest civilian public-use landing area. The site elevation of this site point is 9 feet amsl.

The structure height exceeds the obstruction standards of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 77 as follows:

Section 77.17(a)(2) by 116 feet, a height more than 200 feet above the HNL Field Elevation, within 3 nautical miles of the ARP.

Section 77.19(a) by 166 feet, a height exceeding the HNL Horizontal Surface.

Details of the proposal were distributed via the Public Notice process in order to gather aeronautical information from interested aviation users and other members of the public. A comment was received from Hawaiian
Airlines objecting to the cranes based on their one engine inoperative (OEI) departure path for commercial aircraft departing Honolulu (HNL) Runway 08L.

FAA Response: Airspace determinations issued under Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 77 do not consider OEI departure paths. The FAA is considering the feasibility of protecting a single OEI path per runway at participating airports, but any policy changes have not been finalized at this time.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE EFFECT UPON THE OPERATION OF AN AIR NAVIGATION AID:

- None.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE INSTRUMENT FLIGHT RULES (IFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR arrival/departure routes, operations, or procedures. RWY 08R, required climb gradient is less than currently published.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR en route routes, operations, or procedures.

- The proposal would have no effect on any existing or proposed IFR minimum flight altitudes.

AERONAUTICAL STUDY FOR POSSIBLE VISUAL FLIGHT RULES (VFR) EFFECT DISCLOSED THE FOLLOWING:

- The proposal would have minimal effect on any existing or proposed VFR arrival or departure routes, operations or procedures.

HONOLULU TERMINAL AREA - VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES RESPONSIBILITIES

VFR CLASS B DEPARTURE ROUTES WILL BE ISSUED ONLY UPON REQUEST. Detailed departure instructions will be furnished to others. All procedures and altitudes described in this letter are subject to weather and traffic conditions. Pilots are not relieved of their responsibilities to see and avoid other traffic, to maintain appropriate terrain and obstruction clearance, and to remain in weather conditions equal to or better than the minima required by FAR 91.155. When compliance with an assigned route, heading, or altitude is likely to compromise pilot responsibility with respect to terrain, obstruction clearance, and/or weather minima, approach control should be so advised.

DEPARTURE PROCEDURES

Runway 04/08L Procedures
Shoreline Four Departure
Departing runways 4 maintain runway heading to the H-1 freeway. Departing runway 8L maintain runway heading to Nimitz Highway. Turn right, parallel Nimitz Highway proceeding direct to the center of Honolulu Harbor. Fly one mile offshore passing abeam Kewalo Basin thence direct to one mile due south of Diamond Head. Turn left and resume own navigation, remaining within 2 miles of the shoreline until departing the Class B. Maintain 1500 feet while within CLASS B.

Runway 04L/04R
Freeway Six Departure
Depart runway 04L or 04R on runway heading to Moanalua Freeway (State Highway 78/Interstate Highway H201, or depart runway 08L and turn left to fly parallel to runway 04L or Moanalua Road. Then turn Right to follow Moanalua Road eastbound to H-1 Freeway and Kalanianaole Highway until passing abeam Koko Head. Maintain 1500 while in Class B.

VFR Pilots flying the Shoreline Four or the Freeway Six departure routes would be expected to be at or above see and avoid obstruction clearance altitudes when passing near or above these obstruction marked and lighted container cranes.

- The proposal would not conflict with airspace required to conduct normal VFR traffic pattern operations at any known public use or military airports, including HNL. Aircraft at normal Traffic Pattern altitudes and standard rates of descent, flying in accordance with FAR 91, have reasonable clearance above these structures, in a VFR see and avoid environment, as they have been able to avoid the existing container cranes on this northern boundary of Sand Island.

- The proposal would not penetrate those altitudes normally considered available to airmen for VFR en route flight.

- The structure shall be appropriately obstruction paint marked for daytime and red obstruction lighted to make it more conspicuous to airmen flying in VFR weather conditions between sunset and sunrise.

The cumulative impact of the proposed structure, when combined with other existing structures is not considered significant. Study did not disclose any adverse effect on existing or proposed public-use or military airports or navigational facilities. Nor would the proposal affect the capacity of any known existing or planned civilian public-use or military airport.

Therefore, it is determined that the proposed construction would not have a substantial adverse effect on the safe and efficient utilization of the navigable airspace by aircraft or on any air navigation facility and would not be a hazard to air navigation.

This determination, issued in accordance with Part 77, concerns the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by aircraft and does not relieve the sponsor of any compliance responsibilities relating to laws, ordinances, or regulations of any Federal, state, or local governmental bodies.

Determinations, which are issued in accordance with Part 77, do not supersede or override any state, county, or local laws, avigation easements, or ordinances, or local zoning maximum heights.
APPENDIX D

Consultation Documentation
March 8, 2017

SUBJECT: No Permit Required for Matson Terminal Improvements Piers 51 B/C, 52 and 53, Oahu, Hawaii; Department of the Army Permit POH-2017-00042

Attn: Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suit 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

We have received your letter dated February 15, 2017 requesting a determination of permitting requirements for the proposed Matson Terminal Improvements Piers 51 B/C, 52 and 53, Oahu, Hawaii. We have assigned your project Department of the Army (DA) file number POH-2017-00042. Please reference this number in all future correspondence concerning this project.

We have reviewed your submittal pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (Section 10) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404). Section 10 requires that a DA permit be obtained for certain structures or work in or affecting navigable waters of the United States, prior to conducting the work (33 U.S.C. 403). Section 404 requires that a DA permit be obtained for the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands and navigable waters of the U.S., prior to conducting the work (33 U.S.C. 1344).

Based on our review of the information you furnished, and assuming your project is conducted only as set forth in the information provided, this office has determined the proposed activity does not affect the course, capacity, condition, or location of a Navigable Water of the U.S. as defined by Section 10 and would not result in the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404. Therefore, a DA permit will not be required.

Although a permit is not required from this office, we recommend use of Best Management Practices to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to the aquatic resource. It is your responsibility to ensure that your project complies with all other Federal, State, or local statutes, ordinances and regulations.

Thank you for your cooperation with the Honolulu District Regulatory Program. Should you have any questions related to this determination, please contact me at 808-835-4307 or Rebecca.M.Frager@usace.army.mil. You are encouraged to provide comments on your experience with the Honolulu District Regulatory Office by accessing
our web-based customer survey form at

Sincerely,

Becca Frager
Biologist
Project Manager

Enclosure(s)

cc:
State of Hawaii DOH-CWB (Darryl Lum)
October 12, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Frager
Biologist and Project Manager
Department of the Army
Honolulu District
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Fort Shafter, Hawai’i 96858-5440

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O’ahu, Hawai’i

Dear Ms. Frager:

Thank you for your letter dated March 8, 2017 (POH-2017-00042) regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that based on your review, a Department of the Army (DA) permit will not be required. We intend to use Best Management Practices throughout implementation of the project and will ensure that the project complies with all other Federal, State, or Local statutes, ordinances and regulations.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Subject: Technical Assistance for the Matson Terminal Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53 Proposed Site Improvements, Oahu

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) received your letter, dated February 13, 2017, requesting technical assistance for performing your environmental review for your project. The Wilson Okamoto Corporation (on behalf of Matson Inc.) is proposing to create improvements to its terminal facility located on Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53 on the northwestern portion of Sand Island on Oahu. The proposed improvements include demolition and removal of four existing cranes, relocating one crane, and installing up to four new cranes. The improvements also include upgrading the electrical and civil infrastructure, installing a new diesel generator set, and upgrading the existing crane tie down system utilizing existing piles. The Service offers the following comments to assist you in your planning process so that impacts to trust resources can be avoided. Our comments are provided under the authorities of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act [16 U.S.C. 703-712] (MBTA).

Based on the information in our database and records, including data provided by the Hawaii Biodiversity and Mapping Project, the following are known threatened or endangered species that occur or transit through the vicinity of your proposed project area: the federally threatened Newell’s shearwater (Puffinus newelli) and the threatened Green sea turtle (Chelonia mydas). In addition, seabirds protected under the MBTA such as the Wedge-tailed shearwater (Puffinus pacificus), may also occur in the vicinity of the proposed project area. There is no designated critical habitat present in the vicinity of the proposed project area.

**Newell’s shearwater and Wedge-tailed shearwater**

Hawaiian seabirds may traverse the project area at night during the breeding season. Outdoor lighting could result in seabird disorientation, fallout, and injury or mortality. Seabirds are attracted to lights and after circling the lights they may collide with nearby wires, buildings, or other structures or they may land on the ground due to exhaustion. Downed seabirds are subject to increased mortality due to collision with automobiles, starvation, and predation by dogs, cats, and other predators. Young birds
(fledglings) traversing the project area between September 15 and December 15, in their first flights from their mountain rests to the sea, are particularly vulnerable. To minimize potential project impacts to seabirds during their breeding season, all outdoor lights should be fully shielded so the bulb can only be seen from below bulb height and only used when necessary. Automatic motion sensor switches and controls should be installed on all outdoor lights or lights should be turned off when human activity is not occurring in the lighted area. Any increase in night-time lighting, particularly during each year’s peak fallout period (September 15 through December 15), could result in seabird injury or mortality. Nighttime construction should be avoided during the seabird fledging period, September 15 through December 15.

The Service consults on sea turtles and their use of terrestrial habitats (beaches where nesting and/or basking is known to occur), whereas the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) consults on sea turtles and their use of off-shore and open ocean habitats. We recommend that you consult with NMFS regarding the potential impacts from the proposed project to sea turtles in near-shore and open ocean habitats.

To minimize potential impacts to the marine habitat adjacent to the project site, there should be measures developed and in place to minimize debris falling in the marine environment during demolition, removal, and installation of the new cranes. A salvage plan should be developed during the planning process to address the potential for this to occur. Fueling of project-related vehicles and equipment should take place away from the aquatic environment and a contingency plan to control petroleum products accidentally spilled during the project should be developed. The plan should be retained on site with the person responsible for compliance with the plan. Absorbent pads and containment booms should be stored on-site to facilitate the clean-up of accidental petroleum releases.

If additional information becomes available, or it is determined that the proposed project may affect federally listed species, we recommend you coordinate with our office early in the planning process so that we may further assist you with Endangered Species Act compliance.

We appreciate your efforts to conserve listed species and native habitats. Please contact Stacey Lowe, Fish and Wildlife Biologist (phone: 808-792-9400, email: stacey_lowe@fws.gov) should you have any questions pertaining to this response or require further guidance. When referring to this project, please include this reference number: 01EPIF00-2017-TA-0149.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Aaron Nadig
Island Team Manager
Oahu, Kauai, Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, and American Samoa
Mr. Aaron Nadig  
Island Team Manager  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office  
300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room 3-122  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96850  

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)  
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i  

Dear Mr. Nadig:

Thank you for the technical assistance provided by letter dated March 2, 2017 (01EPIF00-2017-TA-0149) for the subject project. We appreciate the information regarding federally listed species and critical habitats within the vicinity of the proposed project area. In addition to this information, several conservation measures were recommended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to avoid and minimize project impacts to listed species as well as to marine habitat adjacent to the project site. We will consider this information and the conservation measures provided for incorporation into the project design, as applicable.

We have consulted with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and intend to work cooperatively with them to avoid and minimize potential impacts to sea turtles in near-shore and open ocean habitats.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP  
Project Manager  

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 7, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa
Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 S. Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Pre-Assessment Consultation for Environmental Assessment – Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)
TMKs: (1) 1-5-041:111 (por), (1) 1-5-041:313, and (1) 1-5-041:321 (por)

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this pre-assessment consultation request for the preparation of a Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) on the Matson Terminal Improvements at Honolulu Harbor for Piers 51, 52, and 53. The pre-consultation review material was transmitted to our office via letter dated February 10, 2017.

It is our understanding that Matson, Inc. is proposing improvements to its terminal facilities in Honolulu Harbor at Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53. Planned improvements to these piers include the demolition and removal of four of the seven existing shipping container lifting cranes; the relocation of one crane; the installation of four new cranes; the upgrade of electrical and civil infrastructure; and the installation of a new diesel generator.

The Office of Planning (OP) has reviewed the transmitted material and has the following comments to offer:

1. Pursuant to Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) § 11-200-10(4) – general description of the action’s technical, economic, social, and environmental characteristics; this project must demonstrate that it is consistent with a number of state environmental, social, economic goals, and policies for land use. Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) Chapter 226, the Hawaii State Planning Act provides goals, objectives, policies, and priority guidelines for growth, development, and the allocation of resources throughout the state in areas of state interest.

The analysis on the Hawaii State Planning Act should also include a discussion on the project’s ability to meet all of the goals, objectives, policies, and priority guidelines or clarify where it is in conflict with them. If any of these themes are not applicable to
the project, the Draft EA should affirmatively state such determination.

2. The coastal zone management (CZM) area is defined as “all lands of the State and the area extending seaward from the shoreline to the limit of the State’s police power and management authority, including the U.S. territorial sea” (see HRS § 205A-1).

HRS § 205A-5(b) requires all state and county agencies to enforce the CZM objectives and policies. The Draft EA should include an assessment as to how the proposed action conforms to the goals and objectives of the Hawaii CZM program as listed in HRS § 205A-2. Compliance with HRS § 205A-2 is an important component for satisfying the requirements of HRS Chapter 343.

3. The proposed project site is located within the special management area (SMA). Please consult with the Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP), City and County of Honolulu for the regulatory requirements on SMA use.

This project is located within a harbor facility. Please consult with DPP to determine whether there are any shoreline setback requirements for the subject parcel pursuant to HRS §§ 205A-43, 205A-43.5, and 205A-43.6.

4. Pursuant to HAR § 11-200-10 – the identification and summary of impacts and alternatives considered; in order to ensure that the natural resources and coastal areas within the State of Hawaii remain protected, the Draft EA should summarize the potential impact to nearshore marine resources and actions proposed to ensure the coastal ecosystems are protected and potential hazards mitigated. The marine water quality classification, should be considered when developing mitigation measures to protect the coastal ecosystem. The Draft EA should detail proposed safeguards and best management practices (BMP) used to protect water quality, and prevent sediment, soils, and construction debris from impacting the marine ecosystem.

This project may benefit from reviewing OP’s Stormwater Impact Assessment. This document can be used to identify and evaluate information on hydrology, stressors, sensitivity of aquatic and riparian resources, and management measures to control runoff occurrences. Mitigation measures and BMPs listed in this document can be applied to water runoff strategies to prevent damage to coastal ecosystems. This document will assist in integrating stormwater impact assessment within the planning and environmental review process of a project. The document can be found at
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa  
Planner  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
March 7, 2017  
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If you have any questions regarding this comment letter, please contact Joshua Hekekia of our office at (808) 587-2845.

Sincerely,

Leo R. Asuncion  
Director
October 12, 2017

Mr. Leo R. Asuncion
Director
Office of Planning
State of Hawai‘i
P.O. Box 2359
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Asuncion:

Thank you for your letter dated March 7, 2017 (P-15512) regarding the subject project. This letter confirms:

1. Project documents will include a discussion of the project’s consistency with various state environmental, social, economic goals, and policies for land use as well as with Chapter 226, the Hawai‘i State Planning Act.

2. Project documents will include an assessment as to how the project conforms to the goals and objectives of the Hawai‘i CZM program as listed in HRS §205A-2.

3. The City and County of Honolulu Department of Planning and Permitting (DPP) has been consulted on the project. We will continue to work cooperatively with their office and DOT-Harbors regarding all applicable rules and regulations.

4. A summary of the potential impact to nearshore marine resources and actions proposed to ensure the coastal ecosystems are protected and potential hazards mitigated will be included in project documents. We appreciate the information on the OP’s Stormwater Impact Assessment and will use this resource to identify mitigation measures and BMPs that can be applied to protect water quality and the marine ecosystem.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400  
Honolulu, Hawaii  96826  

Dear Ms. Candilasa:  

Subject: Pre-Assessment Consultation for Environmental Assessment for  
Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)  
Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii  

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject project. The Department of  
Accounting and General Services’ has no facilities in or near the project area and we have no  
comments or concerns regarding this project at this time.  

If you have any questions, your staff may call Ms. Gayle Takasaki of the Public Works Division  
at 586-0584.  

Sincerely,  

RODERICK K. BECKER  
Comptroller  

Attachment
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Mr. Roderick K. Becker
Comptroller
Department of Accounting and General Services
State of Hawai‘i
P.O. Box 119
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96810-0119

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Becker:

Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2017 ((P)1057.7) regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that the Department of Accounting and General Services does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa  
Planner  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826  

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Comments on the Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements Project (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)  
Honolulu, Island of Oahu, Hawaii

The Department of Health (DOH), Clean Water Branch (CWB), acknowledges receipt of your letter, received February 13, 2017, requesting comments on your project. The DOH-CWB has reviewed the document and offers these comments. Please note that our review is based solely on the information provided in the subject document and its compliance with the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapters 11-54 and 11-55. You may be responsible for fulfilling additional requirements related to our program. We recommend that you also read our standard comments on our website at: http://health.hawaii.gov/epo/files/2013/05/Clean-Water-Branch-Std-Comments.pdf.

1. Any project and its potential impacts to State waters must meet the following criteria:

   a. Antidegradation policy (HAR, Section 11-54-1.1), which requires that the existing uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses of the receiving State water be maintained and protected.

   b. Designated uses (HAR, Section 11-54-3), as determined by the classification of the receiving State waters.

   c. Water quality criteria (HAR, Sections 11-54-4 through 11-54-8).

2. You may be required to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit coverage for discharges of wastewater, including storm water runoff, into State surface waters (HAR, Chapter 11-55).
For NPDES general permit coverage, a Notice of Intent (NOI) form must be submitted at least 30 calendar days before the commencement of the discharge. An application for an NPDES individual permit must be submitted at least 180 calendar days before the commencement of the discharge. To request NPDES permit coverage, you must submit the applicable form ("CWB Individual NPDES Form" or "CWB NOI Form") through the e-Permitting Portal and the hard copy certification statement with the respective filing fee ($1,000 for an individual NPDES permit or $500 for a Notice of General Permit Coverage). Please open the e-Permitting Portal website located at: https://eha-cloud.doh.hawaii.gov/epermit/. You will be asked to do a one-time registration to obtain your login and password. After you register, click on the Application Finder tool and locate the appropriate form. Follow the instructions to complete and submit the form.

3. If your project involves work in, over, or under waters of the United States, it is highly recommended that you contact the Army Corp of Engineers, Regulatory Branch (Tel: 835-4303) regarding their permitting requirements.

Pursuant to Federal Water Pollution Control Act [commonly known as the "Clean Water Act" (CWA)], Paragraph 401(a)(1), a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) is required for "[a]ny applicant for Federal license or permit to conduct any activity including, but not limited to, the construction or operation of facilities, which may result in any discharge into the navigable waters..." (emphasis added).
The term "discharge" is defined in CWA, Subsections 502(16), 502(12), and 502(6); Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Section 122.2; and HAR, Chapter 11-54.

4. Please note that all discharges related to the project construction or operation activities, whether or not NPDES permit coverage and/or Section 401 WQC are required, must comply with the State's Water Quality Standards. Noncompliance with water quality requirements contained in HAR, Chapter 11-54, and/or permitting requirements, specified in HAR, Chapter 11-55, may be subject to penalties of $25,000 per day per violation.

5. It is the State's position that all projects must reduce, reuse, and recycle to protect, restore, and sustain water quality and beneficial uses of State waters. Project planning should:

a. Treat storm water as a resource to be protected by integrating it into project planning and permitting. Storm water has long been recognized as a source of irrigation that will not deplete potable water resources. What is often overlooked is that storm water recharges ground water supplies and feeds streams and estuaries; to ensure that these water cycles are not disrupted, storm water
cannot be relegated as a waste product of impervious surfaces. Any project planning must recognize storm water as an asset that sustains and protects natural ecosystems and traditional beneficial uses of State waters, like community beautification, beachgoing, swimming, and fishing. The approaches necessary to do so, including low impact development methods or ecological bio-engineering of drainage ways must be identified in the planning stages to allow designers opportunity to include those approaches up front, prior to seeking zoning, construction, or building permits.

b. Clearly articulate the State’s position on water quality and the beneficial uses of State waters. The plan should include statements regarding the implementation of methods to conserve natural resources (e.g., minimizing potable water for irrigation, grey water re-use options, energy conservation through smart design) and improve water quality.

c. Consider storm water Best Management Practice (BMP) approaches that minimize the use of potable water for irrigation through storm water storage and reuse, percolate storm water to recharge groundwater to revitalize natural hydrology, and treat storm water which is to be discharged.

d. Consider the use of green building practices, such as pervious pavement and landscaping with native vegetation, to improve water quality by reducing excessive runoff and the need for excessive fertilization, respectively.

e. Identify opportunities for retrofitting or bio-engineering existing storm water infrastructure to restore ecological function while maintaining, or even enhancing, hydraulic capacity. Particular consideration should be given to areas prone to flooding, or where the infrastructure is aged and will need to be rehabilitated.

If you have any questions, please visit our website at: http://health.hawaii.gov/cwb, or contact the Engineering Section, CWB, at (808) 586-4309.

Sincerely,

Alec Wong

ALEC WONG, P.E., CHIEF
Clean Water Branch

NN:ak

c: DOH-EPO #17-037 [via e-mail Noella.Narimatsu@doh.hawaii.gov only]
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa
Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Water Pollution Control Requirements in the State of Hawaii for Matson Terminal Improvements at Piers 51 B/C, 52 and 53 Honolulu, Island of Oahu, Hawaii
DA File No. POH-2017-00042

The Department of Health (DOH), Clean Water Branch (CWB) is given the responsibility of water pollution control in the State of Hawaii under the authorization of Federal Clean Water Act (CWA); Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), Chapter 342D; and Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapters 11-54 (titled Water Quality Standards (WQS)) and 11-55 (titled Water Pollution Control). HRS, Subsection 342D-50(a) requires that: "No person, including any public body, shall discharge any water pollutant into state waters, or cause or allow any water pollutant to enter state waters except in compliance with this chapter, rules adopted pursuant to this chapter, or a permit or variance issued by the director." As defined in HRS, Section 342D-1, the term "Water pollutant" means dredged spoil, solid refuse, incinerator residue, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical waste, biological materials, radioactive materials, heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, soil, sediment, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste.

The DOH-CWB has received a copy of a letter from the Regulatory Office of the Honolulu District, Pacific Ocean Division (POH) of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), dated March 8, 2017, which stated that a Department of the Army (DA) permit will not be required for the subject project. Although a DA permit is not required, any water pollutant discharges to State waters from your project construction and/or operation related activities is required by State law to comply with applicable HRS, Chapter 342D and HAR, Chapters 11-55 and 11-54 requirements.
The DCH-CWB is providing you and your client, Matson Terminals, Inc., with the following comments for your information and appropriate actions:

1. The Matson Terminals, Inc. must be informed and ensures that the proposed construction activity will be conducted in accordance with information submitted to the POH. A CWA, Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) may be required if a DA permit is required by the POH in the future due to any unforeseen reasons.

2. Any project and its potential impacts to State waters must comply with State WQS in HAR, Chapter 11-54. It is Matson Terminals, Inc. and your responsibility to ensure that the proposed project will not violate applicable State WQS. HAR, Chapter 11-54 (Effective November 15, 2014) is located on the DOH-CWB website at: http://health.hawaii.gov/cwb/files/2013/04/Clean_Water_Branch_HAR_11-54_20141115.pdf.

3. Design, implement, operate, and maintain Best Management Practices or BMPs to collect, isolate and confine the introduction of pollutants from entering/re-entering receiving State waters. BMPs are schedules of activities, prohibitions or designations of practices, maintenance procedures, treatment requirements, operating procedures, management practices, structural and nonstructural controls. BMPs shall be applied before, during, and after pollution-producing activities.

4. Applicable observation/monitoring measures should be established and implemented to properly document the adequacy of the implemented BMPs and ensure that there will be no adverse impacts to the aquatic environment/habitat resulting from the proposed construction activity.

5. The proposed construction activity related potential water pollutant discharges may be required to obtain National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit coverage for discharges of wastewater, including storm water runoff, into State surface waters (HAR, Chapter 11-55). Construction related activities that require NPDES permit coverage include, but are not limited to, land disturbance activities (e.g. clearing, grading, grubbing, uprooting of vegetation, stockpiling, staging, and demolition on a foundation) that disturb one (1) acre or more of total land area; hydrotesting effluent discharges to State waters, and dewatering effluent discharges to State waters. All operational related discharges to State waters (e.g. cooling water, wastewater, wash water, etc.) require NPDES permit coverage.
For NPDES general permit coverage, a Notice of intent (NOI) form must be submitted at least 30 calendar days before the commencement of the discharge. An application for a NPDES individual permit must be submitted at least 180 calendar days before the commencement of the discharge. To request NPDES permit coverage, you must submit the applicable form ("CWB Individual NPDES Form" or "CWB NOI Form") through the e-Permitting Portal and the hard copy certification statement with the respective filing fee ($1,000 for an individual NPDES permit or $500 for a Notice of General Permit Coverage). Please open the e-Permitting Portal website located at: https://eha-cloud.doh.hawaii.gov/epermit. You will be asked to do a one-time registration to obtain your login and password. After you register, click on the Application Finder tool and locate the appropriate form. Follow the instructions to complete and submit the form.

As a reminder, HRS, §342D-50(a) requires that:

"§342D-50 Prohibition. (a) No person, including any public body, shall discharge any water pollutant into state waters, or cause or allow any water pollutant to enter state waters except in compliance with this chapter, rules adopted pursuant to this chapter, or a permit or variance issued by the director."

Please include the following certification statement in all future correspondence with the DOH for the subject project:

"I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations."
If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Edward Chen of the Engineering Section, CWB. at (808) 586-4309.

Sincerely,

ALEC WONG, P.E., CHIEF
Clean Water Branch

EC: bk
c: Dr. Wendy Wiltse, PICO, EPA [via e-mail Wiltse.Wendy@epa.gov only]
   Regulatory Office, USACE [via e-mail cemoh-ro@usace.army.mil only]
   Mr. Tunis McElwain, USACE [via e-mail Tunis.W.McElwain@usace.army.mil only]
   Ms. Becca Frager, POH, COE [via e-mail Rebecca.M.Frager@usace.army.mil only]
   Mr. John Nakagawa, CZM Program, OP, DBEDT
      [via e-mail JNakagawa@dbedt.hawaii.gov only]
   Mr. John Frackrell, Matson Terminals, Inc. [via e-mail JFackrell@matson.com only]
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October 12, 2017

Mr. Alec Wong, P.E.
Chief
Clean Water Branch
Department of Health
State of Hawai‘i
P.O. Box 3376
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96801-3378

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Wong:

Thank you for your letters dated March 8, 2017 (03005PNN.17) and March 10, 2017 (03017CEC.17) regarding the subject project. We would like to provide the following response to your letters.

1. We appreciate the information provided on the applicability of the Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapters 11-54 and 11-55 and any other additional requirements related to your program. We intend to comply with applicable rules and regulations pertaining to water quality.

2. We acknowledge that National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit coverage for the discharges of wastewater, including storm water runoff, into State surface waters may be required for the proposed project.

3. We have consulted the Army Corps of Engineers during the consultation phase and intend to work cooperatively with their office regarding permitting requirements.

4. All discharges related to project construction or operation will comply with the State’s water quality standards. Best Management Practices or BMPs will be implemented to ensure no adverse impacts to the aquatic environment/habitat result from the proposed construction activity. Applicable observation/monitoring measures shall also be implemented to properly document the adequacy of the implemented BMPs.

5. Guidelines set forth in your letter with regard to an emphasis on reducing, reusing, and recycling to protect, restore, and sustain water quality and beneficial use of State waters will be considered in project planning efforts and implemented, as applicable.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
February 16, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Eeretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment Consultation for Environmental Assessment (PAC EA) Matson Terminal Improvements – Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53

The Department of Health (DOH), Environmental Planning Office (EPO), acknowledges receipt of your PAC EA to our office on February 13, 2017.

We understand from the PAC EA that “Matson, Inc. is proposing improvements to its terminal facilities located at Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53 on the northwestern portion of Sand Island in order to service new vessels that will be added to the Matson container ship fleet as early as 2018. Proposed improvements include demolishing and removing four of the seven existing cranes, relocating a single crane, and installing three to four new larger cranes. Associated improvements involve upgrading the electrical and civil infrastructure and installing a new diesel generator set.”

In the development and implementation of all projects, EPO strongly recommends regular review of State and Federal environmental health land use guidance. State standard comments and available strategies to support sustainable and healthy design are provided at: http://health.hawaii.gov/eppo/landuse. Projects are required to adhere to all applicable standard comments.

EPO has recently updated the environmental Geographic Information System (GIS) website page. It now compiles various maps and viewers from our environmental health programs. The eGIS website page is continually updated so please visit it regularly at: http://health.hawaii.gov/eppo/egis.

EPO also encourages you to examine and utilize the Hawaii Environmental Health Portal at: https://eha-cloud.ohc.hawaii.gov. This site provides links to our e-Permitting Portal, Environmental Health Warehouse, Groundwater Contamination Viewer, Hawaii Emergency Response Exchange, Hawaii State and Local Emission Inventory System, Water Pollution Control Viewer, Water Quality Data, Warnings, Advisories and Postings.

We suggest you review the requirements of the Clean Water Branch (HAR, Section 11-54-1.1, -3, 4-8) and/or the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (HAR, Chapter 11-55) at: http://health.hawaii.gov/cwb. If you have any questions, please contact the Clean Water Branch, Engineering Section at (808) 586-4309 or cleanwaterbranch@ohc.hawaii.gov. If your project involves waters of the U.S., it is highly recommended that you contact the Army Corps of Engineers, Regulatory Branch at: (808) 835-4303.

You may also wish to review the draft Office of Environmental Quality Control (OEQC) viewer at: http://eha-web.ohc.hawaii.gov/oequc_viewer. This viewer geographically shows where some previous Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA) (Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 343) documents have been prepared.
In order to better protect public health and the environment, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed a new environmental justice (EJ) mapping and screening tool called EJSCREEN. It is based on nationally consistent data and combines environmental and demographic indicators in maps and reports. EPO encourages you to explore, launch and utilize this powerful tool in planning your project. The EPA EJSCREEN tool is available at: http://www.epa.gov/ejscreen.

Hawaii's climate is changing. Sea level rise and the associated coastal impacts have the potential to harm an array of natural and built environments in Hawaii. For additional information on projected sea level rise in Hawaii, EPO recommends that you visit the following informative links:

- University of Hawaii, Manoa, School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology, Coastal Geology Group: http://www.soest.hawaii.edu/coasts/index.html
- US Environmental Protection Agency – Climate Impacts on Coastal Areas: https://www.epa.gov/climate-impacts/climate-impacts-coastal-areas

We request that you utilize all of this information on your proposed project to increase sustainable, innovative, inspirational, transparent and healthy design. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Mahalo nui loa,

[Signature]
Laurie Leialoha Phillips McIntyre, AICP
Program Manager, Environmental Planning Office

LM:nn

Attachment 1: Environmental Health Management Web App Snip of Project Area: http://health.hawaii.gov/epovqgis
Attachment 2: Clean Water Branch: Water Quality Standards Map
Attachment 3: Wastewater Branch: Recycled Water Use Map of Project Area
Attachment 4: OEOC viewer (of past EA’s, EIS’s in area)
Attachment 5: U.S. EPA EJSCREEN Report for Project Area

c: DOH: CWB, HEER (via email only)
Attachment 5: U.S. EPA EJSCREEN Report for Project Area

**EJSCREEN Report (Version 2016)**

1 mile Ring Centered at 21.311711,-157.878247, HAWAII, EPA Region 9.

Approximate Population: 6,500

Input Area (sq. miles): 3.14

Matson Terminal Improvements (The study area contains 1 blockgroup(s) with zero population.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Variables</th>
<th>State Percentile</th>
<th>EPA Region Percentile</th>
<th>USA Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for PM2.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Ozone</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for NATA Diesel PM</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for NATA Air Toxics Cancer Risk</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for NATA Respiratory Hazard Index</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Traffic Proximity and Volume</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Lead Paint Indicator</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Superfund Proximity</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for RMP Proximity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Hazardous Waste Proximity</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Index for Water Discharger Proximity</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EJ Index for the Selected Area Compared to All People’s Blockgroups in the State/Region/US**

This map shows the results for environmental demographics and EJSCREEN indicators. The data shown was obtained from the EPA’s Environmental Health Initiative (EHII) and the American Community Survey (ACS) and other sources. The data is at the block-group level, which means that only 5 percent of the US population has a higher block-group EJSCREEN score than the average person in the location being assessed. The sources used vary across these indicators. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, and the results can’t be used to make policy or regulatory decisions. Please refer to the EJSCREEN documentation for discussion of caveats and uncertainties.

February 18, 2013
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EJSCREEN Report (Version 2016)

1 mile Ring Centered at 21°31’17.11’’-157°6’8.62’’W, HAWAII, EPA Region 9.
Approximate Population: 6,500
Input Area (sq. miles): 3.14

Mapson Terminal Improvements (The study area contains 1 blockgroup(s) with zero population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites reporting to EPA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superfund NPL</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDF)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Indicators</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM2.5 in μg/m³)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (ppb)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Diesel PM (μg/m³)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Cancer Risk (lifetime risk per million)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Respiratory Hazard Index</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Proximity and Volume (daily traffic count/distance to road)</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Paint Indicator (% of households)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfund Proximity (near or far)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 Proximity (facility count/km distance)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Discharge Proximity (facility count/km distance)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Indicators**

- **Demographic Index**: 64%<br>52%<br>60%<br>47%<br>77%<br>36%<br>87%
- **Minority Population**: 95%<br>77%<br>70%<br>58%<br>82%<br>37%<br>90%
- **Low Income Population**: 45%<br>28%<br>89%<br>36%<br>65%<br>35%<br>70%
- **Linguistically Isolated Population**: 31%<br>6%<br>88%<br>6%<br>94%<br>5%<br>97%
- **Population With Less Than High School Education**: 23%<br>9%<br>94%<br>17%<br>68%<br>14%<br>80%
- **Population Under 5 years of age**: 5%<br>6%<br>37%<br>7%<br>36%<br>6%<br>39%
- **Population over 65 years of age**: 14%<br>15%<br>48%<br>13%<br>67%<br>14%<br>59%

*The National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) is EPA's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. EPA developed the NATA to identify and prioritize areas for further study. It is important to remember that NATA rankings and EPA region rankings are subject to uncertainty. Further details can be found at [http://www.epa.gov/nata](http://www.epa.gov/nata). For additional information, see: [www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice](http://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice).*
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Ms. Laura Leialoha Phillips McIntyre, AICP
Program Manager
Environmental Planning Office
Department of Health
State of Hawai‘i
P.O. Box 3378
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96801-3378

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. McIntyre:

Thank you for your letter dated February 16, 2017 (EPO 17-037) regarding the subject project. We appreciate your recommendation to review State and Federal environmental health land use guidance in the development and implementation of the project. We intend to adhere to all applicable standard comments. Thank you also for the information provided regarding the environmental GIS website, Hawai‘i Environmental Health Portal, OEQC viewer, EPA EJSCREEN tool, and projected sea level rise. These resources will be useful in the review and design of the project.

We have consulted the Clean Water Branch and the Army Corps of Engineers and intend to work with them toward fulfilling all applicable regulatory requirements.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
Attention: Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826
reandilasa@wilsonokamoto.com

March 13, 2017

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment Consultation for Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the subject matter. The Department of Land and Natural Resources' (DLNR) Land Division distributed or made available a copy of your report pertaining to the subject matter to DLNR Divisions for their review and comments.

At this time, enclosed are comments from the (a) Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation, (b) Office of Conservation & Coastal Lands, and (c) Land Division – Oahu District on the subject matter. Should you have any questions, please feel free to call Lydia Morikawa at 587-0410. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Russell Y. Tsuji
Land Administrator

Enclosure(s)
cc: Central Files
MEMORANDUM

TO: DLNR Agencies:
   X Div. of Boating & Ocean Recreation
   X Engineering Division
   - Div. of Forestry & Wildlife
   - Div. of State Parks
   X Commission on Water Resource Management
   X Office of Conservation & Coastal Lands
   X Land Division – Oahu District
   X Historic Preservation

FROM: Russell Y. Tsuiji, Land Administrator

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment consultation for Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)

LOCATION: Sand Island, Island of Oahu; TMK: (1) 1-4-041:111

APPLICANT: Matson, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment is information on the above-referenced project. We would appreciate your comments on this project. Please submit any comments by March 8, 2017.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact Lydia Morikawa at 587-0410. Thank you.

Attachments

( ) We have no objections.
( ) We have no comments.
( ) Comments are attached.

Signed: [Signature]

Print Name: [Name]

Date: [Date]

cc: Central Files
MEMORANDUM

TO: Land

FROM: Russell Y. Tsuji, Land Administrator

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment consultation for Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)

LOCATION: Sand Island, Island of Oahu; TMK: (1) 1A-041:111 and 313

APPLICANT: Matson, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment is information on the above-referenced project. We would appreciate your comments on this project. Please submit any comments by March 8, 2017.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact Lydia Morikawa at 587-0410. Thank you.

Attachments

( ) We have no objections.
( ) We have no comments.
( ) Comments are attached.

Signed: [Signature]

Print Name: K. Tyler Mills
Date: 2/17/2017

cc: Central Files

*Pursuant to HRS, § 266-2.2 DOT-Ports is exempt from Conservation District Rules in Commercial Harbors
MEMORANDUM

TO: DLNR Agencies:
   - Div. of Aquatic Resources
   - Div. of Boating & Ocean Recreation
   - Engineering Division
   - Div. of Forestry & Wildlife
   - Div. of State Parks
   - Commission on Water Resource Management
   - Office of Conservation & Coastal Lands
   - Land Division - Oahu District
   - Historic Preservation

FROM: Russell Y. Tsuji, Land Administrator

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment consultation for Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53) - REVISED

LOCATION: Sand Island, Island of Oahu; TMK: (1) 1-5-041:111,185, 313, 320, & 321 (portions)

APPLICANT: Matson, Inc.

Transmitted for your review and comment is information on the above-referenced project. We would appreciate your comments on this project. Please submit any comments by March 10, 2017.

If no response is received by this date, we will assume your agency has no comments. If you have any questions about this request, please contact Lydia Morikawa at 587-0410. Thank you.

Attachments

( ) We have no objections.
( ) We have no comments.
( ) Comments are attached.

Signed: Darlen J. Bryan-Takamatsu
Print Name: Darlen J. Bryan-Takamatsu
Date: 2/22/17

cc: Central Files
October 12, 2017

Mr. Russell Y. Tsuji
Land Administrator
Land Division
Department of Land and Natural Resources
State of Hawai‘i
P.O. Box 621
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96809

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Tsuji:

Thank you for your letter dated March 13, 2017 regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that the Division of Boating and Ocean Recreation, Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands, and Land Division-O‘ahu district do not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

We additionally note that pursuant to HRS §266-2.2, the Department of Transportation, Harbors Division (HDOT-HAR) is exempt from Conservation District Rules in Commercial Harbors.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa  
Planner  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 South Beretania Street  
Artesian Plaza, Suite 400  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826  

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52 and 53)  
Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation  
Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii  
TMK: (1) 1-5-041:313

Our Department of Transportation’s (DOT) comments on the subject project are as follows:

Airports Division (DOT-AIR)

1. The Matson Terminal Improvements area is located approximately 1.8 miles from the end of runways 26L and 26R of the Honolulu International Airport (HNL).

2. Installation of structures that may penetrate the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) air space at the HNL, pursuant to FAA’s “Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration” (also known as FAA Form 7460-1), will require responsible parties to submit to FAA Form 7460-1 for approval prior to installations. This requirement is codified at Title 14, Part 77.9 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The management of FAA protected air space, with regard to height restriction, is applicable to tall equipment, such as cranes, that may be used during construction. FAA Form 7460-1 and criteria for its submittal can be found at the following website:

   https://ocean.faa.gov/ocean/external/portal.jsp

3. The crane operation of all cranes in the harbor including the new cranes that are included in the subject proposal should be stored in the lowest possible position when not in use. Crane operational use should be coordinated with HNL Air Traffic Control Tower (ACTC).
4. The applicant and subsequent developers need to be aware of the duties of the State and County agencies to implement the Technical Advisory Memo related to this project and all projects within 5 miles of an airport:


Harbors Division (DOT-HAR)

The DOT-HAR strongly supports this action to modernize its Commercial harbors. Transpacific shippers like Matson Inc. are constructing new “Aloha” class vessels that will be introduced to Hawaii in the next few years. The proposed improvements are in order to service these new container ship vessels that are expected as early as 2018. With regard to the proposed improvements, it is required that Matson:

1. Complete its impacts analysis for the structural integrity of the existing pier superstructure to carry additional loads. Matson shall ensure they continue to coordinate plans and specifications for its improvements with the DOT-HAR.

2. Submit complete plans and obtain all approvals necessary to meet the DOT-HAR’s requirements and its Capital Advancement Contract requirements in accordance with Hawaii Revised Statutes 266-19.5.

3. The diesel generator could be considered a “stationary source” requiring an Air Emissions permit and subject to reporting requirements to the Department of Health (DOH), Clean Air Branch. Recommend that Matson contact the DOH to determine if a Clear Air permit is required before the fixed generators are operational.

4. Matson and its contractor(s) must comply with a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) NOI-C permit requirement administered by the DOH, Clean Water Branch (CWB) if this project disturbs an area greater than one (1) acre per Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) 11-5 Appendix C. The NOI-C permit application include preparation and submission of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the CWB for review and approval. Additionally, Matson and its contractor(s) will be required to submit documents required by the DOT-HAR Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) for Honolulu Harbor. Such documents include: a Construction Site Design Review Checklist, a Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practice (BMP) Plan Checklist, a Post-Construction Stormwater Mitigation Plan and a Permit to Discharge into the State Harbors Drainage System, as applicable. Matson and its contractor(s) will be required to perform self-inspections by their NPDES permit. The site will also be subject to initial, regular and final BMP inspection by the State in accordance with the SWMP.
5. If the total project disturbs less than one (1) acre, it will not be subject to the NPDES program requirements. In this case, Matson and its contractor(s) will still have to comply with the DOT-HAR SWMP which will require the preparation of a site-specific BMP plan for review and approval by the State prior to commencement of the project. Other SWMP document requirements include a Notification Form for a Project Site Disturbing Less Than One Acre and a Permit Application to Discharge into the State Harbors Drainage System, if applicable.

Highways Division (DOT-HWY)

A Traffic Assessment (TA) will be required.

1. The TA should include a brief description of how the improvements will (if it does) affect the types of vehicles and the number of trips that the improved facility will generate as well as conservatively estimate the impact of the improved facilities. This will provide context for the rest of the TA.

2. The TA should also examine and discuss the departure and arrival points for the trucks to the pier facilities to/from Sand Island Access Road (State Route 64) regarding their adequacy, in their current configuration, for the continued operation of the improved pier complex, otherwise improvements should be recommended as required.

3. The TA shall also include the Professional Engineer (PE) stamp of the Traffic Engineer who wrote/supervised the creation of the TA.

If there are any questions, please contact Mr. Norren Kato of the DOT Statewide Transportation Planning Office at telephone number (808) 831-7976.

Sincerely,

FORD N. FUCHIGAMI
Director of Transportation
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Mr Ford N. Fuchigami
Director of Transportation
Department of Transportation
State of Hawai‘i
869 Punchbowl Street
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813-5097

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Fuchigami:

Thank you for your letter dated March 30, 2017 (STP 8.2100) regarding the subject project. We would like to provide the following response to your letter.

**Airports Division (DOT-AIR)**

1. We acknowledge that the project area is located approximately 1.8 miles from the departure end of runways 8L and 8R of the Daniel K. Inouye International Airport (HNL), formerly known as the Honolulu International Airport.

2. On April 3, 1991, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) issued Matson a Determination of No Hazard under 14 CFR Part 77. This determination was for a height of 309 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). With the original determination for 309 feet AMSL cranes on Sand Island in 1991, a condition was imposed that Matson, in concert with FAA’s Honolulu Control Facility (HCF), establish a letter of agreement when the cranes were operated at full height. This was accomplished and over a period of two decades, the letter of agreement was modified several times. On January 11, 2010 Matson received a letter from the Manager of the HCF rescinding the letter of agreement with no further action required on the part of Matson. The gantry cranes operated by Matson operate at this height today and do so based on this determination.

Based on the need for new cranes and related infrastructure, Matson applied for new determinations on October 22, 2014. The height filed for these determinations was 329 feet AMSL, 20 feet higher than the no hazard determinations issued back in 1991. The FAA determined that a public notice would be required to fully consider Matson’s request. This public notice was issued on February 3, 2015. This comment period was open to both the HDOT and airline industry at HNL. On July 7, 2015, Matson received Determinations of No Hazard to
operate cranes at a height of 329 feet AMSL. These determinations have no special requirement for coordination with the Honolulu HCF.

Through this entire process, Matson has enlisted the support of a professional consultant, familiar with rules applicable to United States Code Title 49 and 14 CFR Part 77.

3. We appreciate the information provided pertaining to the Technical Advisory Memo (TAM) related to this and all projects within 5 miles of an airport and understand the duties of the State and County agencies to implement the TAM.

Harbors Division (DOT-HAR)

1. A structural analysis has been performed in order for the existing pier superstructure to carry additional loads. As such, Matson will continue to coordinate plans and specifications for its improvements with the DOT-HAR.

2. Complete plans will be submitted and all approvals will be obtained as necessary to meet the DOT-HAR’s requirements and its Capital Advancement Contract requirements in accordance with Hawai’i Revised Statutes 266-19.5.

3. If required, we will work cooperatively with the Department of Health to fulfill applicable regulatory requirements before the generator sets are operational.

4. We acknowledge a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) may be required for the proposed project. We intend to work cooperatively with the Department of Health toward fulfilling applicable regulatory requirements.

Highways Division (DOT-HWY)

1. A Traffic Assessment (TA) has been prepared for the proposed project. The study concluded that no long term impacts on traffic are anticipated with the project. Proposed improvements are not expected to generate additional trips to the project vicinity due to shifting industry trends towards longer containers which is expected to keep constant or possibly slightly decrease the total number of containers processed at the site. Recommended measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on traffic include:
   i. Provide sufficient turning radii at the cargo driveway to accommodate all vehicles to avoid or minimize vehicle encroachments to oncoming traffic lanes.
   ii. Provide adequate space for on-site vehicle queuing to accommodate the anticipated changes in vehicle volume and size accessing the site.
iii. Consider preparing a Traffic Management Plan for the Matson terminal to formalize procedures to ensure that on-site operations and queuing do not affect the adjacent public roadways.

The proposed improvements are not expected to generate additional trips to the project vicinity. With the implementation of the aforementioned recommendations, the traffic operations in the project vicinity are expected to remain similar to existing conditions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Your Letter Dated February 10, 2017 Requesting Comments on the Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation for Matson Terminal Improvements on Sand Island - Tax Map Key: 1-5-041: 111 & 313

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed pier improvement project.

The existing water system is adequate to accommodate the proposed development. However, please be advised that this information is based upon current data, and therefore, the Board of Water Supply reserves the right to change any position or information stated herein up until the final approval of the building permit application. The final decision on the availability of water will be confirmed when the building permit application is submitted for approval.

The on-site fire protection requirements should be coordinated with the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Honolulu Fire Department.

If you have any questions, please contact Robert Chun, Project Review Branch of our Water Resources Division at 748-5443.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

ERNEST Y. W. LAU, P.E.
Manager and Chief Engineer
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ernest Y. W. Lau, P.E.
Manager and Chief Engineer
Board of Water Supply
City and County of Honolulu
630 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96843

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Lau:

Thank you for your letter dated February 24, 2017 regarding the subject project. We appreciate your preliminary review of the ability of the existing water system to accommodate the proposed development and understand that a final decision on the availability of water will be confirmed upon further review of the project. It should be noted that no additional demand on the existing water system is anticipated with the proposed project.

We intend to coordinate with the Honolulu Fire Department regarding on-site fire protection requirements.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 14, 2017

Wilson Okamoto Corporation
Attn: Rebecca Candilasa
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, HI 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa,

Subject: Matson Terminal Improvements (Pier 51 B/C, 52 and 53)
Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation
Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. The Department of Design and Construction has no comments at this time.

If you have any other questions please call me at 768-8480.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Kroning, P.E.
Director

RJK:ms(680237)
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Mr. Robert J. Kroning, P.E.
Director
Department of Design and Construction
City and County of Honolulu
650 South King Street, 11th Floor
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Kroning:

Thank you for your letter dated March 14, 2017 regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that the Department of Design and Construction does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 8, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53), Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii

The City and County of Honolulu Department of Environmental Services has reviewed your letter received by our office on February 13, 2017. We have the following comments:

1. Please note that our Hart Street Wastewater Pump Station Force Mains run beneath the Matson Terminal Improvements site, see enclosed figure. The presence and location of the force mains should be disclosed in the Environmental Assessment.

2. Due to the Hart Street Wastewater Pump Station Force Mains beneath the Matson Terminal Improvements site, the Environmental Assessment should describe measures to ensure that the force mains are protected from potential ground movement activities such as pile driving, excavations, soil stock piling, soil compaction, etc.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please call Lisa Kimura, Civil Engineer, at 768-3455. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lori M.K. Kahikina, P.E.
Director

Enclosure

cc: DPP, SDD, Wastewater Branch
    ENV, CSM
October 12, 2017

Ms. Lori M. K. Kahikina, P.E.
Director
Department of Environmental Services
City and County of Honolulu
1000 Uluohia Street, Suite 308
Kapolei, Hawai‘i 96707

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Kahikina:

Thank you for your letter dated March 8, 2017 (PRO 17-022) regarding the subject project. We would like to provide the following response to your letter.

We acknowledge that the Hart Street Wastewater Pump Station Force Main run beneath the project site. New piles are proposed to be installed along the landside girder of Piers 51 to 53. The project will be designed to avoid adverse effects on existing wastewater facilities from pile driving, soil stock piling, soil compaction and other ground movement activities.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 2, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53) Environmental Assessment Pre-Assessment Consultation Honolulu, O'ahu, Hawai'i

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide our input regarding your letter dated February 10, 2017, on the above subject project.

We have no comments at this time, as we do not have any facilities or easements on the subject property.

If you have any questions, please call Mr. Kyle Oyasato of the Division of Road Maintenance at 768-3697.

Sincerely,

Ross S. Sasamura, P.E.
Director and Chief Engineer
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ross S. Sasamura, P.E.
Director and Chief Engineer
Department of Facility Maintenance
City and County of Honolulu
1000 Uluohia Street, Suite 215
Kapolei, Hawaiʻi 96707

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, Oʻahu, Hawaiʻi

Dear Mr. Sasamura:

Thank you for your letter dated March 2, 2017 (DRM 17-109) regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that the Department of Facility Maintenance does not have any specific comments at this time.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

cc: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 15, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment Consultation for Environmental Assessment
Matson Terminal Improvements (Pier 51 B/C, 52 and 53
Honolulu, Hawaii)

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment at the pre-assessment consultation for the Environmental Assessment.

The Department of Parks and Recreation has no comment as the proposed project will have no impact on any program or facility of the Department. You may remove us as a consulted party.

Should you have any questions, please contact John Reid, Planner at 768-3017.

Sincerely,

Michele K. Nekota
Director

MKN:jr
(880243)
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Ms. Michele K. Nekota
Director
Department of Parks and Recreation
City and County of Honolulu
1000 Uluohia Street, Suite 309
Kapolei, Hawai‘i 96707

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Nekota:

Thank you for your letter dated March 15, 2017 regarding the subject project. We appreciate your review of the project and acknowledge that the Department of Parks and Recreation does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 6, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

SUBJECT: Pre-Assessment Consultation  
Draft Environmental Assessment  
Matson Terminal Improvement (New Gantry Cranes)  
Piers 51 B/C, 52 and 53 - Sand Island  
Tax Map Keys 1-5-41:111, 185, 313, 320, and 321

This responds to your request for comments on the forthcoming Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA), which is to be prepared for the above Project.

We note that the proposed terminal improvements and the replacement of four of the seven existing gantry cranes will require a Special Management Area Use Permit, pursuant to Chapter 25, Revised Ordinances of Honolulu (ROH). The Project will also require a Zoning Variance for structures which exceed the 60-foot height limit in this I-3 Waterfront Industrial District pursuant to Chapter 21, ROH. We also request that a section of the DEA include a discussion on sea level rise and its possible implications on the overall operation of the Sand Island Matson Terminal. We will provide further comment when the draft document is submitted.

Should you have any questions, please contact Steve Tagawa of our staff at 768-8024.

Very truly yours,

Kathy K. Sokugawa,  
Acting Director
Ms. Kathy K. Sokugawa  
Acting Director  
Department of Planning and Permitting  
City and County of Honolulu  
650 South King Street, 7th Floor  
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)  
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Ms. Sokugawa:

Thank you for your letters dated March 6, 2017 (2017/ELOG-364(ST)) and October 2, 2017 (2017/ELOG-364(ST)) regarding the subject project. We appreciate the information on permitting requirements, and we will work with the Department of Planning and Permitting on complying with applicable permitting requirements.

As noted in your letter, you requested consideration of sea level rise and its possible implications on the overall operation of the Sand Island Matson Terminal. According to the Center for Island Climate Adaptation and Policy, Hawai‘i is expected to experience sea-level rise by one foot by 2050 and three feet by the end of the century. The project site sits at approximately 9 feet above mean sea level. Therefore, a rise in sea levels by three feet is unlikely to adversely affect overall operation of the Sand Island Matson Terminal. However, if sea level rise were to exceed these predicted values, possible impacts may include submersion of harbor infrastructure; weakened drainage systems that remove storm water runoff from harbor facilities; and delayed shipments, higher shipping costs, and loss of operational time. To avoid or minimize the potential for these events to occur, DOT-HAR is engaged in efforts to develop adaptation strategies to address the long-term impacts of climate change. This includes collaborating with other agencies and incorporating climate change adaptation into harbor master plans and designs.

After consultation and review of possible project impacts, the State of Hawai‘i Department of Transportation has determined that the project is exempt from preparation of an Environmental Assessment under the Exemption Class noted below.

- Exemption Class 2, replacement or reconstruction of existing structures and facilities where the new structure will be located, generally on the same site, and will have substantially the same purpose, capacity, density, height and dimensions as the structure replaced. Item No. 5,
replacement or repair of existing deteriorated and/or damaged structures to their original/better condition within areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation such as piers, mooring buoys, single story office buildings, warehouses, sheds, comfort station, and shelters.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 7, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Environmental Assessment Preassessment Consultation
Matson Terminal Improvements
Honolulu, Hawaii

In response to your letter dated February 10, 2017, regarding the above-mentioned subject, the Honolulu Fire Department (HFD) requires that the following be complied with:

1. Fire department access roads shall be provided such that any portion of the facility or any portion of an exterior wall of the first story of the building is located not more than 150 feet (46 m) from fire department access roads as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. (National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] 1; Uniform Fire Code [UFC]™, 2012 Edition, Section 18.2.3.2.2.)

A fire department access road shall extend to within 50 feet (15 m) of at least one exterior door that can be opened from the outside and that provides access to the interior of the building. (NFPA 1; UFC™, 2012 Edition, Section 18.2.3.2.1.)

2. A water supply approved by the county, capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection, shall be provided to all premises upon which facilities or buildings, or portions thereof, are hereafter constructed, or moved into or within the county. When any portion of the facility or building is in excess of 150 feet (45 720 mm) from a
water supply on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains capable of supplying the required fire flow shall be provided when required by the AHJ [Authority Having Jurisdiction]. (NFPA 1; UFC™, 2012 Edition, Section 18.3.1, as amended.)

3. The unobstructed width and unobstructed vertical clearance of a fire apparatus access road shall meet county requirements. (NFPA 1; UFC™, 2012 Edition, Section 18.2.3.4.1.1 and 18.2.3.4.1.2, as amended.)

4. Submit civil drawings to the HFD for review and approval.

Should you have questions, please contact Acting Battalion Chief Jarin Wong of our Fire Prevention Bureau at 723-7151 or jwong@honoolulu.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SOCRATES D. BRATAKOS
Assistant Chief

$DB/SY:hh
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Mr. Socrates D. Bratakos
Assistant Chief
Honolulu Fire Department
City and County of Honolulu
636 South Street
Honolulu, Hawai’i 96813-5007

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O’ahu, Hawai’i

Dear Mr. Bratakos:

Thank you for your letter dated March 7, 2017 regarding the subject project. We acknowledge that the project is required to comply with all applicable codes and standards of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1 Uniform Fire Code (UFC)™, 2012 Edition, including standards related to access roads and water supply. In addition, civil drawings will be submitted for Honolulu Fire Department review and approval during the design phase of the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
February 21, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner
Wilson Okamoto Corporation
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

This is in response to your letter of February 10, 2017, requesting comments on an Pre-Assessment Consultation, Environmental Assessment, for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53) project.

Based on the information provided, this project should have no significant impact on the services or operations of the Honolulu Police Department at this time.

If there are any questions, please call Major Crizalmer Caraang of District 5 (Kalihi) at 723-8202.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project.

Sincerely,

CARY OKIMOTO
Acting Chief of Police

By
MARK TSUYEMURA,
Management Analyst VI
Office of the Chief
October 12, 2017

Mr. Cary Okimoto
Acting Chief of Police
Police Department
City and County of Honolulu
801 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Okimoto:

Thank you for your letter dated February 21, 2017 regarding the subject project. We appreciate your review of the project and note that this project should have no significant impact on the services or operations of the Honolulu Police Department at this time.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

cc: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
March 3, 2017

Ms. Rebecca Candilasa  
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 South Beretania Street, Suite 400  
Honolulu, HI 96826  

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject project. Hawaiian Electric Company has no objection to the project. Should HECO have existing easements and facilities on the subject property, we will need continued access for maintenance of our facilities.

We appreciate your efforts to keep us apprised of the subject project in the planning process. As the proposed Matson Terminal Improvements Project comes to fruition, please continue to keep us informed. Further along in the design, we will be better able to evaluate the effects on our system facilities. If you have any questions, please call me at 543-7245.

Sincerely,

Rouen Q.W. Liu  
Permits Engineer

RL:kmk

Enclosure

cc: Alan Oshima
10278-01
October 12, 2017

Mr. Rouen Q. W. Liu
Permits Engineer
Hawaiian Electric Company
P.O. Box 2750
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96840-0001

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Mr. Liu:

Thank you for your letter dated March 3, 2017 regarding the subject project. We appreciate your review of the project and note that Hawaiian Electric Company (HECO) has no objection to the project. We, in coordination with DOT-Harbors, will ensure continued access for maintenance of your facilities should there be any existing easements and facilities on the subject property. We also intend to keep HECO informed further along in the design process in order to better evaluate the effects of the project on your system facilities.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.
Wilson Okamoto Corporation  
1907 S. Beretania Street  
Artesian Plaza, Suite 400  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96826  
Attention: Ms. Rebecca Candilasa, Planner

Dear Ms. Candilasa:

Subject: Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51 B/C, 52, and 53)  
Environmental Assessment (EA) Pre-Assessment Consultation  
Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the environmental assessment pre-assessment consultation phase for the subject project.

In response to your letter dated February 10, 2017 that was addressed to Mr. Scott Barber, Hawaiian Telcom does not have any comments to offer at this time.

Please submit all future correspondence to:

Hawaiian Telcom, Inc.  
Senior Manager – Network Development  
Mail Code: HIA10  
P.O. Box 2200  
Honolulu, HI 96841

If you have any questions or require assistance in the future on this project, please call me at 546-7761.

Sincerely,

Les Loo  
Network Engineer – OSP Engineering  
Network Engineering & Planning

cc: File
October 12, 2017

Hawaiian Telcom, Inc.
Senior Manager – Network Development
Mail Code: HIA10
P.O. Box 2200
Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96841

Subject: Consultation for the Matson Terminal Improvements (Piers 51, 52, and 53)
Honolulu, O‘ahu, Hawai‘i

Dear Sir / Madam:

Thank you for your letter dated March 7, 2017 regarding the subject project. We appreciate your review of the project and acknowledge that Hawaiian Telcom does not have any specific comments or concerns at this time.

Sincerely,

Earl Matsukawa, AICP
Project Manager

c: Paul Johnescu, Matson Terminals, Inc.